

PARTNERRE LTD  
Form 10-K  
February 27, 2014  
Table of Contents

**UNITED STATES**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Washington, D.C. 20549

**FORM 10-K**

x **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**

.. **TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**  
**For the transition period from                      to**

**Commission file number 1-14536**

**PartnerRe Ltd.**

**(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)**

Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

<b>Bermuda</b> (State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)	<b>Not Applicable</b> (I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)
<b>90 Pitts Bay Road, Pembroke, Bermuda</b> (Address of principal executive offices)	<b>HM 08</b> (Zip Code)
<b>(441) 292-0888</b> (Registrant's telephone number, including area code)	

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

<b>Title of each class</b>	<b>Name of each exchange on which registered</b>
<b>Common Shares, \$1.00 par value</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange, Bermuda Stock Exchange</b>
<b>6.50% Series D Cumulative Preferred Shares,</b> <b>\$1.00 par value</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange</b>
<b>7.25% Series E Cumulative Preferred Shares,</b> <b>\$1.00 par value</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange</b>
<b>5.875% Series F Non-Cumulative Preferred Shares,</b> <b>\$1.00 par value</b>	<b>New York Stock Exchange</b>

**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 Securities Act. Yes  No

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  No

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  No

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 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes  No

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K 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.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

Large accelerated filer  Accelerated filer   
Non-accelerated filer  Smaller reporting company

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

The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of the most recently completed second fiscal quarter (June 30, 2013) was \$4,928,998,593 based on the closing sales price of the registrant's common shares of \$90.56 on that date.

The number of the registrant's common shares (par value \$1.00 per share) outstanding, net of treasury shares, as of February 21, 2014 was 51,645,126.

### Documents Incorporated by Reference:

#### Document

Portions of the registrant's definitive proxy statement to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to Regulation 14A under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, relating to the registrant's Annual General Meeting of Shareholders scheduled to be held May 14, 2014 are incorporated by reference into Part II and Part III of this report. With the exception of the portions of the Proxy Statement specifically incorporated herein by reference, the Proxy Statement is not deemed to be filed as part of this report.

#### Part(s) Into Which Incorporated

**Table of Contents****TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>PART I</b>	
Item 1. <u>Business</u>	2
Item 1A. <u>Risk Factors</u>	37
Item 1B. <u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	57
Item 2. <u>Properties</u>	57
Item 3. <u>Legal Proceedings</u>	57
Item 4. <u>Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	58
<b>PART II</b>	
Item 5. <u>Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	59
Item 6. <u>Selected Financial Data</u>	61
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>	147
Item 8. <u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	156
Item 9. <u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	219
Item 9A. <u>Controls and Procedures</u>	219
Item 9B. <u>Other Information</u>	222
<b>PART III</b>	
Item 10. <u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	222
Item 11. <u>Executive Compensation</u>	222
Item 12. <u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	222
Item 13. <u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u>	224
Item 14. <u>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u>	224
<b>PART IV</b>	
Item 15. <u>Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules</u>	225

**Table of Contents**

**SPECIAL NOTE REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS**

PartnerRe Ltd. has made statements under the captions Business, Risk Factors, Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations, particularly under the captions 2014 Outlook (or similarly captioned sections) and in other sections of this annual report on Form 10-K that are forward-looking statements. In some cases, you can identify these statements by forward-looking words such as may, might, will, should, expects, plans, anticipates, believes, estimates, predicts, potential, or continue, the negative of comparable terminology. These forward-looking statements, which are subject to risks, uncertainties and assumptions about us, may include projections of our future financial performance, our anticipated growth strategies and anticipated trends in our business. These statements are only predictions based on our current expectations and projections about future events. There are important factors that could cause our actual results, level of activity, performance or achievements to differ materially from the results, level of activity, performance or achievements expressed or implied by the forward-looking statements, including those factors described under the caption entitled Risk Factors. You should specifically consider the numerous risks outlined under Risk Factors.

Although we believe the expectations reflected in the forward-looking statements are reasonable, we cannot guarantee future results, level of activity, performance or achievements. Moreover, neither we nor any other person assumes responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of any of these forward-looking statements. We are under no duty to update any of these forward-looking statements after the date of this annual report on Form 10-K to conform our prior statements to actual results or revised expectations.

---

**Table of Contents**

**PART I**

**ITEM 1. BUSINESS**

**General**

PartnerRe Ltd., incorporated in Bermuda in August 1993, is the ultimate holding company for our international reinsurance and insurance group (collectively, the Company, PartnerRe or we). The Company predominantly provides reinsurance and certain specialty insurance lines on a worldwide basis through its principal wholly-owned subsidiaries, including Partner Reinsurance Company Ltd. (PartnerRe Bermuda), Partner Reinsurance Europe SE (PartnerRe Europe) and Partner Reinsurance Company of the U.S. (PartnerRe U.S.). Risks reinsured include, but are not limited to, property, casualty, motor, agriculture, aviation/space, catastrophe, credit/surety, engineering, energy, marine, specialty property, specialty casualty, multiline and other lines, mortality, longevity, accident and health and alternative risk products. The Company's alternative risk products include weather and credit protection to financial, industrial and service companies on a worldwide basis.

In 1997, recognizing the limitation of a monoline strategy, the Company shifted its strategic focus to become a leading multiline reinsurer. In July 1997, the Company completed the acquisition of SAFR (subsequently renamed PartnerRe SA and reinsurance business transferred into PartnerRe Europe), a well-established global professional reinsurer based in Paris. In December 1998, the Company completed the acquisition of the reinsurance operations of Winterthur Re, further enhancing the Company's expansion strategy. In December 2009, the Company completed the acquisition of PARIS RE Holdings Limited (Paris Re), a French-listed, Swiss-based holding company and its operating subsidiaries. This acquisition provided the Company with enhanced strategic and financial flexibility in a less predictable and more limited growth environment.

Effective December 31, 2012, the Company completed the acquisition of Presidio Reinsurance Group, Inc. (subsequently renamed and referred herein as PartnerRe Health), a California-based U.S. specialty accident and health reinsurance and insurance writer. The Consolidated Statements of Operations and Cash Flows include PartnerRe Health's results from January 1, 2013.

**Business Strategy**

The Company is in the business of assessing and assuming risk for an appropriate return. The Company creates value through its ability to understand, evaluate, diversify and distribute risk. Its strategy is founded on a capital-based risk appetite and the selected risks that Management believes will allow the Company to meet its goals for appropriate profitability and risk management within that appetite. Management believes that this construct allows the Company to balance cedants' need for confidence of claims payment with its shareholders' need for an appropriate return on their capital. Compound annual growth rate in diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding plus dividends is the prime metric used by Management to measure the Company's performance. Other important measures include operating earnings or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders, operating earnings or loss per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (diluted operating earnings or loss per share) and operating return on beginning diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Operating ROE). See Key Financial Measures in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a detailed discussion of the key measures used by the Company to evaluate its financial performance, including definitions and basis of calculation.

The Company has adopted the following five-point strategy:

*We are diversified across products and insurance markets:* PartnerRe writes most lines of reinsurance and writes selected specialty insurance lines of business to further diversify its earnings stream and to provide access to risks that position the Company for future growth. Management believes diversification is a competitive advantage, which increases return per unit of risk, provides access to risk worldwide and reduces the overall volatility of results. Diversification is also the cornerstone of the Company's risk management approach. The (re)insurance business is cyclical, but cycles by line of business and by geography are rarely synchronized.

---

## **Table of Contents**

*We have an appetite for risk provided it helps us deliver superior risk-adjusted returns:* PartnerRe's products address accumulation risks, complex coverage issues and large exposures faced by clients. The Company's book of business is focused on severity lines of business such as casualty, catastrophe, specialized property and aviation. The Company is willing to assume such above average risk, but only if the pricing implies significantly above average risk-adjusted returns. The Company's diversification enables it to assume risks that are individually large for our clients, but are more easily diversified within PartnerRe's portfolio. The Company also writes frequency lines of business such as standard property, motor and life, which have historically provided modestly lower levels of returns with less volatility.

*We manage our capital to optimize long-term returns while maintaining an appropriate risk profile:* PartnerRe's business is cyclical and the Company responds to that reality. The Company seeks to manage its capital to optimize shareholder returns over the reinsurance cycle, but it will not unbalance the portfolio by writing only the business that offers the highest return at any point in time. In order to manage capital appropriately across a portfolio and over a reinsurance cycle, the Company believes two things are critical: an appropriate and common measure of risk-adjusted performance and the ability and willingness to redeploy capital for its most efficient and effective use, either within the business or by returning capital to shareholders. To achieve effective and efficient capital allocation, the Company uses Operating ROE as a portfolio management tool, supported by strong actuarial and financial analysis.

*We create value through superior risk evaluation and intelligent portfolio and relationship management:* The Company's technical underwriting, actuarial and portfolio management skills enable the Company to create value by understanding, valuing, diversifying, and distributing risk. The Company's objective is overall portfolio profitability. The aim is not to select a few highly profitable transactions in any year, but to build sustainable portfolios that can deliver superior returns over several years. While our primary focus is assuming risk for our own account, we are open to intermediating risk in order to optimize our retained portfolio and enhance overall returns.

*We enhance overall returns through prudent financial and investment management and an efficient support framework:* Strong underwriting must be complemented with prudent financial management, careful reserving, superior asset management and efficient support in order to achieve the Company's targeted returns. The Company's principal business is the assumption of reinsurance and insurance risk and, when selecting asset strategies and support services, the Company's priority is to support the reinsurance operations. The Company is willing to take some additional risk on its assets if it helps us generate extra return, but this risk-taking is managed so that it will not put at risk the reinsurance operations. We will not use insurance or reinsurance as a means of raising funds to pursue other goals.

## **Reinsurance and Insurance Operations**

### ***General***

The Company provides reinsurance and certain specialty insurance lines for its clients in approximately 150 countries around the world. The Company's principal offices are located in Hamilton (Bermuda), Dublin, Greenwich (Connecticut), Paris and Zurich.

Through its subsidiaries and branches, the Company provides reinsurance or insurance of non-life and life risks to ceding companies (primary insurers, cedants or reinsureds). Reinsurance is offered on either a proportional or non-proportional basis through treaties or facultative reinsurance.

In a proportional (or quota share) treaty reinsurance agreement, the reinsurer assumes a proportional share of the original premiums and losses incurred by the cedant. The reinsurer pays the ceding company a commission, which is generally based on the ceding company's cost of acquiring the business being reinsured (including commissions, premium taxes, assessments and miscellaneous administrative expenses) and may also include a profit.

**Table of Contents**

In a non-proportional (or excess of loss) treaty reinsurance agreement the reinsurer indemnifies the reinsured against all or a specified portion of losses on underlying insurance policies in excess of a specified amount, which is called a retention or attachment point. Non-proportional business is written in layers and a reinsurer or group of reinsurers accepts a band of coverage up to a specified amount. The total coverage purchased by the cedant is referred to as a program and is typically placed with predetermined reinsurers in pre-negotiated layers. Any liability exceeding the upper limit of the program reverts to the ceding company.

In a facultative (proportional or non-proportional) reinsurance agreement the reinsurer assumes individual risks. The reinsurer separately rates and underwrites each risk rather than assuming all or a portion of a class of risks as in the case of treaty reinsurance.

In addition, the Company provides certain specialty insurance lines of business, which include certain business written in aviation, energy, engineering, marine, specialty casualty, specialty property, health and other lines.

The Company monitors the performance of its operations in three segments, Non-life, Life and Health and Corporate and Other. Segments and the sub-segments of the Company's Non-life segment represent markets that are reasonably homogeneous in terms of geography, client types, buying patterns, underlying risk patterns and approach to risk management. The composition of the Non-life and Life and Health segments is described in more detail below. Corporate and Other is comprised of the capital markets and investment related activities of the Company, including principal finance transactions, insurance-linked securities and strategic investments, and its corporate activities, including other operating expenses. See also the description of the Company's segments and sub-segments as well as a discussion of how the Company measures its segment results in Note 21 to Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 8 of Part II of this report.

The Company's gross premiums written by segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012	2011
Non-life segment	\$ 4,590	\$ 3,910	\$ 3,831
Life and Health segment	972	802	790
Corporate and Other segment	8	6	12
Total	\$ 5,570	\$ 4,718	\$ 4,633

The Company's Non-life and Life and Health business is geographically diversified with premiums being written on a worldwide basis. See Note 21 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report for additional disclosure of the geographic distribution of gross premiums written and financial information about segments and sub-segments.

***Non-life Segment***

The Non-life segment is divided into four sub-segments, North America, Global (Non-U.S.) Property and Casualty (Global (Non-U.S.) P&C), Global Specialty and Catastrophe. The North America sub-segment includes agriculture, casualty, credit/surety, motor, multiline, property and other risks generally originating in the U.S. The Global (Non-U.S.) P&C sub-segment includes casualty, motor and property business generally originating outside of the U.S. The Global Specialty sub-segment is comprised of business that is generally considered to be specialized due to the sophisticated technical underwriting required to analyze risks, and is global in nature. This sub-segment consists of several lines of business for which the Company believes it has developed specialized knowledge and underwriting capabilities. These lines of business include agriculture, aviation/space, credit/surety, energy, engineering, marine, specialty casualty, specialty property and other lines. The Catastrophe sub-segment is comprised of the Company's catastrophe line of business.

**Table of Contents**

The gross premiums written in each of the Company's Non-life sub-segments for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Non-life sub-segment	2013		2012		2011	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
North America	\$ 1,601	35%	\$ 1,221	31%	\$ 1,104	29%
Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	818	18	684	18	682	18
Global Specialty	1,676	36	1,505	38	1,446	38
Catastrophe	495	11	500	13	599	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,590</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 3,910</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 3,831</b>	<b>100%</b>

The gross premiums written in each Non-life sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, and the year over year comparisons, are described in Results by Segment in Item 7 of Part II of this report.

*Lines of Business*

The gross premiums written by line of business in the Company's Non-life segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Line of business	2013		2012		2011	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Property and casualty						
Casualty	\$ 660	14%	\$ 594	15%	\$ 510	13%
Motor	365	8	240	6	229	6
Multiline and other	211	4	117	3	71	2
Property	670	15	655	17	676	18
Specialty						
Agriculture	627	14	311	8	292	8
Aviation / Space	231	5	244	6	235	6
Catastrophe	495	11	500	13	599	15
Credit / Surety	354	8	327	8	326	8
Energy	91	2	101	3	115	3
Engineering	225	5	179	5	189	5
Marine	360	8	363	9	334	9
Specialty casualty	140	3	102	3	108	3
Specialty property	161	3	177	4	147	4
<b>Total Non-life segment</b>	<b>\$ 4,590</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 3,910</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 3,831</b>	<b>100%</b>

Gross premiums written and the distribution of gross premiums written by line of business written in the Non-life segment vary between periods as a result of changes in the allocation of capital among lines of business driven by the Company's response to market conditions and risk assessment, the timing of renewals of treaties, a change in treaty structure, premium adjustments reported by cedants, foreign exchange fluctuations and other factors.

The following discussion summarizes the business written in each line of business in the Company's Non-life segment.

*Agriculture* The Company reinsures, primarily on a proportional basis, agricultural yield and price/revenue risks related to flood, drought, hail and disease related to crops, livestock and aquaculture.

*Aviation/Space* The Company provides specialized reinsurance and insurance protection for airline, general aviation and space business. The reinsurance is provided primarily on a proportional basis and through facultative arrangements. The space business relates to coverages for satellite assembly, launch and operation for commercial space programs.



## **Table of Contents**

*Casualty* The Company's casualty business includes third party liability, employers' liability, workers' compensation and personal accident coverages written on both a proportional and non-proportional basis, including structured reinsurance of casualty risks.

*Catastrophe* The Company provides property catastrophe reinsurance protection, written primarily on a non-proportional basis, against the accumulation of losses caused by windstorm, earthquake, tornado, tropical cyclone, flood or by any other natural hazard that is covered under a comprehensive property policy. Through the use of underwriting tools based on proprietary computer models developed by its research team, the Company combines natural science with highly professional underwriting skills in order to offer capacity at a price commensurate with the risk.

*Credit/Surety* The Company provides credit reinsurance, written primarily on a proportional basis, to mortgage guaranty insurers and commercial credit insurers. The Company's surety line relates primarily to bonds and other forms of security written by specialized surety insurers, and is written primarily on a proportional basis.

*Energy (Energy Onshore)* The Company provides reinsurance and insurance coverage for the onshore oil and gas industry, mining, power generation and pharmaceutical operations. The reinsurance is provided predominantly on a proportional basis and through facultative arrangements.

*Engineering* The Company provides reinsurance and insurance for engineering projects throughout the world. The reinsurance is offered mainly on a proportional basis and through facultative arrangements.

*Marine (Marine/Energy Offshore)* The Company provides reinsurance and insurance protection and technical services relating to marine hull, cargo, transit and offshore oil and gas operations. The reinsurance is offered predominantly on a proportional basis and through facultative arrangements.

*Motor* The Company's motor business includes reinsurance coverages for third party liability and property damage risks arising from both passenger and commercial fleet automobile coverages written by cedants. This business is written predominantly on a proportional basis.

*Multiline* The Company's multiline business provides both property and casualty reinsurance coverages written on both a proportional and non-proportional basis and whole account coverages written on a proportional basis.

*Property* Property business provides reinsurance coverage to insurers for property damage or business interruption losses resulting from fires, catastrophes and other perils covered in industrial and commercial property and homeowners' policies and is written on both a proportional and non-proportional basis. The Company's most significant exposure is typically to losses from windstorm, tornado and earthquake, although the Company is exposed to losses from sources as diverse as freezes, riots, floods, industrial explosions, fires, hail and a number of other loss events. The Company's predominant exposure under these property coverages is to property damage. However, other risks, including business interruption and other non-property losses may also be covered under a property reinsurance contract when arising from a covered peril. In accordance with market practice, the Company's property reinsurance treaties generally exclude certain risks such as war, nuclear, biological and chemical contamination, radiation and environmental pollution.

*Specialty Casualty* The Company provides specialized reinsurance and insurance protection primarily for non-U.S. casualty business that requires specialized underwriting expertise due to the nature of the underlying risk. The reinsurance protection is offered on a proportional, non-proportional or facultative basis.

*Specialty Property* The Company provides specialized reinsurance and insurance protection primarily for non-U.S. property business that requires specialized underwriting expertise due to the nature of the underlying risk. The reinsurance protection is offered on a proportional, non-proportional or facultative basis.

**Table of Contents**

*Distribution*

The Company's Non-life business is produced both through brokers and through direct relationships with insurance companies. In North America, business is primarily written through brokers, while in the rest of the world, the business is written on both a direct and broker basis.

For the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company had two brokers that individually accounted for 10% or more of its total Non-life gross premiums written: Marsh (including Guy Carpenter) accounted for approximately 25% of total Non-life gross premiums written; and the Aon Group (including the Benfield Group) accounted for approximately 24% of total Non-life gross premiums written.

The combined percentage of gross premiums written through these two brokers by Non-life sub-segment for the year ended December 31, 2013 was as follows:

<b>Non-life sub-segment</b>	<b>2013</b>
North America	60%
Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	29
Global Specialty	41
Catastrophe	74

*Competition*

The Company competes with other reinsurers and certain insurers, some of which have greater financial, marketing and management resources than the Company, and it also competes with new market entrants, and, specifically in the catastrophe line of business, with alternative capital sources and insurance-linked securities. Competition in the types of reinsurance and insurance that the Company underwrites is based on many factors, including the perceived and relative financial strength, pricing and other terms and conditions, services provided, ratings assigned by independent rating agencies, speed of claims payment and reputation and experience in the lines of business to be written.

The Company's competitors include independent reinsurance companies, subsidiaries or affiliates of established worldwide insurance companies, reinsurance departments of certain primary insurance companies and, specifically in the catastrophe line of business, alternative capital sources and insurance-linked securities. Management believes that the Company's major competitors are the larger European, U.S. and Bermuda-based international reinsurance companies, as well as specialty reinsurers and regional companies in certain local markets. These competitors include, but are not limited to, Munich Re, Swiss Re, Everest Re, Hannover Re, SCOR and reinsurance operations of certain primary insurance companies, such as ACE, Arch Capital, Axis Capital and XL Group.

Management believes the Company ranks among the world's largest professional reinsurers and is well positioned in terms of client services and highly technical underwriting expertise. Management also believes that the Company's global franchise and diversified platform, which allows the Company to provide broad risk solutions across many lines of business and geographies, is increasingly attractive to cedants who are choosing to utilize fewer reinsurers and focus on those reinsurers who can cover more than one line of business. Furthermore, the Company's capitalization and strong financial ratios allow the Company to offer security to its clients.

***Life and Health Segment***

*Lines of Business*

The Company's Life and Health segment includes the mortality, longevity and health lines of business written primarily in the United Kingdom (U.K.), Ireland and France and, following the acquisition of PartnerRe Health on December 31, 2012, accident and health business written in the U.S. Gross premiums written for the Life and Health segment presented below include premiums written by PartnerRe Health from January 1, 2013.

**Table of Contents**

The gross premiums written by line of business in the Company's Life and Health segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars) were as follows:

Line of business	2013		2012		2011	
Accident and health	\$ 144	15%	\$ 21	2%	\$ 21	3%
Longevity	249	26	247	31	203	25
Mortality	579	59	534	67	566	72
Total Life and Health segment	\$ 972	100%	\$ 802	100%	\$ 790	100%

The gross premiums written in the Life and Health segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, and the year over year comparisons, are described in Results by Segment in Item 7 of Part II of this report.

The following discussion summarizes the business written in the Company's Life and Health segment by line of business.

*Accident and health* The Company provides reinsurance coverage to primary life insurers with respect to individual and group health risks. PartnerRe Health writes specialty accident and health business, predominantly in the U.S., including Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO) reinsurance, medical reinsurance and provider and employer excess of loss programs.

*Longevity* The Company provides reinsurance coverage to employer sponsored pension schemes and primary life insurers who issue annuity contracts offering long-term retirement benefits to consumers, who seek protection against outliving their financial resources. Longevity business is written on a long-term, proportional basis primarily in the U.K. The Company's longevity portfolio is subdivided into standard and non-standard annuities. The non-standard annuities are annuities sold to consumers with aggravated health conditions and are usually medically underwritten on an individual basis. The main risk the Company is exposed to by writing longevity business is an increase in the future life span of the insured compared to the expected life span.

*Mortality* The Company provides reinsurance coverage to primary life insurers and pension funds to protect against individual and group mortality and disability risks. Mortality business is written primarily on a proportional basis through treaty agreements. Mortality business is subdivided into death and disability covers (with various riders) primarily written in Continental Europe, term assurance and critical illness (TCI) primarily written in the U.K. and Ireland, and guaranteed minimum death benefit (GMDB) primarily written in Continental Europe. The Company also writes certain treaties on a non-proportional basis, primarily in France.

Other than gross premiums written, Management uses reinsurance business in force to measure the growth of the Company's mortality business. Reinsurance business in force reflects the addition or acquisition of new mortality business, offset by terminations (e.g., voluntary surrenders of underlying life insurance policies, lapses of underlying policies, deaths of insureds, and the exercises of recapture option by cedants), changes in foreign exchange, and any other changes in the amount of insurance in force. The term "in force" refers to the aggregate insurance policy face amounts, or net amounts at risk. The net assumed business in force for the mortality line of business, including health, was \$210 billion, \$212 billion and \$198 billion at December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. While the business in force at December 31, 2013 is comparable to 2012, the increase in business in force to \$212 billion at December 31, 2012 from \$198 billion at December 31, 2011 was primarily driven by TCI business written in the U.K. and growth in exposure on certain small to medium sized mortality treaties.

*Distribution*

The Company's Life and Health business is produced both through brokers and through direct relationships with insurance companies. For the year ended December 31, 2013, one cedant accounted for 11% of the Life and Health segment's total gross premiums written and one broker, the Aon Group (including the Benfield Group), accounted for 11% of the Life and Health segment's total gross premiums written. No other cedant or broker contributed more than 10% of the Life and Health segment's total gross premiums written.

**Table of Contents***Competition*

The Company's competition differs by location but generally includes multi-national reinsurers and local reinsurers or state-owned insurers in the U.K., Ireland and Continental Europe for its mortality and longevity lines of business. The competition specifically related to the PartnerRe Health business generally includes other specialty accident and health insurance and reinsurance providers in the U.S. and departments of worldwide insurance and reinsurance companies.

**Reserves***General*

Loss reserves represent estimates of amounts an insurer or reinsurer ultimately expects to pay in the future on claims incurred at a given time, based on facts and circumstances known at the time that the loss reserves are established. It is possible that the total future payments may exceed, or be less than, such estimates. The estimates are not precise in that, among other things, they are based on predictions of future developments and estimates of future trends in claim severity, frequency and other variable factors such as inflation. During the loss settlement period, it often becomes necessary to refine and adjust the estimates of liability on a claim either upward or downward. Despite such adjustments, the ultimate future liability may exceed or be less than the revised estimates.

As part of the reserving process, insurers and reinsurers review historical data and anticipate the impact of various factors such as legislative enactments and judicial decisions that may affect potential losses from casualty claims, changes in social and political attitudes that may increase exposure to losses, mortality and morbidity trends and trends in general economic conditions. This process assumes that past experience, adjusted for the effects of current developments, is an appropriate basis for anticipating future events.

See Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a discussion of the Company's reserving process.

*Non-life Reserves*

At December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Company recorded gross Non-life reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses of \$10,646 million and \$10,709 million, respectively, and net Non-life reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses of \$10,379 million and \$10,418 million, respectively.

The reconciliation of the net Non-life reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012	2011
Net liability at beginning of year	<b>\$ 10,418</b>	\$ 10,920	\$ 10,318
Net incurred losses related to:			
Current year	<b>3,119</b>	2,786	4,252
Prior years	<b>(721)</b>	(628)	(530)
	<b>2,398</b>	2,158	3,722
Change in Paris Re Reserve Agreement	<b>(50)</b>	(86)	(61)
Net paid losses	<b>(2,402)</b>	(2,705)	(2,991)
Effects of foreign exchange rate changes	<b>15</b>	131	(68)
Net liability at end of year	<b>\$ 10,379</b>	\$ 10,418	\$ 10,920

Net Non-life reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses of \$10,418 million at December 31, 2012 and \$10,379 million at December 31, 2013 were comparable and reflect the payment of losses, which was partially offset by net losses incurred. The decrease in net Non-life reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses from

**Table of Contents**

\$10,920 million at December 31, 2011 to \$10,418 million at December 31, 2012 primarily reflects the payment of losses in 2012, which was partially offset by net losses incurred and the impact of foreign exchange. The high level of loss payments during the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011 included a significant level of payments related to the catastrophic events that occurred in 2011, including the Japan earthquake and resulting tsunami (Japan Earthquake), the New Zealand earthquakes that occurred in February and June 2011 (the February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes), the floods that impacted Thailand following unusually heavy monsoon rains in October 2011 (Thailand Floods), tornadoes that caused severe destruction to large areas of southern, mid-western and northeastern United States in April and May 2011 (U.S. tornadoes) and the floods in Queensland, Australia (Australian Floods) (collectively, 2011 catastrophic events).

The net incurred losses for the year ended December 31, 2013 relating to the current and prior accident years by Non-life sub-segment were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	North America	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	Global Specialty	Catastrophe	Total Non-life segment <sup>(1)</sup>
Net incurred losses related to:					
Current year	\$ 1,198	\$ 553	\$ 1,147	\$ 223	\$ 3,121
Net prior year favorable loss development	(223)	(180)	(227)	(91)	(721)
Total net incurred losses	\$ 975	\$ 373	\$ 920	\$ 132	\$ 2,400

(1) In addition to the current year net incurred losses in the Non-life segment of \$3,121 million were current year net recoveries of \$2 million related to the Corporate and Other segment, resulting in total net incurred losses of \$2,398 million.

The net favorable loss development on prior accident years of \$721 million for the year ended December 31, 2013 primarily resulted from favorable loss emergence, as losses reported by cedants were lower than expected. The most significant drivers of the Non-life net prior year favorable loss development during the year ended December 31, 2013 were the casualty line of business in the North America sub-segment, the property line of business in the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C sub-segment, the Catastrophe sub-segment and the aviation and marine lines of business in the Global Specialty sub-segment. See Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations for a more detailed discussion of net prior year favorable loss development by Non-life sub-segment and Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates Losses and Loss Expenses and Life Policy Benefits in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a discussion of the net prior year favorable loss development by reserving lines for the Company's Non-life operations.

**Reserve Agreement**

On December 21, 2006, Colisée Re (formerly known as AXA RE), a subsidiary of AXA SA (AXA) transferred substantially all of its assets and liabilities, other than specified reinsurance and retrocession agreements and certain other excluded assets and liabilities, to PARIS RE Holdings SA's French operating subsidiary Paris Re France (AXA Transfer) (Paris Re France). The AXA Transfer was immediately followed by the acquisition by Paris Re of all the outstanding capital stock of Paris Re France (AXA Acquisition). In connection with the AXA Acquisition, AXA, Colisée Re and Paris Re entered into various agreements (2006 Acquisition Agreements).

On the closing of the AXA Acquisition, AXA, Colisée Re and Paris Re France entered into a reserve agreement (Reserve Agreement). The Reserve Agreement provides that AXA and Colisée Re shall guarantee reserves in respect of Paris Re France and subsidiaries acquired in the AXA Acquisition. The Reserve Agreement covers losses incurred prior to December 31, 2005, including any adverse development in respect thereof, by the subsidiaries of Colisée Re transferred to Paris Re France as part of the 2006 Acquisition Agreements, in respect of reinsurance policies issued or renewed, and in respect of which premiums were earned, on or prior to December 31, 2005 (but excluding any amendments thereto effected after the closing of the 2006 Acquisition Agreements).

**Table of Contents**

Pursuant to the Reserve Agreement, AXA has agreed to cause AXA Liabilities Managers, an affiliate of Colisée Re (AXA LM), to provide Paris Re France with periodic reports setting forth the amount of losses incurred in respect of the business guaranteed by AXA. The reserve guarantee provided by AXA and Colisée Re is conditioned upon, among other things, the guaranteed business, including all related ceded reinsurance, being managed by AXA LM. The Reserve Agreement further contemplates that Colisée Re or Paris Re France, as the case may be, shall pay to the other party amounts equal to any deficiency or surplus in the transferred reserves with respect to losses incurred, such losses being net of any recovery by Colisée Re including through retrocessional protection, salvage or subrogation. During the year ended December 31, 2012, pursuant to the terms of the Reserve Agreement with Colisée Re, the Company settled the payable to Colisée Re of approximately \$265 million based on the estimated cumulative balance of net favorable prior year loss development related to the guaranteed reserves. The settlement was funded by the sale of assets underlying the funds held directly managed account.

See Financial Condition, Liquidity and Capital Resources Funds Held Directly Managed in Item 7 of Part II and Note 8 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report for more detail.

The rights and obligations of AXA LM with respect to the management of this business are set forth in a run off services and management agreement among AXA LM, Colisée Re and Paris Re France (Run Off Services and Management Agreement). Under the Run Off Services and Management Agreement, Paris Re has agreed that AXA LM will manage claims arising from all reinsurance and retrocession contracts subject to the Reserve Agreement, either directly or, for contracts that were issued by certain Colisée Re entities identified in the agreement, by delegation to certain other specified entities, including Paris Re France. This includes contract administration, the administration of ceded reinsurance, claims handling, settlements and business commutations. Although Paris Re France has certain consultation rights in connection with the management of the run-off of the contracts subject to the Reserve Agreement, AXA LM does not need to obtain Paris Re France's prior consent in connection with claims handling and settlements, and no consent is required for business commutations if the amount of case reserves related to commuted contracts does not exceed 100 million in any twelve month period.

On October 1, 2010, PartnerRe Europe and Paris Re France effected a cross border merger whereby all the assets and liabilities of Paris Re France were transferred to PartnerRe Europe, including the agreements between Paris Re France and Colisée Re.

*Changes in Non-life Reserves*

The gross, retroceded and net reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses for the Company's Non-life business, and the portion of the gross, retroceded and net reserves that relates to the reserves subject to the Reserve Agreement (Guaranteed Reserves), at December 31, 2013 and 2012 were as follows (in thousands of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012
Gross reserves	<b>\$ 10,646,318</b>	\$ 10,709,371
Less: Guaranteed Reserves	<b>732,386</b>	864,116
Gross reserves, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	<b>9,913,932</b>	9,845,255
Retroceded reserves	<b>267,384</b>	291,330
Less: Guaranteed Reserves	<b>5,549</b>	7,375
Retroceded reserves, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	<b>261,835</b>	283,955
Net reserves	<b>\$ 10,378,934</b>	\$ 10,418,041
Net reserves, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	<b>\$ 9,652,097</b>	\$ 9,561,300

**Table of Contents**

The reconciliation of the net paid losses related to prior years and the net paid losses related to prior years, excluding the paid losses for the Guaranteed Reserves, for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in thousands of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012	2011
Net paid losses related to prior years	<b>\$ 2,159,506</b>	\$ 2,467,279	\$ 2,060,152
Less: net paid losses on Guaranteed Reserves	<b>82,997</b>	90,407	136,885
<b>Net paid losses related to prior years, excluding Guaranteed Reserves</b>	<b>\$ 2,076,509</b>	\$ 2,376,872	\$ 1,923,267

The Guaranteed Reserves have been excluded from the following tables that analyze the development of the Company's net reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses for the Company's Non-life business given the Reserve Agreement covers any adverse or favorable development related to the reserves acquired by Paris Re in the AXA Acquisition, and therefore, they have no impact on the development of the Company's gross and net reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses.

The development of net reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses for the Company's Non-life business, excluding Guaranteed Reserves, is shown in the following table. The table begins by showing the initial reported year-end gross and net reserves, including incurred but not reported (IBNR) reserves, recorded at the balance sheet date for each of the ten years presented.

The next section of the table shows the re-estimated amount of the initial reported net reserves, excluding Guaranteed Reserves, for up to ten subsequent years, based on experience at the end of each subsequent year. The re-estimated net liabilities reflect additional information, received from cedants or obtained through reviews of industry trends, regarding claims incurred prior to the end of the preceding financial year. A redundancy (or deficiency) arises when the re-estimation of reserves is less (or greater) than its estimation at the preceding year-end. The cumulative redundancies (or deficiencies) reflect cumulative differences between the initial reported net reserves and the currently re-estimated net reserves. Annual changes in the estimates are reflected in the income statement for each year as the liabilities are re-estimated. Reserves denominated in foreign currencies are revalued at each year-end's foreign exchange rates.

The lower section of the table shows the portion of the initial year-end net reserves, excluding Guaranteed Reserves, that were paid (claims paid) as of the end of subsequent years. This section of the table provides an indication of the portion of the re-estimated net liability that is settled and is unlikely to develop in the future. Claims paid are converted to U.S. dollars at the average foreign exchange rates during the year of payment and are not revalued at the current year foreign exchange rates. Because claims paid in prior years are not revalued at the current year's foreign exchange rates, the difference between the cumulative claims paid at the end of any given year and the immediately previous year represents the claims paid during the year.

**Table of Contents****Development of Loss and Loss Expense Reserves (Excluding Guaranteed Reserves subject to the Reserve Agreement)**

(in thousands of U.S. dollars)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 <sup>(1)</sup>	2010	2011	2012	2013
Gross liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	\$ 4,755,059	\$ 5,766,629	\$ 6,737,661	\$ 6,870,785	\$ 7,231,436	\$ 7,510,666	\$ 9,248,529	\$ 9,379,028	\$ 10,234,291	\$ 9,845,255	\$ 9,913,932
Retroceded liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	175,685	153,018	185,280	138,585	132,479	125,215	270,938	300,648	325,841	283,955	261,835
<b>Net liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses, excluding Guaranteed Reserves</b>	<b>\$ 4,579,374</b>	<b>\$ 5,613,611</b>	<b>\$ 6,552,381</b>	<b>\$ 6,732,200</b>	<b>\$ 7,098,957</b>	<b>\$ 7,385,451</b>	<b>\$ 8,977,591</b>	<b>\$ 9,078,380</b>	<b>\$ 9,908,450</b>	<b>\$ 9,561,300</b>	<b>\$ 9,652,097</b>
<b>Net liability re-estimated, excluding Guaranteed Reserves at:</b>											
One year later	4,688,964	5,006,767	6,602,832	6,715,107	6,343,714	7,076,796	8,354,221	8,505,130	9,409,795	8,853,321	
Two years later	4,301,161	5,044,922	6,618,112	6,165,297	6,009,194	6,686,926	7,877,438	8,076,932	8,885,350		
Three years later	4,373,992	5,092,289	6,168,445	5,897,044	5,674,509	6,351,663	7,595,556	7,751,543			
Four years later	4,494,182	4,845,644	6,002,031	5,645,132	5,409,460	6,195,352	7,346,493				
Five years later	4,315,702	4,731,856	5,802,799	5,436,353	5,282,511	6,074,551					
Six years later	4,264,865	4,595,232	5,627,952	5,323,062	5,200,087						
Seven years later	4,171,108	4,467,678	5,551,669	5,264,917							
Eight years later	4,091,315	4,426,580	5,507,151								
Nine years later	4,069,743	4,399,890									
Ten years later	4,054,308										
<b>Cumulative net redundancy</b>	<b>\$ 525,066</b>	<b>\$ 1,213,721</b>	<b>\$ 1,045,230</b>	<b>\$ 1,467,283</b>	<b>\$ 1,898,870</b>	<b>\$ 1,310,900</b>	<b>\$ 1,631,098</b>	<b>\$ 1,326,837</b>	<b>\$ 1,023,100</b>	<b>\$ 707,979</b>	
<b>Cumulative amount of net liability paid through:</b>											
One year later	\$ 1,120,756	\$ 1,250,534	\$ 1,718,996	\$ 1,473,964	\$ 1,340,788	\$ 1,716,798	\$ 2,094,379	\$ 1,923,267	\$ 2,376,872	\$ 2,076,509	
Two years later	1,573,312	1,821,773	2,482,695	2,116,025	1,971,376	2,448,950	2,983,833	2,872,951	3,494,429		
	1,948,203	2,207,692	2,948,837	2,581,022	2,470,068	2,991,497	3,599,683	3,548,021			

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

Three years later							
Four years later	2,219,506	2,511,446	3,273,808	2,932,356	2,818,018	3,359,297	4,060,903
Five years later	2,439,361	2,721,266	3,534,003	3,183,573	3,070,717	3,636,744	
Six years later	2,589,798	2,898,779	3,713,402	3,349,279	3,268,994		
Seven years later	2,717,665	3,043,151	3,834,448	3,494,055			
Eight years later	2,820,421	3,128,606	3,940,622				
Nine years later	2,883,674	3,215,722					
Ten years later	2,954,513						

- (1) Paris Re's liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses is included at December 31, 2009 for the first time. For years prior to 2009, this table excludes the reserves of the Paris Re companies acquired. Accordingly, the reserve development (net liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses at the end of the year, as originally estimated, less net liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses re-estimated as of subsequent years) for years prior to 2009 relates only to losses recorded by PartnerRe and subsidiaries not acquired in the Paris Re acquisition.

**Table of Contents**

The reconciliation of the Company's re-estimated gross year-end reserves with the re-estimated net year-end reserves at December 31, 2013 provided above was as follows (in thousands of U.S. dollars):

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Reconciliation of gross reserves:</b>										
Gross liability re-estimated, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	\$ 4,191,170	\$ 4,501,893	\$ 5,675,079	\$ 5,365,170	\$ 5,284,625	\$ 6,181,258	\$ 7,559,903	\$ 7,999,446	\$ 9,175,054	\$ 9,151,846
Re-estimated retroceded liability, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	136,862	102,003	167,928	100,253	84,538	106,707	213,410	247,903	289,704	298,525
Net liability re-estimated, excluding Guaranteed Reserves	\$ 4,054,308	\$ 4,399,890	\$ 5,507,151	\$ 5,264,917	\$ 5,200,087	\$ 6,074,551	\$ 7,346,493	\$ 7,751,543	\$ 8,885,350	\$ 8,853,321

<b>Cumulative gross redundancy</b>	<b>\$ 563,889</b>	<b>\$ 1,264,736</b>	<b>\$ 1,062,582</b>	<b>\$ 1,505,615</b>	<b>\$ 1,946,811</b>	<b>\$ 1,329,408</b>	<b>\$ 1,688,626</b>	<b>\$ 1,379,582</b>	<b>\$ 1,059,237</b>	<b>\$ 693,409</b>
------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------

The Company's reserve development is composed of the change in ultimate losses from what the Company originally estimated as well as the impact of the foreign exchange revaluation on reserves. The Company conducts its reinsurance operations in a variety of non-U.S. currencies and records its net reserves in the currency of the treaty, with the principal exposures being the euro, Canadian dollar, British pound, New Zealand dollar and Australian dollar. The impact of reporting the Company's net reserves based on the foreign exchange rates at the balance sheet date can be a significant component of the cumulative redundancy or deficiency in net reserves and in some years can be the principal component. The amount of foreign exchange included in the cumulative net redundancy reported above as well as the net redundancy excluding the impact of foreign exchange movements on net reserves were as follows (in thousands of U.S. dollars):

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Cumulative net redundancy</b>	<b>\$ 525,066</b>	<b>\$ 1,213,721</b>	<b>\$ 1,045,230</b>	<b>\$ 1,467,283</b>	<b>\$ 1,898,870</b>	<b>\$ 1,310,900</b>	<b>\$ 1,631,098</b>	<b>\$ 1,326,837</b>	<b>\$ 1,023,100</b>	<b>\$ 707,979</b>
Less: Cumulative net (deficiency) redundancy due to foreign exchange	(223,456)	99,106	(443,122)	(211,177)	270,484	(122,583)	95,473	(55,111)	(131,168)	(13,520)

<b>Cumulative net redundancy excluding the impact of foreign exchange</b>	<b>\$ 748,522</b>	<b>\$ 1,114,615</b>	<b>\$ 1,488,352</b>	<b>\$ 1,678,460</b>	<b>\$ 1,628,386</b>	<b>\$ 1,433,483</b>	<b>\$ 1,535,625</b>	<b>\$ 1,381,948</b>	<b>\$ 1,154,268</b>	<b>\$ 721,499</b>
---	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Movements in foreign exchange rates between accounting periods have typically resulted in significant variations in the Company's loss reserves as the U.S. dollar, the Company's reporting currency, appreciated/depreciated against multiple currencies. The Company, however, generally holds investments in the same currencies as its net reserves, or enters into derivative foreign exchange contracts, with the intent of matching the

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

foreign exchange movements on its assets and liabilities. See Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk contained in Item 7A of Part II of this report for a more detailed discussion of the foreign currency risk of the Company's assets and liabilities.

**Table of Contents**

The Company believes that in order to enhance the understanding of its reserve development, it is useful for investors to evaluate the Company's reserve development excluding the impact of foreign exchange. The development of initial net reserves converted at each year's average foreign exchange rates is shown in the following table (in thousands of U.S. dollars). Using the historical average foreign exchange rates for the development lines of the table has the effect of linking each year's development with that year's income statement. This table should not be considered as a substitute for the table provided above as it does not reflect a significant portion of the initial net reserve development that is due to foreign exchange revaluation.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Net liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses, excluding Guaranteed Reserves</b>	<b>\$ 4,579,374</b>	<b>\$ 5,613,611</b>	<b>\$ 6,552,381</b>	<b>\$ 6,732,200</b>	<b>\$ 7,098,957</b>	<b>\$ 7,385,451</b>	<b>\$ 8,977,591</b>	<b>\$ 9,078,380</b>	<b>\$ 9,908,450</b>	<b>\$ 9,561,300</b>
<b>Net liability re-estimated, excluding Guaranteed Reserves at:</b>										
One year later	4,440,338	5,382,101	6,300,633	6,318,157	6,681,021	6,899,642	8,499,708	8,547,923	9,280,385	8,839,801
Two years later	4,298,493	5,232,707	6,023,025	6,014,782	6,222,150	6,597,688	8,052,350	8,035,622	8,754,182	
Three years later	4,223,937	5,076,765	5,774,643	5,640,480	5,961,748	6,300,375	7,705,719	7,696,432		
Four years later	4,178,131	4,972,632	5,521,034	5,451,479	5,738,024	6,098,886	7,441,966			
Five years later	4,118,436	4,794,445	5,376,045	5,278,886	5,575,292	5,951,968				
Six years later	4,012,792	4,704,184	5,232,117	5,132,300	5,470,571					
Seven years later	3,958,493	4,604,022	5,126,778	5,053,740						
Eight years later	3,901,891	4,541,584	5,064,029							
Nine years later	3,860,518	4,498,996								
Ten years later	3,830,852									
<b>Cumulative net redundancy</b>	<b>\$ 748,522</b>	<b>\$ 1,114,615</b>	<b>\$ 1,488,352</b>	<b>\$ 1,678,460</b>	<b>\$ 1,628,386</b>	<b>\$ 1,433,483</b>	<b>\$ 1,535,625</b>	<b>\$ 1,381,948</b>	<b>\$ 1,154,268</b>	<b>\$ 721,499</b>

**Table of Contents***Other P&C Exposures*

The Company's reserve for unpaid losses and loss expenses at December 31, 2013 includes reserves that are difficult to estimate using traditional reserving methodologies. See Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates Losses and Loss Expenses and Life Policy Benefits in Item 7 of Part II of this report for additional information and discussion of the uncertainties and complexities related to the Japan Earthquake and the New Zealand earthquakes that occurred in 2010 and in February and June 2011 (the 2010 and the February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes) and the Company's exposure to claims arising from asbestos and environmental exposures.

There can be no assurance that the reserves established by the Company will not be adversely affected by development of other latent exposures, and further, there can be no assurance that the reserves established by the Company will be adequate. However, they represent Management's best estimate for ultimate losses based on available information at this time.

*Life and Health Reserves*

At December 31, 2013 and 2012, the Company recorded gross policy benefits for life and annuity contracts of \$1,974 million and \$1,813 million, respectively, and net policy benefits for life and annuity contracts of \$1,967 million and \$1,793 million, respectively.

The reconciliation of the net policy benefits for life and annuity contracts for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2011</b>
Net liability at beginning of year	<b>\$ 1,793</b>	\$ 1,636	\$ 1,736
Net liability acquired related to PartnerRe Health		54	
Net incurred losses related to:			
Current year	<b>800</b>	661	651
Prior years	<b>(39)</b>	(14)	(1)
	<b>761</b>	647	650
Net policy benefits restructured by a cedant			(131)
Net paid losses	<b>(626)</b>	(594)	(588)
Effects of foreign exchange rate changes	<b>39</b>	50	(31)
Net liability at end of year	<b>\$ 1,967</b>	\$ 1,793	\$ 1,636

The increase in net policy benefits for life and annuity contracts from \$1,793 million at December 31, 2012 to \$1,967 million at December 31, 2013 is primarily due to net incurred losses and the impact of foreign exchange, which were partially offset by paid losses. The net incurred losses for the Company's Life and Health reserves will generally exceed net paid losses in any one given year due to the long-term nature of the liabilities and the growth in the book of business.

For the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company experienced net prior year favorable loss development related to its mortality line of business of \$39 million, which was primarily due to the GMDDB business and, to a lesser extent, certain short-term treaties in the mortality line of business. There was no prior year loss development in 2013 related to the Company's longevity line of business.

**Table of Contents**

The Company's gross policy benefits for life and annuity contracts by line of business and ceded and net policy benefits for life and annuity contracts at December 31, 2013 and 2012 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Line of business	2013	2012
Accident and health	\$ 99	\$ 74
Longevity	556	525
Mortality	1,319	1,214
Gross policy benefits for life and annuity contracts	1,974	1,813
Ceded policy benefits for life and annuity contracts	(7)	(20)
Net policy benefits for life and annuity contracts	\$ 1,967	\$ 1,793

**Investments and Investments underlying the Funds Held Directly Managed Account**

The Company has developed specific investment objectives and guidelines for the management of its investment portfolio and the investments underlying the funds held directly managed account (see below for details). These objectives and guidelines stress diversification of risk, matching of the underlying liability payments, low credit risk and stability of portfolio income. Despite the prudent focus of these objectives and guidelines, the Company's investments are subject to general market risk, as well as to risks inherent in particular securities.

The Company's investment strategy is largely consistent with previous years. To ensure that the Company will have sufficient assets to pay its clients' claims, the Company's investment philosophy distinguishes between those assets, including the investments underlying the funds held directly managed account, that are matched against existing liabilities (liability funds) and those that represent shareholders' equity (capital funds). Liability funds are invested in high quality fixed income securities and cash and cash equivalents. Capital funds are available for investing in a broadly diversified portfolio, which includes investments in preferred and common stocks, private bond and equity investments, investment grade and below investment grade securities and other asset classes that offer potentially higher returns.

**Investments**

The Company's investment portfolio, excluding the funds held directly managed account which is discussed below, includes fixed maturities, short-term investments and equities that are classified as trading securities and recorded at fair value, and other invested assets. The carrying values of the Company's investments at December 31, 2013 and 2012 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012	
Fixed maturities				
U.S. government and government sponsored enterprises	\$ 1,624	11%	\$ 1,131	7%
U.S. states, territories and municipalities	124	1	243	1
Non-U.S. sovereign government, supranational and government related	2,354	15	2,376	15
Corporate	6,049	40	6,656	42
Asset-backed securities	1,138	8	723	5
Residential mortgage-backed securities	2,268	15	3,200	20
Other mortgage-backed securities	36		66	
Total fixed maturities	\$ 13,593	90%	\$ 14,395	90%
Short-term investments	14		151	1
Equities	1,221	8	1,094	7
Other invested assets	321	2	333	2
Total investments	\$ 15,149	100%	\$ 15,973	100%

---

**Table of Contents**

(1) *In addition to the total investments shown in the above table of \$15.1 billion and \$16.0 billion at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively, the Company held cash and cash equivalents of \$1.5 billion and \$1.1 billion, respectively.*

The decrease in the fair value of the Company's fixed maturities at December 31, 2013 compared to December 31, 2012, primarily reflects the sale and maturity of fixed maturities to fund the Company's share repurchases and dividend payments and increases in U.S. and European risk-free interest rates. At December 31, 2013, there has been a shift in the distribution of the fixed maturity portfolio compared to December 31, 2012 as the Company decreased its holdings of corporate bonds and residential mortgage-backed securities (primarily due to narrowing credit spreads), and increased its holdings of U.S. government securities and asset-backed securities.

The overall average credit rating of the portfolio at December 31, 2013 was A, and 92% of the fixed maturities and short-term investments were rated investment grade (BBB- or higher) by Standard & Poor's. For further discussion of the composition of the investment portfolio, see Financial Condition, Liquidity and Capital Resources - Investments in Item 7 of Part II of this report.

The investment portfolio is divided and managed by strategy and legal entity. Each segregated portfolio is managed against a specific benchmark to properly control the risk of each portfolio as well as the aggregate risks of the combined portfolio. The performance of each portfolio and the aggregate investment portfolio is measured against several benchmarks to ensure that they have the appropriate risk and return characteristics.

In order to manage the risks of the investment portfolio, several controls are in place. First, the overall duration (interest rate risk) of the portfolio is managed relative to the duration of the net reinsurance liabilities, defined as reinsurance liabilities net of all reinsurance assets, so that the economic value of changes in interest rates have offsetting effects on the Company's assets and liabilities. Second, to ensure diversification and avoid aggregation of risks, limits on assets types, economic sector exposure, industry exposure and individual security exposure are placed on the investment portfolio. These exposures are monitored on an ongoing basis and reported at least quarterly to the Risk and Finance Committee of the Board of Directors (Board). See Risk Management below for a discussion of Market Risk, Interest Rate Risk and Default and Credit Spread Risk. See Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report for a discussion of the Company's interest rate, equity and foreign currency management strategies.

***Investments underlying the Funds Held - Directly Managed Account***

Following the AXA Acquisition, Paris Re France and certain subsidiaries entered into an Issuance Agreement with Colisée Re to enable Colisée Re to write business on behalf of Paris Re France between January 1, 2006 and September 30, 2007. In addition, effective January 1, 2006, Paris Re France and Colisée Re entered into 100% quota share retrocession agreements to transfer the benefits and risks of Colisée Re's reinsurance agreements to Paris Re and provide for the payment of premiums to Paris Re France in consideration for reinsuring the covered liabilities (the Quota Share Retrocession Agreement). The Quota Share Retrocession Agreement provides that these premiums will be on a funds withheld basis. Paris Re France will receive any surplus, and be responsible for any deficits remaining with respect to the funds held - directly managed account, after all liabilities have been discharged and payments pursuant to the Reserve Agreement have been settled. In addition, realized and unrealized investment gains and losses and net investment income related to the investment portfolio underlying the funds held - directly managed account inure to the benefit of Paris Re France. The investments underlying the funds held - directly managed account were predominantly maintained by Colisée Re in a segregated investment portfolio and managed by the Company. The Company's strategy related to the management of the funds held - directly managed account is as described above related to the Company's investment portfolio.

**Table of Contents**

The Company's investment portfolio underlying the funds held directly managed account includes fixed maturities and short-term investments that are recorded at fair value, and other invested assets. The carrying values of the investments underlying the funds held directly managed account at December 31, 2013 and 2012 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012	
Fixed maturities				
U.S. government and government sponsored enterprises	\$ 158	28%	\$ 219	26%
Non-U.S. sovereign government, supranational and government related	137	25	234	28
Corporate	249	44	362	44
Total fixed maturities	\$ 544	97	\$ 815	98
Short-term investments	2			
Other invested assets	15	3	18	2
Total investments	\$ 561	100%	\$ 833	100%

(1) In addition to the investments underlying the funds held directly managed account shown in the above table of \$561 million and \$833 million at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively, the funds held directly managed account also included cash and cash equivalents of \$85 million and \$54 million, respectively, accrued investment income of \$7 million and \$10 million, respectively, and other assets and liabilities held by Colisée Re related to the underlying business of \$133 million and \$34 million, respectively.

The decrease in the fair value of the investment portfolio underlying the funds held directly managed account at December 31, 2013 compared to December 31, 2012 was primarily related to the run-off of the underlying loss reserves associated with this account and increases in U.S. and European risk-free interest rates.

The overall average credit rating of the portfolio at December 31, 2013 was AA, and substantially all (more than 99%) of the fixed maturities were rated investment grade (BBB- or higher) by Standard & Poor's.

For further discussion of the composition of the investment portfolio underlying the funds held directly managed account, see Financial Condition, Liquidity and Capital Resources Funds Held Directly Managed in Item 7 of Part II of this report. The credit risk of Colisée Re in the event of its insolvency or its failure to honor the value of the funds held balances for any other reason is discussed in Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk Counterparty Credit Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report.

**Risk Management**

In the reinsurance industry, the core of the business model is the assumption and management of risk. A key challenge is to create total shareholder value through the intelligent and optimal assumption and management of reinsurance and investment risks while limiting and mitigating those risks that can destroy tangible as well as intangible value, those risks for which the organization is not sufficiently compensated, and those risks that could threaten the ability of the Company to achieve its objectives. While many companies start with a return goal and then attempt to shed risks that may derail that goal, the Company starts with a capital-based risk appetite and then looks for risks that meet its return targets within that framework. Management believes that this construct allows the Company to balance the cedants' need for certainty of claims payment with the shareholders' need for an adequate total return.

All business decisions entail a risk/return trade-off, and these decisions are applicable to the Company's risks. In the context of assumed business risks, this requires an accurate evaluation of risks to be assumed, and a determination of the appropriate economic returns required as fair compensation for such risks. In the context of other than voluntarily assumed business risks, the decision relates to comparing the probability and potential

## **Table of Contents**

severity of a risk event against the costs of risk mitigation strategies. In many cases, the potential impact of a risk event is so severe as to warrant significant, and potentially expensive, risk mitigation strategies. In other cases, the probability and potential severity of a risk does not warrant extensive risk mitigation.

The Company's results are primarily determined by how well the Company understands, prices and manages assumed risk. Management also believes that every organization faces numerous risks that could threaten the successful achievement of a company's goals and objectives. These include choice of strategy and markets, economic and business cycles, competition, changes in regulation, data quality and security, fraud, business interruption and management continuity; all factors which can be viewed as either strategic, financial, or operational risks that are common to any industry. See Risk Factors in Item 1A of Part I of this report.

The Company has a clearly defined governance structure for risk management. Executive Management and the Board are responsible for setting the overall vision and goals of the Company, which include the Company's risk appetite and return expectations. The Company's risk framework, including key risk policies, is recommended by Executive Management and approved by the Risk and Finance Committee of the Board (Risk and Finance Committee). Each of the Company's risk policies relates to a specific risk and describes the Company's approach to risk management, defines roles and responsibilities relating to the assumption, mitigation, and control processes for that risk, and an escalation process for exceptions. Key policies are established by the Chief Executive Officer and policies at the next level down are established by Business Unit and Support Unit management. Key policies are approved by the relevant Committee of the Board and other policies are approved by the Chief Executive Officer. Risk management policies and processes are coordinated by Group Risk Management and compliance is verified by Internal Audit on a periodic basis. The results of audits are monitored by the Audit Committee of the Board.

The Company utilizes a multi-level risk management structure, whereby critical exposure limits, return requirement guidelines, capital at risk and key policies are established by the Executive Management and Board, but day-to-day execution of risk assumption activities and related risk mitigation strategies are delegated to the Business Units and Support Units. Reporting on risk management activities is integrated within the Company's annual planning process, quarterly operations reports, periodic reports on exposures and large losses, and presentations to the Executive Management and Board. Individual Business Units and Support Units employ, and are responsible for reporting on, operating risk management procedures and controls, while Internal Audit periodically evaluates the effectiveness of such procedures and controls.

### ***Strategic Risks***

Strategic risks are managed by Executive Management and include the direction and governance of the Company, as well as its response to key external factors faced by the reinsurance industry, such as changes in cedants' risk retention behavior, regulation, competitive structure and macroeconomic, legal and social trends. Management considers that strong governance procedures, including a robust system of processes and internal controls is appropriate to manage risks related to its reputation and risks related to new initiatives, including acquisitions, new products or markets. The Company seeks to preserve its reputation through high professional and ethical standards and manages the impact of identified risks through the adoption and implementation of a sound and comprehensive Assumed Risk Framework.

---

## **Table of Contents**

### ***Assumed Risks***

Central to the Company's assumed risk framework is its risk appetite. The Company's risk appetite is a statement of how much and how often the Company will tolerate operating losses and economic losses during an annual period. The Company's risk appetite is expressed as the maximum operating loss and the maximum economic loss that the Board is willing to incur. The Company's risk appetite is approved by the Board on an annual basis. Definitions for the maximum operating loss, economic loss, maximum economic loss and economic capital are as follows:

*The Maximum Operating Loss.* The maximum operating loss is a loss expressed as a percentage of common shareholders' equity with a modeled probability of occurring once every 10 years and once every 100 years.

*Economic Loss.* The Company defines an economic loss as a decrease in the Company's economic value, which is defined as common shareholders' equity attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. plus the time value of money discount of the Non-life reserves that is not recognized in the consolidated financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States (U.S. GAAP), net of tax, plus the embedded value of the Life portfolio that is not recognized in the consolidated financial statements in accordance with U.S. GAAP, net of tax, less goodwill and intangible assets, net of tax.

*Economic Capital.* The Company defines economic capital as the economic value, as defined above, plus preferred shareholders' equity.

*The Maximum Economic Loss.* The maximum economic loss is a loss expressed as a percentage of economic capital with a modeled probability of occurring once every 10 years and once every 100 years.

The Company manages exposure levels from multiple risk sources to provide reasonable assurance that modeled operating or economic losses are contained within the risk appetite approved by the Board. The Company utilizes an internal model to evaluate capital at risk levels and compliance with the Company's risk appetite. The results of the Company's assessment of capital at risk levels in relation to the risk appetite are reported to the Board on a periodic basis.

To mitigate the chance of operating losses and economic losses exceeding the risk appetite, the Company relies upon diversification of risk sources and risk limits to manage exposures. Diversification enables losses from one risk source to be offset by profits from other risk sources so that the chance of overall losses exceeding the Company's risk appetite is reduced. However, if multiple losses from multiple risk sources occur within the same year, there is the potential that operating and economic losses can exceed the risk appetite. In addition, there is the chance that the Company's internal assessment of capital at risk for a single source of risk or for multiple sources of risk proves insufficient resulting in actual losses exceeding the Company's risk appetite. To reduce the chance of either of these unfavorable outcomes, the Company uses risk limits to minimize the chance that losses from a single risk source or from multiple risk sources will cause operating losses and economic losses to exceed the Company's risk appetite.

The Company establishes key risk limits for any risk source deemed by Management to have the potential to cause operating losses or economic losses greater than the Company's risk appetite. The Risk and Finance Committee approves the key risk limits. Executive and Business and Support Unit Management may set additional specific and aggregate risk limits within the key risk limits approved by the Risk and Finance Committee. The actual level of risk is dependent on current market conditions and the need for balance in the Company's portfolio of risks. On a quarterly basis, Management reviews and reports to the Risk and Finance Committee the actual limits deployed against the approved limits.

Individual Business and Support Units manage assumed risks, subject to the appetite and principles approved by the Board, limits approved by the Risk and Finance Committee, and policies established by Executive and Business Unit Management. At an operational level, Business and Support Units manage assumed

**Table of Contents**

risk through risk mitigation strategies including strong processes, technical risk assessment and collaboration among different groups of professionals who each contribute a particular area of expertise.

Management established key risk limits that are approved by the Risk and Finance Committee for the risk sources described below. During 2013, the Company added agriculture risk and mortgage reinsurance risk to its Risk Management framework. The risk limits for agriculture and mortgage reinsurance risks were approved by the Risk and Finance Committee. In addition, during 2013 the Company also refined its methodology to monitor interest rate risk related to the excess fixed income investment portfolio included in the Company's capital funds from previously monitoring interest rate risk related to the total fixed income portfolio. Accordingly, the comparatives at December 31, 2012 have not been provided for the two new risks and the new interest rate risk metric.

The limits approved by the Risk and Finance Committee and the actual limits deployed at December 31, 2013 and 2012 were as follows:

	December 31, 2013		December 31, 2012	
	Limit approved	Actual deployed	Limit approved	Actual deployed
Natural Catastrophe Risk	\$ 2.3 billion	\$ 1.5 billion	\$ 2.3 billion	\$ 1.6 billion
Long Tail Reinsurance Risk	\$ 1.2 billion	\$ 0.8 billion	\$ 1.2 billion	\$ 0.7 billion
Market Risk	\$ 3.4 billion	\$ 2.6 billion	\$ 3.4 billion	\$ 2.5 billion
Equity and equity-like sublimit	\$ 2.8 billion	\$ 1.8 billion	\$ 2.8 billion	\$ 1.7 billion
Interest Rate Risk (duration) excess fixed income investment portfolio <sup>(1)</sup>	6.0 years	1.5 years		
Interest Rate Risk (duration) total fixed income investment portfolio <sup>(2)</sup>			5.0 years	2.7 years
Default and Credit Spread Risk	\$ 9.5 billion	\$ 6.8 billion	\$ 9.5 billion	\$ 7.1 billion
Trade Credit Underwriting Risk	\$ 0.9 billion	\$ 0.7 billion	\$ 0.9 billion	\$ 0.6 billion
Longevity Risk	\$ 2.0 billion	\$ 1.2 billion	\$ 2.0 billion	\$ 1.1 billion
Pandemic Risk	\$ 1.3 billion	\$ 0.6 billion	\$ 1.3 billion	\$ 0.6 billion
Agriculture Risk	\$ 0.3 billion	\$ 0.1 billion		
Mortgage Reinsurance Risk	\$ 0.7 billion	\$ 0.2 billion		
Any one country sub-limit	\$ 0.5 billion	\$ 0.2 billion		

- (1) The excess fixed income investment portfolio relates to fixed income securities included in the Company's capital funds, which are in excess of those included in the Company's liability funds and which support the net reinsurance liabilities.
- (2) During 2013, the Company refined its methodology to monitor interest rate risk related to the excess fixed income investment portfolio included in the Company's capital funds from previously monitoring interest rate risk related to the total fixed income portfolio. Accordingly, the limit approved and the actual deployed at December 31, 2013 are not provided for the total fixed income portfolio.
- (3) The limits approved and the actual limits deployed in the table above are shown net of retrocession.
- Natural Catastrophe Risk

The Company defines this risk as the risk that the aggregate losses from natural perils materially exceed the net premiums that are received to cover such risks, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. The Company considers both catastrophe losses due to a single large event and catastrophe losses that would occur from multiple (but potentially smaller) events in any year.

Natural catastrophe risk is managed through the allocation of catastrophe exposure capacity in each exposure zone to different Business Units, regular catastrophe modeling and a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The Company considers a peril zone to be an area within a geographic region, continent or

---

## **Table of Contents**

country in which losses from insurance exposures are likely to be highly correlated to a single catastrophic event. Not all peril zones have the same limit and zones are broadly defined so that it would be unlikely for any single event to substantially erode the aggregate exposure limits from more than one peril zone. Even extremely high severity/low likelihood events will only partially exhaust the limits in any peril zone, as they are likely to only affect a part of the area covered by a wide peril zone.

The Company imposes a limit to natural catastrophe risk from any single loss through exposure limits, net of retrocession, in each zone and to each peril and also utilizes probable maximum loss estimates to manage its exposures to specific peril zones. Limits from catastrophe exposed business include limits on both reinsurance treaties and insurance-linked securities. Specifically, the Company uses the lesser of any contractually defined limits or the probable maximum loss per contract as the measure of capacity per treaty including proportional exposures for the key peak exposures. This capacity measure is aggregated by contract within a peril zone to establish the total exposures. Actual exposure limits deployed and estimated probable maximum loss in a specific peril zone will vary from period to period depending on Management's assessment of current market conditions, the results of the Company's exposure modeling, and other analysis. See Natural Catastrophe Probable Maximum Loss below for a discussion of the Company's estimated exposures for selected peak industry natural catastrophe perils at December 31, 2013.

### *Long Tail Reinsurance Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk that the estimates of ultimate losses for casualty and other long-tail lines will prove to be too low, leading to the need for substantial reserve strengthening, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. One of the greatest risks in long-tail lines of business, and particularly in U.S. casualty, is that loss trends are higher than the assumptions underlying the Company's ultimate loss estimates, resulting in ultimate losses that exceed recorded loss reserves. When loss trends prove to be higher than those underlying the reserving assumptions, the impact can be large because of an accumulation effect: for long-tail lines, the Company carries reserves to cover claims arising from several years of underwriting activity and these reserves are likely to be similarly affected by unfavorable loss trends. The effect is likely to be more pronounced for recent underwriting years because, with the passage of time, actual loss emergence and data provide greater confidence around the adequacy of ultimate liability estimates for older underwriting years. Management believes that the volume of long-tail business most exposed to these reserving uncertainties is limited.

The Company manages and mitigates the reserving risk for long-tail lines in a variety of ways. Underwriters and pricing actuaries follow a disciplined underwriting process that utilizes all available data and information, including industry trends, and the Company establishes prudent reserving policies for determining recorded reserves. These policies are systematic and Management endeavors to apply them consistently over time. The Company's limit for long tail reinsurance risk represents the written premiums for casualty and other long-tail lines for the four most recent calendar quarters. See Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates Losses and Loss Expenses and Life Policy Benefits in Item 7 of Part II of this report.

### *Market Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk of a substantial decline in the value of its Risk Assets. Risk Assets comprise the Company's equity and equity-like securities which include all invested assets that are not investment grade standard fixed income securities and certain fixed income asset classes that are not liquid (but excludes insurance-linked securities as that risk is aggregated with liability risks). The Company limits the market value of Risk Assets as well as sub-limits the market value of equity and equity-like securities that it will hold in its investment portfolio.

Assuming equity and equity-like risks within that part of the investment portfolio that is not required to support the Company's reinsurance liabilities provides valuable diversification from other risk classes, along with the potential for higher returns. However overexposure to equity risk could lead to a large loss in the value

---

## **Table of Contents**

of equity and equity-like securities and non-standard fixed income securities in the case of a market crash. The Company sets strict limits on investments in any one name and any one industry, which creates a diversified portfolio and allows Management to focus on the systemic effects of equity risks. Systemic risk is managed by asset allocation, subject to strict caps on Risk Assets as a percentage of shareholders' equity. The Company's fully integrated information system provides real-time investment data, allowing for continuous monitoring and decision support. Each portfolio is managed against a pre-determined benchmark to enable alignment with appropriate risk parameters and achievement of desired returns. See Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk - Equity Price Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report.

### *Interest Rate Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk of a substantial mismatch of asset and liability durations, which may result in economic losses to the Company. Economically, the Company is hedged against changes in asset and liability values resulting from small parallel changes in the risk free yield curve to the degree asset and liability durations are matched. Non-parallel shifts in the yield curve or extremely large changes in yields can introduce interest rate risk and investment losses to the degree asset maturity and coupon payments are not exactly matched to liability payments. Investment losses associated with interest rate risk of a magnitude that have the potential to exceed the Company's risk appetite are associated with extremely large increases in interest rates over an annual period. The Company limits and monitors the interest rate exposure on its fixed income assets held in excess of those that are matched against liabilities. The Company both matches assets and liabilities to hedge against changes in interest rates and limits the total amount of interest rate exposure. See Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk - Interest Rate Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report.

### *Default and Credit Spread Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk of a substantial increase in defaults in the Company's standard fixed income credit securities (which includes investment grade corporate bonds and asset-backed securities) leading to realized investment losses or a significant widening of credit spreads resulting in realized or unrealized investment losses, either of which may result in economic losses to the Company. Investment losses of the magnitude that have the potential to exceed the Company's risk appetite are associated with the systemic impacts of severe economic and financial stress. As a result, the Company limits the market value of the standard fixed income credit securities so that investment losses will be mitigated in an extreme economic or financial crisis. See Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk - Credit Spread Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report.

### *Trade Credit Underwriting Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk that aggregated trade credit losses materially exceed the net premiums that are received to cover such risks, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. Trade credit underwriting losses of the magnitude that have the potential to exceed the Company's risk appetite are associated with the systemic impacts of severe economic and financial stress. In these events, underwriting losses may arise from defaults of single large named insureds and from a high frequency of defaults of smaller insureds. In addition, trade credit underwriting risk is highly correlated with default and credit spread widening risk of the standard investment grade fixed income portfolio during times of economic stress or financial crises.

In order to determine a trade credit underwriting limit metric for the purposes of risk accumulation, the Company examined extreme scenarios and measured its exposure to loss under those scenarios. Examples of these scenarios included, but were not limited to, historical losses from the largest trade credit defaults, prior periods of financial crisis and economic stress (e.g. 1990-1991 recession and 2008-2009 financial crisis), and potential impacts of financial crisis and economic stress scenarios. The Company did not rely upon modeled losses to determine the limit metric, but did benchmark the scenario results against existing tests, scenarios and

---

**Table of Contents**

models. For risk accumulation purposes, the Company examined the extreme scenario that would result in 100% of loss ratio adverse deviation on the trade credit portfolio written on a proportional basis (which far exceeds any adverse deviation of the loss ratio experienced in past periods of economic stress or financial crises) increased by the net probable maximum losses of the two largest named insureds in the Company's trade credit portfolio.

*Longevity Risk*

The Company considers longevity exposure to have a material accumulation potential and has established a limit to manage the risk of loss associated with this exposure, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. The Company defines longevity risk as the potential for increased actual and future expected annuity payments resulting from annuitants living longer than expected, or the expectation that annuitants will live longer in the future. Assuming longevity risk, through reinsurance or capital markets transactions, is part of the Company's strategy of building a diversified portfolio of risks. While longevity risk is highly diversifying in relation to other risks in the Company's portfolio (e.g. mortality products), longevity risk itself is a systemic risk with little opportunity to diversify within the risk class. Longevity risk accumulates across cedants, geographies, and over time because mortality trends can impact diverse populations in the same manner. Longevity risk can manifest slowly over time as experience proves annuitants are living longer than original expectations, or abruptly as in the case of a miracle drug that increases the life expectancy of all annuitants simultaneously.

In order to determine a longevity limit metric for the purposes of risk accumulation, the Company examined extreme scenarios and measured its exposure to loss under those scenarios. Examples of these scenarios included, but were not limited to, immediate elimination of major causes of death and an extreme improvement scenario equivalent to the adverse result of every annuitant's life expectancy increasing to approximately 100 years. The Company did not rely upon modeled losses to determine the limit metric, but did benchmark the scenario results against existing tests, scenarios and models. For risk accumulation purposes, the Company selected the most extreme scenario and added an additional margin for potential deviation. To measure utilization of the longevity limit (accumulation of longevity exposure) the Company accumulates the net present value of adverse loss resulting from the application of the selected most extreme scenario, adds an additional margin to every in-force longevity treaty for potential deviation and, where appropriate, includes the notional value of longevity insurance-linked securities.

*Pandemic Risk*

The Company considers mortality exposure to have a material accumulation potential to common risk drivers, in particular to pandemic events, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. The Company defines pandemic risk as the increase in mortality over an annual period associated with a rapidly spreading virus (either within a highly populated geographic area or on a global basis) with a high mortality rate. Assuming mortality risk, through reinsurance or capital markets transactions, is part of the Company's strategy of building a diversified portfolio of risks. While mortality risk is highly diversifying in relation to other risks in the Company's portfolio (e.g. longevity products), mortality risk itself is a systemic risk when the risk driver is a pandemic with little opportunity to diversify within the risk class. Mortality risk from pandemics can accumulate across cedants and geographies.

In order to determine a pandemic limit metric for the purposes of risk accumulation, the Company examined extreme scenarios and measured its exposure to loss under those scenarios. Examples of these scenarios included, but were not limited to, increased mortality associated with past pandemic events (e.g. 1918 Spanish flu) and potential mortality outcomes from transmission scenarios across differing age groups and developed and developing countries. The Company did not rely upon modeled losses to determine the limit metric, but did benchmark the scenario results against existing tests, scenarios and models. For risk accumulation purposes, the Company selected an extreme mortality scenario applied to developing and developed countries that would have twice the fatality rate of the 1918 Spanish flu with the same transmissibility characteristics.

## **Table of Contents**

### *Agriculture Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk that losses from multi-peril crop insurance materially exceed the net premiums that are received to cover such risks, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. Multi-peril crop underwriting losses of the magnitude that have the potential to exceed the Company's risk appetite are associated with the systemic impacts of severe weather events, particularly drought or flooding, over a large geographic area. Localized events such as convective thunderstorms or hail, while potentially devastating, are unlikely to have the large geographic footprint necessary to create material losses exceeding the net premiums collected.

Multi-peril crop risk is managed through geographic diversification both within individual countries and across countries. This is accomplished through the allocation and tracking of capacity across exposure zones (defined as individual countries) and is accompanied by regular extreme event modeling, and a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis.

The Company utilizes probable maximum loss estimates, net of retrocession, to manage its exposures. The limit approved measure is aggregated by contract within an exposure zone to establish the total exposures. Actual exposures deployed and estimated probable maximum losses in a specific zone will vary from period to period depending on Management's assessment of current market conditions, the results from exposure modeling, and other analysis.

### *Mortgage Reinsurance Risk*

The Company defines this risk as the risk that losses from mortgage insurance materially exceed the net premiums that are received to cover such risks, which may result in operating and economic losses to the Company. Mortgage insurance underwriting losses that have the potential to exceed the Company's risk appetite are associated with the systemic impacts of severe mortgage defaults, driven by large scale economic downturns and high unemployment. Localized or regional economic downturns are unlikely to have a large enough geographic footprint necessary to create material losses exceeding the net premiums collected.

At December 31, 2013, the majority of the Company's exposure to mortgage risk related to risks in the U.S. All of the Company's U.S. mortgage portfolio is considered to consist of prime mortgages, with virtually all of the underlying risks related to policies written post-financial crisis and subject to enhanced post-financial crisis underwriting procedures that differentiate between risks. Mortgage insurance is managed through geographic diversification both within countries and across countries. This is accomplished through the allocation and tracking of capacity across exposure zones (defined as individual countries) and is accompanied by regular extreme event modeling, and a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis.

The Company utilizes total limits deployed, net of retrocession, to manage its exposures. The limits per individual contract are aggregated within an exposure zone to establish the total exposures. Actual exposures deployed and estimated probable maximum losses in a specific zone will vary from period to period depending on Management's assessment of current market conditions, the results from exposure modeling, and other analysis.

### *Operational and Financial Risks*

Operational and financial risks are managed by designated functions within the organization. These risks include, but are not limited to, failures or weaknesses in financial reporting and controls, regulatory non-compliance, poor cash management, fraud, breach of information technology security, disaster recovery planning and reliance on third party vendors. The Company seeks to minimize these risks through robust processes and monitoring processes throughout the organization.

## **Table of Contents**

### ***Other Underwriting Risk and Exposure Controls***

The Company's underwriting is conducted at the Business Unit level through specialized underwriting teams with the support of technical staff in disciplines such as actuarial, claims, legal, risk management and finance.

The Company's underwriters generally speak the local language and/or are native to their country or area of specialization. They develop close working relationships with their ceding company counterparts and brokers through regular visits, gathering detailed information about the cedant's business and local market conditions and practices. As part of the underwriting process, the underwriters also focus on the reputation and quality of the proposed cedant, the likelihood of establishing a long-term relationship with the cedant, the geographic area in which the cedant does business and the cedant's market share, historical loss data for the cedant and, where available, historical loss data for the industry as a whole in the relevant regions, in order to compare the cedant's historical loss experience to industry averages, and to gauge the perceived insurance and reinsurance expertise and financial strength of the cedant. The Company trains its underwriters extensively and strives to maintain continuity of underwriters within specific geographic markets and areas of specialty.

Given the Company underwrites volatile lines of business, such as catastrophe reinsurance, the operating results and financial condition of the Company can be adversely affected by catastrophes and other large losses that may give rise to claims under reinsurance coverages provided by the Company. The Company manages its exposure to catastrophic and other large losses by (i) limiting its aggregate exposure on catastrophe reinsurance in any particular geographic zone, (ii) selective underwriting practices, (iii) diversification of risks by geographic area and by lines and classes of business, and (iv) by purchasing retrocessional reinsurance.

The Company generally underwrites risks with specified limits per treaty program. Like other reinsurance companies, the Company is exposed to multiple insured losses arising out of a single occurrence, whether a natural event such as hurricane, windstorm, tornado, flood or earthquake, or man-made events. Any such catastrophic event could generate insured losses in one or many of the Company's reinsurance treaties and facultative contracts in one or more lines of business. The Company considers such event scenarios as part of its evaluation and monitoring of its aggregate exposures to catastrophic events.

### ***Retrocessional reinsurance***

The Company uses retrocessional reinsurance agreements to reduce its exposure on certain reinsurance risks assumed and to mitigate the effect of any single major event or the frequency of medium-sized events. These agreements provide for the recovery of a portion of losses and loss expenses from retrocessionaires. The majority of the Company's retrocessional reinsurance agreements cover the property exposures, predominantly those that are catastrophe exposed. The Company also utilizes retrocessions in the Life and Health segment to manage the amount of per-event and per-life risks to which it is exposed. Retrocessionaires are selected based on their financial condition and business practices, with stability, solvency and credit ratings being important criteria.

The Company remains liable to its cedants to the extent that the retrocessionaires do not meet their obligations under retrocessional agreements, and therefore retrocessions are subject to credit risk in all cases and to aggregate loss limits in certain cases. The Company holds collateral, including escrow funds, trusts, securities and letters of credit under certain retrocessional agreements. Provisions are made for amounts considered potentially uncollectible and reinsurance losses recoverable from retrocessionaires are reported after allowances for uncollectible amounts.

In addition to the retrocessional agreements, PartnerRe Europe has a Reserve Agreement in place with Colisée Re (see Business Reserves Non-life Reserves Reserve Agreement in Item 1 of Part I of this report).

## **Table of Contents**

### *Claims*

In addition to managing and settling reported claims and consulting with ceding companies on claims matters, the Company conducts periodic audits of specific claims and the overall claims procedures at the offices of ceding companies. The Company attempts to evaluate the ceding company's claim adjusting techniques and reserve adequacy and whether it follows proper claims processing procedures. The Company also provides recommendations regarding procedures and processes to the ceding company.

### *Natural Catastrophe Probable Maximum Loss (PML)*

The following discussion of the Company's natural catastrophe probable maximum loss (PML) information contains forward-looking statements based upon assumptions and expectations concerning the potential effect of future events that are subject to uncertainties. See Item 1A of Part I of this report for a list of the Company's risk factors. Any of these risk factors could result in actual losses that are materially different from the Company's PML estimates below.

Natural catastrophe risk is a source of significant aggregate exposure for the Company and is managed by setting risk appetite and limits, as discussed above. Natural catastrophe perils can impact geographic regions of varying size and can have economic repercussions beyond the geographic region directly impacted.

The Company considers a peril zone to be an area within a geographic region, continent or country in which losses from insurance exposures are likely to be highly correlated to a single catastrophic event. The Company defines peril zones to capture the vast majority of exposures likely to be incorporated by typical modeled events. There is, however, no industry standard and the Company's definitions of peril zones may differ from those of other parties.

The Company has exposure to and monitors more than 300 natural and man-made catastrophe peril zones on a worldwide basis. The peril zones in the disclosure below are major peril zones for the industry. The Company has exposures in other peril zones that can potentially generate losses greater than the PML estimates below. The Company's PMLs represent an estimate of loss for a single event for a given return period. The table below discloses the Company's 1-in-250 and 1-in-500 year return period estimated loss for a single occurrence of a natural catastrophe event in a one-year period. In other words, the 1-in-250 and 1-in-500 year return period PMLs mean that there is a 0.4% and 0.2% chance, respectively, in any given year that an occurrence of a natural catastrophe in a specific peril zone will lead to losses exceeding the stated estimate.

The PML estimates below include all significant exposure from our Non-life and Life and Health business operations. This includes coverage for property, marine, energy, aviation, engineering, workers' compensation and mortality and exposure to catastrophe from insurance-linked securities. The PML estimates do not include casualty coverage that could be exposed as a result of a catastrophic event. In addition, they do not include estimates for contingent losses to insureds that are not directly impacted by the event (e.g. loss of earnings due to disruption in supply lines).

**Table of Contents**

The Company's single occurrence estimated net PML exposures (pre-tax and net of retrocession and reinstatement premiums) for certain selected peak industry natural catastrophe perils at October 1, 2013 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Zone	Peril	Single Occurrence Estimated Net PML Exposure	
		1-in-250 year PML	1-in-500 year PML (Earthquake Perils Only)
U.S. Southeast	Hurricane	\$ 1,054	
U.S. Northeast	Hurricane	1,121	
U.S. Gulf Coast	Hurricane	1,025	
Caribbean	Hurricane	276	
Europe	Windstorm	872	
Japan	Typhoon	124	
California	Earthquake	575	\$ 679
British Columbia	Earthquake	305	513
Japan	Earthquake	435	457
Australia	Earthquake	418	552
New Zealand	Earthquake	250	272

The Company estimates that the incremental loss at the 1-in-250 year return period from a U.S. hurricane impacting more than one of the three hurricane risk zones in the U.S. would be 20% higher than the PML of the largest zone impacted. In addition, there is the potential for a hurricane to impact the Caribbean peril zone and one or more U.S. hurricane peril zones.

**Other Key Issues of Management***Capital Adequacy*

A key challenge for Management is to maintain an appropriate level of capital. Management's first priority is to hold sufficient capital to meet all of the Company's obligations to cedants, meet regulatory requirements and support its position as one of the stronger reinsurers in the industry. Holding an excessive amount of capital, however, will reduce the Company's compound annual growth in diluted tangible book value per share and Operating ROE. Consequently, Management closely monitors its capital needs and capital level throughout the reinsurance cycle and in times of volatility and turmoil in global capital markets, and actively takes steps to increase or decrease the Company's capital in order to achieve an appropriate balance of financial strength and shareholder returns. Capital management is achieved by either deploying capital to fund attractive business opportunities, or in times of excess capital and times when business opportunities are not so attractive, returning capital to its common shareholders by way of share repurchases and dividends. During 2013, the Company repurchased 7.7 million of its common shares for a total cost of \$695 million. In addition, the Company increased the quarterly dividends on its common shares by 3% during 2013, from \$0.62 per share to \$0.64 per share, and a further 5% increase for 2014 from \$0.64 per share to \$0.67 per share.

*Liquidity and Cash Flows*

The Company aims to be a reliable and financially secure partner to its cedants. This means that the Company must maintain sufficient liquidity at all times so that it can support its cedants by settling claims quickly. The Company generates cash flows primarily from its underwriting and investment operations. Management believes that a profitable, well-run reinsurance organization will generate sufficient cash from premium receipts to pay claims, acquisition costs and operating expenses in most years. To the extent that underwriting cash flows are not sufficient to cover operating cash outflows in any year, the Company may utilize cash flows generated from investments and may ultimately liquidate assets from its investment portfolio. Management ensures that its liquidity requirements are supported by maintaining a high quality, well balanced and liquid investment portfolio, and by matching the duration and currency of its investments and investments

## **Table of Contents**

underlying the funds held directly managed account with that of its net reinsurance liabilities. In 2014, the Company expects to continue to generate positive operating cash flows, absent a series of unusual catastrophic events.

### ***Enterprise Culture***

Management is focused on ensuring that the structure and culture of the organization promote intelligent, prudent, transparent and ethical decision-making. Management believes that a sound enterprise culture starts with the tone at the top. Management holds regular company-wide information sessions to present and review Management's latest decisions, whether operational, financial or structural, as well as the financial results of the Company. Employees are encouraged to address questions related to the Company's results, strategy or Management decisions, either anonymously or otherwise to Management so that they can be answered during these information sessions. Management believes that these sessions provide a consistent message to all employees about the Company's value of transparency. Management also strives to promote a work environment that (i) aligns the skill set of individuals with challenges encountered by the Company, (ii) includes segregation of duties to ensure objectivity in decision-making, and (iii) provides a compensation structure that encourages and rewards intelligent risk taking and ethical behavior. To that effect, the Company has a written Code of Business Conduct and Ethics and provides employees with a direct communication channel to the Audit Committee of the Board in the event they become aware of questionable behavior of Management or any other employee. Finally, Management believes that building a sound internal control environment, including a strong Internal Audit function, helps ensure that behaviors are consistent with the Company's cultural values.

### **Employees**

The Company had 1,112 employees at December 31, 2013. The Company believes that its relations with its employees are good.

### **Regulation**

The business of reinsurance is regulated in all countries in which we operate, although the degree and type of regulation varies significantly from one jurisdiction to another. Some jurisdictions impose complex regulatory requirements on insurance businesses while other jurisdictions impose fewer requirements. In certain foreign countries, reinsurers are required to be licensed by governmental authorities. These licenses may be subject to modification, suspension or revocation dependent on such factors as amount and types of reserves and minimum capital and solvency tests. The violation of regulatory requirements may result in fines, censures and/or criminal sanctions in various jurisdictions. See Risk Factors in Item 1A of Part I of this report.

As a holding company, PartnerRe Ltd. is not directly subject to (re)insurance regulations, but its various material operating subsidiaries are subject to regulation as follows:

#### ***Bermuda***

The Insurance Act 1978 of Bermuda and related regulations, as amended (the Insurance Act), regulates the insurance business of PartnerRe Bermuda. The Insurance Act imposes solvency and liquidity standards and auditing and reporting requirements on Bermuda insurance companies and grants the Bermuda Monetary Authority (BMA) powers to supervise, investigate and intervene in the affairs of insurance companies. The Insurance Act makes no distinction between insurance and reinsurance business.

**Table of Contents**

PartnerRe Bermuda is licensed as a Class 4 and Class E insurer in Bermuda and is therefore authorized to carry on general and long-term insurance business, respectively. Significant aspects of the Bermuda insurance regulatory framework and requirements imposed on Class 4 and Class E insurers such as PartnerRe Bermuda include the following:

*Minimum Capital Requirements.* The BMA imposes certain minimum capital regulatory requirements on PartnerRe Bermuda, which are to hold statutory capital and surplus equal to or exceeding the Target Capital Level, which is equivalent to 120% of the Enhanced Capital Requirement (ECR). PartnerRe Bermuda's Enhanced Capital Requirement (ECR) should be calculated by either (a) the model developed by the BMA, or (b) an internal capital model which the BMA has approved for use for this purpose. PartnerRe Bermuda currently uses the BMA model in calculating its solvency requirements. The Bermuda risk-based regulatory capital adequacy and solvency margin regime provides a risk-based capital model (termed the Bermuda Solvency Capital Requirement (BSCR)) as a tool to assist the BMA both in measuring risk and in determining appropriate levels of capitalization. The BSCR employs a standard mathematical model that correlates the risk underwritten by Bermuda insurers to the capital that is dedicated to their business;

*Solvency Assessment.* PartnerRe Bermuda must perform an assessment of its own risk and solvency requirements, referred to as a Commercial Insurer's Solvency Self Assessment (CISSA). The CISSA allows the BMA to obtain an insurer's view of the capital resources required to achieve its business objectives and to assess a company's governance, risk management and controls surrounding this process. In addition, PartnerRe Bermuda must file with the BMA a Catastrophe Risk Return which assesses an insurer's reliance on vendor models in assessing catastrophe exposure;

*Reporting Requirements.* PartnerRe Bermuda must prepare audited annual statutory financial statements and file them with the BMA, together with audited annual financial statements which are prepared in accordance with the accounting principles generally accepted in the United States (U.S. GAAP); and

*Dividends and Distributions.* PartnerRe Bermuda is prohibited from declaring or paying any dividends of more than 25% of its total statutory capital and surplus, as shown in its previous financial year statutory balance sheet, unless at least seven days before payment of the dividends it files with the BMA an affidavit that it will continue to meet its minimum capital requirements as described above. In addition, PartnerRe Bermuda must obtain the BMA's prior approval before reducing its total statutory capital, as shown in its previous financial year statutory balance sheet, by 15% or more.

In addition to the above regulatory requirements impacting PartnerRe Bermuda, current international initiatives in the regulation of global insurance and reinsurance groups, such as the European Union's Solvency II initiative (Solvency II), are trending towards the imposition of group supervisory regimes, introducing one principal home regulator over all the operating entities in a particular insurance or reinsurance group (referred to as Group Supervision). The Insurance Act sets out provisions regarding Group Supervision, including the power of the BMA to exclude specified entities from Group Supervision, the power of the BMA to withdraw as group supervisor, the functions of the BMA as group supervisor and the power of the BMA to make rules regarding Group Supervision. This Group Supervision regime is in addition to the regulation of the Company's various operating subsidiaries in their local jurisdictions. The BMA's Group Supervision rules set out the rules in respect of the assessment of the financial situation and solvency of an insurance group, the system of governance and risk management, and supervisory reporting and disclosures of an insurance group. The group solvency rules set out the rules in respect of the capital and solvency return and enhanced capital requirements for an insurance group. The BMA has chosen PartnerRe Bermuda as the designated insurer for the purposes of Group Supervision, and the BMA will act as group supervisor of the PartnerRe group. As group supervisor, the BMA will gather relevant and essential information on and assess the financial situation of the PartnerRe group, and coordinate the dissemination of such information to other relevant competent authorities for the purposes of assisting in their regulatory functions and the enforcement of regulatory action against the PartnerRe group or any of its members. PartnerRe is not an insurer and, as such, is not regulated in Bermuda. However, pursuant to its functions as group supervisor, the BMA may include any member of the group within its Group Supervision, including PartnerRe.

---

## **Table of Contents**

Significant aspects of the Bermuda insurance regulatory framework and requirements imposed on Insurance Groups include the solvency assessment. The PartnerRe group must annually perform an assessment of its own risk and solvency requirements, referred to as a Group's Solvency Self Assessment (GSSA). The GSSA allows the BMA to obtain an insurance group's view of the capital resources required to achieve its business objectives and to assess a group's governance, risk management and controls surrounding this process. In addition, the PartnerRe group must file with the BMA a Catastrophe Risk Return which assesses an insurer's reliance on vendor models in assessing catastrophe exposure.

Effective January 1, 2014, the BMA imposes the ECR on the PartnerRe group. The PartnerRe group's ECR should be calculated by either (a) the model developed by the BMA, or (b) an internal capital model which the BMA has approved for use for this purpose. In addition, the PartnerRe group will be required to prepare and submit annual audited group U.S. GAAP financial statements, annual group statutory financial statements, annual group statutory financial return, annual group capital and solvency return and quarterly group unaudited financial returns.

In addition to the above, PartnerRe Bermuda maintains an operating branch in Canada and representative offices in Chile, China, Mexico and South Korea. The Canadian branch is subject to regulation in Canada by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions. For a further discussion of the regulations pertaining to the Canadian branch see below.

### *Ireland*

The Central Bank of Ireland (the Central Bank) regulates insurance and reinsurance companies authorized in Ireland, including PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe Ireland Insurance Limited (PartnerRe Ireland). PartnerRe Holdings Europe Limited, a holding company for PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe Ireland, is not subject to regulation by the Central Bank.

PartnerRe Europe is a reinsurance company incorporated under the laws of Ireland and is duly authorized as a reinsurance undertaking to carry on non-life and life reinsurance business in accordance with the European Communities (Reinsurance) Regulations 2006. PartnerRe Ireland is an insurance company incorporated under the laws of Ireland and is duly authorized as an insurance undertaking to carry on non-life insurance business in accordance with the European Communities (Non-Life Insurance) Framework Regulations 1994.

Significant aspects of the Irish re/insurance regulatory framework and requirements imposed on PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe Ireland include the following:

*Solvency Requirements.* As a composite reinsurer, PartnerRe Europe is required to maintain a minimum capital (Solvency I) requirement throughout the year. This solvency margin is determined on a premium or claims basis that covers the total sum of required solvency margins in respect of both non-life and life business activities. In addition, the Central Bank requires PartnerRe Europe to specify their Strategic Solvency Target, in excess of the minimum capital requirement. As a non-life insurer PartnerRe Ireland is required to maintain assets free of liabilities to cover the higher of 200% of the EU Solvency margin or 100% of the minimum guaranteed funds (€ 3.7 million). The EU Solvency margin is determined on a premium or claims basis that covers the total sum of required solvency margins in respect of non-life business activities;

*Reporting Requirements.* PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe Ireland must file and submit annual audited financial statements in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and related reports to the Irish Companies Registration Office (CRO) together with an annual return of certain core corporate information. Changes to core corporate information during the year must also be notified to the CRO. These requirements are in addition to the regulatory returns required to be filed annually with the Central Bank and additionally, in the case of PartnerRe Ireland, with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) in the U.S.; and

**Table of Contents**

*Dividends and Distributions.* Pursuant to Irish company law, PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe Ireland are restricted to declaring dividends only out of profits available for distribution. Profits available for distribution are, broadly, a company's accumulated realized profits less its accumulated realized losses. Such profits may not include profits previously utilized.

In addition to the above, PartnerRe Europe has also established operating branches in France, Switzerland, Canada, Singapore, Labuan and Hong Kong and a representative office in Brazil, which are subject to Irish reinsurance supervision regulations. In addition, the Canadian branch is subject to regulation in Canada by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, the Singapore branch is subject to regulation by the Monetary Authority of Singapore, the Labuan branch is subject to regulation by the Labuan Financial Services Authority and the Hong Kong branch to regulation by the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance of Hong Kong. For a further discussion of the regulations pertaining to the Canadian branch see below. PartnerRe Ireland, pursuant to the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010 (part of the Dodd-Frank Act), is a nonadmitted alien insurer in the U.S. and is eligible to write business as an excess and surplus lines insurer in all U.S. states.

*United States*

PartnerRe U.S. Corporation is a Delaware domiciled holding company for its wholly owned (re)insurance subsidiaries, PartnerRe U.S., PartnerRe Insurance Company of New York (PRNY) and PartnerRe America Insurance Company (PRAIC) (PartnerRe U.S., PRNY and PRAIC together being the PartnerRe U.S. Insurance Companies). The PartnerRe U.S. Insurance Companies are subject to regulation under the insurance statutes and regulations of their domiciliary states, New York in the case of PartnerRe U.S. and PRNY, and Delaware in the case of PRAIC, and all states where they are licensed, accredited or approved to underwrite insurance and reinsurance.

PartnerRe U.S. Corporation is also the owner of the Presidio Reinsurance Group, Inc. and its 100% owned subsidiaries Presidio Excess Insurance Services, Inc. (PXS), PartnerRe Management Ltd. (PRM) and Presidio Reinsurance Corporation Inc. (PRC). PXS is a managing general underwriter licensed in a number of states. PRM is an approved coverholder in the Lloyd's market domiciled in the U.K. and regulated by the Financial Services Authority. PRC is a Montana domiciled captive reinsurer.

Currently, the PartnerRe U.S. Insurance Companies are licensed, accredited or approved reinsurers and/or insurers in all fifty states and the District of Columbia, and are subject to the requirements described below:

*Risk-Based Capital Requirements.* The Risk-Based Capital (RBC) for Insurers Model Act (the Model RBC Act), as it applies to property and casualty insurers and reinsurers, was initially adopted by the NAIC in December 1993. The Model RBC Act or similar legislation has been adopted by the majority of states in the U.S. The main purpose of the Model RBC Act is to provide a tool for insurance regulators to evaluate the capital of insurers with respect to the risks assumed by them and to determine whether there is a need for possible corrective action. U.S. insurers and reinsurers are required to report the results of their RBC calculations as part of the statutory annual statements that such insurers and reinsurers file with state insurance regulatory authorities. The Model RBC Act provides for four different levels of regulatory actions, each of which may be triggered if an insurer's Total Adjusted Capital (as defined in the Model RBC Act) is less than a corresponding level of risk-based capital. Decreases in an insurer's Total Adjusted Capital as a percentage of its Annualized Control Level (as defined in the Model RBC Act) triggers increasing regulatory actions. Such regulatory actions include but are not limited to issuance of orders for corrective action by the insurer, rehabilitation or liquidation of the insurer.

*Insurance Regulatory Information System (IRIS) Ratios.* A committee of state insurance regulators developed the NAIC's IRIS primarily to assist state insurance departments in executing their statutory mandates to oversee the financial condition of insurance or reinsurance companies operating in their respective states. IRIS identifies thirteen industry ratios and specifies usual values for each ratio. Generally, a company will become

---

## **Table of Contents**

subject to regulatory scrutiny if it falls outside the usual ranges with respect to four or more of the ratios, and regulators may then act, if the company has insufficient capital, to constrain the company's underwriting capacity. No such action has been taken with respect to the PartnerRe U.S. Companies.

*Reporting Requirements.* Regulations vary from state to state, but generally require insurance holding companies and insurers and reinsurers that are subsidiaries of insurance holding companies to register and file with their state domiciliary regulatory authorities certain reports, including information concerning their capital structure, ownership, financial condition and general business operations. State regulatory authorities monitor compliance with, and periodically conduct examinations with respect to, state mandated standards of solvency, licensing requirements, investment limitations, and restrictions on the size of risks which may be reinsured, deposits of securities for the benefit of reinsureds, methods of accounting for assets, reserves for unearned premiums and losses, and other purposes. In general, such regulations are for the protection of reinsureds and, ultimately, their policyholders, rather than security holders. In the U.S., the New York State Department of Financial Services is the domiciliary regulator of PartnerRe U.S. and PRNY, and the Delaware Department of Insurance is the domiciliary regulator of PRAIC.

*Dividends and Distributions.* Under New York law, the New York State Department of Financial Services must approve any dividend declared or paid by PartnerRe U.S. or PRNY that, together with all dividends declared or distributed by each of them during the preceding twelve months, exceeds the lesser of 10% of their respective statutory surplus as shown on the latest statutory financial statements on file with the New York Department of Financial Services, or 100% of their respective adjusted net investment income during that period. Under Delaware law the Delaware Commissioner of Insurance must approve any dividend declared or paid by PRAIC that, together with all dividends or distributions made within the preceding 12 months exceeds the greater of (i) ten percent of PRAIC's surplus as regards policyholders as of the preceding December 31 or (ii) the net income, not including realized capital gains, for the 12-month period ending the preceding December 31. Both Delaware and New York do not permit a dividend to be declared or distributed, except out of earned surplus.

In addition to the above, the following laws and initiatives currently impact or may impact the PartnerRe U.S. Insurance Companies in the future:

*The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (the Dodd-Frank Act).* The Dodd-Frank Act represents a comprehensive overhaul of the financial services industry within the U.S. and establishes a Federal Insurance Office under the U.S. Treasury Department. Although the Federal Insurance Office does not have general supervisory or regulatory authority over the business of insurance or reinsurance, it is charged with monitoring all aspects of the insurance industry, consulting with state insurance regulators, assisting in administration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (TRIA) and other duties. The Federal Insurance Office is also responsible for issuing certain reports to Congress such as a December 2013 report which recommended limited federal regulatory involvement in areas such as the development of a uniform agreement on reinsurance collateral requirements, as well as an upcoming report on the role of the global reinsurance market in supporting insurance in the U.S. Furthermore, the director of the Federal Insurance Office may recommend that the multi-agency Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC) subject an insurance company or an insurance holding company to heightened prudential standards following an extended designation process, and the FSOC itself may make such designations. The Dodd-Frank Act also made small changes to the regulation of credit for reinsurance and surplus lines insurance in the U.S. See Risk Factors in Item 1A of Part I of this report.

*NAIC Solvency Modernization Initiative.* In 2008, the NAIC began its Solvency Modernization Initiative to examine the United States insurance solvency regulation framework with a focus on capital requirements, international accounting, insurance valuation, reinsurance and group regulatory issues. While some activities arising from the Solvency Modernization Initiative, such as such as adoption of changes to the Insurance Holding Company System Regulatory Act and Insurance Holding Company System Model Regulation and adoption of the Risk Management and Own Risk and Solvency Assessment Model Act, are complete, other activities are ongoing.

---

## **Table of Contents**

### *Canada*

Canadian branches of PartnerRe Bermuda, PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe U.S. hold licenses to write reinsurance business in Canada. Each Canadian branch is authorized to insure, in Canada, risks falling within the classes of insurance as specified in their respective licenses and is limited to the business of reinsurance. The Canadian branch of PartnerRe Bermuda is licensed to write life business in Ontario. The Canadian branch of PartnerRe Europe is licensed to write life business in Ontario and Quebec. The Canadian branch of PartnerRe U.S. is licensed to write property and casualty business in Ontario and Quebec. Each Canadian branch is subject to local regulation for its Canadian branch business, specified principally pursuant to Part XIII of the Insurance Companies Act (the Canadian Insurance Act) applicable to foreign property and casualty companies and to foreign life companies as well as relevant provincial insurance acts. The Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, Canada (OSFI) supervises the application of the Canadian Insurance Act.

PartnerRe Bermuda, PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe U.S. maintain sufficient assets, vested in trust at a Canadian financial institution approved by OSFI, to allow their branches to meet minimum statutory solvency requirements as required by the Act and the regulations made under it. Certain statutory information is filed with federal and provincial insurance regulators in respect of both property and casualty and life business written by branches. This information includes, among other things, a yearly business plan and an annual Dynamic Capital Adequacy Test (DCAT) report from the Appointed Actuary of the branch that tests the adequacy of the assets that are vested under various adverse scenarios.

### *Other Regulatory Considerations*

Moreover, there are various regulatory bodies and initiatives that impact PartnerRe in multiple international jurisdictions and the potential for significant impact on PartnerRe could be heightened as a result of recent industry and economic developments. In particular, Solvency II, adopted in the European Union but yet to be finalized, aims to establish a revised set of risk-based capital requirements and risk management standards that will replace the current Solvency I requirements. Once implementing measures are finalized, with implementation scheduled to take effect on January 1, 2016, Solvency II is expected to set out new, strengthened requirements applicable to the entire European Union relating to capital adequacy and risk management for insurers. Other similar measures, such as the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS) announced plans to include a risk-based global insurance capital standard within the common supervision framework it is currently developing, also have the potential for significant impact on PartnerRe. Furthermore, the IAIS has developed policy measures for institutions it designates as globally systemically important insurers (G-SIIs), including enhanced supervision standards, measures to facilitate resolution, and capital requirements to increase loss absorption capacity. The IAIS has announced that it will decide in 2014 on potential designation of major reinsurers as G-SIIs. See Risk Factors in Item 1A of Part I of this report.

## **Taxation of the Company and its Subsidiaries**

The following summary of the taxation of PartnerRe Ltd., PartnerRe Bermuda, PartnerRe Europe and the PartnerRe U.S. Corporation and its subsidiaries (collectively PartnerRe U.S. Companies) is based upon current law. Legislative, judicial or administrative changes may be forthcoming that could affect this summary. Certain subsidiaries, branch offices and representative offices of the Company are subject to taxation related to operations in Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, France, Hong Kong, Ireland, Labuan, Singapore, Switzerland and the U.S. The discussion below covers the significant locations for which the Company or its subsidiaries are subject to taxation.

### *Bermuda*

PartnerRe Ltd. and PartnerRe Bermuda have each received from the Minister of Finance an assurance under The Exempted Undertakings Tax Protection Act, 1966 of Bermuda, to the effect that in the event that there is any legislation enacted in Bermuda imposing tax computed on profits or income, or computed on any capital asset,

---

**Table of Contents**

gain or appreciation, or any tax in the nature of estate duty or inheritance tax, then the imposition of any such tax shall not be applicable to PartnerRe Ltd. or PartnerRe Bermuda or to any of their operations or the shares, debentures or other obligations of PartnerRe Ltd. or PartnerRe Bermuda until March 2035. These assurances are subject to the proviso that they are not construed to prevent the application of any tax or duty to such persons as are ordinarily resident in Bermuda (PartnerRe Ltd. and PartnerRe Bermuda are not currently so designated) or to prevent the application of any tax payable in accordance with the provisions of The Land Tax Act, 1967 of Bermuda or otherwise payable in relation to the property leased to PartnerRe Bermuda.

*Canada*

The Canadian life branch of PartnerRe Bermuda, the Canadian life branch of PartnerRe Europe and the Canadian non-life branch of PartnerRe U.S. are subject to Canadian taxation on their profits.

The profits of the Canadian life branch of PartnerRe Bermuda are taxed at the federal level as well as the Ontario provincial level at a total rate that was 26.50% in 2013. The profits of the Canadian life branch of PartnerRe Europe are taxed at the federal level as well as the Ontario and Quebec provincial level at a total rate that was 26.50% in 2013. The Canadian non-life branch of PartnerRe U.S. is subject to taxation on its profits at the federal level as well as the Ontario and Quebec provincial level at a total rate that was an average of 26.58% in 2013. See also the discussion of taxation in the United States and Ireland below.

*France*

The French branch of PartnerRe Europe is conducting business in and is subject to taxation in France. The French Parliament approved the 2014 Finance Bill, which increased the statutory rate of tax on corporate profits in France from 36.1% to 38.0%, effective for 2013 and 2014. See also the discussion of taxation in Ireland below.

*Ireland*

The Company's Irish subsidiaries, PartnerRe Holdings Europe Ltd., PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe Ireland Insurance Ltd, conduct business in and are subject to taxation in Ireland. Profits of an Irish trade or business are subject to Irish corporation tax at the rate of 12.5%, whereas profits arising from other than a trade or business are taxable at the rate of 25%. The Swiss, U.S., French and Canadian branches of PartnerRe Europe are subject to taxation in Ireland at the Irish corporation tax rate of 12.5%. However, under Irish domestic tax law, the amount of tax paid in Switzerland, U.S., France and Canada can be credited or deducted against the Irish corporation tax. As a result, the Company does not expect to incur significant taxation in Ireland with respect to the Swiss, U.S., French and Canadian branches.

*Switzerland*

The Swiss branch of PartnerRe Europe is subject to Swiss taxation, mainly on profits and capital. To the extent that net profits are generated, profits are taxed at a rate of approximately 21%. The branch pays capital taxes at a rate of approximately 0.17% on its imputed branch capital calculated according to a procured taxation ruling. See also the discussion of taxation in Ireland above.

*United States*

PartnerRe U.S. Corporation and its subsidiaries (collectively the PartnerRe U.S. Companies) transact business in Canada and in the U.S. and are subject to taxation in the U.S.

In addition, PartnerRe Europe writes certain U.S. Facultative and Latin American business, through its reinsurance intermediaries, PartnerRe Miami Inc. (PartnerRe Miami) in Miami, Florida and PartnerRe Connecticut Inc. (PartnerRe Connecticut) in Greenwich, Connecticut. As a result, PartnerRe Europe is deemed to

---

## **Table of Contents**

be engaged in a U.S. trade or business and thus is subject to taxation in the U.S. Finally, PartnerRe Capital Investments Corporation is also a U.S. corporation subject to taxation in the U.S. The current statutory rate of tax on corporate profits in the U.S. is 35%. See the discussion of U.S. branch taxation below and the discussion of taxation in Ireland above.

On this basis, the Company does not expect that it and its subsidiaries, other than the PartnerRe U.S. Companies and PartnerRe Europe for its U.S. branches (PartnerRe Miami and PartnerRe Connecticut), will be required to pay U.S. corporate income taxes (other than withholding taxes as described below). However, because there is considerable uncertainty as to the activities that constitute a trade or business in the U.S., there can be no assurance that the Internal Revenue Service (the IRS) will not contend successfully that the Company or its non-U.S. subsidiaries are engaged in a trade or business in the U.S. The maximum federal tax rate is currently 35% for a corporation's income that is effectively connected with a trade or business in the U.S. In addition, U.S. branches of foreign corporations may be subject to the branch profits tax, which imposes a tax on U.S. branch after-tax earnings that are deemed repatriated out of the U.S., for a potential maximum effective federal tax rate of approximately 54% on the net income connected with a U.S. trade or business.

Foreign corporations not engaged in a trade or business in the U.S. are subject to U.S. income tax, effected through withholding by the payer, on certain fixed or determinable annual or periodic gains, profits and income derived from sources within the U.S. as enumerated in Section 881(a) of the Internal Revenue Code, such as dividends and interest on certain investments.

The U.S. also imposes an excise tax on insurance and reinsurance premiums paid to foreign insurers or reinsurers with respect to risks located in the U.S. The rate of tax applicable to reinsurance premiums paid to PartnerRe Bermuda is 1% of gross premiums.

## **Where You Can Find More Information**

The Company's 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 Securities Exchange Act are available free of charge through the investor information pages of its website, located at <http://www.partnerre.com>. Alternatively, the public may read or copy the Company's filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) at the SEC's Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Room 1580, Washington, D.C. 20549. The public may obtain information on the operation of the Public Reference Room by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330. The SEC also maintains an internet site that contains reports, proxy and information statements, and other information regarding issuers that file electronically with the SEC (<http://www.sec.gov>). None of the information on the Company's website or on the SEC's website is incorporated into this report except to the extent explicitly incorporated by reference in this report.

## **ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS**

### **Introduction**

Current and potential investors in the Company should be aware that, as with any publicly traded company, investing in our securities carries risk. Managing risk effectively is paramount to our success, and our organization is built around intelligent risk assumptions and careful risk management, as evidenced by our development of the PartnerRe risk management framework, which provides an integrated approach to risk across the entire organization. We have identified what we believe reflect key significant risks to the organization, and, in turn, the shareholders. These risks should be read in conjunction with other Risk Factors described in more detail below under the heading Risk Factors.

First, in order to achieve an appropriate compound annual growth in diluted tangible book value per share over the reinsurance cycle, we believe we must be able to generate an appropriate operating return on beginning diluted book value per share over the reinsurance cycle. Our ability to do that over a reinsurance cycle is dependent on our individual performance, but also on industry factors that impact the level of competition and

**Table of Contents**

the price of risk. The level of competition is determined by supply of and demand for capacity. Demand is determined by client buying behavior, which varies based on the client's perception of the amount and volatility of risk, its financial capacity to bear it and the cost of risk transfer. Supply is determined by the existing reinsurance companies' level of financial strength and the introduction of capacity from new start-ups or capital markets. Significant new capacity or significant reduction in demand will depress industry profitability until the supply/demand balance is redressed. Extended periods of imbalance could depress industry profitability to a point where we would fail to meet our targets.

Second, we knowingly expose ourselves to significant volatility in our quarterly and annual net income. We create shareholder value by assuming risk from the insurance and capital markets. This exposes us to volatile earnings as untoward events happen to our clients and in the capital markets. Examples of potential large loss events include, without limitation:

Natural catastrophes such as hurricane, windstorm, flood, tornado, earthquake, etc.;

Man-made disasters such as terrorism;

Declines in the equity and credit markets;

Systemic increases in the frequency or severity of casualty losses; and

New mass tort actions or reemergence of old mass torts such as cases related to asbestosis.

We manage large loss events through evaluation processes, which are designed to enable proper pricing of these risks over time, but which do little to moderate short-term earnings volatility. The only effective tool to dampen earnings volatility is through diversification by building a portfolio of uncorrelated risks. We do not currently buy significant amounts of retrocessional coverage, nor do we use significant capital market hedges or trading strategies in the pursuit of stability in earnings.

Third, we expose ourselves to several very significant risks that are of a size that can impact our financial strength as measured by U.S. GAAP or regulatory capital. We believe that the following can be categorized as very significant risks:

Natural catastrophe risk;

Long tail reinsurance risk;

Market risk;

Interest rate risk;

Default and credit spread risk;

Trade credit underwriting risk;

Longevity risk;

Pandemic risk;

Agriculture risk; and

Mortgage reinsurance risk.

Most of these risks can accumulate to the point that they exceed a year's worth of earnings and affect the capital base of the Company (for further information about these risks see Risk Management in Item 1 of Part I of this report).

We rely on our internal risk management processes, models and systems to manage these risks at the nominal exposure levels approved by the Company's Board. However, because these models and processes may fail, we also impose limits on our exposure to these risks.

**Table of Contents**

In addition to these enumerated risks, we face numerous other strategic and operational risks that could in the aggregate lead to shortfalls to our long-term goals or add to short-term volatility in our earnings, as described in Risk Management in Item 1 of Part I of this report. The following review of important risk factors should not be construed as exhaustive and should be read in conjunction with other cautionary statements that are included herein or elsewhere. The words or phrases believe, anticipate, estimate, project, plan, expect, intend, hope, forecast, evaluate, will likely result or will continue or words or phrases of similar import generally involve forward-looking statements. As used in these Risk Factors, the terms the Company, PartnerRe, we, our or us may, depending upon the context, refer solely to the Company, to one or more of the Company's consolidated subsidiaries or to all of them taken as a whole.

**Table of Contents****Risk Factors***Risks Related to Our Company**The volatility of the catastrophe business that we underwrite will result in volatility of our earnings.*

Catastrophe reinsurance comprised approximately 8% of our net premiums written for the year ended December 31, 2013 and a larger percentage of our capital at risk. Catastrophe losses result from events such as windstorms, hurricanes, tsunamis, earthquakes, floods, hailstorms, tornadoes, severe winter weather, fires, drought, explosions and other natural and man-made disasters, the incidence and severity of which are inherently unpredictable. Because catastrophe reinsurance accumulates large aggregate exposures to man-made and natural disasters, our loss experience in this line of business could be characterized as low frequency and high severity. This is likely to result in substantial volatility in our financial results for any fiscal quarter or year, and may create downward pressure on the market price of our common shares and limit our ability to make dividend payments and payments on our debt securities.

Notwithstanding our endeavors to manage our exposure to catastrophic and other large losses, the effect of a single catastrophic event or series of events affecting one or more geographic zones, or changes in the relative frequency or severity of catastrophic or other large loss events, could reduce our earnings and limit the funds available to make payments on future claims. The effect of an increase in frequency of mid-size losses in any one reporting period affecting one or more geographic zones, such as an unusual level of hurricane activity, could also reduce our earnings. Should we incur more than one very large catastrophe loss, our ability to write future business may be adversely impacted if we are unable to replenish our capital.

By way of illustration, during the past five calendar years, the Company incurred the following pre-tax large catastrophic losses and large losses, net of any related reinstatement premiums, reinsurance and profit commissions (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Calendar year	Pre-tax large catastrophe losses and large losses
2013	\$ 142
2012	318
2011	1,790
2010	559
2009	

Examples of pre-tax large catastrophic losses and large losses reflected in the illustration above include losses in 2013, 2012, 2011 and 2010 which were incurred, to varying extents, as the result of multiple medium and large catastrophic events. In 2013, these events included the extensive flooding in Alberta, Canada (Alberta Floods) in June 2013, the hailstorm that affected large parts of Germany in July 2013 (German Hailstorm) and the floods that impacted large areas of Central Europe in June 2013 (European Floods). In 2012, these events included Superstorm Sandy and the U.S. drought which impacted the agriculture line of business in the North America sub-segment. In 2011, these events included the Japan Earthquake, the February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes, Thailand Floods, U.S. tornadoes and Australian Floods. In 2010, these events included the earthquake that hit Chile in February 2010, the New Zealand earthquake that occurred in September 2010 (2010 New Zealand Earthquake) and large losses related to the explosion and subsequent sinking of the Deepwater Horizon Drilling Platform.

A significant amount of judgment was used to estimate the range of potential losses related to the 2010 and the February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes (collectively, the New Zealand Earthquakes) and the Japan Earthquake, and there remains a considerable degree of uncertainty related to the range of possible ultimate losses related to these events and, in particular, the New Zealand Earthquakes. Loss estimates arising

## Table of Contents

from earthquakes are inherently more uncertain than those from other catastrophic events and the Company believes the ultimate losses arising from the New Zealand Earthquakes may be materially in excess of, or less than, the amounts provided for in the Consolidated Balance Sheet at December 31, 2013. The remaining significant risks and uncertainties related to the New Zealand Earthquakes include the ongoing cedant revisions of loss estimates for each of these events, the degree to which inflation impacts construction materials required to rebuild affected properties, the characteristics of the Company's program participation for certain affected cedants and potentially affected cedants, and the expected length of the claims settlement period. In addition, there is additional complexity related to the New Zealand Earthquakes given multiple earthquakes occurred in the same region in a relatively short period of time, resulting in cedants continuing to revise their allocation of losses between the various events and between different treaties, under which the Company may provide different amounts of coverage.

While the Company remains cautious regarding the estimated ultimate losses from the Japan Earthquake, as time has passed the estimates received from the Company's cedants have stabilized, paid losses have increased and the remaining complexities have reduced. However, there can be no assurance that ultimate losses will not exceed our estimates.

We believe, and recent scientific studies have indicated, that the frequency of Atlantic basin hurricanes has increased and may change further in the future relative to the historical experience over the past 100 years. As a result of changing climate conditions, such as global warming, there may be increases in the frequency and severity of natural catastrophes and the losses that result from them. We 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. 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 and ocean temperatures, and the effects of inflation may continue to increase the severity of claims from catastrophic events in the future.

***We could face unanticipated losses from man-made catastrophic events and these or other unanticipated losses could impair our financial condition, reduce our profitability and decrease the market price of our shares.***

We may have substantial exposure to unexpected, large losses resulting from future man-made catastrophic events, such as acts of terrorism, acts of war, nuclear accidents and political instability, or from other perils. Although we may attempt to exclude losses from terrorism and certain other similar risks from some coverage we write, we may continue to have exposure to such unforeseen or unpredictable events. This may be because, irrespective of the clarity and inclusiveness of policy language, there can be no assurance that a court or arbitration panel will not limit enforceability of policy language or otherwise issue a ruling adverse to us.

It is also difficult to predict the timing of such events with statistical certainty, or estimate the amount of loss any given occurrence will generate. Under U.S. GAAP, we are not permitted to establish reserves for potential losses associated with man-made or other catastrophic events until an event that may give rise to such losses occurs. If such an event were to occur, our reported income would decrease in the affected period. In particular, unforeseen large losses could reduce our profitability or impair our financial condition. See Political, regulatory, governmental and industry initiatives could adversely affect our business below for a summary of relevant U.S. federal initiatives regarding supply of commercial insurance coverage for certain types of terrorist acts in the U.S.

---

## Table of Contents

*Given the inherent uncertainty of models, the usefulness of such models as a tool to evaluate risk is subject to a high degree of uncertainty that could result in actual losses that are materially different than our estimates including probable maximum losses (PMLs), and our financial results may be adversely impacted, perhaps significantly.*

In addition to our own proprietary catastrophe models, we use third party vendor analytic and modeling capabilities to provide us with objective risk assessment relating to other risks in our reinsurance portfolio. We use these models to help us control risk accumulation, inform management and other stakeholders of capital requirements and to improve the risk/return profile or minimize the amount of capital required to cover the risks in each reinsurance contract in our overall portfolio of reinsurance contracts. However, given the inherent uncertainty of modeling techniques and the application of such techniques, these models and databases may not accurately address a variety of matters which might be deemed to impact certain of our coverages.

For example, catastrophe models that simulate loss estimates based on a set of assumptions are important tools used by us to estimate our PMLs. These assumptions address a number of factors that impact loss potential including, but not limited to, the characteristics of the natural catastrophe event; demand surge resulting from an event; the types, function, location and characteristics of exposed risks; susceptibility of exposed risks to damage from an event with specific characteristics; and the financial and contractual provisions of the (re)insurance contracts that cover losses arising from an event. We run many model simulations in order to understand the impact of these assumptions on its catastrophe loss potential. Furthermore, there are risks associated with catastrophe events, which are either poorly represented or not represented at all by catastrophe models. Each modeling assumption or un-modeled risk introduces uncertainty into PML estimates that management must consider. These uncertainties can include, but are not limited to, the following:

The models do not address all the possible hazard characteristics of a catastrophe peril (e.g. the precise path and wind speed of a hurricane);

The models may not accurately reflect the true frequency of events;

The models may not accurately reflect a risk's vulnerability or susceptibility to damage for a given event characteristic;

The models may not accurately represent loss potential to insurance or reinsurance contract coverage limits, terms and conditions; and

The models may not accurately reflect the impact on the economy of the area affected or the financial, judicial, political, or regulatory impact on insurance claim payments during or following a catastrophe event.

Our PMLs are selected after assessment of multiple third party vendor model output, internally constructed independent models, including the Company's CatFocus suite of models, and other qualitative and quantitative assessments by management, including assessments of exposure not typically modeled in vendor or internal models. Our methodology for estimating PMLs may differ from methods used by other companies and external parties given the various assumptions and judgments required to estimate a PML.

As a result of these factors and contingencies, our reliance on assumptions and data used to evaluate our entire reinsurance portfolio and specifically to estimate a PML, is subject to a high degree of uncertainty that could result in actual losses that are materially different from our PML estimates and our financial results may be adversely impacted, perhaps significantly.

*Our net income may be volatile because certain products sold by our Life business unit expose us to reserve and fair value liability changes that are directly affected by market and other factors and assumptions.*

Our pricing, establishment of reserves for future policy benefits and valuation of life insurance and annuity products, including reinsurance programs, are based upon various assumptions, including but not limited to market changes, mortality rates, morbidity rates, and policyholder behavior. The process of establishing reserves



---

**Table of Contents**

for future policy benefits relies on our ability to accurately estimate insured events that have not yet occurred but that are expected to occur in future periods. Significant deviations in actual experience from assumptions used for pricing and for reserves for future policy benefits could have an adverse effect on the profitability of our products and our business.

Under reinsurance programs covering variable annuity guarantees we assumed the risk of guaranteed minimum death benefits (GMDB). Our net income is directly impacted by changes in the reserves calculated in connection with the reinsurance of GMDB liabilities. Reported liabilities for GMDB reinsurance are determined using internal valuation models. Such valuations require considerable judgment and are subject to significant uncertainty. The valuation of these products is subject to fluctuations arising from, among other factors, changes in interest rates, changes in equity markets, changes in credit markets, changes in the allocation of the investments underlying annuitant's account values, and assumptions regarding future policyholder behavior. Significant changes in behavior as a result of policyholder reactions to market or economic conditions could be material. Adverse changes in market factors and policyholder behavior will have an impact on both life underwriting income and net income. When evaluating these risks, we expect to be compensated for taking both the risk of a cumulative long-term economic net loss, as well as the short-term accounting variations caused by these market movements. Therefore, we evaluate this business in terms of its long-term economic risk and reward. For further information see Life Policy Benefits in Item 7 of Part II of this report.

***If actual losses exceed our estimated loss reserves, our net income and capital position will be reduced.***

Our success depends upon our ability to accurately assess the risks associated with the businesses that we reinsure. We establish loss reserves to cover our estimated liability for the payment of all losses and loss expenses incurred with respect to premiums earned on the contracts that we write. Loss reserves are estimates involving actuarial and statistical projections at a given time to reflect our expectation of the costs of the ultimate settlement and administration of claims. 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. 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.

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. Losses for casualty and liability lines often take a long time to be reported, and frequently can be impacted by lengthy, unpredictable litigation and by the inflation of loss costs over time. Changes in the level of inflation also result in an increased level of uncertainty in our estimation of loss reserves, particularly for long tail lines of business. As a consequence, actual losses and loss expenses paid may deviate substantially from the reserve estimates reflected in our financial statements.

Although we did not operate prior to 1993, we assumed certain asbestos and environmental exposures through our acquisitions. Our reserves for losses and loss expenses include an estimate of our ultimate liability for asbestos and environmental claims for which we cannot estimate the ultimate value using traditional reserving techniques, and for which there are significant uncertainties in estimating the amount of our potential losses. These liabilities are especially hard to estimate for many reasons, including the long delays between exposure and manifestation of any bodily injury or property damage, difficulty in identifying the source of the asbestos or environmental contamination, long reporting delays and difficulty in properly allocating liability for the asbestos or environmental damage. Certain of our subsidiaries have received and continue to receive notices of potential reinsurance claims from ceding insurance companies, which have in turn received claims asserting asbestos and environmental losses under primary insurance policies, in part reinsured by us. Such claims notices are often precautionary in nature and are generally unspecific, and the primary insurers often do not attempt to

---

**Table of Contents**

quantify the amount, timing or nature of the exposure. Given the lack of specificity in some of these notices, and the legal and tort environment that affects the development of claims reserves, the uncertainties inherent in valuing asbestos and environmental claims are not likely to be resolved in the near future. In addition, the reserves that we have established may be inadequate. If ultimate losses and loss expenses exceed the reserves currently established, we will be required to increase loss reserves in the period in which we identify the deficiency to cover any such claims. As a result, even when losses are identified and reserves are established for any line of business, ultimate losses and loss expenses may deviate, perhaps substantially, from estimates reflected in loss reserves in our financial statements. Variations between our loss reserve estimates and actual emergence of losses could be material and could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

*Since we rely on a few reinsurance brokers for a large percentage of our business, loss of business provided by these brokers could reduce our premium volume and net income.*

We produce our business both through brokers and through direct relationships with insurance company clients. For the year ended December 31, 2013, approximately 71% of our gross premiums written were produced through brokers. In 2013, we had two brokers that accounted for 43% of our gross premiums written. Because broker-produced business is concentrated with a small number of brokers, we are exposed to concentration risk. A significant reduction in the business produced by these brokers could potentially reduce our premium volume and net income.

*We are exposed to credit risk relating to our reinsurance brokers and cedants.*

In accordance with industry practice, we may pay amounts owed under our policies to brokers, and they in turn pay these amounts to the ceding insurer. In some jurisdictions, if the broker fails to make such an onward payment, we might remain liable to the ceding insurer for the deficiency. Conversely, the ceding insurer may pay premiums to the broker, for onward payment to us in respect of reinsurance policies issued by us. In certain jurisdictions, these premiums are considered to have been paid to us at the time that payment is made to the broker, and the ceding insurer will no longer be liable to us for those amounts, whether or not we have actually received the premiums. We may not be able to collect all premiums receivable due from any particular broker at any given time. We also assume credit risk by writing business on a funds withheld basis. Under such arrangements, the cedant retains the premium they would otherwise pay to us to cover future loss payments.

*If we are significantly downgraded by rating agencies, our standing with brokers and customers could be negatively impacted and may adversely impact our results of operations.*

Third party rating agencies assess and rate the claims paying ability and financial strength of insurers and reinsurers, such as the Company's principal operating subsidiaries. These ratings are based upon criteria established by the rating agencies and have become an important factor in establishing our competitive position in the market. Insured, insurers, ceding insurers and intermediaries use these ratings as one measure by which to assess the financial strength and quality of insurers and reinsurers. They are not an evaluation directed to investors in our common shares, preferred shares or debt securities, and are not a recommendation to buy, sell or hold our common shares, preferred shares or debt securities.

Our financial strength ratings are subject to periodic review as rating agencies evaluate us to confirm that we continue to meet their criteria for ratings assigned to us by them. Such ratings may be revised downward or revoked at the sole discretion of such ratings agencies in response to a variety of factors, including capital adequacy, management strategy, operating earnings and risk profile. In addition, from time to time one or more rating agencies may effect changes in their capital models and rating methodologies that could have a detrimental impact on our ratings. It is also possible that rating agencies may in the future heighten the level of scrutiny they apply when analyzing companies in our industry, may increase the frequency and scope of their reviews, may request additional information from the companies that they rate, and may adjust upward the capital and other

**Table of Contents**

requirements employed in their models for maintenance of certain rating levels. We can offer no assurances that our ratings will remain at their current levels.

Our current financial strength ratings are:

Standard & Poor's	A+
Moody's	A1
A.M. Best	A+
Fitch	AA-

If our ratings were significantly downgraded, our competitive position in the reinsurance industry may suffer, and it could result in a reduction in demand for our products. In addition, certain business that we write contains terms that give the ceding company or derivative counterparty the right to terminate cover and/or require collateral if our ratings are downgraded significantly.

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

Our future capital requirements depend on many factors, including regulatory requirements, our ability to write new business successfully, the frequency and severity of catastrophic events, and our ability to establish premium rates and reserves at levels sufficient to cover losses. We may need to raise additional funds through financings or curtail our growth and reduce our assets. Any equity or debt financing, if available at all, may be on terms that are not favorable to us. Equity financings could be dilutive to our existing shareholders and could result in the issuance of securities that have rights, preferences and privileges that are senior to those of our other securities. Financial markets in the U.S., Europe and elsewhere have experienced extreme volatility and disruption in recent times, resulting in part from financial stresses affecting the liquidity of the banking system. Continued disruption in the financial markets may limit our ability to access capital required to operate our business and we may be forced to delay raising capital or bear a higher cost of capital, which could decrease our profitability and significantly reduce our financial flexibility. In addition, if we experience a credit rating downgrade, withdrawal or negative watch/outlook in the future, we could incur higher borrowing costs and may have more limited means to access capital. If we cannot obtain adequate capital on favorable terms or at all, our business, operating results and financial condition could be adversely affected.

***The exposure of our investments to interest rate, credit and equity risks may limit our net income and may affect the adequacy of our capital.***

We invest the net premiums we receive unless and until such time as we pay out losses and/or until they are made available for distribution to shareholders and /or otherwise used for general corporate purposes. Investment results comprise a substantial portion of our income. For the year ended December 31, 2013, we had net investment income of \$484 million, which represented approximately 9% of total revenues. In addition, we recorded realized and unrealized gains on investments during 2013, and we record all realized and unrealized gains or losses through net income. While the Board has implemented what it believes to be prudent risk management and investment asset allocation practices, we are exposed to significant financial and capital market risks, including changes in interest rates, credit spreads, equity prices, foreign exchange rates, market volatility, the performance of the economy in general and other factors outside our control.

Interest rates are highly sensitive to many factors, including fiscal and monetary policies of major economies, inflation, economic and political conditions and other factors outside our control. Changes in interest rates can negatively affect us in two ways. In a declining interest rate environment, we will be required to invest our funds at lower rates, which would have a negative impact on investment income. We may be forced to liquidate investments prior to maturity at a loss in order to cover liabilities. In a rising interest rate environment, the market value of our fixed income portfolio may decline.

---

## **Table of Contents**

Our fixed maturity portfolio is primarily invested in high quality, investment grade securities. However, we invest a portion of the portfolio in securities that are below investment grade, including high yield fixed maturity investments and convertible fixed maturity investments. We also invest a portion of our portfolio in other investments such as fixed income type mutual funds, notes receivable, loans receivable, private placement bond investments, derivative exposure assumed and other specialty asset classes. These securities generally pay a higher rate of interest and have a higher degree of credit or default risk. These securities may also be less liquid in times of economic weakness or market disruptions.

We invest a portion of our portfolio in preferred and common stocks or equity-like securities. The value of these assets fluctuates with equity markets. In times of economic weakness, the market value and liquidity of these assets may decline, and may impact net income and capital.

We use the term equity-like investments to describe our investments that have market risk characteristics similar to equities and are not investment grade fixed maturity securities. This category includes high yield and convertible fixed maturity investments and private placement equity investments. Fluctuations in the fair value of our equity-like investments may reduce our income in any period or year and cause a reduction in our capital.

### ***Foreign currency fluctuations may reduce our net income and our capital levels.***

Through our multinational reinsurance operations, we conduct business in a variety of foreign (non-U.S.) currencies, the principal exposures being the euro, Canadian dollar, British pound, New Zealand dollar, Japanese yen and Australian dollar. Assets and liabilities denominated in foreign currencies are exposed to changes in currency exchange rates. Our reporting currency is the U.S. dollar, and exchange rate fluctuations relative to the U.S. dollar may materially impact our results and financial position. We employ various strategies (including hedging) to manage our exposure to foreign currency exchange risk. To the extent that these exposures are not fully hedged or the hedges are ineffective, our results or equity may be reduced by fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates. The sovereign debt crisis in Europe and the related financial restructuring efforts, which may cause the value of the euro to deteriorate, may magnify these risks.

### ***The current state of the global economy and capital markets increases the possibility of adverse effects on our financial position and results of operations. Economic downturns could impair our investment portfolio and affect the primary insurance market, which could, in turn, harm our operating results and reduce our volume of new business.***

Global capital markets in the U.S., Europe and other leading markets continue to experience volatility and certain economies remain in recession. Although conditions may be improving, the longer this economic dislocation persists, the greater the probability that these risks could have an adverse effect on our financial results. This may be evidenced in several ways including, but not limited to, a potential reduction in our premium income, financial losses in our investment portfolio and decreases in revenue and net income.

Unfavorable economic conditions also could increase our funding costs, limit our access to the capital markets or result in a decision by lenders not to extend credit to us. These events could prevent us from increasing our underwriting activities and negatively impact our operating results. In addition, our cedants and other counterparties may be affected by such developments in the financial markets, which could adversely affect their ability to meet their obligations to us.

The global sovereign debt crisis has resulted in financial market restructuring efforts. The impact of these efforts is unclear, however, they may cause a further deterioration in the value of various currencies and consequently exacerbating instability in global credit markets, and increased credit concerns resulting in the widening of bond yield spreads. In addition, recent rating agency downgrades on certain sovereign debt and a possible concern of the potential default of government issuers has contributed to this uncertainty. The impact of these developments, while potentially severe, remains extremely difficult to predict. However, should governments default on their obligations, there will be a negative impact on government and non-government

## **Table of Contents**

issued bonds, government guaranteed corporate bonds and bonds and equities issued by financial institutions and other financial instruments held within the country of default which in turn could adversely impact assets held in our investment portfolio.

### ***We may be adversely impacted by inflation.***

Recent deficit spending by governments in the Company's major markets exposes the Company to heightened risk of 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. Inflation in relation to medical costs, construction costs and tort issues in particular impact the property and casualty industry. The onset, duration and severity of an inflationary period cannot be estimated with precision. The global sovereign debt crisis and the related financial restructuring efforts have, among other factors, made it more difficult to predict the inflationary environment.

### ***We may suffer losses due to defaults by others, including issuers of investment securities, reinsurance and derivative counterparties.***

Issuers or borrowers whose securities we hold, reinsurers, clearing agents, clearing houses, derivative instrument counterparties and other financial intermediaries may default on their obligations to us due to bankruptcy, insolvency, lack of liquidity, adverse economic conditions, operational failure, fraud or other reasons. Even if we are entitled to collateral when a counterparty defaults, such collateral may be illiquid or proceeds from such collateral when liquidated may not be sufficient to recover the full amount of the obligation. Our investment portfolio may include investment securities in the financial services sector that have recently experienced defaults. All or any of these types of default could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity.

### ***We may be adversely affected if Colisée Re, AXA or their affiliates fail to honor their obligations to Paris Re or its clients.***

As part of the AXA Acquisition, Paris Re entered into the 2006 Acquisition Agreements. See Business Reserves Non-life Reserves Reserve Agreement in Item 1 of Part I of this report.

Pursuant to the Quota Share Retrocession Agreement, the benefits and risks of Colisée Re's reinsurance agreements were ceded to Paris Re France (now PartnerRe Europe), but Colisée Re remains both the legal counterparty for all such reinsurance contracts and the legal holder of the assets relating to such reserves.

Under the Run Off Services and Management Agreement, Paris Re France (now PartnerRe Europe) has agreed that AXA LM will manage claims arising from all reinsurance and retrocession contracts subject to the Reserve Agreement. If AXA LM does not take into account Paris Re France's commercial concerns in the context of Paris Re France's on-going business relations with the relevant ceding companies and retrocessionaires, our ability to renew reinsurance and retrocession contracts with them may be adversely affected.

There can be no assurance that our business activities, financial condition, results or future prospects may not be adversely affected in spite of the existence of the 2006 Acquisition Agreements. In general, if AXA or its affiliates breach or do not satisfy their obligations under the 2006 Acquisition Agreements (potentially as a result of insolvency or inability or unwillingness to make payments under the terms of the 2006 Acquisition Agreements), we could be materially adversely affected.

---

## **Table of Contents**

***Our debt, credit and International Swap Dealers Association (ISDA) agreements may limit our financial and operational flexibility, which may affect our ability to conduct our business.***

We have incurred indebtedness, and may incur additional indebtedness in the future. Additionally, we have entered into credit facilities and ISDA agreements with various institutions. Under these credit facilities, the institutions provide revolving lines of credit to us and our major operating subsidiaries and issue letters of credit to our clients in the ordinary course of business.

The agreements relating to our debt, credit facilities and ISDA agreements contain various covenants that may limit our ability, among other things, to borrow money, make particular types of investments or other restricted payments, sell assets, merge or consolidate. Some of these agreements also require us to maintain specified ratings and financial ratios, including a minimum net worth covenant. If we fail to comply with these covenants or meet required financial ratios, the lenders or counterparties under these agreements could declare a default and demand immediate repayment of all amounts owed to them.

If we are in default under the terms of these agreements, then we would also be restricted in our ability to declare or pay any dividends, redeem, purchase or acquire any shares or make a liquidation payment.

***If any one of the financial institutions that we use in our operations, including those that participate in our credit facilities, fails or is otherwise unable to meet their commitments, we could incur substantial losses and reduced liquidity.***

We maintain cash balances significantly in excess of the U.S. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insurance limits at various depository institutions. We also have funding commitments from a number of banks and financial institutions that participate in our credit facilities. See Item 7 Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations Credit Facilities. Access to funds under these existing credit facilities is dependent on the ability of the banks that are parties to the facilities to meet their funding requirements. Those banks may not be able to meet their funding requirements if they experience shortages of capital and liquidity or if they experience excessive volumes of borrowing requests within a short period of time, and we might be forced to replace credit sources in a difficult market. There have also been recent consolidations in the banking industry which could lead to increased reliance on and exposure to a limited number of institutions. If we cannot obtain adequate financing or sources of credit on favorable terms, or at all, our business, operating results and financial condition could be adversely impacted.

***Changes in current accounting practices and future pronouncements may materially impact our reported financial results.***

Developments in accounting practices, for example a convergence of U.S. GAAP with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), may require considerable additional expense to comply, particularly if we are required to prepare information relating to prior periods for comparative purposes or to apply the new requirements retroactively. The impact of changes in current accounting practices and future pronouncements may be significant. The impact may affect the results of our operations, including among other things, the calculation of net income, and may affect our financial position, including among other things, the calculation of unpaid losses and loss expenses, policy benefits for life and annuity contracts and total shareholders' equity. In particular, recent guidance and ongoing projects put in place by standard setters globally have indicated a move away from the current insurance accounting models toward more fair value based models which could introduce significant volatility in the earnings of insurance industry participants.

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

Operational risks and losses can result from many sources including fraud, errors by employees, failure to document transactions properly or to obtain proper internal authorization, failure to comply with regulatory requirements or information technology failures.

## **Table of Contents**

We believe our modeling, underwriting and information technology and application systems are critical to our business and reputation. Moreover, our technology and applications have been an important part of our underwriting process and our ability to compete successfully. Such technology is and will continue to be a very important part of our underwriting process. We have also licensed certain systems and data from third parties. We cannot be certain that we will have access to these, or comparable service providers, or that our technology or applications will continue to operate as intended. In addition, we cannot be certain that we would be able to replace these service providers or consultants without slowing our underwriting response time. A major defect or failure in our internal controls or information technology and application systems could result in management distraction, harm to our reputation, a loss or delay of revenues or increased expense.

***Cybersecurity events could disrupt business operations, result in the loss of critical and confidential information, and adversely impact our reputation and results of operations.***

We are dependent upon the effective functioning and availability of our information technology and application systems platforms. These platforms include, but are not limited to, our proprietary software programs such as catastrophe models as well as those licensed from third-party vendors including analytic and modeling systems. We rely on the security of such platforms for the secure processing, storage and transmission of confidential information. Examples of significant cybersecurity events are unauthorized access, computer viruses, malware or other malicious code or cyber-attack, catastrophic events, system failures and disruptions and other events that could have security consequences (each, Cybersecurity Event). A Cybersecurity Event could materially impact our ability to adequately price products and services, establish reserves, provide efficient and secure services to our clients, brokers, vendors, regulators and Board of Directors, value our investments and to timely and accurately report our financial results. Although we have implemented controls and have taken protective measures to reduce the risk of Cybersecurity Events, we cannot reasonably anticipate or prevent rapidly evolving types of cyber attacks and such measures may be insufficient to prevent a Cybersecurity Event. Cybersecurity Events could expose us to a risk of loss or misuse of our information, litigation, reputational damage, violations of applicable privacy and other laws, fines, penalties or losses that are either not insured against or not fully covered by insurance maintained. We may be required to expend significant additional resources to modify our protective measures or to investigate and remediate vulnerabilities.

***The loss of key executive officers could adversely affect us.***

Our success has depended, and will continue to depend, partly upon our ability to attract and retain executive officers. If any of these executives ceased to continue in his or her present role, we could be adversely affected.

We believe there are only a limited number of available qualified executives in the business lines in which we compete. Our ability to execute our business strategy is dependent on our ability to attract and retain a staff of qualified executive officers, underwriters and other key personnel. The skills, experience and knowledge of the reinsurance industry of our management team constitute important competitive strengths. If some or all of these managers leave their positions, and even if we were able to find persons with suitable skills to replace them, our operations could be adversely affected.

### ***Risks Related to Our Industry***

***Our profitability is affected by the cyclical nature of the reinsurance industry.***

Historically, the reinsurance industry has experienced significant fluctuations in operating results due to competition, levels of available capacity, trends in cash flows and losses, general economic conditions and other factors. Demand for reinsurance is influenced significantly by underwriting results of primary insurers, including

---

## **Table of Contents**

catastrophe losses, and prevailing general economic conditions. The supply of reinsurance is related directly to prevailing prices and levels of capacity that, in turn, may fluctuate in response to changes in rates of return on investments being realized in the reinsurance industry. If any of these factors were to result in a decline in the demand for reinsurance or an overall increase in reinsurance capacity, our profitability could be impacted. In recent years, we have experienced a generally softening market cycle, with increased competition, surplus underwriting capacity, deteriorating rates and less favorable terms and conditions all having an impact on our ability to write business.

Currently, the Company is facing a challenging and limited growth environment, which is driven by price decreases in most markets and lines of business, reflecting increased competition and excess capacity in the industry, relatively low loss experience and a prolonged period of low interest rates, which has impacted our investment portfolio. In addition, we may experience increased competition as a result of the consolidation in the (re)insurance industry. These consolidated entities 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.

We anticipate that competition and pricing pressure may adversely affect our profitability and results of operations in future periods, and the impact may be material.

### ***We operate in a highly competitive environment.***

The reinsurance industry is highly competitive and we compete with a number of worldwide reinsurance companies, including, but not limited to, Munich Re, Swiss Re, Everest Re, Hannover Re, SCOR and reinsurance and insurance operations of certain primary insurance companies, such as ACE, Arch Capital, Axis Capital and XL Group. The lack of strong barriers to entry into the reinsurance business means that we also compete with new companies that continue to be formed to enter the insurance and reinsurance markets. In addition, we may experience increased competition as a result of the consolidation in the (re)insurance industry. These consolidated entities 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.

Competition in the types of reinsurance and insurance that we underwrite is based on many factors, including the perceived and relative financial strength, pricing and other terms and conditions, services provided, ratings assigned by independent rating agencies, speed of claims payment, geographic scope of business, client and broker relationships, reputation and experience in the lines of business to be written. If competitive pressures reduce our prices, we would expect to write less business. In addition, competition for customers would become more intense and we could incur additional expenses relating to customer acquisition and retention, further reducing our operating margins.

Further, insurance-linked securities and derivative and other non-traditional risk transfer mechanisms and vehicles are being developed and offered by other parties, which could impact the demand for traditional insurance or reinsurance. A number of new, proposed or potential industry or legislative developments could further increase competition in our industry. New competition from these developments could cause the demand for insurance or reinsurance to fall or the expense of customer acquisition and retention to increase, either of which could have a material adverse effect on our growth and profitability.

All of the above factors may adversely affect our profitability and results of operations in future periods, the impact of which may be material, and may adversely affect our ability to successfully execute our strategy as a global diversified reinsurance and specialty insurance company.

### ***Legal and Regulatory Risks***

#### ***Political, regulatory, governmental and industry initiatives could adversely affect our business.***

Our reinsurance operations are subject to extensive laws and regulations that are administered and enforced by a number of different governmental and non-governmental self-regulatory authorities and associations in each of their respective jurisdictions and internationally. Our businesses in each jurisdiction are subject to varying degrees of regulation and supervision. The laws and regulations of the jurisdictions in which our insurance and

---

**Table of Contents**

reinsurance subsidiaries are domiciled require, among other things, maintenance of minimum levels of statutory capital, surplus, and liquidity; various solvency standards; and periodic examinations of subsidiaries' financial condition. In some jurisdictions, laws and regulations also restrict payments of dividends and reductions of capital. Applicable statutes, regulations, and policies may also restrict the ability of these subsidiaries to write insurance and reinsurance policies, to make certain investments, and to distribute funds.

As a result of the current financial crisis, some of these authorities regularly consider enhanced or new regulatory requirements intended to prevent future crises or otherwise assure the stability of institutions under their supervision. These authorities may also seek to exercise their supervisory authority in new and more robust ways, and new regulators could become authorized to oversee parts of our business. For example, the European Union's Solvency II initiative (see below Solvency II could adversely impact our financial results and operations) and the NAIC's Solvency Modernization Initiative include meaningful changes in consolidated supervision and corporate governance requirements as they apply to insurance and reinsurance corporate groups, which could lead to increases in regulatory capital requirements, reduced operational flexibility and increased compliance costs. We cannot predict what regulations will finally be adopted.

In addition, in 2010 the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS) introduced a concept paper promoting a common framework for the supervision of internationally active insurance groups (IAIGs). Through the common framework, still in its development phase, the IAIS aims to: (i) develop methods of operating group-wide supervision of IAIGs, (ii) establish a comprehensive framework for supervisors to address group-wide activities and risks and also set grounds for better supervisory cooperation, and (iii) foster global convergence of regulatory and supervisory measures and approaches. In addition, in October 2013 the IAIS announced its plan to include a risk-based global insurance capital standard within its common framework by 2016. Furthermore, the IAIS has developed policy measures for institutions it designates as globally systemically important insurers (G-SIIs), including enhanced supervision standards, measures to facilitate resolution, and capital requirements to increase loss absorption capacity. The IAIS has announced that it will decide in 2014 on potential designation of major reinsurers as G-SIIs.

It is not possible to predict all future impacts of these types of changes but they could affect the way we conduct our business and manage our capital, and may require us to satisfy increased capital requirements, any of which, in turn, could affect our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity. Our material subsidiaries' regulatory environments are described in detail under the heading Business Regulation. Regulations relating to each of our material subsidiaries may in effect restrict each of those subsidiaries' ability to write new business, to make certain investments and to distribute funds or assets to us.

Recent government intervention and the possibility of future government intervention have created uncertainty in the insurance and reinsurance markets. Government regulators are generally concerned with the protection of policyholders to the exclusion of other interested parties, including shareholders of reinsurers. We believe it is likely there will continue to be increased regulation of, and other forms of government participation in, our industry in the future, which could adversely affect our business by, among other things:

Providing reinsurance capacity in markets and to clients that we target or requiring our participation in industry pools and guaranty associations;

Further restricting our operational or capital flexibility;

Expanding the scope of coverage under existing policies;

Regulating the terms of reinsurance policies; or

Disproportionately benefiting the companies domiciled in one country over those domiciled in another.

Such a U.S. federal initiative was put forward in response to the tightening of supply in certain insurance and reinsurance markets resulting from, among other things, the September 11th tragedy, and consequently the TRIA was enacted to ensure the availability of commercial insurance coverage for certain types of terrorist acts



---

**Table of Contents**

in the U.S. In December 2007, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (TRIPRA) was enacted, which further renewed TRIA for another 7 years ending December 31, 2014. This law established a federal program to help the commercial property and casualty insurance industry cover claims related to future terrorism-related losses and required that coverage for terrorist acts be offered by insurers. We cannot provide assurance that TRIPRA will be extended beyond 2014, and its expiration or a significant change in terms could have an adverse effect on us, our clients or the insurance industry.

Such a state initiative in the U.S. was put forward by the Florida Legislature in response to the tightening of supply in certain insurance and reinsurance markets in Florida resulting from, among other things, hurricane damage in Florida, which enacted the Hurricane Preparedness and Insurance Act to ensure the availability of catastrophe insurance coverage for catastrophes in the state of Florida. More recent legislative proposals would limit the reinsurance coverage available from the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund and limit exposure to assessments from the state-run Citizens Property Insurance Company.

The insurance industry is also affected by political, judicial and legal developments that may create new and expanded theories of liability, which may result in unexpected claim frequency and severity and delays or cancellations of products and services we provide, which could adversely affect our business.

***We are unable to predict the effect that governmental actions for the purpose of stabilizing the financial markets will have on such markets generally or on the Company in particular.***

In response to the financial crisis affecting the banking system and financial markets, the U.S. federal government, the European Central Bank and other governmental and regulatory bodies have taken or are considering taking other actions to address the governance of those industries that are viewed as presenting a systemic risk to economic stability. Such actions include the International Monetary Fund's proposal to levy a financial stability tax on all financial institutions, the proposals for enhanced regulation and supervision contained in the most recently published Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) paper on the impact of the financial crisis on the Insurance sector and the financial regulatory reform provisions contained within the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd-Frank Act). Measures taken in Europe include the European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR), as well as the proposed revisions to the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) and the proposed new Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation (MiFIR). We are unable to predict the effect that the enactment of any such proposals will have on the financial markets generally or on the Company's competitive position, business and financial condition in particular, though we are monitoring these and similar proposals as they evolve.

***The Dodd-Frank Act and other U.S. regulatory changes may adversely impact our business.***

The U.S. Congress and the current administration have made, or called for consideration of, several additional proposals relating to a variety of issues with respect to financial regulation reform, including regulation of the over-the-counter derivatives market, the establishment of a single-state system of licensure for U.S. and foreign reinsurers, further regulation of executive compensation and others. One of those initiatives, the Dodd-Frank Act, was signed into law by the President of the U.S. on July 21, 2010. The Dodd-Frank Act represents a comprehensive overhaul of the financial services industry within the U.S. and establishes a Federal Insurance Office under the U.S. Treasury Department. Although the Federal Insurance Office does not have general supervisory or regulatory authority over the business of insurance or reinsurance, it is charged with monitoring all aspects of the insurance industry, consulting with state insurance regulators, assisting in administration of the TRIA, and other duties. The Federal Insurance Office is also responsible for issuing certain reports to Congress such as a December 2013 report which recommended limited federal regulatory involvement in areas such as the development of a uniform agreement on reinsurance collateral requirements, as well as an upcoming report on the role of the global reinsurance market in supporting insurance in the U.S. Furthermore, the director of the Federal Insurance Office may recommend that the multi-agency Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC) subject an insurance company or an insurance holding company to heightened prudential

**Table of Contents**

standards following an extended designation process, and FSOC itself may make such designations. Proposed U.S. regulatory changes outside the scope of the Dodd-Frank Act include legislation to repeal the insurance company exemption from certain U.S. federal antitrust laws, which has been introduced in the past. It is not possible to predict whether this or similar legislation may be enacted in the future.

Compliance with these new laws and regulations may result in additional costs which may adversely impact our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity. However, at this time, it is not possible to predict with any degree of certainty whether any other proposed legislation, rules or regulatory changes will be adopted or what impact, if any, the Dodd-Frank Act or any other such legislation, rules or changes could have on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

***Solvency II could adversely impact our financial results and operations.***

Solvency II, a European Union directive concerning the capital adequacy, risk management and regulatory reporting for insurers, was adopted by the European Parliament and the European Council in April of 2009 and may adversely affect our reinsurance businesses. The implementation of Solvency II by the European Commission will replace current solvency requirements and is scheduled to take effect January 1, 2016. Solvency II adopts 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 insurers across the European Union Member States, establish consistent corporate governance standards for insurance and reinsurance companies, and establish transparency through standard reporting of insurance operations. Implementation of Solvency II will require us to utilize a significant amount of resources to ensure compliance. The measures implementing Solvency II have not been finalized and may be subject to change; consequently, our implementation plans, which are based on our current understanding of the Solvency II requirements, may need to change. The current uncertainty as to timing and requirements may add to the cost of compliance. The European Union is in the process of considering the Solvency II equivalence of Bermuda's insurance regulatory and supervisory regime. The European Union equivalence assessment considers whether Bermuda's regulatory regime provides a similar level of policyholder protection as provided under Solvency II. A finding that Bermuda's insurance regulatory regime is not equivalent to the European Union's Solvency II could have an adverse effect on the cost of PartnerRe's European business due to the potential of having to post collateral. It would not affect PartnerRe's ability to operate in Europe. Such a finding could also have adverse indirect commercial impacts on our operations. An interim assessment has determined that the Bermuda regime applicable to Class 3A, 3B and 4 Companies is equivalent with certain caveats, but a final determination is yet to be made and it is not known when a final determination will be made. In addition, European policymakers have recently drafted a set of criteria by which the European Commission will be able to assess unilaterally whether the solvency regime of a third country such as Bermuda is broadly equivalent to Solvency II. If Bermuda is considered broadly equivalent then it could be granted provisional equivalence to Solvency II for a period of 10 years with the possibility that such period could be extended. We are monitoring the ongoing legislative and regulatory steps associated with the adoption of Solvency II and the equivalence system, as well as other standards such as the IAIS's planned risk-based global insurance capital standard. The principles, standards and requirements of Solvency II may also, directly or indirectly through its impact on other market participants, including ceding insurers, impact the future supervision of additional operating subsidiaries of ours.

***Legislative and regulatory activity in health care and other employee benefits could increase the costs or administrative burdens of providing benefits to our employees or hinder or prevent us from attracting and retaining employees, or affect our profitability as a provider of accident and health insurance benefit products.***

We derive revenues from the provision of accident and health premiums in the U.S., that is, providing insurance to institutions that participate in the U.S. healthcare delivery infrastructure. Changes in U.S. healthcare legislation, specifically the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (the Healthcare Act), have made significant changes to the regulation of health insurance and may negatively affect our healthcare liability

## **Table of Contents**

business including, but not limited to, the healthcare delivery system and the healthcare cost reimbursement structure in the U.S. In addition, the Company may be subject to regulations, guidance or determinations emanating from the various regulatory authorities authorized under the Healthcare Act. It is difficult to predict the effect that the Healthcare Act, or any regulatory pronouncement made thereunder, will have on its results of operations or financial condition. Additionally, future healthcare proposals could include tort reform provisions under which plaintiffs would be restricted in their ability to bring suit against healthcare providers, which could negatively impact the demand for our healthcare liability products. Any material changes in how healthcare providers insure their malpractice liability risks could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

### ***Legal and enforcement activities relating to the insurance industry could affect our business and our industry.***

The insurance industry has experienced substantial volatility as a result of litigation, investigations and regulatory activity by various insurance, governmental and enforcement authorities concerning certain practices within the insurance industry. These practices include the accounting treatment for finite reinsurance or other non-traditional or loss mitigation insurance and reinsurance products.

These investigations have resulted in changes in the insurance and reinsurance markets and industry business practices. While at this time, none of these changes have caused an adverse effect on our business, we are unable to predict the potential effects, if any, that future investigations may have upon our industry. 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.

### ***Emerging claim and coverage issues could adversely affect our business.***

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, reinsurance and other contracts. These developments and changes may adversely affect our business by either extending coverage beyond our underwriting intent or by increasing the number or size of claims. With respect to our casualty businesses, these legal, social and environmental changes may not become apparent until sometime after their occurrence. Our exposure to these uncertainties could be exacerbated by an increase in insurance and reinsurance contract disputes, arbitration and litigation.

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, and in particular, our casualty reinsurance contracts, may not be known for many years after a contract is issued.

The insurance industry is also affected by political, judicial and legal developments that may create new and expanded theories of liability, which may result in unexpected claim frequency and severity and delays or cancellations of products and services we provide, which could adversely affect our business.

### ***Investors may encounter difficulties in service of process and enforcement of judgments against us in the United States.***

We are a Bermuda company and some of our directors and officers are residents of various jurisdictions outside the U.S. All, or a substantial portion, of the assets of our officers and directors and of our assets are or may be located in jurisdictions outside the U.S. Although we have appointed an agent and irrevocably agreed that the agent may be served with process in New York with respect to actions against us arising out of violations of the U.S. Federal securities laws in any Federal or state court in the U.S., it could be difficult for investors to effect service of process within the U.S. on our directors and officers who reside outside the U.S. It could also be difficult for investors to enforce against us or our directors and officers judgments of a U.S. court predicated upon civil liability provisions of U.S. Federal securities laws.

---

## **Table of Contents**

There is no treaty in force between the U.S. and Bermuda providing for the reciprocal recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters. As a result, whether a U.S. judgment would be enforceable in Bermuda against us or our directors and officers depends on whether the U.S. court that entered the judgment is recognized by the Bermuda court as having jurisdiction over us or our directors and officers, as determined by reference to Bermuda conflict of law rules. A judgment debt from a U.S. court that is final and for a sum certain based on U.S. Federal securities laws will not be enforceable in Bermuda unless the judgment debtor had submitted to the jurisdiction of the U.S. court, and the issue of submission and jurisdiction is a matter of Bermuda law and not U.S. law.

In addition to and irrespective of jurisdictional issues, Bermuda courts will not enforce a U.S. Federal securities law that is either penal or contrary to public policy. An action brought pursuant to a public or penal law, the purpose of which is the enforcement of a sanction, power or right at the instance of the state in its sovereign capacity will not be entered by a Bermuda court. Certain remedies available under the laws of U.S. jurisdictions, including certain remedies under U.S. Federal securities laws, would not be available under Bermuda law or enforceable in a Bermuda court, as they would be contrary to Bermuda public policy. Further, no claim can be brought in Bermuda against us or our directors and officers in the first instance for violation of U.S. Federal securities laws because these laws have no extra jurisdictional effect under Bermuda law and do not have force of law in Bermuda. A Bermuda court may, however, impose civil liability on us or our directors and officers if the facts alleged in a complaint constitute or give rise to a cause of action under Bermuda law.

***Our international business is subject to applicable laws and regulations relating to sanctions and foreign corrupt practices, the violation of which could adversely affect our operations.***

We must comply with all applicable economic sanctions and anti-bribery laws and regulations of the U.S. and other foreign jurisdictions where we operate, including the U.K. and the European Community. U.S. laws and regulations applicable to us include the economic trade sanctions laws and regulations administered by the United States Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control as well as certain laws administered by the United States Department of State. In addition, we are subject to the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and other anti-bribery laws such as the U.K. Bribery Act that generally bar corrupt payments or unreasonable gifts to foreign governments or officials. Although we have policies and controls in place that are designed to ensure compliance with these laws and regulations, it is possible that an employee or intermediary could fail to comply with applicable laws and regulations. In such event, we could be exposed to civil penalties, criminal penalties and other sanctions, including fines or other punitive actions. In addition, such violations could damage our business and/or our reputation. Such criminal or civil sanctions, penalties, other sanctions, and damage to our business and/or reputation could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

### ***Risks Related to Our Common Shares and Preferred Shares***

***We are a holding company, and if our subsidiaries do not make dividend and other payments to us, we may not be able to pay dividends or make payments on our common and preferred shares and other obligations.***

We are a holding company with no operations or significant assets other than the capital stock of our subsidiaries and other intercompany balances. We have cash outflows in the form of operating expenses, dividends to both common and preferred shareholders and, from time to time, cash outflows for the repurchase of common shares under our share repurchase program. We rely primarily on cash dividends and payments from our subsidiaries to meet our cash outflows. We expect future dividends and other permitted payments from our subsidiaries to be the principal source of funds to pay expenses and dividends. The ability of our subsidiaries to pay dividends or to advance or repay funds to us is subject to general economic, financial, competitive, regulatory and other factors beyond our control. In particular, the payment of dividends by our reinsurance subsidiaries is limited under Bermuda and Irish laws and certain statutes of various U.S. states in which our U.S. subsidiaries are licensed to transact business and include minimum solvency and liquidity thresholds. As of

## **Table of Contents**

December 31, 2013, there were no significant restrictions on the payment of dividends by the Company's subsidiaries that would limit the Company's ability to pay common and preferred shareholders' dividends and its corporate expenses.

Because we are a holding company, our right, and hence the right of our creditors and shareholders, to participate in any distribution of assets of any subsidiary of ours, upon our liquidation or reorganization or otherwise, is subject to the prior claims of policyholders and creditors of these subsidiaries.

### ***Provisions in our bye-laws may restrict the voting rights of our shares and may restrict the transferability of our shares.***

Our bye-laws generally provide that if any person owns, directly, indirectly or by attribution, more than 9.9% of the total combined voting power of our shares entitled to vote, the voting rights attached to such shares will be reduced so that such person may not exercise and is not attributed more than 9.9% of the total combined voting power. In addition, our board of directors may limit a shareholder's exercise of voting rights where it deems it necessary to do so to avoid non-de minimis adverse tax, legal or regulatory consequences to us, any of our subsidiaries or any of our shareholders.

Under our bye-laws, subject to waiver by our board of directors, no transfer of our shares is permitted if such transfer would result in a shareholder controlling more than 9.9% determined by value or by voting power of our outstanding shares. Our bye-laws also provide that if our board of directors determines that share ownership by a person may result in (i) shareholder owning directly, indirectly or by retribution, more than 9.9% of the total combined voting power of our shares entitled to vote, or (ii) any non-de minimis adverse tax, legal or regulatory consequences to us, any of our subsidiaries or any of our shareholders, then we have the option, but not the obligation, to require that shareholder to sell to us for fair market value the minimum number of shares held by such person which is necessary so that after such purchase such shareholder will not own more than 9.9% of the total combined voting power, or is necessary to eliminate the non-de minimis adverse tax, legal or regulatory consequences.

We also have the authority under our bye-laws to request information from any shareholder for the purpose of determining whether a shareholder's voting rights are to be limited pursuant to our bye-laws. If a shareholder fails to timely respond to our request for information or submits incomplete or inaccurate information in response to a request by us, we may, in our sole discretion, eliminate or reduce the shareholder's voting rights.

## ***Taxation Risks***

### ***Changes in our effective income tax rate could affect our results of operations.***

Our effective income tax rate could be adversely affected in the future by net income being lower than anticipated in jurisdictions where we have a relatively lower statutory tax rate and net income being higher than anticipated in jurisdictions where we have a relatively higher statutory tax rate, or by changes in corporate tax rates and tax regulations in any of the jurisdictions in which we operate. We are subject to regular audit by tax authorities in the various jurisdictions in which we operate. Any adverse outcome of such an audit could have an adverse effect on our net income, effective income tax rate and financial condition.

In addition, the determination of our provisions for income taxes requires significant judgment, and the ultimate tax determination related to certain positions taken is uncertain. Although we believe our provisions are reasonable, the ultimate tax outcome may differ from the amounts recorded in our consolidated financial statements and may materially affect our net income and effective income tax rate in the period such determination is made.

---

**Table of Contents**

*If our non-U.S. operations become subject to U.S. income taxation, our net income will decrease.*

We believe that we and our non-U.S. subsidiaries (other than business sourced by PartnerRe Europe through PartnerRe Miami and PartnerRe Connecticut) have operated, and will continue to operate, our respective businesses in a manner that will not cause us to be viewed as engaged in a trade or business in the U.S. and, on this basis, we do not expect that either we or our non-U.S. subsidiaries will be required to pay U.S. corporate income taxes (other than potential withholding taxes on certain types of U.S. source passive income) or branch profits taxes. Because there is considerable uncertainty as to the activities that constitute being engaged in a trade or business within the U.S., the IRS may contend that either we or our non-U.S. subsidiaries are engaged in a trade or business in the U.S. In addition, legislation regarding the scope of non-U.S. entities and operations subject to U.S. income tax has been proposed in the past, and may be proposed again in the future. If either we or our non-U.S. subsidiaries are subject to U.S. income tax, our shareholders' equity and net income will be reduced by the amount of such taxes, which might be material.

*The impact of Bermuda's letter of commitment to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to eliminate harmful tax practices is uncertain and could adversely affect our tax status in Bermuda.*

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has published reports and launched a global initiative among member and non-member countries on measures to limit harmful tax competition. These measures are largely directed at counteracting the effects of tax havens and preferential tax regimes in countries around the world. Bermuda was not listed in the most recent report as an uncooperative tax haven jurisdiction because it had previously committed to eliminate harmful tax practices, to embrace international tax standards for transparency, to exchange information and to eliminate an environment that attracts 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.

*If proposed U.S. legislation is passed, our U.S. reinsurance subsidiary may be subject to higher U.S. taxation and our net income would decrease.*

Currently, our U.S. reinsurance subsidiary retrocedes or may retrocede a portion of its U.S. business to our non-U.S. reinsurance subsidiaries and is generally entitled to deductions for premiums paid for such retrocessions. Proposed legislation has been introduced that if enacted would impose a limitation on such deductions, which could result in increased U.S. tax on this business and decreased net income. It is not possible to predict whether this or similar legislation may be enacted in the future. In addition, it is possible that other legislative proposals could be introduced in the future that could have an adverse impact on us or our shareholders.

**ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS**

None.

**ITEM 2. PROPERTIES**

The Company leases office space in Hamilton (Bermuda) where the Company's principal executive offices are located. Additionally, the Company leases office space in various locations, principally in Dublin, Greenwich (Connecticut), Paris and Zurich.

**ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS**

*Litigation*

**Table of Contents**

The Company's reinsurance subsidiaries, and the insurance and reinsurance industry in general, are subject to litigation and arbitration in the normal course of their business operations. In addition to claims litigation, the Company and its subsidiaries may be 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. This category of business litigation typically involves, among other things, allegations of underwriting errors or omissions, employment claims or regulatory activity. While the outcome of business litigation cannot be predicted with certainty, the Company will dispute all allegations against the Company and/or its subsidiaries that Management believes are without merit.

At December 31, 2013, the Company was not a party to any litigation or arbitration that it believes could have a material effect on the financial condition, results of operations or liquidity of the Company.

**ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES**

Not applicable.

**Table of Contents****PART II****ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS AND ISSUER PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES**

The Company has the following securities (with their related symbols) traded on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE):

Common shares	PRE
6.50% Series D cumulative preferred shares	PRE-PrD
7.25% Series E cumulative preferred shares	PRE-PrE
5.875% Series F non-cumulative preferred shares	PRE-PrF

The Company's common shares are also traded on the Bermuda Stock Exchange under the symbol PRE.

As of February 14, 2014, the approximate number of common shareholders was 87,675.

The following table provides information about purchases by the Company during the quarter ended December 31, 2013, of equity securities that are registered by the Company pursuant to Section 12 of the Exchange Act.

**Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities**

Period	Total number of shares purchased	Average price paid per share	Total number of shares purchased as part of a publicly announced program <sup>(1) (2)</sup>	Maximum number of shares that may yet be purchased under the program <sup>(1)</sup>
10/01/2013-10/31/2013	90,000	\$ 91.77	90,000	5,880,000
11/01/2013-11/30/2013	287,200	99.90	287,200	5,592,800
12/01/2013-12/31/2013	638,500	100.26	638,500	4,954,300
Total	1,015,700	\$ 99.41	1,015,700	

(1) In September 2013, the Company's Board of Directors approved a new share repurchase authorization of up to a total of 6 million common shares, which replaced the prior authorization of 6 million common shares approved in March 2013. Unless terminated earlier by resolution of the Company's Board of Directors, the program will expire when the Company has repurchased all shares authorized for repurchase thereunder.

(2) At December 31, 2013, approximately 34.2 million common shares were held in treasury and available for reissuance.

The high and low sales prices per share of the Company's common shares for each of the fiscal quarters in the last two fiscal years as reported on the New York Stock Exchange Composite Tape and dividends declared by the Company were as follows:

Period	2013			2012		
	High	Low	Dividends Declared	High	Low	Dividends Declared
Three months ended March 31	\$ 93.83	\$ 81.45	\$ 0.64	\$ 68.41	\$ 63.02	\$ 0.62
Three months ended June 30	96.05	86.86	0.64	75.67	65.87	0.62
Three months ended September 30	93.23	86.64	0.64	76.55	72.44	0.62

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

Three months ended December 31

**105.43**    **90.50**    **0.64**    82.88    75.32    0.62

Other information with respect to the Company's common shares, dividends and other related shareholder matters is contained in Notes 11, 12, 14 and 16 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report and in the Proxy Statement and is incorporated by reference to this item.

**Table of Contents**

**Comparison of 5-Year Cumulative Total Return**

The graph below compares the cumulative shareholder return, including reinvestment of dividends, on the Company's common shares to such return for Standard & Poor's (S&P) 500 Composite Stock Price Index and S&P's 1500 Composite Property & Casualty Insurance Index for the period commencing on December 31, 2008 and ending on December 31, 2013, assuming \$100 was invested on December 31, 2008. Each measurement point on the graph below represents the cumulative shareholder return as measured by the last sale price at the end of each year during the period from December 31, 2008 through December 31, 2013. As depicted in the graph below, during this period the cumulative total shareholder return on the Company's common shares was 72%, the cumulative total return for the S&P 500 Composite Stock Price Index was 128% and the cumulative total return for the S&P 1500 Composite Property & Casualty Insurance Index was 107%.

The Company has attempted to identify an index which most closely matches its business. There are no indices that properly reflect the returns of the reinsurance industry. The S&P 1500 Composite Property & Casualty Insurance Index is used as it is the broadest index of companies in the property and casualty industry. We caution the reader that this index of 27 companies does not include any companies primarily engaged in the reinsurance business, and therefore it is provided to offer context for evaluating performance, rather than direct comparison.

**Table of Contents****ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA****Selected Consolidated Financial Data**

This data should be read in conjunction with the Consolidated Financial Statements and the accompanying Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report and with other information contained in this report, including Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations in Item 7 of Part II of this report.

The Statement of Operations Data reflects the consolidated results of the Company and its subsidiaries for 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013, including Paris Re's results from October 2, 2009 and PartnerRe Health's results from January 1, 2013. The Balance Sheet Data reflects the consolidated financial position of the Company and its subsidiaries at December 31, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013, including Paris Re from December 31, 2009 and PartnerRe Health from December 31, 2012.

(Expressed in millions of U.S. dollars or shares, except per share data)

Statement of Operations Data	For the years ended December 31,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Gross premiums written	\$ 5,570	\$ 4,718	\$ 4,633	\$ 4,885	\$ 4,001
Net premiums written	5,397	4,573	4,486	4,705	3,949
Net premiums earned	\$ 5,198	\$ 4,486	\$ 4,648	\$ 4,776	\$ 4,120
Net investment income	484	571	629	673	596
Net realized and unrealized investment (losses) gains	(161)	494	67	402	591
Net realized gain on purchase of capital efficient notes					89
Other income	17	12	8	10	22
Total revenues	5,538	5,563	5,352	5,861	5,418
Losses and loss expenses and life policy benefits	3,158	2,805	4,373	3,284	2,296
Total expenses	4,830	4,234	5,797	4,892	3,635
Income (loss) before taxes and interest in earnings (losses) of equity investments	708	1,329	(445)	969	1,783
Income tax expense	49	204	69	129	262
Interest in earnings (losses) of equity investments	14	10	(6)	13	16
Net income (loss)	\$ 673	\$ 1,135	\$ (520)	\$ 853	\$ 1,537
Net income (loss) attributable to noncontrolling interests	9				
Net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd.	\$ 664	\$ 1,135	\$ (520)	\$ 853	\$ 1,537
Preferred dividends	58	62	47	35	35
Loss on redemption of preferred shares	9				
Net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders	597	1,073	(567)	818	1,502
Basic net income (loss) per common share	\$ 10.78	\$ 17.05	\$ (8.40)	\$ 10.65	\$ 23.93
Diluted net income (loss) per common share	\$ 10.58	\$ 16.87	\$ (8.40)	\$ 10.46	\$ 23.51
Dividends declared and paid per common share	\$ 2.56	\$ 2.48	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.05	\$ 1.88
Operating earnings (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders <sup>(1) (4)</sup>	\$ 722	\$ 664	\$ (642)	\$ 492	\$ 931
Diluted operating earnings (loss) per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 12.79	\$ 10.43	\$ (9.50)	\$ 6.29	\$ 14.57
Operating return on beginning diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(2) (4)</sup>	12.7%	12.3%	(10.1)%	7.4%	22.4%
Weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding	56.4	63.6	67.6	78.2	63.9
<b>Non-life ratios</b>					

Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

Loss ratio	<b>56.7%</b>	58.5%	96.7%	65.9%	52.7%
Acquisition ratio	<b>22.5</b>	22.3	21.3	21.3	21.9
Other operating expense ratio	<b>6.1</b>	7.0	7.4	7.8	7.2
<b>Combined ratio</b>	<b>85.3%</b>	87.8%	125.4%	95.0%	81.8%

**Table of Contents**

Balance Sheet Data	At December 31,				
	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Total investments, funds held directly managed and cash and cash equivalents	\$ 17,431	\$ 18,026	\$ 17,898	\$ 18,181	\$ 18,165
Total assets	23,038	22,980	22,855	23,364	23,733
Unpaid losses and loss expenses and policy benefits for life and annuity contracts	12,620	12,523	12,919	12,417	12,427
Debt related to senior notes	750	750	750	750	250
Debt related to capital efficient notes	71	71	71	71	71
Total shareholders' equity attributable to PartnerRe Ltd.	6,710	6,933	6,468	7,207	7,646
Diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding	\$ 109.26	\$ 100.84	\$ 84.82	\$ 93.77	\$ 84.51
Diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(3)</sup>	\$ 98.49	\$ 90.86	\$ 76.47	\$ 85.53	\$ 76.92
Number of common shares outstanding, net of treasury shares	53.6	58.9	65.3	70.0	82.6

- (1) Operating earnings or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders (operating earnings or loss) is calculated as net income or loss available to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders excluding net realized and unrealized gains or losses on investments, net of tax (except where the Company has made a strategic investment in an insurance or reinsurance related investee), net foreign exchange gains or losses, net of tax, loss on redemption of preferred shares and the interest in earnings or losses of equity investments, net of tax (except where the Company has made a strategic investment in an insurance or reinsurance related investee and where the Company does not control the investee's activities), and is calculated after preferred dividends. Diluted operating earnings or loss per common share and common share equivalent outstanding (diluted operating earnings or loss per share) are calculated using operating earnings or loss for the period divided by the weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding. The presentation of operating earnings or loss or diluted operating earnings or loss per share are non-GAAP financial measures within the meaning of Regulation G. See Key Financial Measures in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a detailed discussion of the measures used by the Company to evaluate its financial performance.
- (2) Operating return on beginning diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Operating ROE) is calculated using diluted operating earnings or loss per share, as defined above, divided by diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding at the beginning of the year. The presentation of Operating ROE is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G. See Key Financial Measures in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a detailed discussion of the measures used by the Company to evaluate its financial performance.
- (3) Diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share) is calculated using common shareholders' equity attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. (total shareholders' equity less noncontrolling interests and the aggregate liquidation value of preferred shares) less goodwill and intangible assets, net of tax, divided by the weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding (assuming exercise of all stock-based awards and other dilutive securities). The presentation of Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G. See Key Financial Measures in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a detailed discussion of the measures used by the Company to evaluate its financial performance.
- (4) Effective January 1, 2011, Management redefined its operating earnings or loss available to common shareholders calculation to additionally exclude net foreign exchange gains or losses. In addition, Management redefined its Operating return on beginning diluted book value per share and common share equivalents outstanding calculation to measure operating return on a diluted per share basis (Operating ROE, previously referred to as operating return on beginning common shareholders' equity). Operating earnings or loss and Operating ROE for all periods presented have been recast to reflect the Company's redefined non-GAAP measures. See Key Financial Measures in Item 7 of Part II of this report for a discussion of Management's reasons for redefining these measures.

---

**Table of Contents**

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

The following discussion and analysis reflects the consolidated results of the Company and its subsidiaries for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011.

**Executive Overview**

The Company is a leading global reinsurer and insurer, with a broadly diversified and balanced portfolio of traditional reinsurance and insurance risks and capital markets risks.

Successful risk management is the foundation of the Company's value proposition, with diversification of risks at the core of its risk management strategy. The Company's ability to succeed in the risk assumption and management business is dependent on its ability to accurately analyze and quantify risk, to understand volatility and how risks aggregate or correlate, and to establish the appropriate capital requirements and limits for the risks assumed. All risks, whether they are reinsurance related risks or capital market risks, are managed by the Company within an integrated framework of policies and processes to ensure the intelligent and consistent evaluation and valuation of risk, and to ultimately provide an appropriate return to shareholders. For further discussion of the Company's risk management framework, see Risk Management in Item 1 of Part I of this report.

The Company's economic objective is to manage a portfolio of risks that will create total shareholder value and uses annual diluted tangible book value per share and share equivalents outstanding plus dividends to measure its success. Management assesses this economic objective over the reinsurance cycle, rather than any particular quarterly or annual period, given the Company's profitability is significantly affected by the level of large catastrophic losses that it incurs each period. The Company uses a number of other metrics to monitor its performance in meeting its economic objective, which are discussed further below under Key Financial Measures.

As described in more detail below, the Company is facing a challenging and limited growth environment, which is driven by price decreases in most markets and lines of business, reflecting increased competition and excess capacity in the industry, relatively low loss experience and a prolonged period of low interest rates. However, the Company's strong global franchise and geographical footprint position the Company well for the future as does the acquisition of Paris Re in 2009, which provided enhanced strategic and financial flexibility, and the recent acquisition of PartnerRe Health in 2012, which provided additional diversification into the U.S. accident and health market. While the Company continues to face this challenging business environment, Management has also focused on implementing cost saving initiatives. In 2013, Management announced the restructuring of its business support operations into a single integrated worldwide support platform and changes to the structure of certain of its Non-life operations, both of which are expected to provide greater operational efficiency. Regarding capital management, and as a result of the challenging business environment described above, during 2013 the Company returned approximately \$840 million to its common shareholders through share repurchases and dividends. As the Company looks to 2014 and beyond, despite the challenging environment, Management remains confident in the Company's strong global franchise, geographical footprint and technical underwriting skills and is focused on continuing to maintain its strong relationships with clients and actively managing its capital resources.

The following discussion provides an overview of the Company's business and trends and commentary regarding the outlook for 2014 in each business.

***Non-life reinsurance and insurance business, trends and 2014 outlook***

The Company generates its Non-life reinsurance and insurance revenue from premiums. Premium rates and terms and conditions vary by line of business depending on market conditions. Pricing cycles are driven by supply of capital in the industry and demand for reinsurance and insurance and other risk transfer products. The

---

**Table of Contents**

reinsurance and insurance business is also influenced by several other factors, including variations in interest rates and financial markets, changes in legal, regulatory and judicial environments, loss trends, inflation and general economic conditions.

In its reinsurance portfolio, the Company writes all lines of business in virtually all markets worldwide. In addition, the Company provides certain specialty insurance lines of business. The Company differentiates itself through its risk management strategy, its financial strength and its strong global franchise. In assuming its clients' risks, the Company removes the volatility associated with those risks from the client, and then manages those risks and the risk-related volatility. Through its broad product and geographic diversification, its execution capabilities and its local presence in most major markets, the Company is able to stabilize returns, respond quickly to market needs, and capitalize on business opportunities virtually anywhere in the world.

A key challenge facing the Company is to successfully manage risk through all phases of the reinsurance cycle. The Company believes that its long-term strategy of closely monitoring the progression of each line of business, being selective in the business that it writes, and maintaining the diversification and balance of its portfolio, will optimize returns over the reinsurance cycle. Individual lines of business and markets have their own unique characteristics and are at different stages of the reinsurance pricing cycle at any given point in time. Management believes it has achieved appropriate portfolio diversification by product, geography, line and type of business, length of tail, and distribution channel. Further, Management believes that this diversification, in addition to the financial strength of the Company and its strong global franchise, will help to mitigate cyclical declines in underwriting profitability and achieve a more stable return over the reinsurance cycle.

The Non-life reinsurance market has historically been highly cyclical in nature. The reinsurance cycle is driven by competition, the amount of capital and capacity in the industry, loss events and investment returns. The Company's long-term strategy to generate total shareholder value focuses on broad product, asset and geographic diversification of risks.

The cyclicity of the Non-life reinsurance market is characterized by cycles of growth and decline, known as hard and soft insurance cycles. Since late 2003, the Company began to see the emergence of a soft market across most lines of business with general decreases in pricing and profitability. With the exception of lines and markets impacted by specific catastrophic or large loss events, this trend continued throughout the decade. From 2011 to 2013, the Company experienced increases in pricing in certain loss affected lines of business and markets, which were primarily related to the increased catastrophic and large loss activity during 2011 and from the impact of Superstorm Sandy in 2012. During 2013, in lines of business and markets that have not been specifically impacted by any large losses in recent years, the terms and conditions continued to be mainly static and soft in most markets, with price deteriorations observed in some markets as a result of increased competition and excess capacity in the industry.

During the January 1, 2014 renewals the Company experienced an increase of approximately 3% in renewable Non-life treaty business, on a constant foreign exchange basis. The increase in expected premium volume was driven primarily by the Company's diversifying lines, and was mainly attributable to certain contracts negotiated earlier in 2013 and incepting on January 1, 2014. As a result, the North America and Global Specialty sub-segments experienced increases in renewable premium base, while the Catastrophe and Global (Non-U.S.) P&C sub-segments experienced declines driven by declining pricing and pressure on terms and conditions in most markets that were not loss affected. The Company writes a large majority of its business on a treaty basis and renews approximately 65% of its total annual Non-life treaty business on January 1. The remainder of the Non-life treaty business renews at other times during the year.

During the January 1, 2014 renewals, all Non-life sub-segments experienced increased cedant retentions and increased competition, which resulted in further declines in pricing and deterioration in terms and conditions. The excess capacity in the industry, which results in cedants retaining more business and decreasing the available premium in the global industry, combined with the growth in insurance-linked securities and other alternative

---

**Table of Contents**

capital flows into the industry, continue to provide a challenge to writing business meeting our profitability requirements. Despite these persistent challenging market conditions, the Company believes that its strong global franchise and geographic footprint, long track record and broad yet highly technical capabilities over many lines of business, position the Company well. The Company expects to continue with its initiatives to find new diversifying risks and expand relationships with existing clients.

***Life and Health reinsurance business, trends and 2014 outlook***

The Company's Life and Health segment derives revenues primarily from renewal premiums from existing reinsurance treaties and new premiums from existing or new reinsurance treaties. Within the Life and Health segment, the Company writes mortality (including disability), longevity and, following the acquisition of PartnerRe Health, U.S. accident and health products. The acquisition of the PartnerRe Health business on December 31, 2012 provides additional specialty risks not previously written by the Company. Management believes the existing life business and PartnerRe Health business provide the Company with diversification benefits and balance to its portfolio as they are generally not correlated to the Company's Non-life business.

For the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011, the Company did not write any new life business in the U.S., however, following the acquisition of PartnerRe Health, from January 1, 2013 the Company began writing accident and health business in the U.S.

The long-term profitability of the life business (including the mortality and longevity lines of business) mainly depends on the volume and amount of death claims incurred and the ability to adequately price the risk the Company assumes. The life reinsurance policies are often in force for the remaining lifetime of the underlying individuals insured, with premiums earned typically over a period of 10 to 30 years. The volume of the business may be reduced each year by terminations of the underlying treaties related to lapses, voluntary surrenders, death of insureds and recaptures by ceding companies. While death claims are reasonably predictable over a period of many years, claims become less predictable over shorter periods and can fluctuate significantly from quarter to quarter or from year to year.

The long-term profitability of the accident and health business mainly depends on the volume and amount of medical claims and expenses. While the volume of medical claims can be predicted to a certain extent, the amount of claims and expenses depends on various factors, primarily health care inflation rates, driven by a shift towards the older population, reliance on expensive medical equipment and technology, and changes in demand for health care services over time.

In 2013, PartnerRe Health principally operated as a Managing General Agent (MGA), writing all of its business on behalf of third party insurance companies and earning a fee for producing the business. The third party insurance companies then ceded a portion of the original business written through quota-share reinsurance agreements to the Company's reinsurance subsidiary, such that PartnerRe Health participated in the original premiums and losses incurred related to the business it has produced and ensuring an alignment of interests with the third party insurance companies. During 2013, the Company obtained the necessary licenses and approvals and began transitioning the portfolio to PartnerRe carriers. As of January 1, 2014, virtually all of the PartnerRe Health business is originated directly, without the use of third party insurance companies. As such, PartnerRe Health's premiums are expected to grow in 2014 and the MGA fees will be substantially reduced.

The acquisition of the PartnerRe Health business resulted in substantial overall premium growth in the Company's Life and Health segment in 2013 and more modest growth is expected in 2014 as a result of the transition described above. At the January 1, 2014 renewals, opportunities in managed care and specialty lines of the PartnerRe Health business were observed as a result of the implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. In terms of the Company's Life portfolio, the majority of the premium arises from long-term in-force contracts. The active January 1 renewals impact a relatively limited portion of the short-term in-force premium in the mortality line. For those treaties that actively renewed, pricing conditions and terms were

---

## **Table of Contents**

modestly softer from the January 1, 2013 renewals. Management expects moderate continued growth in the Company's existing Life portfolio in 2014, assuming constant foreign exchange rates.

### ***Investment business, trends and 2014 outlook***

The Company generates revenue from its high quality investment portfolio, as well as the investments underlying the funds held directly managed account, through net investment income, including coupon interest on fixed maturities and dividends on equities, and realized and unrealized gains and losses on investments.

For the Company's investment risks, which include both public and private market investments, diversification of risk is critical to achieving the risk and return objectives of the Company. The Company's investment policy distinguishes between liquid, high quality assets that support the Company's liabilities, and the more diversified, higher risk asset classes that make up the Company's capital funds. While there will be years where investment markets risks achieve less than the risk-free rate of return, or potentially even negative results, the Company believes the rewards for assuming these risks in a disciplined and measured way will produce a positive excess return to the Company over time.

Additionally, since investment risks are not fully correlated with the Company's reinsurance risks, this increases the overall diversification of the Company's total risk portfolio.

The Company follows prudent investment guidelines through a strategy that seeks to maximize returns while managing investment risk in line with the Company's overall objectives of earnings stability and long-term book value growth. The Company allocates its invested assets into two categories: liability funds and capital funds. See the discussion of liability funds and capital funds in Financial Condition, Liquidity and Capital Resources. A key challenge for the Company is achieving the right balance between current investment income and total returns (that include price appreciation or depreciation) in changing market conditions. The Company regularly reviews the allocation of investments to asset classes within its investment portfolio and its funds held directly managed account and allocates investments to those asset classes the Company anticipates will outperform in the near future, subject to limits and guidelines. Similarly, the Company reduces its exposure to risk asset classes where returns are underperforming. The Company may also lengthen or shorten the duration of its fixed maturity portfolio in anticipation of changes in interest rates, or increase or decrease the amount of credit risk it assumes, depending on credit spreads and anticipated economic conditions.

The Company's investment operations, including public and private market investments, have experienced volatile market conditions since the middle of 2007. The market conditions remained volatile in 2013, primarily due to increases in risk-free interest rates, improvements in equity markets and narrowing credit spreads, while during 2012 the volatility was due to narrowing spreads and improvements in equity markets.

Assuming constant foreign exchange rates, Management expects net investment income to continue to decrease in 2014 compared to 2013 primarily due to lower reinvestment rates with low yields expected to continue throughout 2014. Management expects this decrease to be partially offset by expected positive cash flow from operations (including net investment income).

### **Overview of the Results of Operations**

The Company measures its performance in several ways. Among the performance measures accepted under U.S. GAAP is diluted net income or loss per share, a measure that focuses on the return provided to the Company's common shareholders. Diluted net income or loss per share is obtained by dividing net income or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders by the weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding. Net income or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders is defined as net income or loss less preferred dividends and loss on redemption of preferred shares. The Company also utilizes certain non-GAAP measures to assess performance (see the discussion of these non-GAAP measures and the reconciliation of those non-GAAP measures to the most directly comparable GAAP measures in Key Financial Measures below).

**Table of Contents****Overview of Net Income (Loss)**

Net income (loss), net income attributable to noncontrolling interests, preferred dividends, loss on redemption of preferred shares, net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders and diluted net income (loss) per share for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars, except per share data):

	2013	2012	2011
Net income (loss)	\$ 673	\$ 1,135	\$ (520)
Less: net income attributable to noncontrolling interests	9		
Net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd.	\$ 664	\$ 1,135	\$ (520)
Less: preferred dividends	58	62	47
Less: loss on redemption of preferred shares	9		
Net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders	\$ 597	\$ 1,073	\$ (567)
Diluted net income (loss) per share attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders	\$ 10.58	\$ 16.87	\$ (8.40)

*2013 compared to 2012*

The decrease in net income of \$462 million, from \$1,135 million in 2012 to \$673 million in 2013 resulted primarily from:

an increase of \$655 million in pre-tax net realized and unrealized investment losses, mainly as a result of increases in risk-free interest rates during 2013 compared to narrowing spreads and improvements in equity markets in 2012;

a decrease of \$87 million in net investment income, primarily driven by lower reinvestment rates; and

an increase of \$68 million in other operating expenses, primarily driven by the restructuring charges described below; partially offset by

an increase of \$170 million in the Non-life underwriting result, which was mainly driven by a lower level of large catastrophic losses and large losses and an increase in favorable prior year loss development and partially offset by a higher level of mid-sized loss activity;

a decrease of \$155 million in income tax expense, primarily resulting from a lower pre-tax net income in 2013 compared to 2012; and

an increase of \$28 million in the Life and Health underwriting result, primarily driven by an increase in favorable prior year loss development.

The decrease in net income attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders and diluted net income per share for the year ended December 31, 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily due to the above factors. For diluted net income per share specifically, the decrease was partially offset by the accretive impact of a reduction in the diluted number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding as a result of share repurchases.

*2012 compared to 2011*

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

The increase in net income of \$1,655 million in 2012 compared to 2011 resulted primarily from:

an increase of \$1,429 million in the Non-life underwriting result, which was primarily driven by a decrease of \$1,417 million in large catastrophic losses and large losses; and

**Table of Contents**

an increase of \$427 million in pre-tax net realized and unrealized investment gains primarily as a result of narrowing credit spreads, improvements in worldwide equity markets and decrease in risk-free rates; partially offset by

an increase of \$135 million in income tax expense, resulting from a higher pre-tax net income; and

a decrease of \$58 million in net investment income, primarily driven by lower reinvestment rates.

The increase in net income available to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders and diluted net income per share in 2012 compared to 2011 was primarily due to the above factors, partially offset by an increase in preferred dividends following the issuance of preferred shares in June 2011. For diluted net income per share specifically, the increase was also due to a decrease in the diluted number of common shares outstanding as a result of share repurchases during 2012.

**Key Factors Affecting Year over Year Comparability**

The following key factors affected the year over year comparison of the Company's results and are discussed in more detail in Review of Net Income (Loss) below.

*Large catastrophic and large loss events*

As the Company's reinsurance operations are exposed to low frequency and high severity risk events, some of which are seasonal, results for certain periods may include unusually low loss experience, while results for other periods may include significant catastrophic losses. For example, the Company's results for 2013 and 2012 included a comparatively lower level of catastrophic losses, while 2011 included an unusually high frequency of high severity catastrophic events as discussed further below. The total impact of large catastrophic losses and large losses on pre-tax net income (loss) for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Year ended December 31,	Total <sup>(1)</sup>
2013	\$ 142
2012	318
2011	1,790

(1) Large catastrophic losses and large losses are shown net of any reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions.

The combined impact of the large catastrophic losses and large losses, the impact on the Company's technical result, net realized and unrealized investment gains or losses, pre-tax net income or loss, loss ratio, technical ratio and combined ratio by segment and sub-segment, and the large catastrophic losses and large losses by event for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	North America	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	Global Specialty	Catastrophe	Total Non-life segment	Life and Health segment	Corporate and Other	Total
<b>2013</b>								
Net losses and loss expenses and life policy benefits	\$ 14	\$ 11	\$ 15	\$ 115	\$ 155	\$	\$	\$ 155
Reinstatement premiums				(13)	(13)			(13)
Impact on technical result and pre-tax net income	\$ 14	\$ 11	\$ 15	\$ 102	\$ 142	\$	\$	\$ 142
Impact on the loss ratio	0.9%	1.5%	1.0%	25.0%	3.5%			
Impact on the technical ratio	0.9	1.5	1.0	25.0	3.4			
Impact on the combined ratio					3.4%			



**Table of Contents**

<b>2013</b>	<b>Total <sup>(1)</sup></b>
German Hailstorm	<b>\$ 58</b>
Alberta Floods	<b>48</b>
European Floods	<b>36</b>
Impact on pre-tax net income	<b>\$ 142</b>

(1) Large catastrophic losses and large losses are shown net of any reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions.

	North America	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	Global Specialty	Catastrophe	Total Non-life segment	Life and Health segment	Corporate and Other	Total
<b>2012</b>								
Net losses and loss expenses and life policy benefits	\$ 157	\$ 2	\$ 87	\$ 82	\$ 328	\$	\$	\$ 328
Reinstatement premiums			(1)	(11)	(12)			(12)
Impact on technical result	\$ 157	\$ 2	\$ 86	\$ 71	\$ 316	\$	\$	\$ 316
Net realized and unrealized investment losses							2	2
Impact on pre-tax income					\$ 316	\$	\$ 2	\$ 318
Impact on the loss ratio	13.4%	0.3%	6.3%	17.8%	8.7%			
Impact on the technical ratio	13.4	0.3	6.3	17.6	8.7			
Impact on the combined ratio					8.7%			

<b>2012</b>	<b>Total <sup>(1)</sup></b>
Superstorm Sandy	<b>\$ 227</b>
U.S. drought	<b>91</b>
Impact on pre-tax net income	<b>\$ 318</b>

(1) Large catastrophic losses and large losses are shown net of any reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions.

	North America	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	Global Specialty	Catastrophe	Total Non-life segment	Life and Health segment	Corporate and Other	Total
<b>2011</b>								
Net losses and loss expenses and life policy benefits	\$ 56	\$ 149	\$ 65	\$ 1,511	\$ 1,781	\$ 3	\$ 5	\$ 1,789
Reinstatement premiums				(33)	(33)			(33)
Acquisition costs	(6)			(9)	(15)			(15)
Impact on technical result	\$ 50	\$ 149	\$ 65	\$ 1,469	\$ 1,733	\$ 3	\$ 5	\$ 1,741
Net realized and unrealized investment losses							49	49
Impact on pre-tax net loss					\$ 1,733	\$ 3	\$ 54	\$ 1,790
Impact on the loss ratio	4.9%	19.7%	4.8%	262.1%	45.9%			
Impact on the technical ratio	4.4	19.7	4.8	260.1	45.3			
Impact on the combined ratio					45.2%			



**Table of Contents**

2011	Total <sup>(1)</sup>
Japan Earthquake	\$ 919
February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes	455
Thailand Floods	120
U.S. tornadoes	107
Aggregate contracts covering losses in New Zealand and Australia	100
Australian Floods	41
Additional IBNR <sup>(2)</sup>	48
Impact on pre-tax net loss	\$ 1,790

(1) Large catastrophic losses and large losses are shown net of any reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions.

(2) The Company recorded an additional IBNR reserve related to the 2011 catastrophic events, above the sum of the recorded point estimates, given the high frequency of, and uncertainty related to, these complex and highly volatile events.

*Volatility in capital and credit markets*

In 2013, U.S. and European risk-free interest rates increased and equity markets improved and credit spreads narrowed, while the U.S. dollar ending exchange rate at December 31, 2013 weakened against most major currencies compared to December 31, 2012. As a result of these movements, the value of the Company's investment portfolio and cash and cash equivalents at December 31, 2013 decreased compared to December 31, 2012, with the resulting mark-to-market net loss recorded in net income. Offsetting the gross mark-to-market loss was an unrealized gain related to the initial public offering of an investment in a mortgage guaranty insurance company.

In 2012, credit spreads narrowed, equity markets improved and U.S. and European risk-free interest rates decreased, while the U.S. dollar ending exchange rate at December 31, 2012 weakened against most major currencies compared to December 31, 2011. As a result of these movements, the value of the Company's investment portfolio and cash and cash equivalents at December 31, 2012 increased compared to December 31, 2011, with the resulting mark-to-market net gain recorded in net income.

*Restructuring charges*

In April 2013, the Company announced the restructuring of its business support operations into a single integrated worldwide support platform and changes to the structure of its Global Non-life Operations. The restructuring includes involuntary and voluntary employee termination plans in certain jurisdictions (collectively, termination plans) and certain real estate costs. Employees affected by the termination plans have varying leaving dates, largely through to mid-2014.

During the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company recorded a pre-tax charge of approximately \$58 million related to the costs of the restructuring, which was primarily related to the termination plans and certain real estate costs, within other operating expenses. The continuing salary and other employment benefit costs related to the affected employees will be expensed as the employee remains with the Company and provides service.

In connection with the restructuring, and included within the total expected costs of between \$60 million and \$70 million announced by the Company in April 2013, the Company expects to incur further real estate costs totaling between \$5 million and \$10 million in the first half of 2014.

**Table of Contents***Acquisition of PartnerRe Health*

Effective December 31, 2012, the Company completed the acquisition of PartnerRe Health. The Consolidated Statements of Operations and Cash Flows, and the Life and Health segment, include the results of PartnerRe Health from January 1, 2013.

**Key Financial Measures**

In addition to the Consolidated Balance Sheets and Consolidated Statements of Operations and Comprehensive Income (Loss), Management uses certain other key measures, some of which are non-GAAP financial measures within the meaning of Regulation G (see below), to evaluate its financial performance and the overall growth in value generated for the Company's common shareholders.

The Company's long-term objective is to manage a portfolio of diversified risks that will create total shareholder value. The Company measures its success in achieving its long-term objective by targeting a return, which is variable and can be adjusted by Management, in excess of a referenced risk-free rate over the reinsurance cycle. The return, which is currently targeted to exceed 700 basis points in excess of the referenced risk-free rate, is calculated using compound annual growth in diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding plus dividends per common share (growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends). Management uses growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends as its prime measure of long-term financial performance and believes this measure aligns the Company's stated long-term objective with the measure most investors use to evaluate total shareholder value creation given that it focuses on the tangible value of total shareholder returns, excluding the impact of goodwill and intangibles. Given the Company's profitability in any particular quarterly or annual period can be significantly affected by the level of large catastrophic losses, Management assesses this long-term objective over the reinsurance cycle as the Company's performance during any particular quarterly or annual period is not necessarily indicative of its performance over the longer-term reinsurance cycle.

While growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends is the Company's prime financial measure, Management also uses other key financial measures to monitor performance. At December 31, 2013 and 2012 and for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 these were as follows:

	<b>December 31, 2013</b>	<b>December 31, 2012</b>	
Diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 98.49	\$ 90.86	
Growth in diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding plus dividends <sup>(2)</sup>	11.2%		
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2011</b>
Operating earnings (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders (in millions of U.S. dollars) <sup>(3)</sup>	\$ 722	\$ 664	\$ (642)
Diluted operating earnings (loss) per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(3)</sup>	\$ 12.79	\$ 10.43	\$ (9.50)
Operating return on beginning diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(4)</sup>	12.7%	12.3%	(10.1)%
Combined ratio <sup>(5)</sup>	85.3%	87.8%	125.4%

(1) Diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share) is calculated using common shareholders' equity attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. (total shareholders' equity less noncontrolling interests and the aggregate liquidation value of preferred shares) less goodwill and intangible assets, net of tax, divided by the weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding (assuming exercise of all stock-based awards)

**Table of Contents**

and other dilutive securities). The presentation of Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures below) and is reconciled to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure below.

- (2) Growth in diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding plus dividends (growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends) is calculated using Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends per common share divided by Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share at the beginning of the year. The presentation of growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures below) and is reconciled to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure below.
- (3) Operating earnings or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders (operating earnings or loss) is calculated as net income or loss available to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders excluding net realized and unrealized gains or losses on investments, net of tax (except where the Company has made a strategic investment in an insurance or reinsurance related investee), net foreign exchange gains or losses, net of tax, loss on redemption of preferred shares and the interest in earnings or losses of equity investments, net of tax (except where the Company has made a strategic investment in an insurance or reinsurance related investee and where the Company does not control the investee's activities), and is calculated after preferred dividends. Operating earnings or loss per common share and common share equivalent outstanding (diluted operating earnings or loss per share) are calculated using operating earnings or loss for the period divided by the weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding. The presentation of operating earnings or loss and diluted operating earnings or loss per share are non-GAAP financial measures within the meaning of Regulation G (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures below) and are reconciled to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure below.
- (4) Operating return on beginning diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Operating ROE) is calculated using operating earnings or loss, as defined above, per diluted common share and common share equivalents outstanding, divided by diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding as of the beginning of the year, as defined above. The presentation of Operating ROE is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures below) and is reconciled to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure below.
- (5) The combined ratio of the Non-life segment is calculated as the sum of the technical ratio (losses and loss expenses and acquisition costs divided by net premiums earned) and the other operating expense ratio (other operating expenses divided by net premiums earned).

**Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share:** Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share focuses on the underlying fundamentals of the Company's financial position and performance without the impact of goodwill or intangible assets. As discussed above, the Company uses this measure as the basis for its prime measure of long-term shareholder value creation, growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends. Management believes that Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share aligns the Company's stated long-term objectives with the measure most investors use to evaluate total shareholder value creation and that it focuses on the tangible value of shareholder returns, excluding the impact of goodwill and intangibles. Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share is impacted by the Company's net income or loss, capital resources management and external factors such as foreign exchange, interest rates, credit spreads and equity markets, which can drive changes in realized and unrealized gains or losses on its investment portfolio.

**Table of Contents**

Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share at December 31, 2013 and 2012 and the calculation of the growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends for the year ended December 31, 2013 were as follows. As described above, this metric is a long-term performance measure, however, the below table shows the total shareholder value creation for the year ended December 31, 2013 in order for the shareholders to monitor performance.

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Diluted tangible book value per common share and share equivalents outstanding	\$ 98.49	\$ 90.86
Dividends per common share for the year ended December 31, 2013	2.56	
<b>Diluted tangible book value per share plus dividends</b>	<b>\$ 101.05</b>	
Growth in diluted tangible book value per share plus dividends	11.2%	

The Company's Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share increased by 8.4% to \$98.49 at December 31, 2013 from \$90.86 at December 31, 2012 primarily due to net income attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. and the accretive impact of the share repurchases, which were partially offset by dividends on the common and preferred shares. The growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends was 11.2% during the year ended December 31, 2013. This growth was driven by net income attributable to PartnerRe Ltd., dividends on the common shares and the accretive impact of share repurchases, which were partially offset by realized and unrealized losses from the Company's investment portfolio that were attributable to increases in risk-free rates.

Over the past five years, since December 31, 2008, and over the past ten years, since December 31, 2003, the Company has generated a compound annual growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends in excess of 14%.

The presentation of Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G and should be considered in addition to, and not as a substitute for, measures of financial performance prepared in accordance with GAAP (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures). The reconciliation of Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure, diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding, at December 31, 2013 and 2012 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	December 31, 2013	December 31, 2012
Diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 109.26	\$ 100.84
Less: goodwill and other intangible assets, net of tax	10.77	9.98
<b>Diluted tangible book value per share</b>	<b>\$ 98.49</b>	<b>\$ 90.86</b>

(1) Diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Diluted Book Value per Share) is calculated using common shareholders' equity attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. (total shareholders' equity less noncontrolling interests and the aggregate liquidation value of preferred shares) divided by the weighted average number of common shares and common share equivalents outstanding (assuming exercise of all stock-based awards and other dilutive securities).

**Operating earnings or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders (operating earnings or loss) and operating earnings or loss per common share and common share equivalent outstanding (diluted operating earnings or loss per share):** Management uses operating earnings or loss and diluted operating earnings or loss per share to measure its financial performance as these measures focus on the underlying fundamentals of the Company's operations by excluding net realized and unrealized gains or losses on investments (except where the Company has made a strategic investment in an investee whose operations are insurance or reinsurance related and where the Company does not control the investee's activities), net foreign exchange gains or losses, loss on redemption of preferred shares and certain interest in earnings or losses of

**Table of Contents**

equity investments (except where the Company has made a strategic investment in an investee whose operations are insurance or reinsurance related and where the Company does not control the investee's activities). Net realized and unrealized gains or losses on investments in any particular period are not indicative of the performance of, and distort trends in, the Company's business as they predominantly result from general economic and financial market conditions, and the timing of realized gains or losses on investments is largely opportunistic. Net foreign exchange gains or losses are not indicative of the performance of, and distort trends in, the Company's business as they predominantly result from general economic and foreign exchange market conditions. Loss on the redemption of preferred shares is not indicative of the performance of, and distorts trends in, the Company's business as it resulted from general economic and financial market conditions, and the timing of the loss on redemption was largely opportunistic. Interest in earnings or losses of equity investments are also not indicative of the performance of, or trends in, the Company's business where the investee's operations are not insurance or reinsurance related and where the Company does not control the investee companies' activities. Management believes that the use of operating earnings or loss and diluted operating earnings or loss per share enables investors and other users of the Company's financial information to analyze its performance in a manner similar to how Management analyzes performance. Management also believes that these measures follow industry practice and, therefore, allow the users of financial information to compare the Company's performance with its industry peer group, and that the equity analysts and certain rating agencies which follow the Company, and the insurance industry as a whole, generally exclude these items from their analyses for the same reasons.

Operating earnings increased by \$58 million, from \$664 million in 2012 to \$722 million in 2013. The increase was primarily due to an improvement in the Non-life and Life and Health underwriting results, driven by a lower level of large catastrophic and large losses and a higher level of favorable prior year loss development, and partially offset by a higher level of mid-sized loss activity. These increases were partially offset by a decline in net investment income driven by lower reinvestment rates and higher operating expenses driven by restructuring charges. Diluted operating earnings per share increased from \$10.43 in 2012 to \$12.79 in 2013, driven by the same factors as operating earnings and the accretive impact of share repurchases.

Operating earnings increased by \$1,306 million, from a loss of \$642 million in 2011 to an income of \$664 million in 2012 primarily due to an increase in the Non-life underwriting result of \$1,429 million, partially offset by an increase in income tax expense on the higher level of operating earnings. Diluted operating earnings per share increased from a loss of \$9.50 in 2011 to earnings of \$10.43 in 2012, driven by the same factors as operating earnings and the accretive impact of share repurchases.

The other lesser factors contributing to the increases or decreases in operating earnings in 2013 compared to 2012 and in 2012 compared to 2011 are further described in Review of Net Income (Loss) below.

**Table of Contents**

Operating earnings or loss attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders and diluted operating earnings or loss per share are non-GAAP financial measures within the meaning of Regulation G and should be considered in addition to, and not as a substitute for, measures of financial performance prepared in accordance with GAAP (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures). The reconciliation of operating earnings or loss and diluted operating earnings or loss per share to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012	2011
Net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd.	\$ 664	\$ 1,135	\$ (520)
Less:			
Net realized and unrealized investment (losses) gains, net of tax	(127)	392	15
Net foreign exchange gains, net of tax	2	8	67
Interest in earnings (losses) of equity investments, net of tax	9	9	(7)
Dividends to preferred shareholders	58	62	47
<b>Operating earnings (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders</b>	<b>\$ 722</b>	<b>\$ 664</b>	<b>\$ (642)</b>
Per diluted share:			
Net income (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders	\$ 10.58	\$ 16.87	\$ (8.40)
Less:			
Net realized and unrealized investment (losses) gains, net of tax	(2.25)	6.17	0.23
Net foreign exchange gains, net of tax	0.04	0.13	0.98
Loss on redemption of preferred shares	(0.16)		
Interests in earnings (losses) of equity investments	0.16	0.14	(0.11)
<b>Operating earnings (loss) attributable to PartnerRe Ltd. common shareholders</b>	<b>\$ 12.79</b>	<b>\$ 10.43</b>	<b>\$ (9.50)</b>

**Operating ROE:** Management uses Operating ROE as a measure of profitability that focuses on the return to common shareholders on an annual basis. To support the Company's growth objectives, most economic decisions, including capital attribution and underwriting pricing decisions, incorporate an Operating ROE impact analysis. For the purpose of that analysis, an appropriate amount of capital (equity) is attributed to each transaction for determining the transaction's priced return on attributed capital. Subject to an adequate return for the risk level as well as other factors, such as the contribution of each risk to the overall risk level and risk diversification, capital is attributed to the transactions generating the highest priced return on deployed capital. Management's challenge consists of (i) attributing an appropriate amount of capital to each transaction based on the risk created by the transaction, (ii) properly estimating the Company's overall risk level and the impact of each transaction on the overall risk level, (iii) assessing the diversification benefit, if any, of each transaction, and (iv) deploying available capital. The risk for the Company lies in mis-estimating any one of these factors, which are critical in calculating a meaningful priced return on deployed capital, and entering into transactions that do not contribute to the Company's growth objectives.

Operating ROE increased modestly from 12.3% in 2012 to 12.7% in 2013. The increase in Operating ROE was primarily due to higher operating earnings in 2013 compared to 2012, as described above, and the accretive impact of share repurchases, which were partially offset by a higher beginning diluted book value per share at January 1, 2013 compared to January 1, 2012. The factors contributing to increases or decreases in operating earnings are described further in Review of Net Income (Loss) below.

Operating ROE increased from a loss of 10.1% in 2011 to an income of 12.3% in 2012. The increase in Operating ROE was primarily due to the increase in operating earnings in 2012 compared to 2011, which was driven by the lower level of catastrophic loss activity. The factors contributing to increases or decreases in operating earnings are described further in Review of Net Income (Loss) below.

The average Operating ROE for the last five years and ten years was 8.9% and 11.5%, respectively. Both the five-year and the ten-year averages primarily reflect some years that were impacted by significant catastrophic losses and other years that were not impacted by catastrophes. Due to the volatility related to the

**Table of Contents**

level of catastrophic losses incurred, Management believes that it is more appropriate to measure performance based on an average Operating ROE target over the reinsurance cycle rather than focusing on the results for single periods.

The presentation of Operating ROE is a non-GAAP financial measure within the meaning of Regulation G and should be considered in addition to, and not as a substitute for, measures of financial performance prepared in accordance with GAAP (see Comment on Non-GAAP Measures). The reconciliation of Operating ROE to the most directly comparable GAAP financial measure for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows:

	2013	2012	2011
Return on beginning diluted book value per common share calculated with net income (loss) per share attributable to common shareholders	10.5%	19.9%	(9.0)%
Less:			
Net realized and unrealized investment (losses) gains, net of tax, on beginning diluted book value per common share	(2.2)	7.3	0.2
Net foreign exchange gains, net of tax, on beginning diluted book value per common share		0.1	1.0
Net interest in earnings (losses) of equity investments, net of tax, on beginning diluted book value per common share	0.2	0.2	(0.1)
Loss on redemption of preferred shares on beginning diluted book value per common share	(0.2)		
<b>Operating return on beginning diluted book value per common share</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>12.3%</b>	<b>(10.1)%</b>

**Combined ratio:** The combined ratio is used industry-wide as a measure of underwriting profitability for Non-life business. A combined ratio under 100% indicates underwriting profitability, as the total losses and loss expenses, acquisition costs and other operating expenses are less than the premiums earned on that business. While an important metric of underwriting profitability, the combined ratio does not reflect all components of profitability, as it does not recognize the impact of investment income earned on premiums between the time premiums are received and the time loss payments are ultimately made to clients. The key challenges in managing the combined ratio metric consist of (i) focusing on underwriting profitable business even in the weaker part of the reinsurance cycle, as opposed to growing the book of business at the cost of profitability, (ii) diversifying the portfolio to achieve a good balance of business, with the expectation that underwriting losses in certain lines or markets may potentially be offset by underwriting profits in other lines or markets, and (iii) maintaining control over expenses.

Since 2003, the Company has had nine years of underwriting profitability reflected in combined ratios of less than 100% for its Non-life segment, with the only exceptions being 2005 and 2011. In 2005, when the industry recorded its worst year in history in terms of catastrophe losses in the U.S., with Hurricane Katrina being the largest insured event ever, the Company recorded a net underwriting loss and Non-life combined ratio of 116.3%. In 2011, when the industry incurred a high frequency of large losses related to the 2011 catastrophic events the Company recorded a net underwriting loss and Non-life combined ratio of 125.4%.

The Non-life combined ratio decreased by 2.5 points, from 87.8% in 2012 to 85.3% in 2013. The decrease in the combined ratio in 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily due to a lower level of large catastrophic losses and large losses of 5.3 points (from 8.7 points 2012 to 3.4 points in 2013) and a lower other operating expense ratio of 0.9 points (from 7.0 points in 2012 to 6.1 points in 2013) driven by an increased level of net premiums earned, which were partially offset by a higher level of mid-sized loss activity. The impact on the combined ratio of the catastrophic events for each period is analyzed above.

The Non-life combined ratio decreased by 37.6 points, from 125.4% in 2011 to 87.8% in 2012. The decrease in the combined ratio in 2012 compared to 2011 primarily reflected a decrease in the impact of large

---

**Table of Contents**

catastrophic losses and large losses of 36.5 points (from 45.2 points in 2011 to 8.7 points in 2012). The impact on the combined ratio by catastrophic event for each year is analyzed above.

The other lesser factors contributing to increases or decreases in the combined ratio for all years presented are described further in Review of Net Income (Loss) below.

The Company uses the combined ratio to measure its overall underwriting profitability for its Non-life segment as a whole. Given the Company does not allocate operating expenses to its Non-life sub-segments, Management measures the underwriting profitability of the Non-life sub-segments by using the technical result and technical ratio as described in Results by Segment below.

*Other Key Financial Measures*

In addition to using the growth in Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends as the Company's prime financial long-term measure, and diluted tangible book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share) as the basis for this measure, the Company uses other metrics to monitor its financial performance and to measure total shareholder value. Other such metrics used by Management include, but are not limited to, diluted book value per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Diluted Book Value per Share) and Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus the discount in Non-life loss reserves per common share and common share equivalents outstanding (Diluted Tangible Book Value plus the discount in Non-life reserves). Diluted Book Value per Share is a similar metric to Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share, except that it includes the impact on book value of goodwill and intangible assets. Diluted Tangible Book Value plus the discount in Non-life loss reserves is a shorter-term metric that adjusts the Company's Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share for the impact that changes in interest rates have on the time value of money that is embedded in the Company's Non-life loss reserves.

*Comment on Non-GAAP Measures*

Throughout this filing, the Company's results of operations have been presented in the way that Management believes will be the most meaningful and useful to investors, analysts, rating agencies and others who use financial information in evaluating the performance of the Company. This presentation includes the use of Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share, Diluted Tangible Book Value per Share plus dividends, operating earnings or loss, diluted operating earnings or loss per share and Operating ROE that are not calculated under standards or rules that comprise U.S. GAAP. These measures are referred to as non-GAAP financial measures within the meaning of Regulation G. Management believes that these non-GAAP financial measures are important to investors, analysts, rating agencies and others who use the Company's financial information and will help provide a consistent basis for comparison between years and for comparison with the Company's peer group, although non-GAAP measures may be defined or calculated differently by other companies. Investors should consider these non-GAAP measures in addition to, and not as a substitute for, measures of financial performance prepared in accordance with GAAP. A reconciliation of these measures to the most directly comparable U.S. GAAP financial measures, diluted book value per share, net income or loss and return on beginning common shareholders' equity calculated with net income or loss attributable to common shareholders, is presented above.

**Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates**

The Company's Consolidated Financial Statements have been prepared in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States (U.S. GAAP). The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. GAAP requires Management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. The following presents a discussion of those accounting policies and estimates that Management believes are the most critical to its operations and require the most difficult, subjective and complex judgment. If actual events differ significantly from the underlying assumptions and

**Table of Contents**

estimates used by Management, there could be material adjustments to prior estimates that could potentially adversely affect the Company's results of operations, financial condition and liquidity. These critical accounting policies and estimates should be read in conjunction with the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements, including Note 2, Significant Accounting Policies, for a full understanding of the Company's accounting policies. The sensitivity estimates that follow are based on outcomes that the Company considers reasonably likely to occur.

**Losses and Loss Expenses and Life Policy Benefits*****Losses and Loss Expenses***

Because a significant amount of time can elapse between the assumption of risk, occurrence of a loss event, the reporting of the event to an insurance company (the primary company or the cedant), the subsequent reporting to the reinsurance company (the reinsurer) and the ultimate payment of the claim on the loss event by the reinsurer, the Company's liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses (loss reserves) is based largely upon estimates. The Company categorizes loss reserves into three types of reserves: reported outstanding loss reserves (case reserves), additional case reserves (ACRs) and IBNR. The Company updates its estimates for each of the aforementioned categories on a quarterly basis using information received from its cedants. Case reserves represent unpaid losses reported by the Company's cedants and recorded by the Company. ACRs are established for particular circumstances where, on the basis of individual loss reports, the Company estimates that the particular loss or collection of losses covered by a treaty may be greater than those advised by the cedant. IBNR reserves represent a provision for claims that have been incurred but not yet reported to the Company, as well as future loss development on losses already reported, in excess of the case reserves and ACRs. Unlike case reserves and ACRs, IBNR reserves are often calculated at an aggregated level and cannot usually be directly identified as reserves for a particular loss or treaty. The Company also estimates the future unallocated loss adjustment expenses (ULAE) associated with the loss reserves and these form part of the Company's loss adjustment expense reserves. The Company's Non-life loss reserves for each category, line and sub-segment are reported in the tables included later in this section.

The amount of time that elapses before a claim is reported to the cedant and then subsequently reported to the reinsurer is commonly referred to in the industry as the reporting tail. Lines of business for which claims are reported quickly are commonly referred to as short-tail lines; and lines of business for which a longer period of time elapses before claims are reported to the reinsurer are commonly referred to as long-tail lines. In general, for reinsurance, the time lags are longer than for primary business due to the delay that occurs between the cedant becoming aware of a loss and reporting the information to its reinsurer(s). The delay varies by reinsurance market (country of cedant), type of treaty, whether losses are first paid by the cedant and the size of the loss. The delay could vary from a few weeks to a year or sometimes longer. The Company considers agriculture, catastrophe, energy, property, motor business written in the U.S., proportional motor business written outside of the U.S., specialty property and structured risk to be short-tail lines; aviation/space, credit/surety, engineering, marine and multiline to be medium-tail lines; and casualty, non-proportional motor business written outside of the U.S. and specialty casualty to be long-tail lines of business. For all lines, the Company's objective is to estimate ultimate losses and loss expenses. Total loss reserves are then calculated by subtracting losses paid. Similarly, IBNR reserves are calculated by subtraction of case reserves and ACRs from total loss reserves.

The Company analyzes its ultimate losses and loss expenses after consideration of the loss experience of various reserving cells. The Company assigns treaties to reserving cells and allocates losses from the treaty to the reserving cell. The reserving cells are selected in order to ensure that the underlying treaties have homogeneous loss development characteristics (e.g., reporting tail) but are large enough to make estimation of trends credible. The selection of reserving cells is reviewed annually and changes over time as the business of the Company evolves. For each reserving cell, the Company tabulates losses in reserving triangles that show the total reported or paid claims at each financial year end by underwriting year cohort. An underwriting year is the year during which the reinsurance treaty was entered into as opposed to the year in which the loss occurred (accident year), or the calendar year for which financial results are reported. For each reserving cell, the Company's estimates of

**Table of Contents**

loss reserves are reached after a review of the results of several commonly accepted actuarial projection methodologies. In selecting its best estimate, the Company considers the appropriateness of each methodology to the individual circumstances of the reserving cell and underwriting year for which the projection is made. The methodologies that the Company employs include, but may not be limited to, paid and reported Chain Ladder methods, Expected Loss Ratio method, paid and reported Bornhuetter-Ferguson (B-F) methods, and paid and reported Benktander methods. In addition, the Company uses other methodologies to estimate liabilities for specific types of claims. For example, internal and vendor catastrophe models are typically used in the estimation of loss and loss expenses at the early stages of catastrophe losses before loss information is reported to the reinsurer. In the case of asbestos and environmental claims, the Company has established reserves for future losses and allocated loss expenses based on the results of periodic actuarial studies, which consider the underlying exposures of the Company's cedants.

The reserve methodologies employed by the Company are dependent on data that the Company collects. This data consists primarily of loss amounts and loss payments reported by the Company's cedants, and premiums written and earned reported by cedants or estimated by the Company. The actuarial methods used by the Company to project loss reserves that it will pay in the future do not generally include methodologies that are dependent on claim counts reported, claim counts settled or claim counts open as, due to the nature of the Company's business, this information is not routinely provided by cedants for every treaty.

A brief description of the reserving methods commonly employed by the Company and a discussion of their particular advantages and disadvantages follows:

*Chain Ladder (CL) Development Methods (Reported or Paid)*

These methods use the underlying assumption that losses reported (paid) for each underwriting year at a particular development stage follow a stable pattern. For example, the CL development method assumes that on average, every underwriting year will display the same percentage of ultimate liabilities reported by the Company's cedants (say  $x\%$ ) at 24 months after the inception of the underwriting year. The percentages reported (paid) are established for each development stage (e.g., at 12 months, 24 months, etc.) after examining historical averages from the loss development data. These are sometimes supplemented by external benchmark information. Ultimate liabilities are estimated by multiplying the actual reported (paid) losses by the reciprocal of the assumed reported (paid) percentage (e.g.,  $1/x\%$ ). Reserves are then calculated by subtracting paid claims from the estimated ultimate liabilities.

The main strengths of the method are that it is reactive to loss emergence (payments) and that it makes full use of historical experience on claim emergence (payments). For homogeneous low volatility lines, under stable economic conditions the method can often produce good estimates of ultimate liabilities and reserves. However, the method has weaknesses when the underlying assumption of stable patterns is not true. This may be the consequence of changes in the mix of business, changes in claim inflation trends, changes in claim reporting practices or the presence of large claims, among other things. Furthermore, the method tends to produce volatile estimates of ultimate liabilities in situations where there is volatility in reported (paid) patterns. In particular, when the expected percentage reported (paid) is low, small deviations between actual and expected claims can lead to very volatile estimates of ultimate liabilities and reserves. Consequently, this method is often unsuitable for projections at early development stages of an underwriting year. Finally, the method fails to incorporate any information regarding market conditions, pricing, etc., which could improve the estimate of liabilities and reserves. It therefore tends not to perform very well in situations where there are rapidly changing market conditions.

*Expected Loss Ratio (ELR) Method*

This method estimates ultimate losses for an underwriting year by applying an estimated loss ratio to the earned premium for that underwriting year. Although the method is insensitive to actual reported or paid losses, it can often be useful at the early stages of development when very few losses have been reported or paid, and the

**Table of Contents**

principal sources of information available to the Company consist of information obtained during pricing and qualitative information supplied by the cedant. However, the lack of sensitivity to reported or paid losses means that the method is usually inappropriate at later stages of development.

*Bornhuetter-Ferguson (B-F) Methods (Reported or Paid)*

These methods aim to address the concerns of the Chain Ladder Development methods, which are the variability at early stages of development and the failure to incorporate external information such as pricing. However, the B-F methods are more sensitive to reported and paid losses than the Expected Loss Ratio method, and can be seen as a blend of the Expected Loss Ratio and Chain Ladder development methods. Unreported (unpaid) claims are calculated using an expected reporting (payment) pattern and an externally determined estimate of ultimate liabilities (usually determined by multiplying an *a priori* loss ratio with estimates of premium volume). The accuracy of the *a priori* loss ratio is a critical assumption in this method. Usually *a priori* loss ratios are initially determined on the basis of pricing information, but may also be adjusted to reflect other information that subsequently emerges about underlying loss experience. Although the method tends to provide less volatile indications at early stages of development and reflects changes in the external environment, this method can be slow to react to emerging loss development (payment). In particular, to the extent that the *a priori* loss ratios prove to be inaccurate (and are not revised), the B-F methods will produce loss estimates that take longer to converge with the final settlement value of loss liabilities.

*Benktander (B-K) Methods (Reported or Paid)*

These methods can be viewed as a blend between the Chain Ladder Development and the B-F methods described above. The blend is based on predetermined weights at each development stage that depend on the reported (paid) development patterns.

Although mitigated to some extent, this method still exhibits the same advantages and disadvantages as the B-F method, but the mechanics of the calculation imply that it is more reactive to loss emergence (payment) than the B-F method.

*Loss Event Specific Method*

The ultimate losses estimated under this method are derived from estimates of specific events based on reported claims, client and broker discussions, review of potential exposures, market loss estimates, modeled analysis and other event specific criteria.

*Method Weights*

In determining the loss reserves, the Company often relies on a blend of the results from two or more methods (e.g., weighted averages). The judgment as to which of the above method(s) is most appropriate for a particular underwriting year and reserving cell could change over time as new information emerges regarding underlying loss activity and other data issues. Furthermore, as each line is typically composed of several reserving cells, it is likely that the reserves for the line will be dependent on several reserving methods. This is because reserves for a line are the result of aggregating the reserves for each constituent reserving cell and that a different method could be selected for each reserving cell. Although it is not appropriate to refer to reserves for a line as being determined by a particular method, the table below summarizes the methods that were given principal weight in selecting the best estimates of reserves in each reserving line and can therefore be viewed as key drivers of selected reserves. The table distinguishes methods for mature and immature underwriting years, as they are often different. The definition of maturity is specific to a line and is related to the reporting tail. If at the reserve evaluation date, a significant proportion of losses for the underwriting year are expected to have been reported, then the underwriting year is deemed to be mature, otherwise it is deemed to be immature. For short-tail lines, such as property or agriculture, immature years can refer to the one or two most recent underwriting years, while for longer tail lines, such as casualty, immature years can refer to the three or four most recent underwriting years.

**Table of Contents**

The principal reserving methods used for the major components of each reserving line are as follows:

<b>Reserving line</b>	<b>Non-life sub-segment</b>	<b>Immature Underwriting Years</b>	<b>Mature Underwriting Years</b>
Agriculture	North America and  Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F	Reported B-F /Reported CL
Aviation / Space	Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Casualty	North America	Expected Loss Ratio	Reported B-F
Casualty / Specialty Casualty	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and  Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio / Reported B-F /Reported B-K	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Catastrophe	Catastrophe	Expected Loss Ratio based on exposure analysis / Loss event specific	Loss event specific
Credit / Surety	North America and  Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Energy Onshore	Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F	Reported CL / Reported B-F/ Reported B-K
Engineering	Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Marine / Energy Offshore	Global Specialty	Reported B-F /Expected Loss Ratio	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Motor	North America	Expected Loss Ratio	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F
Motor Non-proportional	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	Expected Loss Ratio /  Reported B-F / Paid B-F	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Motor Proportional	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	Expected Loss Ratio / Reported B-F / Paid B-F	Reported B-F / Reported CL
Multiline	North America	Expected Loss Ratio /Reported B-F	Reported B-F
Property	North America	Reported B-F /Expected Loss Ratio	Reported B-F / Loss event specific
Property / Specialty Property	Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and  Global Specialty	Expected Loss Ratio / Reported B-F/Reported B-K	Reported CL / Reported B-F / Reported B-K
Other	North America, Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and Global Specialty	Periodic actuarial studies	Periodic actuarial studies

The reserving methods used by the Company are dependent on a number of key parameter assumptions. The principal parameter assumptions underlying the methods used by the Company are:

the loss development factors used to form an expectation of the evolution of reported and paid claims for several years following the inception of the underwriting year. These are often derived by examining the Company's data after due consideration of the

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

underlying factors listed below. In some cases, where the Company lacks sufficient volume to have statistical credibility, external benchmarks are used to supplement the Company's data;

the tail factors used to reflect development of paid and reported losses after several years have elapsed since the inception of the underwriting year;

the *a priori* loss ratios used as inputs in the B-F methods; and

the selected loss ratios used as inputs in the Expected Loss Ratio method.

**Table of Contents**

As an example of the sensitivity of the Company's reserves to reserving parameter assumptions by reserving line, the effect on the Company's reserves of higher/lower *a priori* loss ratio selections, higher/lower loss development factors and higher/lower tail factors based on amounts recorded at December 31, 2013 was as follows:

Reserving lines selected assumptions	Higher <i>a priori</i> loss ratios	Higher loss development factors	Higher tail factors (1)	Lower <i>a priori</i> loss ratios	Lower loss development factors	Lower tail factors (1)
Agriculture	5 points	3 months	2%	(5) points	(3) months	(2)%
Aviation / Space	5	3	5	(5)	(3)	(5)
Casualty / Specialty Casualty	10	6	10	(10)	(6)	(10)
Catastrophe	5	3	2	(5)	(3)	(2)
Credit / Surety	5	3	2	(5)	(3)	(2)
Energy Onshore	5	3	2	(5)	(3)	(2)
Engineering	10	6	5	(10)	(6)	(5)
Marine / Energy Offshore	5	3	5	(5)	(3)	(5)
Motor Non-U.S. Non-proportional business	10	12	10	(10)	(12)	(10)
Motor Non-U.S. Proportional business	5	3	2	(5)	(3)	(2)
Motor North America business	5	3	2	(5)	(3)	(2)
Multiline	5	6	5	(5)	(6)	(5)
Property / Specialty Property	5	3	2	(5)	(3)	(2)

Reserving lines selected sensitivity  (in millions of U.S. dollars)	Higher <i>a priori</i> loss ratios	Higher loss development factors	Higher tail factors (1)	Lower <i>a priori</i> loss ratios	Lower loss development factors	Lower tail factors (1)
Agriculture	\$ 35	\$ 15	\$	\$ (35)	\$ (5)	\$
Aviation / Space	15	25	15	(15)	(20)	(10)
Casualty / Specialty Casualty	340	120	245	(340)	(80)	(215)
Catastrophe	5			(5)		
Credit / Surety	25	35	5	(25)	(15)	(5)
Energy Onshore	5	10		(5)	(5)	
Engineering	35	50	45	(35)	(40)	(30)
Marine / Energy Offshore	30	40	10	(30)	(30)	(5)
Motor Non-U.S. Non-proportional business	30	20	45	(30)	(25)	(50)
Motor Non-U.S. Proportional business	15	5	5	(15)		(5)
Motor North America business	10	5	15	(10)	(5)	(5)
Multiline	10	15	25	(10)	(10)	(20)
Property / Specialty Property	60	90		(60)	(55)	

(1) Tail factors are defined as aggregate development factors after 10 years from the inception of an underwriting year.

The Company believes that the illustrated sensitivities to the reserving parameter assumptions are indicative of the potential variability inherent in the estimation process of those parameters. Some reserving lines show little sensitivity to a *a priori* loss ratio, loss development factor or tail factor as the Company may use reserving methods such as the Expected Loss Ratio method in several of its reserving cells within those lines. It is not appropriate to sum the total impact for a specific factor or the total impact for a specific reserving line as the lines of business are not perfectly correlated.

The validity of all parameter assumptions used in the reserving process is reaffirmed on a quarterly basis. Reaffirmation of the parameter assumptions means that the actuaries determine that the parameter assumptions continue to form a sound basis for projection of future liabilities. Parameter assumptions used in projecting future



---

**Table of Contents**

liabilities are themselves estimates based on historical information. As new information becomes available (e.g., additional losses reported), the Company's actuaries determine whether a revised estimate of the parameter assumptions that reflects all available information is consistent with the previous parameter assumptions employed. In general, to the extent that the revised estimate of the parameter assumptions are within a close range of the original assumptions, the Company determines that the parameter assumptions employed continue to form an appropriate basis for projections and continue to use the original assumptions in its models. In this case, any differences could be attributed to the imprecise nature of the parameter estimation process. However, to the extent that the deviations between the two sets of estimates are not within a close range of the original assumptions, the Company reacts by adopting the revised assumptions as a basis for its reserve models. Notwithstanding the above, even where the Company has experienced no material deviations from its original assumptions during any quarter, the Company will generally revise the reserving parameter assumptions at least once a year to reflect all accumulated available information.

In addition to examining the data, the selection of the parameter assumptions is dependent on several underlying factors. The Company's actuaries review these underlying factors and determine the extent to which these are likely to be stable over the time frame during which losses are projected, and the extent to which these factors are consistent with the Company's data. If these factors are determined to be stable and consistent with the data, the estimation of the reserving parameter assumptions are mainly carried out using actuarial and statistical techniques applied to the Company's data. To the extent that the actuaries determine that they cannot continue to rely on the stability of these factors, the statistical estimates of parameter assumptions are modified to reflect the direction of the change. The main underlying factors upon which the estimates of reserving parameters are predicated are:

the cedant's business practices will proceed as in the past with no material changes either in submission of accounts or cash flows;

any internal delays in processing accounts received by the cedant are not materially different from that experienced historically, and hence the implicit reserving allowance made in loss reserves through the methods continues to be appropriate;

case reserve reporting practices, particularly the methodologies used to establish and report case reserves, are unchanged from historical practices;

the Company's internal claim practices, particularly the level and extent of use of ACRs are unchanged;

historical levels of claim inflation can be projected into the future and will have no material effect on either the acceleration or deceleration of claim reporting and payment patterns;

the selection of reserving cells results in homogeneous and credible future expectations for all business in the cell and any changes in underlying treaty terms are either reflected in cell selection or explicitly allowed in the selection of trends;

in cases where benchmarks are used, they are derived from the experience of similar business; and

the Company can form a credible initial expectation of the ultimate loss ratio of recent underwriting years through a review of pricing information, supplemented by qualitative information on market events.

The Company's best estimate of total loss reserves is typically in excess of the midpoint of the actuarial ultimate liability estimate. The Company believes that there is potentially significant risk in estimating loss reserves for long-tail lines of business and for immature underwriting years that may not be adequately captured through traditional actuarial projection methodologies as these methodologies usually rely heavily on projections of prior year trends into the future. In selecting its best estimate of future liabilities, the Company considers both the results of actuarial point estimates of loss reserves as well as the potential variability of these estimates as captured by a reasonable range of actuarial liability estimates. The selected best estimates of reserves are always



**Table of Contents**

within the reasonable range of estimates indicated by the Company's actuaries. In determining the appropriate best estimate, the Company reviews (i) the position of overall reserves within the actuarial reserve range, (ii) the result of bottom up analysis by underwriting year reflecting the impact of parameter uncertainty in actuarial calculations, and (iii) specific qualitative information on events that may have an effect on future claims but which may not have been adequately reflected in actuarial estimates, such as potential for outstanding litigation, claims practices of cedants, etc.

During 2013, 2012 and 2011, the Company reviewed its estimate for prior year losses for the Non-life segment (defined below in Results by Segment) and, in light of developing data, adjusted its ultimate loss ratios for prior accident years. The net prior year favorable loss development for each sub-segment of the Company's Non-life segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012	2011
Net Non-life prior year favorable loss development:			
North America	\$ 223	\$ 218	\$ 189
Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	180	114	116
Global Specialty	227	251	129
Catastrophe	91	45	96

Total net Non-life prior year favorable loss development **\$ 721** \$ 628 \$ 530

The net Non-life prior year favorable loss development for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 was driven by the following factors (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	2012	2011
Net Non-life prior year (adverse) favorable loss development:			
Net prior year loss development due to changes in premiums <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ (71)	\$ (94)	\$ (59)
Net prior year loss development due to all other factors <sup>(2)</sup>	792	722	589
Total net Non-life prior year favorable loss development	<b>\$ 721</b>	<b>\$ 628</b>	<b>\$ 530</b>

(1) Net prior year reserve development due to changes in premiums includes, but is not limited to, the impact to prior years' reserves associated with increases in the estimated or actual premium exposure reported by cedants.

(2) Net prior year reserve development due to all other factors includes, but is not limited to, loss experience, changes in assumptions and changes in methodology.

For a discussion of net prior year favorable loss development by Non-life sub-segment, see Results by Segment below and Note 8 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report.

**Table of Contents**

The net prior year favorable loss development for the year ended December 31, 2013 by reserving line for the Company's Non-life segment was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

<b>Reserving lines</b>	<b>Net favorable prior year loss development</b>
Agriculture	\$ 7
Aviation / Space	71
Casualty / Specialty Casualty	250
Catastrophe	91
Credit / Surety	9
Energy Onshore	15
Engineering	7
Marine / Energy Offshore	60
Motor Non-U.S. Non-proportional business	21
Motor Non-U.S. Proportional business	7
Motor North America business	10
Multiline	17
Property / Specialty Property	148
Other	8
<b>Total net Non-life prior year favorable loss development</b>	<b>\$ 721</b>

Actual losses paid and reported compared with the Company's expectations, and the changes of the Company's reserving parameter assumptions in response to the emerging development for each reserving line during the year ended December 31, 2013 were as follows:

*Agriculture:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 for North America business related to the 2012 underwriting year were a modest amount above the Company's expectations. In addition, the Company's Global Specialty agriculture business experienced lower than expected reported losses. The Company increased its loss ratios for the North America business and lowered its loss ratios for the Global Specialty business, however, it did not otherwise materially alter its reserving assumptions.

*Aviation / Space:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 were significantly lower than the Company's expectations. The Company reflected this experience by selecting lower loss ratios for underwriting years 2008 to 2012.

*Casualty / Specialty Casualty:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 for North America business were below the Company's expectations as losses for underwriting years 2009 and prior continue to emerge at levels significantly below expectations. Aggregate losses reported in 2013 for both Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and Global Specialty sub-segments were below the Company's expectations for most prior underwriting years. The Company reflected this experience by reducing the selected loss ratios for these underwriting years.

*Catastrophe:* Reserves established for the catastrophe line are primarily a function of the presence or absence of catastrophic events during the year, and the complexity and uncertainty associated with estimating unpaid losses from these large disclosed events. In addition, reserves are established in consideration of mid-sized and attritional loss events that occur during a year. In aggregate, the Company has not significantly changed its loss estimates for the Japan Earthquake and the 2010 and the February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes, although it did modestly reduce the unallocated IBNR recorded in 2011 specifically for these events during 2013 (see below for more details). In addition, the Company has recorded modest reductions in ultimate loss estimates during 2013 for a number of prior year loss events across several underwriting years to reflect lower loss emergence.

*Credit / Surety:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 were modestly higher than expected for North America business, giving rise to a modest level of adverse development. For the Company's Global

**Table of Contents**

Specialty business, loss development during 2013 was better than expected for Credit and Surety business combined, primarily for the underwriting years 2009 to 2012. The Company reduced its loss ratios for these recent underwriting years to reflect the lower than expected loss emergence. This was partially offset by adverse development in the older underwriting years.

*Energy Onshore:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 were lower than expected across most underwriting years. The Company reflected the favorable development by reducing its loss ratios for most underwriting years.

*Engineering:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 were lower than expected and the Company reflected this experience by selecting lower loss ratios. The lower than expected losses were partially offset by increases in premium adjustments for proportional business reflecting increased exposure on several underwriting years.

*Marine / Energy Offshore:* Aggregate losses reported in 2013 were significantly lower than expected and impacted most underwriting years driven entirely by the Energy Offshore business. The Company reduced its loss ratios for all underwriting years to reflect the lower than expected loss emergence.

*Motor:*

Aggregate losses reported in 2013 for the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C motor non-proportional line were lower than expected resulting in the Company reducing its loss ratios. The Company further increased its weightings to more experience-based indications resulting in further prior year releases on underwriting years 2002 to 2007.

Aggregate losses reported in 2013 for the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C motor proportional line were modestly lower than expectations in aggregate, allowing the Company to select lower loss ratios on some underwriting years.

Aggregate losses reported in 2013 for the North America motor line were lower than expected resulting in the Company reducing its loss ratios.

*Multiline:* Aggregate reported losses in 2013 were lower than expected for North America business for underwriting years 2012 and prior, resulting in modest levels of reserve releases.

*Property / Specialty Property:* Aggregate reported losses in 2013 were lower than expected for North America business and were driven by loss activity related to large property events and attritional property losses from most underwriting years. Aggregate losses reported in 2013 in the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and Global Specialty property lines were significantly lower than expected for most underwriting years. The Company reflected this experience by reducing its loss ratios for most underwriting years.

**Table of Contents**

The gross reserves reported by cedants (case reserves), those estimated by the Company (ACRs and IBNR reserves) and the total gross, ceded and net loss reserves recorded at December 31, 2013 by reserving line for the Company's Non-life operations were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Reserving lines	Case reserves	ACRs	IBNR reserves	Total gross loss reserves recorded	Ceded loss reserves	Total net loss reserves recorded
Agriculture	\$ 32	\$ 8	\$ 591	\$ 631	\$	\$ 631
Aviation / Space	217	4	196	417	(38)	379
Casualty / Specialty Casualty	1,478	126	2,550	4,154	(26)	4,128
Catastrophe	406	191	118	715	(52)	663
Credit / Surety	331	(5)	174	500		500
Energy Onshore	134	4	73	211	(4)	207
Engineering	313	6	203	522	(21)	501
Marine / Energy Offshore	315	12	439	766	(117)	649
Motor Non-U.S. Non-proportional business	455	6	390	851	(6)	845
Motor Non-U.S. Proportional business	121	1	104	226	(2)	224
Motor North America business	83	2	86	171		171
Multiline	83	15	110	208		208
Property / Specialty Property	692	33	504	1,229	(1)	1,228
Other	3		42	45		45
<b>Total Non-life reserves</b>	<b>\$ 4,663</b>	<b>\$ 403</b>	<b>\$ 5,580</b>	<b>\$ 10,646</b>	<b>\$ (267)</b>	<b>\$ 10,379</b>

The net loss reserves represent the Company's best estimate of future losses and loss expense amounts based on the information available at December 31, 2013. Loss reserves rely upon estimates involving actuarial and statistical projections at a given time that reflect the Company's expectations of the costs of the ultimate settlement and administration of claims. Estimates of ultimate liabilities are contingent on many future events and the eventual outcome of these events may be different from the assumptions underlying the reserve estimates. In the event that the business environment and social trends diverge from historical trends, the Company may have to adjust its loss reserves to amounts falling significantly outside its current estimate. These estimates are continually reviewed and the ultimate liability may be in excess of, or less than, the amounts provided, for which any adjustments will be reflected in the period in which the need for an adjustment is determined.

The Company's best estimates are point estimates within a reasonable range of actuarial liability estimates. These ranges are developed using stochastic simulations and techniques and provide an indication as to the degree of variability of the loss reserves. The Company interprets the ranges produced by these techniques as confidence intervals around the point estimates for each Non-life sub-segment. However, due to the inherent volatility in the business written by the Company, there can be no assurance that the final settlement of the loss reserves will fall within these ranges.

**Table of Contents**

The point estimates related to net loss reserves recorded by the Company and the range of actuarial estimates at December 31, 2013 and 2012 for each Non-life sub-segment were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	<b>Recorded Point Estimate</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>
<b>2013 Net Non-life sub-segment loss reserves:</b>			
North America	\$ 3,517	\$ 3,644	\$ 2,879
Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	2,427	2,644	2,045
Global Specialty	3,772	3,984	3,250
Catastrophe	663	675	534
<b>2012 Net Non-life sub-segment loss reserves:</b>			
North America	\$ 3,351	\$ 3,503	\$ 2,646
Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	2,490	2,616	2,132
Global Specialty	3,670	3,795	3,205
Catastrophe	907	922	744

It is not appropriate to add together the ranges of each sub-segment in an effort to determine a high and low range around the Company's total Non-life carried loss reserves.

Of the Company's \$10,379 million of net Non-life loss reserves at December 31, 2013, net loss reserves for accident years 2005 and prior of \$727 million are guaranteed by Colisée Re, pursuant to the Reserve Agreement. The Company is not subject to any loss reserve variability associated with the guaranteed reserves. See Business Reserves in Item 1 of Part I of this report.

A significant amount of judgment was used to estimate the range of potential losses related to the New Zealand Earthquakes and the Japan Earthquake, and there remains a considerable degree of uncertainty related to the range of possible ultimate losses associated with the New Zealand Earthquakes. Loss estimates arising from earthquakes are inherently more uncertain than those from other catastrophic events and the Company believes the ultimate losses arising from the New Zealand Earthquakes and the Japan Earthquake may be materially in excess of, or less than, the amounts provided for in the Consolidated Balance Sheet at December 31, 2013.

The remaining significant risks and uncertainties related to the New Zealand Earthquakes include the ongoing cedant revisions of loss estimates for each of these events, the degree to which inflation impacts construction materials required to rebuild affected properties, the characteristics of the Company's program participation for certain affected cedants and potentially affected cedants, and the expected length of the claims settlement period. In addition, there is additional complexity related to the New Zealand Earthquakes given multiple earthquakes occurred in the same region in a relatively short period of time, resulting in cedants continuing to revise their allocation of losses between the various events and between different treaties, under which the Company may provide different amounts of coverage.

While the Company remains cautious regarding the estimated ultimate losses from the Japan Earthquake, as time has passed the estimates received from the Company's cedants have stabilized, paid losses have increased and the remaining complexities have reduced.

In addition to the sum of the point estimates originally recorded for each of the New Zealand Earthquakes and Japan Earthquake, at December 31, 2011 the Company recorded additional gross reserves of \$50 million (net reserves of \$48 million after the impact of retrocession) specifically related to these events within its Catastrophe sub-segment. The additional gross reserves recorded were in consideration of the number of events, the complexity of certain events and the continuing uncertainties in estimating the ultimate losses for these events in the aggregate. The Company continues to evaluate the additional gross reserves that were recorded as part of its

**Table of Contents**

periodic reserving process and changes to the amounts recorded may either result in: (i) the reallocation of some or all of the additional reserves to one or more of the these events; or (ii) the release of some or all of the additional reserves to net income in future periods; or (iii) an increase in additional reserves recorded.

During the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company cautiously reduced the additional gross reserves by \$10 million to \$40 million, primarily reflecting the reduced level of uncertainty associated with the Japan Earthquake in the first half of 2013. As a result of further cedant revisions to loss estimates and cedants reallocating their losses between the different New Zealand Earthquakes during the latter half of 2013, the Company determined to maintain the additional gross reserves of \$40 million at December 31, 2013 and have primarily allocated this remaining reserve to the New Zealand Earthquakes to reflect the continuing uncertainty related to these events described above. Based upon information currently available and the estimated range of potential ultimate liabilities, the Company believes that unpaid loss and loss expense reserves contemplate a reasonable provision for the remaining exposure related to the New Zealand Earthquakes and Japan Earthquake.

Included in the business that is considered to have a long reporting tail is the Company's exposure to asbestos and environmental claims. The Company's net reserves for unpaid losses and loss expenses at December 31, 2013 included \$193 million that represents estimates of its net ultimate liability for asbestos and environmental claims. The gross liability for such claims at December 31, 2013 was \$203 million, which primarily relates to Paris Re's gross liability for asbestos and environmental claims for accident years 2005 and prior of \$123 million, with any favorable or adverse development being subject to the Reserve Agreement. Of the remaining \$80 million in gross reserves, the majority relates to casualty exposures in the United States arising from business written by the French branch of PartnerRe Europe and PartnerRe U.S.

Ultimate loss estimates for such claims cannot be estimated using traditional reserving techniques and there are significant uncertainties in estimating the amount of the Company's potential losses for these claims. In view of the legal and tort environment that affect the development of such claims, the uncertainties inherent in estimating asbestos and environmental claims are not likely to be resolved in the near future. There can be no assurance that the reserves established by the Company will not be adversely affected by development of other latent exposures, and further, there can be no assurance that the reserves established by the Company will be adequate. The Company does, however, actively evaluate potential exposure to asbestos and environmental claims and establishes additional reserves as appropriate. The Company believes that it has made a reasonable provision for these exposures and is unaware of any specific issues that would materially affect its unpaid losses and loss expense reserves related to this exposure (see Note 8 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report).

***Life Policy Benefits***

Policy benefits for life and annuity contracts relate to the business in the Company's Life and Health segment, which predominantly includes:

reinsurance of longevity, subdivided into standard and non-standard annuities;

mortality business, which includes death and disability covers (with various riders) primarily written in Continental Europe, TCI primarily written in the U.K. and Ireland, and GMDB business primarily written in Continental Europe; and

effective December 31, 2012, following the acquisition of PartnerRe Health, the Company also writes specialty accident and health business, including Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO) reinsurance, medical reinsurance and provider and employer excess of loss programs.

The Company categorizes life reserves into three types of reserves: case reserves, IBNR and reserves for future policy benefits. Case reserves represent unpaid losses reported by the Company's cedants and recorded by the Company. IBNR reserves represent a provision for claims that have been incurred but not yet reported to the Company, as well as future loss development on losses already reported, in excess of the case reserves. Reserves

**Table of Contents**

for future policy benefits, which relate to future events occurring on policies in force over an extended period of time, are calculated as the present value of future expected benefits to be paid, reduced by the present value of future expected premiums. Such liabilities are established based on methods and underlying assumptions in accordance with U.S. GAAP and applicable actuarial standards. Principal assumptions used in the establishment of reserves for future policy benefits have been determined based upon information reported by ceding companies, supplemented by the Company's actuarial estimates of mortality, critical illness, persistency and future investment income, with appropriate provision to reflect uncertainty. Case reserves, IBNR reserves and reserves for future policy benefits are generally calculated at the treaty level. The Company updates its estimates for each of the aforementioned categories on a periodic basis using information received from its cedants.

The Company's reserving practices begin with the categorization of the contracts written as short duration, long duration, or universal life business for U.S. GAAP reserving purposes. This categorization determines the Company's reserving methodology which is described by line of business below.

*Longevity*

The reserves for the annuity portfolio of reinsurance contracts within the longevity book are established in accordance with the provisions for long duration insurance contracts under U.S. GAAP. Many of these contracts subject the Company to risks arising from policyholder mortality over a period that extends beyond the periods in which premiums are collected. For long duration contracts, the Company establishes initial reserves based upon Management's best estimate of policy benefits and includes a provision for adverse deviation. Management's best estimate relies upon actuarial indications of future policy benefits. The provision for adverse deviation contemplates reasonable deviations from the best estimate assumptions for the key risk elements relevant to the product being evaluated, including mortality expenses, and discount rate among others, and are recorded in accordance with U.S. GAAP and applicable actuarial standards. The Company's actuaries annually verify the current reserving assumptions in consideration of evolving experience and the actuarial indications for assumptions relating to future policy benefits, including mortality and future investment income, among others. Management makes no adjustments to recorded deferred acquisition costs or future policy benefits if the actuarial indications conclude that current recorded U.S. GAAP policy benefits are adequate. The Company establishes a premium deficiency reserve, or an increase to future policy benefits to the extent that deferred acquisition costs are insufficient to cover the premium deficiency reserve, if the actuarial indication of life policy benefits is greater than current recorded aggregate amounts for policy benefits, settlement costs, and deferred acquisition costs.

For standard annuities, the main risk is a faster increase in future life span than expected in the medium to long term. Non-standard annuities are annuities sold to people with aggravated health conditions and are usually medically underwritten on an individual basis and the main risk is the inadequate assessment of the future life span of the insured.

*Mortality*

The reserves for the short-term mortality business are established in accordance with the provisions for short duration insurance contracts under U.S. GAAP. They consist of case reserves and IBNR, calculated at the treaty level based upon cedant information. The Company's reserving methodology includes a quarterly review of actual experience against expected experience and the use of the Expected Loss Ratio method described in Losses and Loss Expenses above. Given the very short-term loss development of this portion of the portfolio, this method is considered appropriate.

The reserves for the long-term traditional mortality and TCI reinsurance portfolio are established in accordance with the provisions for long duration insurance contracts under U.S. GAAP and follow the reserving methodology discussed under the Longevity section above. In addition to the assumptions discussed above, persistency and critical illness assumptions are considered in the reserving process for mortality lines.

**Table of Contents**

The reserves for the GMDB reinsurance business are established in accordance with the provisions for universal life contracts under U.S. GAAP. Key actuarial assumptions for this business are mortality, lapses, interest rates, expected returns on cash and bonds and stock market performance. For the last parameter, a stochastic option pricing approach is used and the benefits used in calculating the liabilities are based on the average benefits payable over a range of scenarios. The assumptions of investment performance and volatility are consistent with expected future experience of the respective underlying funds available for policyholder investment options. Recorded reserves for GMDB reflect Management's best estimate which relies upon the quarterly actuarial indications.

*Accident and Health*

The reserves for accident and health business are established in accordance with the provisions for short duration insurance contracts under U.S. GAAP. Reserves are initially calculated using the Expected Loss Ratio method. Subsequently, the Company's reserving methodology utilizes actual reported loss experience and the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method to calculate IBNR.

The Company's gross and net policy benefits for life and annuity contracts by reserving line at December 31, 2013 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	Case reserves	IBNR reserves	Reserves for future policy benefits	Total gross Life and Health reserves recorded	Ceded reserves	Total net Life and Health reserves recorded
Accident and Health	\$ 8	\$ 91	\$	\$ 99	\$ (3)	\$ 96
Longevity	1	131	424	556	(4)	552
Mortality	208	549	562	1,319		1,319
Total policy benefits for life and annuity contracts	\$ 217	\$ 771	\$ 986	\$ 1,974	\$ (7)	\$ 1,967

Total gross policy benefits for life and annuity contracts include provisions for adverse deviation of \$127 million and \$104 million at December 31, 2013 and 2012, respectively. The increase in the provision for adverse deviation is primarily driven by a new longevity swap written in 2013.

As an example of the sensitivity of the Company's policy benefits for life and annuity contracts to reserving parameter assumptions by reserving line, the effect of different assumption selections based on the amounts recorded at December 31, 2013 was as follows:

Reserving lines	Factors	Change	Impact on total Life reserves (in millions of U.S. dollars)
Longevity			
Standard and non-standard annuities	Mortality improvements per annum	1%	249
Mortality			
Long-term and TCI	Mortality	10%	145
GMDB	Stock market performance	10% / -10%	(3)/3

It is not appropriate to sum the total impact for a specific reserving line or the total impact for a specific factor because the reinsurance portfolios are not perfectly correlated.

**Premiums and Acquisition Costs**

The Company provides proportional and non-proportional reinsurance coverage to cedants (insurance companies). In most cases, cedants seek protection for business that they have not yet written at the time they enter into reinsurance agreements and thus have to estimate the volume of premiums they will cede to the



**Table of Contents**

Company. Reporting delays are inherent in the reinsurance industry and vary in length by reinsurance market (country of cedant) and type of treaty. As delays can vary from a few weeks to a year or sometimes longer, the Company produces accounting estimates to report premiums and acquisition costs until it receives the cedant's actual premium reported data. Approximately 48%, 43% and 43% of the Company's reported net premiums written for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively, were based upon estimates.

Under proportional treaties, which represented 76% of the Company's total gross premiums written for the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company shares proportionally in both the premiums and losses of the cedant and pays the cedant a commission to cover the cedant's acquisition costs. Under this type of treaty, the Company's ultimate premiums written and earned and acquisition costs are not known at the inception of the treaty. As such, reported premiums written and earned and acquisition costs on proportional treaties are generally based upon reports received from cedants and brokers, supplemented by the Company's own estimates of premiums written and acquisition costs for which ceding company reports have not been received. Premium and acquisition cost estimates are determined at the individual treaty level. The determination of premium estimates requires a review of the Company's experience with cedants, familiarity with each market, an understanding of the characteristics of each line of business and Management's assessment of the impact of various other factors on the volume of business written and ceded to the Company. Premium and acquisition cost estimates are updated as new information is received from the cedants and differences between such estimates and actual amounts are recorded in the period in which estimates are changed or the actual amounts are determined.

Under non-proportional treaties, which represented 24% of the Company's total gross premiums written for the year ended December 31, 2013, the Company is typically exposed to loss events in excess of a predetermined dollar amount or loss ratio and receives a fixed or minimum premium, which is subject to upward adjustment depending on the premium volume written by the cedant. In addition, many of the non-proportional treaties include reinstatement premium provisions. Reinstatement premiums are recognized as written and earned at the time a loss event occurs, where coverage limits for the remaining life of the contract are reinstated under pre-defined contract terms. The accrual of reinstatement premiums is based on Management's estimate of losses and loss expenses associated with the loss event.

The magnitude and impact of changes in premium estimates differs for proportional and non-proportional treaties. Although proportional treaties may be subject to larger changes in premium estimates compared to non-proportional treaties, as the Company generally receives cedant statements in arrears and must estimate all premiums for periods ranging from one month to more than one year (depending on the frequency of cedant statements), the pre-tax impact is mitigated by changes in the cedant's related reported acquisition costs and losses. The impact of the change in estimate on premiums earned and pre-tax results varies depending on when the change becomes known during the risk period and the underlying profitability of the treaty. Non-proportional treaties generally include a fixed minimum premium and an adjustment premium. While the fixed minimum premiums require no estimation, adjustment premiums are estimated and could be subject to changes in estimates.

The amounts recorded within net premiums written and earned that related to changes in prior year premium estimates reported by cedants for each Non-life sub-segment for the year ended December 31, 2013 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

Non-life sub-segment	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned
North America	\$ 28	\$ 26
Global (Non-U.S.) P&C	29	26
Global Specialty	77	63
Catastrophe	(1)	(1)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 133</b>	<b>\$ 114</b>

These increases in net premiums written and earned, after the corresponding adjustments to acquisition costs and losses and loss expenses, did not have a material impact on the Company's consolidated pre-tax net income.

**Table of Contents**

As an example of the sensitivity of the Company's Non-life net premiums written and acquisition costs to changes in estimates, the effect of different assumption selections on pre-tax net income based on amounts recorded for the year ended December 31, 2013 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	Change	Impact on pre-tax net income
Net premiums written Non-life proportional treaties <sup>(1)</sup>	+/-5%	\$ +/-17
Net premiums written Non-life non-proportional treaties <sup>(2)</sup>	+/-5%	+/-24
Acquisition costs all Non-life treaties <sup>(3)</sup>	+/-1%	-/+5

- (1) The estimate assumes that the changes in net premiums written become known at the mid-point of the risk period and is made by applying the reported technical ratio for the year ended December 31, 2013.
- (2) The estimate assumes that the changes in net premiums written become known at the mid-point of the risk period and also assume there is no change in losses and loss expenses and is made by applying the reported acquisition ratio for the year ended December 31, 2013.
- (3) The estimate relates to all of the Company's Non-life treaties (both proportional and non-proportional) and assumes that the changes become known at the mid-point of the risk period and also assumes there is no change in premium estimates.

Acquisition costs, comprising only incremental brokerage fees, commissions and excise taxes, which vary directly with, and are related to, the acquisition of reinsurance contracts, are capitalized and charged to expense as the related premium is earned. All other acquisition-related costs, including all indirect costs, are expensed as incurred. The recovery of deferred policy acquisition costs is dependent upon the future profitability of the related business. Deferred policy acquisition costs recoverability testing is performed periodically together with the reserve adequacy test, based on the latest best estimate assumptions by line of business.

**Income Taxes**

Under U.S. GAAP, a deferred tax asset or liability is to be recognized for the estimated future tax effects attributable to temporary differences and carryforwards. U.S. GAAP also establishes procedures to assess whether a valuation allowance should be established for deferred tax assets. All available evidence, both positive and negative, is considered to determine whether, based on the weight of that evidence, a valuation allowance is needed for some portion or all of a deferred tax asset. Management must use its judgment in considering the relative impact of positive and negative evidence. The Company has also established tax liabilities relating to uncertain tax positions as defined under U.S. GAAP of \$21 million at December 31, 2013 (see Notes 2(1) and 15 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report).

The Company has estimated the future tax effects attributed to temporary differences and has a deferred tax asset at December 31, 2013 of \$156 million, after a valuation allowance of \$46 million. The most significant component of the deferred tax asset (after valuation allowance) relates to loss reserve discounting for tax purposes.

The Company has projected future taxable income in the tax jurisdictions in which the deferred tax assets arise. These projections are based on Management's projections of premium and investment income, capital gains and losses, and technical and expense ratios. Based on these projections and an analysis of the ability to utilize loss and foreign tax credits carryforwards at the taxable entity level, Management evaluates the need for a valuation allowance. The valuation allowance of \$46 million, recorded at December 31, 2013, primarily related to a foreign tax credit carryforward in Ireland of \$25 million and a tax loss carryforward in Singapore of \$21 million.

In accordance with U.S. GAAP, the Company has assumed that the future reversal of deferred tax liabilities will result in an increase in taxes payable in future years. Underlying this assumption is an expectation that the Company will continue to be subject to taxation in the various tax jurisdictions and that the Company will continue to generate taxable revenues in excess of deductions.

**Table of Contents**

As an example of the sensitivity of the Company's unrecognized tax benefit related to uncertain tax positions, deferred tax asset and net deferred tax liability, the impact of different assumption selections on the Company's net income and the corresponding impact on net assets based on amounts recorded at December 31, 2013 was as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	Change	Impact on net income and net assets
Unrecognized tax benefit related to uncertain tax positions	\$ (21)	+10%	\$ (2)
Deferred tax asset	156	-10%	(16)
Net deferred tax liability	(223)	+10%	(22)

**Valuation of Investments and Funds Held Directly Managed, including certain Derivative Financial Instruments**

The Company defines fair value as the price received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. The Company measures the fair value of its financial instruments according to a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the information used to measure fair value into three broad levels.

The fair value hierarchy prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value by maximizing the use of observable inputs and minimizing the use of unobservable inputs by requiring that the most observable inputs be used when available. Observable inputs are inputs that market participants would use in pricing an asset or liability based on market data obtained from sources independent of the Company. Unobservable inputs are inputs that reflect the Company's assumptions about what market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability based on the best information available in the circumstances. The level in the hierarchy within which a given fair value measurement falls is determined based on the lowest level input that is significant to the measurement.

The Company must determine the appropriate level in the hierarchy for each financial instrument that it measures at fair value. In determining fair value, the Company uses various valuation approaches, including market, income and cost approaches. See Note 3 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report for more detail on the valuation techniques, methods and assumptions that were used by the Company to estimate the fair value of its fixed maturities and short-term investments, equities, other invested assets and its fixed maturities and other invested assets underlying the funds held directly managed account. See Note 6 to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report for more discussion of the Company's use of derivative financial instruments.

The Company records all of its fixed maturities, short-term investments and equities, certain other invested assets, including derivative financial instruments, and its fixed maturities and certain other invested assets underlying the funds held directly managed account at fair value in its Consolidated Balance Sheets. The changes in the fair value of all of the Company's investments and derivatives, carried at fair value, are recorded in net realized and unrealized investment gains and losses, except for certain foreign exchange related derivatives that are recorded in net foreign exchange gains and losses, in the Consolidated Statements of Operations and are included in the determination of net income or loss in the period in which they are recorded.

**Table of Contents**

Under the fair value hierarchy, Management uses certain assumptions and judgments to derive the fair value of its investments, particularly for those assets with significant unobservable inputs, commonly referred to as Level 3 assets. At December 31, 2013, the Company's financial instruments that were measured at fair value and categorized as Level 3 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	<b>December 31, 2013</b>
Fixed maturities	\$ 555
Equities	38
Other invested assets (including certain derivatives)	104
Funds held – directly managed account	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 712</b>

For the Company's fixed maturities, equities, other invested assets and investments underlying the funds held – directly managed account categorized as Level 3, a 10% decline in the fair value of these investments at December 31, 2013 would result in a \$71 million pre-tax charge to net income or loss and a corresponding reduction in total assets.

In addition to other invested assets included in the table above for Level 3 and the combined fair value of Level 1 and Level 2 derivative assets of \$31 million, the Company's other invested assets also include various investments which are accounted for using the cost method of accounting or equity method of accounting, totaling \$186 million at December 31, 2013. The Company does not measure its investments that are accounted for using any of these methods at fair value. For investments that are accounted for using the cost method of accounting or equity method of accounting, a 10% decline in the carrying value of these investments at December 31, 2013 would result in a \$19 million pre-tax charge to net income or loss and a corresponding reduction in investments and total assets.

The Company utilizes derivatives for a variety of purposes. The Company's derivatives are carried at fair value, which is based on quoted market prices or internal valuation models where quoted market prices are not available. Most of the Company's derivatives are fair valued using significant other observable inputs (fair value of \$10 million net unrealized loss at December 31, 2013), referred to as Level 2 assets, and included foreign exchange forward contracts, interest rate swaps, foreign currency options, credit default swaps and to-be-announced mortgage-backed securities (TBAs). The Company's derivatives that are fair valued using quoted prices in active markets, referred to as Level 1 assets, had fair value of \$41 million at December 31, 2013, and included treasury and equity futures. In addition, the Company has certain total return swaps and insurance-linked securities that are fair valued using significant other unobservable inputs, and are included in the Level 3 other invested assets. The total return swaps and insurance-linked securities that are classified as Level 3 have an insignificant combined fair value at December 31, 2013, based on a combined notional exposure of \$200 million.

In aggregate, the Company is not significantly exposed to changes in the valuation of its total return and interest rate swap portfolio due to changes in the general level of interest rates. At December 31, 2013, the Company estimated that a 100 basis point increase or decrease in all risk spread assumptions used in the Company's internal valuation models would result in a \$2 million decrease or increase, respectively, in the fair value of its total return and interest rate swap portfolio categorized as Level 3.

The Company is exposed to changes in the expected amount of future cash flows of the reference assets in its total return swap portfolio. The Company's total return swap portfolio primarily references certain bonds issued by U.S. municipalities. At December 31, 2013, the notional value of the total return swap portfolio categorized as Level 3 was \$32 million and the fair value of the assets underlying the total return swap portfolio categorized as Level 3 was \$31 million. The Company estimated that each 1% increase or decrease in the amount of all expected future cash flows related to the reference assets would result in a \$2 million increase or decrease, respectively, in the fair value of its total return swap portfolio at December 31, 2013.

---

**Table of Contents**

At December 31, 2013, the Company's insurance-linked securities that are classified as Level 3 include longevity swaps and weather derivatives, with an insignificant combined fair value. At December 31, 2013, the notional exposure of the longevity swaps and weather derivatives classified as Level 3 was \$133 million and \$36 million, respectively. At December 31, 2013, the Company estimated that a 10% improvement in the mortality assumption used in the Company's internal valuation models for its longevity swaps would result in a \$4 million decrease in the fair value of its longevity swap portfolio. The weather derivatives categorized as Level 3 are exposed to wind events, and any change in the assumptions used in the Company's internal models would have an insignificant impact on the fair value of weather derivatives at December 31, 2013.

**Goodwill**

Goodwill represents the excess of the purchase price over the fair value of the net assets acquired of PartnerRe SA, Winterthur Re, Paris Re and PartnerRe Health. The Company assesses the appropriateness of its valuation of goodwill on at least an annual basis or more frequently if events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying amount may not be recoverable. If, as a result of the assessment, the Company determines that the value of its goodwill is impaired, goodwill will be written down in the period in which the determination is made. Neither the Company's initial valuation nor its subsequent valuations has indicated any impairment of the Company's goodwill asset of \$456 million at December 31, 2013.

In making an assessment of the value of its goodwill, the Company uses both market based and non-market based valuations. The fair value of the reporting units is determined based on the earnings multiple, price to tangible book value multiple, present value of estimated cash flows and present value of future profits methods. Significant changes in the data underlying these assumptions could result in an assessment of impairment of the Company's goodwill asset. In addition, if the current economic environment and/or the Company's financial performance were to deteriorate significantly, this could lead to an impairment of goodwill, the write-off of which would be recorded against net income in the period such deterioration occurred.

**Intangible Assets**

Intangible assets represent the fair value adjustments related to unpaid losses and loss expenses and the fair values of renewal rights, customer relationships and U.S. licenses arising from the acquisitions of Paris Re and PartnerRe Health. Definite-lived intangible assets are amortized over their useful lives, generally ranging from eleven to thirteen years. The Company recognizes the amortization of all intangible assets in the Consolidated Statement of Operations. Indefinite-lived intangible assets are not subject to amortization. The carrying values of intangible assets are reviewed for indicators of impairment on at least an annual basis. Impairment is recognized if the carrying values of the intangible assets are not recoverable from their undiscounted cash flows and are measured as the difference between the carrying value and the fair value. Based upon the Company's assessment, there was no impairment of its intangible assets of \$187 million at December 31, 2013.

**Results of Operations**

The following discussion of Results of Operations contains forward-looking statements based upon assumptions and expectations concerning the potential effect of future events that are subject to uncertainties. See Item 1A of Part I of this report for a complete list of the Company's risk factors. Any of these risk factors could cause actual results to differ materially from those reflected in such forward-looking statements.

The Company's reporting currency is the U.S. dollar. The Company's significant subsidiaries and branches have one of the following functional currencies: U.S. dollar, euro or Canadian dollar. As a significant portion of the Company's operations is transacted in foreign currencies, fluctuations in foreign exchange rates may affect year over year comparisons. To the extent that fluctuations in foreign exchange rates affect comparisons, their impact has been quantified, when possible, and discussed in each of the relevant sections. See Note 2(m) to Consolidated Financial Statements in Item 8 of Part II of this report for a discussion of translation of foreign currencies.

**Table of Contents**

The foreign exchange fluctuations for the principal currencies in which the Company transacts business were as follows:

the U.S. dollar average exchange rate was stronger against most currencies, except the euro and Swiss franc, in 2013 compared to 2012 and was stronger against most currencies, except the Japanese yen, in 2012 compared to 2011; and

the U.S. dollar ending exchange rate weakened against most currencies, except the Japanese yen and Canadian dollar, at December 31, 2013 compared to December 31, 2012.

**Review of Net Income (Loss)**

Management analyzes the Company's net income or loss in three parts: underwriting result, investment result and other components of net income or loss. Underwriting result consists of net premiums earned and other income or loss less losses and loss expenses and life policy benefits, acquisition costs and other operating expenses. Investment result consists of net investment income, net realized and unrealized investment gains or losses and interest in earnings or losses of equity investments. Net investment income includes interest and dividends, net of investment expenses, generated by the Company's investment activities, as well as interest income generated on funds held assets. Net realized and unrealized investment gains or losses include sales of the Company's fixed income, equity and other invested assets and investments underlying the funds held directly managed account and changes in net unrealized gains or losses. Interest in earnings or losses of equity investments includes the Company's strategic investments. Other components of net income or loss include technical result and other income or loss, other operating expenses, interest expense, amortization of intangible assets, net foreign exchange gains or losses and income tax expense or benefit.

The components of net income (loss) for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 were as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	% Change	2012	% Change	2011
Underwriting result:					
Non-life	\$ 626	37%	\$ 456	NM%	\$ (973)
Life and Health	12	NM	(16)	(39)	(27)
Investment result:					
Net investment income	484	(15)	571	(9)	629
Net realized and unrealized investment (losses) gains	(161)	NM	494	640	67
Interest in earnings (losses) of equity investments <sup>(1)</sup>	14	37	10	NM	(6)
Corporate and Other:					
Technical result <sup>(2)</sup>	8	98	4	(23)	6
Other income <sup>(2)</sup>	3	(24)	3	15	3
Other operating expenses	(170)	67	(102)	3	(99)
Interest expense	(49)		(49)		(49)
Amortization of intangible assets <sup>(3)</sup>	(27)	(15)	(32)	(13)	(36)
Net foreign exchange (losses) gains	(18)	NM		NM	34
Income tax expense	(49)	(76)	(204)	196	(69)
Net income (loss)	\$ 673	(41)	\$ 1,135	NM	\$ (520)

NM: not meaningful

(1) Interest in earnings or losses of equity investments represents the Company's aggregate share of earnings or losses related to several private placement investments and limited partnerships within the Corporate and Other segment.

**Table of Contents**

- (2) *Technical result and other income primarily relate to income on insurance-linked securities and principal finance transactions within the Corporate and Other segment.*
- (3) *Amortization of intangible assets relates to intangible assets acquired in the acquisition of Paris Re in 2009 and PartnerRe Health in 2012. The acquisition of PartnerRe Health was effective December 31, 2012 and, accordingly, no amortization expense related to the intangible assets acquired has been recorded during the years ended December 31, 2012 and 2011.*

Underwriting result is a measurement that the Company uses to manage and evaluate its Non-life and Life and Health segments, as it is a primary measure of underlying profitability for the Company's core reinsurance operations, separate from the investment results. The Company believes that in order to enhance the understanding of its profitability, it is useful for investors to evaluate the components of net income or loss separately and in the aggregate. Underwriting result should not be considered a substitute for net income or loss and does not reflect the overall profitability of the business, which is also impacted by investment results and other items.

The following table provides the components of the underwriting result and combined ratio for the Non-life segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 and the components are discussed further below (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012		2011	
Current accident year technical result and ratio						
Adjusted for large catastrophic losses and large losses	\$ 303	92.8%	\$ 396	89.1%	\$ 509	86.5%
Large catastrophic losses and large losses <sup>(1)</sup>	(142)	3.4	(316)	8.7	(1,733)	45.3
Prior accident years technical result and ratio						
Net favorable prior year loss development	721	(17.0)	628	(17.0)	530	(13.8)
Technical result and ratio, as reported	\$ 882	79.2%	\$ 708	80.8%	\$ (694)	118.0%
Other income	3		5		4	
Other operating expenses	(259)	6.1	(257)	7.0	(283)	7.4
Underwriting result and combined ratio, as reported	\$ 626	85.3%	\$ 456	87.8%	\$ (973)	125.4%

(1) *Large catastrophic losses and large losses are shown net of any related reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions. 2013 compared to 2012*

The underwriting result for the Non-life segment increased by \$170 million (corresponding to a decrease of 2.5 points in the combined ratio), from \$456 million (87.8 points on the combined ratio) in 2012 to \$626 million (85.3 points on the combined ratio) in 2013. The increase in the Non-life underwriting result and the corresponding decrease in the combined ratio in 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily attributable to:

*Large catastrophic losses and large losses* a decrease of \$174 million (decrease of 5.3 points in the technical ratio) compared to no significant catastrophic losses from \$316 million (8.7 points on the technical ratio) in 2012 related to Superstorm Sandy and the U.S. drought that impacted the agriculture line of the North America sub-segment to \$142 million (3.4 points on the technical ratio) in 2013 related to the German Hailstorm, Alberta Floods and European Floods.

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$93 million from \$628 million (17.0 points on the technical ratio) in 2012 to \$721 million (17.0 points on the technical ratio) in 2013. The increase in net favorable prior year loss development was primarily driven by increases in the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and Catastrophe sub-segments, which were partially offset by a decrease in the Global Specialty sub-segment. While net favorable prior year loss development increased in 2013 compared to 2012, this did not decrease the technical ratio as a result of higher net premiums earned in 2013. The components of the net favorable prior year loss development are described in more detail in the discussion of individual sub-segments in Results by Segment below.

**Table of Contents**

These factors driving the increase in the Non-life underwriting result and the corresponding decrease in the combined ratio in 2013 compared to 2012 were partially offset by:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses and large losses* a decrease in the technical result (and a corresponding increase in the technical ratio) primarily driven by higher losses reported by a large cedant in the agriculture line of business of the Company's North America sub-segment and a higher level of mid-sized loss activity in the Global Specialty and Catastrophe sub-segments. These decreases were partially offset by higher upward premium adjustments in the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C sub-segment and a modestly lower level of mid-sized loss activity in the Global (Non-U.S.) P&C and North America sub-segments.

The underwriting result for the Life and Health segment, which does not include allocated investment income, improved by \$28 million, from a loss of \$16 million in 2012 to a gain of \$12 million in 2013. The improvement in the Life and Health underwriting result was primarily due to higher net favorable prior year loss development, driven by the mortality line of business. See Results by Segment below.

Net investment income decreased by \$87 million, from \$571 million in 2012 to \$484 million in 2013. The decrease in net investment income was primarily attributable to a decrease in net investment income from fixed maturities due to lower reinvestment rates. See Corporate and Other Net Investment Income below for more details.

Net realized and unrealized investment losses increased by \$655 million, from gains of \$494 million in 2012 to losses of \$161 million in 2013. The net realized and unrealized investment losses of \$161 million in 2013 were primarily due to increases in risk-free interest rates and were partially offset by improvements in worldwide equity markets and narrower credit spreads. See Corporate and Other Net Realized and Unrealized Investment Gains (Losses) below for more details.

Other operating expenses included in Corporate and Other increased by \$68 million, from \$102 million in 2012 to \$170 million in 2013. The increase was primarily due to restructuring charges described in Overview above.

Interest expense in 2013 was comparable to 2012.

Net foreign exchange losses increased by \$18 million, from breakeven in 2012 to losses of \$18 million in 2013. The net foreign exchange losses in 2013 resulted primarily from currency movements on certain unhedged equity securities. The Company hedges a significant portion of its currency risk exposure as discussed in Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report.

Income tax expense decreased by \$155 million, from \$204 million in 2012 to \$49 million in 2013, reflecting a decrease in pre-tax net income and a higher distribution of pre-tax net income recorded in non-taxable jurisdictions in 2013 compared to 2012. See Corporate and Other Income Taxes below for more details.

*2012 compared to 2011*

The underwriting result for the Non-life segment increased by \$1,429 million (corresponding to a decrease of 37.6 points in the combined ratio), from a loss of \$973 million (125.4 points on the combined ratio) in 2011 to an income of \$456 million (87.8 points on the combined ratio) in 2012. The increase in the Non-life underwriting result and the corresponding decrease in the combined ratio in 2012 compared to 2011 was primarily attributable to:

*Large catastrophic losses and large losses* a decrease of \$1,417 million (decrease of 36.6 points in the technical ratio) from \$1,733 million (45.3 points on the technical ratio) related to the 2011

**Table of Contents**

catastrophic events to \$316 million (8.7 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy and the U.S. drought, which impacted the agriculture line of business in the North America sub-segment, in 2012.

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$98 million (decrease of 3.2 points in the technical ratio) from \$530 million (13.8 points on the technical ratio) in 2011 to \$628 million (17.0 points on the combined ratio) in 2012. The increase was primarily driven by the Global Specialty and North America sub-segments. The components of the net favorable prior year loss development are described in more detail in the discussion of individual sub-segments in Results by Segment below.

*Other operating expenses* a decrease of \$26 million (a decrease of 0.4 points in the combined ratio) from \$283 million (7.4 points on the combined ratio) in 2011 to \$257 million (7.0 points on the combined ratio) in 2012, primarily resulting from a favorable impact of foreign exchange fluctuations and lower information technology costs.

These factors driving the increase in the Non-life underwriting result and the corresponding decrease in the combined ratio in 2012 compared to 2011 were partially offset by:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses and large losses* a decrease of \$113 million (an increase of 2.6 points in the technical ratio) from \$509 million (86.5 points on the technical ratio) in 2011 to \$396 million (89.1 points on the technical ratio) in 2012. The decrease was driven by a lower level of net premiums earned in the Catastrophe sub-segment, which absent catastrophe losses, directly reduces the underwriting result, and a lower level of losses recovered under retrocessional programs. These decreases were partially offset by a lower level of mid-sized loss activity in the Global Specialty and North America sub-segments.

The underwriting result for the Life segment, which does not include allocated investment income, improved by \$11 million, from a loss of \$27 million in 2011 to a loss of \$16 million in 2012, primarily due to higher net favorable prior year loss development, which was driven by the mortality line of business. See Results by Segment below.

Net investment income decreased by \$58 million, from \$629 million in 2011 to \$571 million in 2012. The decrease in net investment income is primarily attributable to a decrease in net investment income from fixed maturities due to lower reinvestment rates. See Corporate and Other Net Investment Income below for more details.

Net realized and unrealized investment gains increased by \$427 million, from \$67 million in 2011 to \$494 million in 2012. The net realized and unrealized investment gains of \$494 million in 2012 were primarily due to narrowing credit spreads, improvements in worldwide equity markets and decreases in U.S. and European risk-free interest rates. See Corporate and Other Net Realized and Unrealized Investment Gains below for more details.

Other operating expenses included in Corporate and Other increased by \$3 million, from \$99 million in 2011 to \$102 million in 2012. The increase was primarily due to higher consulting costs in 2012.

Interest expense in 2012 was comparable to 2011.

Net foreign exchange gains decreased by \$34 million, from \$34 million in 2011 to \$nil in 2012. The net foreign exchange result in 2012 was primarily due to losses related to the timing of hedging activities, which were offset by gains arising from the difference in the forward points embedded in the Company's hedges. The Company hedges a significant portion of its currency risk exposure as discussed in Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk in Item 7A of Part II of this report.

**Table of Contents**

Income tax expense increased by \$135 million, from \$69 million in 2011 to \$204 million in 2012. The increase in the income tax expense was primarily due to the Company's taxable jurisdictions generating a higher pre-tax income in 2012 compared to 2011. See Corporate and Other Income Taxes below for more details.

**Results by Segment**

The Company monitors the performance of its operations in three segments, Non-life, Life and Health and Corporate and Other. The Non-life segment is further divided into four sub-segments, North America, Global (Non-U.S.) Property and Casualty (Global (Non-U.S.) P&C), Global Specialty and Catastrophe. Segments and sub-segments represent markets that are reasonably homogeneous in terms of geography, client types, buying patterns, underlying risk patterns and approach to risk management. See the description of the Company's segments and sub-segments as well as a discussion of how the Company measures its segment results in Note 21 to Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 8 of Part II of this report. Effective January 1, 2013, the Life segment is referred to as Life and Health to reflect the inclusion of PartnerRe Health's results and the Global (Non-U.S.) Specialty sub-segment is referred to as Global Specialty.

**Non-life Segment****North America**

The North America sub-segment is comprised of lines of business that are considered to be either short, medium or long-tail. The short-tail lines consist primarily of agriculture, property and motor business. Casualty is considered to be long-tail, while credit/surety and multiline are considered to have a medium tail. The casualty line typically tends to have a higher loss ratio and a lower technical result due to the long-tail nature of the risks involved. Casualty treaties typically provide for investment income on premiums invested over a longer period as losses are typically paid later than for other lines. Investment income, however, is not considered in the calculation of technical result.

The following table provides the components of the technical result and the corresponding ratios for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	% Change	2012	% Change	2011
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,601	31%	\$ 1,221	11%	\$ 1,104
Net premiums written	1,587	30	1,219	11	1,104
Net premiums earned	\$ 1,533	30	\$ 1,176	4	\$ 1,135
Losses and loss expenses	(975)	19	(816)	10	(741)
Acquisition costs	(351)	21	(291)	5	(276)
Technical result <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 207	200	\$ 69	(41)	\$ 118
Loss ratio <sup>(2)</sup>	63.6%		69.4%		65.3%
Acquisition ratio <sup>(3)</sup>	22.9		24.7		24.3
Technical ratio <sup>(4)</sup>	86.5%		94.1%		89.6%

(1) Technical result is defined as net premiums earned less losses and loss expenses and acquisition costs.

(2) Loss ratio is obtained by dividing losses and loss expenses by net premiums earned.

(3) Acquisition ratio is obtained by dividing acquisition costs by net premiums earned.

(4) Technical ratio is defined as the sum of the loss ratio and the acquisition ratio.

**Table of Contents****Premiums**

The North America sub-segment represented 30%, 27% and 24% of total net premiums written in 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. The following table summarizes the net premiums written and net premiums earned by line of business for this sub-segment for years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013				2012				2011			
	Net premiums written		Net premiums earned		Net premiums written		Net premiums earned		Net premiums written		Net premiums earned	
Agriculture	\$ 478	30%	\$ 478	31%	\$ 231	19%	\$ 231	20%	\$ 222	20%	\$ 223	20%
Casualty	588	37	564	37	520	43	484	41	440	40	434	38
Credit/Surety	54	3	48	3	54	4	54	5	53	5	60	5
Motor	58	4	49	3	51	4	65	6	95	8	100	9
Multiline	97	6	96	6	89	7	87	7	79	7	77	7
Property	241	15	235	16	238	20	227	19	198	18	218	19
Other	71	5	63	4	36	3	28	2	17	2	23	2
Total	\$ 1,587	100%	\$ 1,533	100%	\$ 1,219	100%	\$ 1,176	100%	\$ 1,104	100%	\$ 1,135	100%

2013 compared to 2012

Gross premiums written increased by 31% and net premiums written and earned increased by 30% in 2013 compared to 2012. The increases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned were primarily driven by the increase in the agriculture line of business, and, to a lesser extent, the casualty line of business, which were the result of new business written. Notwithstanding the diverse conditions prevailing in various markets within this sub-segment, the Company was able to write business that met its portfolio objectives.

2012 compared to 2011

Gross and net premiums written increased by 11% and net premiums earned increased by 4% in 2012 compared to 2011. The increases in gross and net premiums written were driven by most lines of business, except the motor line, and were most pronounced in the casualty and property lines of business. The increase in the casualty line of business was primarily driven by new business written and higher upward prior year premium adjustments. The increase in the property line of business was due to new business written. These increases in gross and net premiums written were partially offset by reductions in the motor line of business as a result of non-renewals of certain treaties. The increase in net premiums earned was lower than the increase in gross and net premiums written due to the earning of the reduced level of premiums written in 2011, primarily in the property line as a result of cancellations and lower renewals, and due to the impact of the new casualty and property business in 2012 being written on a proportional basis, which is yet to be fully reflected in net premiums earned.

**Technical result and technical ratio**

The following table provides the components of the technical result and ratio for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012		2011	
Current accident year technical result and ratio						
Adjusted for large catastrophic losses and large losses	\$ (2)	100.1%	\$ 8	99.3%	\$ (21)	101.9%
Large catastrophic losses and large losses <sup>(1)</sup>	(14)	0.9	(157)	13.4	(50)	4.4
Prior accident years technical result and ratio						
Net favorable prior year loss development	223	(14.5)	218	(18.6)	189	(16.7)
Technical result and ratio, as reported	\$ 207	86.5%	\$ 69	94.1%	\$ 118	89.6%

**Table of Contents**

(1) *Large catastrophic losses and large losses are shown net of any related reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions. 2013 compared to 2012*

The increase of \$138 million in the technical result (and the corresponding decrease of 7.6 points in the technical ratio) in 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily attributable to:

*Large catastrophic losses and large losses* a decrease of \$143 million (decrease of 12.5 points in the technical ratio) from \$157 million (13.4 points on the technical ratio) related to the U.S. drought and Superstorm Sandy in 2012 to \$14 million (0.9 points on the technical ratio) related to the Alberta Floods in 2013.

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$5 million (increase of 4.1 points in the technical ratio) from \$218 million (18.6 points on the technical ratio) in 2012 to \$223 million (14.5 points on the technical ratio) in 2013. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2013 was driven by most lines of business, with the casualty line being the most pronounced. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2012 is described below. While net favorable prior year loss development increased in 2013 compared to the 2012, this had a reduced impact on the technical ratio as a result of higher net premiums earned in 2013 compared to 2012.

These factors driving the increase in the technical result in 2013 compared to 2012 were partially offset by:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses and large losses* a decrease in the technical result (and corresponding increase in the technical ratio) primarily due to higher losses reported by a large cedant in the agriculture line of business, partially offset by normal fluctuations in profitability between periods.

*2012 compared to 2011*

The decrease of \$49 million in the technical result (and the corresponding increase of 4.5 points in the technical ratio) in 2012 compared to 2011 was primarily attributable to:

*Large catastrophic losses and large losses* an increase of \$107 million (increase of 9.0 points in the technical ratio) from \$50 million (4.4 points on the technical ratio) related to the U.S. tornadoes in 2011 to \$157 million (13.4 points on the technical ratio) related to the U.S. drought and Superstorm Sandy in 2012.

This factor driving the decrease in the technical result in 2012 compared to 2011 was partially offset by:

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$29 million (decrease of 1.9 points in the technical ratio) from \$189 million (16.7 points on the technical ratio) in 2011 to \$218 million (18.6 points on the technical ratio) in 2012. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2012 and 2011 was driven by most lines of business, with the casualty line of business being the most pronounced.

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses and large losses* an increase in the technical result (and corresponding decrease in the technical ratio) due to a lower level of mid-sized loss activity, higher upward premium adjustments in 2012 compared to 2011 and normal fluctuations in profitability between periods.

**2014 Outlook**

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

During the January 1, 2014 renewals, the Company observed increasingly competitive markets with cedants retaining more business and terms and conditions deteriorating due to an excess supply of reinsurance capital. Despite these factors, the expected premium volume from the Company's January 1, 2014 renewal increased

**Table of Contents**

compared to the prior year primarily as a result of new business. Management expects a continuation of the observed trends in competition and conditions during the remainder of 2014.

**Global (Non-U.S.) P&C**

The Global (Non-U.S.) P&C sub-segment is composed of short-tail business, in the form of property and proportional motor business, that represented approximately 85%, 83% and 84% of net premiums written in 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively, and long-tail business, in the form of casualty and non-proportional motor business, that represented the balance of net premiums written.

The following table provides the components of the technical result and the corresponding ratios for this sub-segment for years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	% Change	2012	% Change	2011
Gross premiums written	\$ 818	20%	\$ 684	%	\$ 682
Net premiums written	811	19	681		678
Net premiums earned	\$ 743	10	\$ 678	(11)	\$ 759
Losses and loss expenses	(373)	(10)	(415)	(27)	(567)
Acquisition costs	(196)	18	(167)	(12)	(191)
Technical result	\$ 174	81	\$ 96	NM	\$ 1
Loss ratio	50.2%		61.3%		74.7%
Acquisition ratio	26.4		24.6		25.1
Technical ratio	76.6%		85.9%		99.8%

NM: not meaningful

**Premiums**

The Global (Non-U.S.) P&C sub-segment represented 15% of total net premiums written in 2013, 2012 and 2011. The following table summarizes the net premiums written and net premiums earned by line of business for this sub-segment for years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013				2012				2011			
	Net premiums written		Net premiums earned		Net premiums written		Net premiums earned		Net premiums written		Net premiums earned	
Casualty	\$ 74	9%	\$ 75	10%	\$ 75	11%	\$ 74	11%	\$ 70	10%	\$ 82	11%
Motor	304	37	238	32	187	28	164	24	132	20	168	22
Property	433	54	430	58	419	61	440	65	476	70	509	67
Total	\$ 811	100%	\$ 743	100%	\$ 681	100%	\$ 678	100%	\$ 678	100%	\$ 759	100%

**Table of Contents**

Business reported in this sub-segment is, to a significant extent, originally denominated in foreign currencies and is reported in U.S. dollars. The U.S. dollar can fluctuate significantly against other currencies and this should be considered when making year to year comparisons. The following table summarizes the effect of foreign exchange fluctuations, described in the Results of Operations above, on gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned in 2013 compared to 2012 and in 2012 compared to 2011:

	Gross premiums written	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned
<i>2013 compared to 2012</i>			
Increase in original currency	20%	19%	9%
Foreign exchange effect			1
Increase as reported in U.S. dollars	20%	19%	10%
<i>2012 compared to 2011</i>			
Increase (decrease) in original currency	4%	4%	(6)%
Foreign exchange effect	(4)	(4)	(5)
Increase (decrease) as reported in U.S. dollars	%	%	(11)%
<i>2013 compared to 2012</i>			

Gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned increased by 20%, 19% and 9% on a constant foreign exchange basis, respectively, in 2013 compared to 2012. The increases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned resulted primarily from new motor business. The increase in net premiums earned was lower than the increases in gross and net premiums written as the new motor business in 2013 was written on a proportional basis and is yet to be fully reflected in net premiums earned. Notwithstanding the continued competitive conditions in most markets, the Company was able to write business that met its portfolio objectives.

*2012 compared to 2011*

Gross and net premiums written increased by 4% and net premiums earned decreased by 6% on a constant foreign exchange basis in 2012 compared to 2011. The increases in gross and net premiums written were primarily due to new business written in the motor line of business, partially offset by decreases in the property line of business. The decreases in the property line were driven by the effects of the Company's decisions in prior periods to reduce certain business to reposition its portfolio. Net premiums earned decreased in 2012 compared to 2011 due to the earning of the reduced level of premiums written in 2011 given a significant percentage of the business is written on a proportional basis with the impact of these reductions reflected in net premiums earned over time, and the new business written in 2012 is yet to be fully reflected in net premiums earned.

**Technical result and technical ratio**

The following table provides the components of the technical result and ratio for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012		2011	
Current accident year technical result and ratio						
Adjusted for large catastrophic losses	\$ 5	99.3%	\$ (16)	102.5%	\$ 34	95.4%
Large catastrophic losses <sup>(1)</sup>	(11)	1.5	(2)	0.3	(149)	19.7
Prior accident years technical result and ratio						
Net favorable prior year loss development	180	(24.2)	114	(16.9)	116	(15.3)
Technical result and ratio, as reported	\$ 174	76.6%	\$ 96	85.9%	\$ 1	99.8%

(1) Large catastrophic losses are shown net of any related reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions.



## **Table of Contents**

### *2013 compared to 2012*

The increase of \$78 million in the technical result (and the corresponding decrease of 9.3 points in the technical ratio) in 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily attributable to:

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$66 million (decrease of 7.3 points in the technical ratio) from \$114 million (16.9 points on the technical ratio) in 2012 to \$180 million (24.2 points on the technical ratio) in 2013. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2013 was driven by all lines of business, with the property line being the most pronounced, and included favorable loss emergence related to certain catastrophic and large loss events. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2012 is described below.

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses* an increase in the technical result (and a corresponding decrease in the technical ratio) due to higher upward premium adjustments reported by cedants in 2013 compared to 2012, modestly lower level of mid-sized loss activity and lower loss picks in certain lines of business, partially offset by a higher acquisition cost ratio.

These factors driving the increase in the technical result in 2013 compared to 2012 were partially offset by:

*Large catastrophic losses* an increase of \$9 million (increase of 1.2 points in the technical ratio) from \$2 million (0.3 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy in 2012 to \$11 million (1.5 points on the technical ratio) in 2013 related to the European Floods and German Hailstorm.

### *2012 compared to 2011*

The increase of \$95 million in the technical result (and the corresponding decrease of 13.9 points in the technical ratio) in 2012 compared to 2011 was primarily attributable to:

*Large catastrophic losses* a decrease of \$147 million (decrease of 19.4 points in the technical ratio) from \$149 million (19.7 points on the technical ratio) related to the Thailand Floods, the February and June 2011 New Zealand Earthquakes, Japan Earthquake and Australian Floods in 2011 to \$2 million (0.3 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy in 2012.

This factor driving the increase in the technical result in 2012 compared to 2011 was partially offset by:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses* a decrease in the technical result due to a lower level of net premiums earned in 2012 compared to 2011, including a decrease in the catastrophe exposed business, which in the absence of catastrophic losses, directly reduces the technical result (and increases the technical ratio). In addition, the decrease in the technical result was due to a higher level of mid-sized loss activity and lower pricing, partially offset by normal fluctuations in profitability between periods.

*Net favorable prior year loss development* a decrease of \$2 million (decrease of 1.6 points in the technical ratio due to the lower level of net premiums earned in 2012) from \$116 million (15.3 points on the technical ratio) in 2011 to \$114 million (16.9 points on the technical ratio) in 2012. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2012 was driven by all lines of business, with the property line being the most pronounced. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2011 was driven by all lines of business, with the motor line being the most pronounced.

### **2014 Outlook**

## Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

During the January 1, 2014 renewals, the Company generally observed challenging market conditions primarily driven by increased competition, increased retentions by cedants and reduced pricing. As a result of these factors, the overall expected premium volume from the Company's January 1, 2014 renewal, at constant

**Table of Contents**

foreign exchange rates, decreased modestly compared to the prior year renewal and was partially offset by new business. Management expects a continuation of the observed trends in competition, retentions and pricing during the remainder of 2014.

**Global Specialty**

The Global Specialty sub-segment is primarily comprised of lines of business that are considered to be either short, medium or long-tail. The short-tail lines consist of agriculture, energy and specialty property. Aviation/space, credit/surety, engineering and marine are considered to have a medium tail, while specialty casualty is considered to be long-tail.

The following table provides the components of the technical result and the corresponding ratios for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	% Change	2012	% Change	2011
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,676	11%	\$ 1,505	4%	\$ 1,446
Net premiums written	1,579	12	1,415	5	1,344
Net premiums earned	\$ 1,506	10	\$ 1,373		\$ 1,376
Losses and loss expenses	(920)	12	(821)	(14)	(950)
Acquisition costs	(362)	13	(321)	(2)	(328)
Technical result	\$ 224	(3)	\$ 231	135	\$ 98
Loss ratio	61.1%		59.8%		69.1%
Acquisition ratio	24.0		23.4		23.8
Technical ratio	85.1%		83.2%		92.9%

**Premiums**

The Global Specialty sub-segment represented 29%, 31% and 30% of total net premiums written in 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. The following table summarizes the net premiums written and net premiums earned by line of business for this sub-segment for years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013				2012				2011			
	Net premiums written		Net premiums earned		Net premiums written		Net premiums earned		Net premiums written		Net premiums earned	
Agriculture	\$ 138	9%	\$ 130	9%	\$ 80	6%	\$ 81	6%	\$ 70	5%	\$ 74	6%
Aviation/Space	204	13	198	13	217	15	215	15	211	16	217	16
Credit/Surety	292	19	285	19	273	19	261	19	272	20	279	20
Energy	86	5	95	6	95	7	100	7	111	8	112	8
Engineering	221	14	212	14	171	12	176	13	183	14	198	14
Marine	306	19	299	20	313	22	298	22	271	20	253	18
Specialty casualty	138	9	110	7	101	7	90	7	108	8	112	8
Specialty property	147	9	154	10	164	12	150	11	134	10	129	10
Other	47	3	23	2	1		2		(16)	(1)	2	
Total	\$ 1,579	100%	\$ 1,506	100%	\$ 1,415	100%	\$ 1,373	100%	\$ 1,344	100%	\$ 1,376	100%

**Table of Contents**

Business reported in this sub-segment is, to a significant extent, originally denominated in foreign currencies and is reported in U.S. dollars. The U.S. dollar can fluctuate significantly against other currencies and this should be considered when making year to year comparisons. The following table summarizes the effect of foreign exchange fluctuations, described in the Results of Operations above, on gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned in 2013 compared to 2012 and in 2012 compared to 2011:

	Gross premiums written	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned
<i>2013 compared to 2012</i>			
Increase in original currency	11%	11%	9%
Foreign exchange effect		1	1
Increase as reported in U.S. dollars	11%	12%	10%
<i>2012 compared to 2011</i>			
Increase in original currency	7%	8%	3%
Foreign exchange effect	(3)	(3)	(3)
Increase (decrease) as reported in U.S. dollars	4%	5%	%
<i>2013 compared to 2012</i>			

Gross and net premiums written increased by 11% and net premiums earned increased by 9% on a constant foreign exchange basis in 2013 compared to 2012. The increases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned were primarily driven by new business written in the agriculture, multiline (included in Other in the above table) and specialty casualty lines of business and upward premium adjustments in the engineering line of business. Notwithstanding the diverse conditions prevailing in various markets within this sub-segment, the Company was able to write business that met its portfolio objectives.

*2012 compared to 2011*

Gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned increased by 7%, 8% and 3% on a constant foreign exchange basis, respectively, in 2012 compared to 2011. The increases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned resulted primarily from the marine and specialty property lines of business primarily due to new business written, while the marine line of business also benefitted from upward prior year premium adjustments. The increase in net premiums earned was lower than the increases in gross and net premiums written due to the earning of the reduced level of premiums written in 2011 given a significant percentage of the business is written on a proportional basis with the impact of these reductions reflected in net premiums earned over time, and the new business written in 2012 is yet to be fully reflected in net premiums earned.

**Technical result and technical ratio**

The following table provides the components of the technical result and ratio for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012		2011	
Current accident year technical result and ratio						
Adjusted for large catastrophic losses	\$ 12	99.2%	\$ 66	95.1%	\$ 34	97.5%
Large catastrophic losses <sup>(1)</sup>	(15)	1.0	(86)	6.3	(65)	4.8
Prior accident years technical result and ratio						
Net favorable prior year loss development	227	(15.1)	251	(18.2)	129	(9.4)
Technical result and ratio, as reported	\$ 224	85.1%	\$ 231	83.2%	\$ 98	92.9%

(1) Large catastrophic losses are shown net of any related reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions.



---

**Table of Contents**

*2013 compared to 2012*

The decrease of \$7 million in the technical result (and the corresponding increase of 1.9 points in the technical ratio) in 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily attributable to:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses* a decrease in the technical result (and corresponding increase in the technical ratio) due to a higher level of mid-sized loss activity, a modest increase in the acquisition cost ratio due to higher commissions and normal fluctuations in profitability.

*Net favorable prior year loss development* a decrease of \$24 million (increase of 3.1 points in the technical ratio) from \$251 million (18.2 points on the technical ratio) in 2012 to \$227 million (15.1 points on the technical ratio) in 2013. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2013 was driven by all lines of business, predominantly the aviation/space, marine and specialty property lines. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2012 is described below.

These factors driving the decrease in the technical result in 2013 compared to 2012 were partially offset by:

*Large catastrophic losses* a decrease of \$71 million (decrease of 5.3 points in the technical ratio) from \$86 million (6.3 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy in 2012 to \$15 million (1.0 points on the technical ratio) related to the Alberta and European Floods in 2013.

*2012 compared to 2011*

The increase of \$133 million in the technical result (and the corresponding decrease of 9.7 points in the technical ratio) in 2012 compared to 2011 was primarily attributable to:

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$122 million (decrease of 8.8 points in the technical ratio) from \$129 million (9.4 points on the technical ratio) in 2011 to \$251 million (18.2 points on the technical ratio) in 2012. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2012 was driven by most lines of business, predominantly the specialty property, aviation/space and marine lines. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years in 2011 was driven by most lines of business.

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses* a decrease in the technical result (and corresponding increase in the technical ratio) due to a lower level of mid-sized loss activity in 2012 compared to 2011 and normal fluctuations in profitability between periods, which were partially offset by lower pricing and a lower level of losses recoverable from retrocessional programs.

These factors driving the increase in the technical result in 2012 compared to 2011 were partially offset by:

*Large catastrophic losses* an increase of \$21 million (increase of 1.5 points in the technical ratio) from \$65 million (4.8 points on the technical ratio) related to the 2011 catastrophic events to \$86 million (6.3 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy in 2012.

***2014 Outlook***

During the January 1, 2014 renewals, the Company generally observed increased competition across all markets, with pressure on pricing and terms and increased retentions. Overall, and despite these factors, the expected premium volume from the Company's January 1, 2014 renewal, at constant foreign exchange rates, increased compared to the prior year renewal as a result of new growth opportunities in certain specialty lines markets. Management expects a continuation of the observed trends in competition, pricing, terms and retentions during the remainder of 2014.



**Table of Contents****Catastrophe**

The Catastrophe sub-segment writes business predominantly on a non-proportional basis and is exposed to volatility from catastrophic losses, as demonstrated by the sub-segment results for 2013, 2012 and 2011, and as a result, profitability in any one year is not necessarily predictive of future profitability. The Catastrophe sub-segment results for 2013 and 2012 included a comparatively low level of large catastrophic losses resulting from the German Hailstorm, European Floods and Alberta Floods in 2013 and Superstorm Sandy in 2012, while the results for 2011 included a comparatively significant amount of losses from a high frequency of high severity catastrophic events related to the 2011 catastrophic events. The varying amounts of catastrophic losses significantly impacted the technical result and ratio and affected year over year comparisons as discussed below.

The Catastrophe sub-segment results are presented before the inter-company quota share of a diversified portfolio of catastrophe treaties to the Company's fully collateralized reinsurance vehicle, Lorenz Re Ltd. (see Note 13 to the Consolidated Financial Statements included in Item 8 of Part II of this report).

The following table provides the components of the technical result and the corresponding ratios for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	% Change	2012	% Change	2011
Gross premiums written	\$ 495	(1)%	\$ 500	(17)%	\$ 599
Net premiums written	450	(1)	453	(19)	562
Net premiums earned	\$ 453	(1)	\$ 457	(20)	\$ 574
Losses and loss expenses	(132)	28	(103)	(93)	(1,459)
Acquisition costs	(44)	3	(42)	64	(26)
Technical result	\$ 277	(11)	\$ 312	NM	\$ (911)
Loss ratio	29.0%		22.4 %		254.2%
Acquisition ratio	9.7		9.3		4.5
Technical ratio	38.7%		31.7 %		258.7%

NM: not meaningful

**Premiums**

The Catastrophe sub-segment represented 8%, 10% and 13% of total net premiums written in 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively.

Business reported in this sub-segment is, to an extent, originally denominated in foreign currencies and is reported in U.S. dollars. The U.S. dollar can fluctuate significantly against other currencies and this should be considered when making year to year comparisons. The following table summarizes the effect of foreign exchange fluctuations, described in the Results of Operations above, on gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned in 2013 compared to 2012 and in 2012 compared to 2011:

	Gross premiums written	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned
<i>2013 compared to 2012</i>			
Increase in original currency	1%	1%	1%
Foreign exchange effect	(2)	(2)	(2)
Decrease as reported in U.S. dollars	(1)%	(1)%	(1)%
<i>2012 compared to 2011</i>			
Decrease in original currency	(16)%	(19)%	(19)%

Edgar Filing: PARTNERRE LTD - Form 10-K

Foreign exchange effect	(1)		(1)
Decrease as reported in U.S. dollars	(17)%	(19)%	(20)%

**Table of Contents***2013 compared to 2012*

Gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned increased modestly by 1% on a constant foreign exchange basis in 2013 compared to 2012. The increases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned were primarily due to certain new business written and were partially offset by cancellations and non-renewals.

*2012 compared to 2011*

Gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned decreased by 16%, 19% and 19% on a constant foreign exchange basis, respectively, in 2012 compared to 2011. The decreases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned were primarily due to the Company reducing certain exposures during 2012 by cancelling and decreasing certain treaty participations and a lower level of reinstatement premiums. These decreases in gross and net premiums written and net premiums earned were partially offset by new business written in 2012.

**Technical result and technical ratio**

The following table provides the components of the technical result and ratio for this sub-segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012		2011	
Current accident year technical result and ratio						
Adjusted for large catastrophic losses	\$ 288	33.8%	\$ 338	23.9%	\$ 462	15.4%
Large catastrophic losses <sup>(1)</sup>	(102)	25.0	(71)	17.6	(1,469)	260.1
Prior accident years technical result and ratio						
Net favorable prior year loss development	91	(20.1)	45	(9.8)	96	(16.8)
Technical result and ratio, as reported	\$ 277	38.7%	\$ 312	31.7%	\$ (911)	258.7%

(1) *Large catastrophic losses are shown net of any related reinsurance, reinstatement premiums and profit commissions. 2013 compared to 2012*

The decrease of \$35 million in the technical result (and the corresponding increase of 7.0 points in the technical ratio) in 2013 compared to 2012 was primarily attributable to:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses* a decrease in the technical result (and corresponding increase in the technical ratio) primarily due to a higher level of mid-sized loss activity and normal fluctuations in profitability between periods.

*Large catastrophic losses* an increase of \$31 million (increase of 7.4 points in the technical ratio) from \$71 million (17.6 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy in 2012 to \$102 million (25.0 points on the technical ratio) related to the German Hailstorm, European Floods and Alberta Floods in 2013.

These factors driving the decrease in the technical result in 2013 compared to 2012 were partially offset by:

*Net favorable prior year loss development* an increase of \$46 million (decrease of 10.3 points in the technical ratio) from \$45 million (9.8 points on the technical ratio) in 2012 to \$91 million (20.1 points on the technical ratio) in 2013. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years was primarily due to favorable loss emergence during both 2013 and 2012.



**Table of Contents***2012 compared to 2011*

The increase of \$1,223 million in the technical result (and the corresponding decrease of 227.0 points in the technical ratio) in 2012 compared to 2011 was primarily attributable to:

*Large catastrophic losses* a decrease of \$1,398 million (decrease of 242.5 points in the technical ratio) from \$1,469 million (260.1 points on the technical ratio) related to the 2011 catastrophic events and losses related to aggregate contracts covering losses in Australia and New Zealand in 2011 to \$71 million (17.6 points on the technical ratio) related to Superstorm Sandy in 2012.

This factor driving the increase in the technical result in 2012 compared to 2011 was partially offset by:

*The current accident year technical result, adjusted for large catastrophic losses* a decrease in the technical result (and corresponding increase in the technical ratio) due to the reduced book of business and exposure, a modestly higher level of mid-sized loss activity and normal fluctuations in profitability between periods.

*Net favorable prior year loss development* a decrease of \$51 million (increase of 7.0 points in the technical ratio) from \$96 million (16.8 points on the technical ratio) in 2011 to \$45 million (9.8 points on the technical ratio) in 2012. The net favorable loss development for prior accident years was primarily due to favorable loss emergence during both 2012 and 2011.

**2014 Outlook**

During the January 1, 2014 renewals, the Company observed a challenging market environment with declining pricing and pressure on terms and conditions in most markets. The exception to this was in certain loss affected markets, where modest price increases were observed. The expected premium volume from the Company's January 1, 2014 renewal, at constant foreign exchange rates, decreased compared to the prior year renewal primarily as a result of the non-renewals of certain treaties due to deterioration in pricing and decreases in participations, which were partially offset by new business. Management expects a continuation of these trends for the remainder of 2014.

**Life and Health Segment**

Effective January 1, 2013, the Life and Health segment includes the results of PartnerRe Health, following its acquisition on December 31, 2012. The acquisition of PartnerRe Health affects the year over year comparisons of the segment results, primarily in the accident and health line of business, other income and other operating expenses. The following table provides the components of the allocated underwriting result for this segment for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013	% Change	2012	% Change	2011
Gross premiums written	\$ 972	21%	\$ 802	2%	\$ 790
Net premiums written	964	21	799	2	786
Net premiums earned	\$ 957	20	\$ 795		\$ 792
Life policy benefits	(760)	18	(647)	(1)	(650)
Acquisition costs	(125)	8	(116)	(1)	(117)
Technical result	\$ 72	127	\$ 32	27	\$ 25
Other income	11	177	4	475	1
Other operating expenses	(71)	36	(52)	(1)	(53)
Net investment income	61	(5)	64	(3)	66
Allocated underwriting result <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 73	53	\$ 48	23	\$ 39

- (1) *Allocated underwriting result is defined as net premiums earned, other income or loss and allocated net investment income less life policy benefits, acquisition costs and other operating expenses.*

**Table of Contents**

***Premiums***

The Life and Health segment represented 18%, 17% and 18% of total net premiums written in 2013, 2012 and 2011, respectively. The following table summarizes the net premiums written and net premiums earned by line of business for this segment for years ended December 31, 2013, 2012 and 2011 (in millions of U.S. dollars):

	2013		2012		2011							
	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned	Net premiums written	Net premiums earned						
Accident and health	\$ 141	15%	\$ 140	15%	\$ 21	3%	\$ 20	3%	\$ 21	3%	\$ 21	3%