

ALLEGHANY CORP /DE
Form 10-K
February 21, 2018
Table of Contents

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

Form 10-K

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

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2017

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 1-9371

ALLEGHANY CORPORATION

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware

51-0283071

(State or other jurisdiction of

(I.R.S. Employer

incorporation or organization)

Identification Number)

1411 Broadway, 34th Floor

New York, New York

10018

(Address of principal executive offices)

(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code:

212-752-1356

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

Title of Each Class	Name of Each Exchange
Common Stock, \$1.00 par value	on Which Registered
	New York Stock Exchange

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

Not applicable

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 (§ 232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files).

Yes 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, a smaller reporting company, or an emerging growth company. See the definitions of large accelerated filer, accelerated filer, smaller reporting company, and emerging growth company in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):

Large accelerated filer
 Accelerated filer
 Non-accelerated filer
 Smaller reporting company
 Emerging growth company
(Do not check if a smaller reporting company)

If an emerging growth company, indicate by check mark if the registrant has elected not to use the extended transition on period for complying with any new or revised financial accounting standards provided pursuant to Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act.

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 126-2 of the Act).

Yes

No

The aggregate market value of voting and non-voting common shares held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of June 30, 2017 (the last business day of the registrant's most recently completed second fiscal quarter) was approximately \$8,815,683,664 based on the closing sale price of the registrant's common shares on the New York Stock Exchange on that date.

As of February 12, 2018, 15,391,416 shares of the registrant's common stock, par value \$1.00 per share, were outstanding.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Portions of the registrant's definitive proxy statement relating to the Annual Meeting of Stockholders of Alleghany Corporation to be held on April 27, 2018 to be filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to Regulation 14A are incorporated by reference into Part III of this Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Table of Contents**ALLEGHANY CORPORATION****Table of Contents**

	Page
PART I	
Item 1. <u>Business</u>	35
Item 1A. <u>Risk Factors</u>	55
Item 1B. <u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u>	65
Item 2. <u>Properties</u>	65
Item 3. <u>Legal Proceedings</u>	65
Item 4. <u>Mine Safety Disclosures</u>	66
PART II	
Item 5. <u>Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities</u>	66
Item 6. <u>Selected Financial Data</u>	68
Item 7. <u>Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u>	69
Item 7A. <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk</u>	124
Item 8. <u>Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u>	127
Item 9. <u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u>	181
Item 9A. <u>Controls and Procedures</u>	181
Item 9B. <u>Other Information</u>	181
PART III	
Item 10. <u>Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance</u>	182
Item 11. <u>Executive Compensation</u>	182
Item 12. <u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u>	182
Item 13. <u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions, and Director Independence</u>	184
Item 14. <u>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u>	184
PART IV	
Item 15. <u>Exhibits and Financial Statement Schedules</u>	185

Table of Contents

ALLEGHANY CORPORATION

References in this Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2017, or this Form 10-K, to the Company, Alleghany, we, us, and our refer to Alleghany Corporation and its consolidated subsidiaries unless the context otherwise requires. In addition, unless the context otherwise requires, references to

TransRe are to our wholly-owned reinsurance holding company subsidiary Transatlantic Holdings, Inc. and its subsidiaries;

AIHL are to our wholly-owned insurance holding company subsidiary Alleghany Insurance Holdings LLC;

RSUI are to our wholly-owned subsidiary RSUI Group, Inc. and its subsidiaries;

CapSpecialty are to our wholly-owned subsidiary CapSpecialty, Inc. and its subsidiaries;

PacificComp are to our former wholly-owned subsidiary Pacific Compensation Corporation and its subsidiary, which were sold on December 31, 2017;

AIHL Re are to our wholly-owned subsidiary AIHL Re LLC;

Roundwood are to our wholly-owned subsidiary Roundwood Asset Management LLC;

Alleghany Capital are to our wholly-owned subsidiary Alleghany Capital Corporation and its subsidiaries;

SORC are to our wholly-owned subsidiary Stranded Oil Resources Corporation and its subsidiaries;

Bourn & Koch are to our majority-owned subsidiary Bourn & Koch, Inc. and its subsidiary;

Kentucky Trailer are to our majority-owned subsidiary R.C. Tway Company, LLC and its subsidiaries;

IPS are to our majority-owned subsidiary IPS-Integrated Project Services, LLC and its subsidiaries;

Jazwares are to our majority-owned subsidiary Jazwares, LLC and its subsidiaries and affiliates;

W&WIAFCO Steel are to our majority-owned subsidiary WWSC Holdings, LLC and its subsidiaries;
and

Alleghany Properties are to our wholly-owned subsidiary Alleghany Properties Holdings LLC and its subsidiaries.

NOTE ON FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

Certain statements contained in this Form 10-K may be deemed to be forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Forward-looking statements may be identified by the use of words such as may, will, expect, project, estimate, anticipate, plan, believe, potential, should or those words or other comparable words. Forward-looking statements do not relate solely to historical or current facts, rather they are based on management's expectations as well as certain assumptions and estimates made by, and information available to, management at the time. These statements are not guarantees of future performance. These forward-looking statements are based upon Alleghany's current expectations and are subject to a number of uncertainties and risks that could significantly affect current plans, anticipated actions and Alleghany's future financial condition and results. Factors that could cause these forward-looking statements to differ, possibly materially, from that currently contemplated include:

significant weather-related or other natural or man-made catastrophes and disasters;

the cyclical nature of the property and casualty reinsurance and insurance industries;

changes in market prices of our significant equity investments and changes in value of our debt securities portfolio;

adverse loss development for events insured by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries in either the current year or prior years;

the long-tail and potentially volatile nature of certain casualty lines of business written by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries;

Table of Contents

the cost and availability of reinsurance;

the reliance by our reinsurance and insurance operating subsidiaries on a limited number of brokers;

legal, political, judicial and regulatory changes;

increases in the levels of risk retention by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries;

changes in the ratings assigned to our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries;

claims development and the process of estimating reserves;

exposure to terrorist acts and acts of war;

the willingness and ability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reinsurers to pay reinsurance recoverables owed to our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries;

the uncertain nature of damage theories and loss amounts;

the loss of key personnel of our reinsurance or insurance operating subsidiaries;

fluctuation in foreign currency exchange rates;

the failure to comply with the restrictive covenants contained in the agreements governing our indebtedness;

the ability to make payments on, or repay or refinance, our debt;

risks inherent in international operations; and

difficult and volatile conditions in the global market.

Additional risks and uncertainties include general economic and political conditions, including the effects of a prolonged U.S. or global economic downturn or recession; changes in costs; variations in political, economic or other factors; risks relating to conducting operations in a competitive environment; effects of acquisition and disposition

activities, inflation rates, or recessionary or expansive trends; changes in interest rates; extended labor disruptions, civil unrest, or other external factors over which we have no control; changes in our plans, strategies, objectives, expectations, or intentions, which may happen at any time at our discretion; and other factors discussed in this Form 10-K and subsequent filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the SEC. All forward-looking statements speak only as of the date they are made and are based on information available at that time. Alleghany does not undertake any obligation to update or revise any forward-looking statements to reflect subsequent circumstances or events. See Part I, Item 1A, Risk Factors of this Form 10-K for additional information.

Table of Contents

PART I

Item 1. Business.

Overview

We are a Delaware corporation which owns and manages certain operating subsidiaries and investments, anchored by a core position in property and casualty reinsurance and insurance. We were incorporated in Delaware in 1984. Through our wholly-owned subsidiary TransRe, we are engaged in the property and casualty reinsurance business. TransRe has been our wholly-owned subsidiary since March 2012. Through our wholly-owned subsidiary AIHL and its subsidiaries, we are engaged in the property and casualty insurance business. AIHL's insurance operations are principally conducted by its subsidiaries RSUI, CapSpecialty and, prior to its sale on December 31, 2017, PacificComp. CapSpecialty has been a subsidiary of AIHL since January 2002, RSUI has been a subsidiary of AIHL since July 2003 and PacificComp had been a subsidiary of AIHL since July 2007. AIHL Re, a captive reinsurance company which provides reinsurance to Alleghany's current and former insurance operating subsidiaries and affiliates, has been a wholly-owned subsidiary of Alleghany since its formation in May 2006.

Although our primary sources of revenues and earnings are our reinsurance and insurance operations and investments, we also source, execute, manage and monitor certain private investments primarily through our wholly-owned subsidiary Alleghany Capital. Alleghany Capital's investments are included in other activities for segment reporting purposes and include:

SORC. In June 2011, we formed SORC, an exploration and production company focused on enhanced oil recovery, headquartered in Golden, Colorado.

Bourn & Koch. On April 26, 2012, we acquired Bourn & Koch, a manufacturer/remanufacturer of specialty machine tools and supplier of replacement parts, accessories and services for a variety of cutting technologies, headquartered in Rockford, Illinois.

Kentucky Trailer. On August 30, 2013, we invested in Kentucky Trailer, a manufacturer of custom trailers and truck bodies for the moving and storage industry and other markets, headquartered in Louisville, Kentucky, for a controlling equity interest.

IPS. On October 31, 2015, we acquired IPS, a technical engineering-focused service provider focused on the global pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries, headquartered in Blue Bell, Pennsylvania.

Jazwares. On July 31, 2014, we invested in Jazwares, a global toy, entertainment and musical instrument company, headquartered in Sunrise, Florida for a 30 percent interest. On April 15, 2016, we acquired an additional 50 percent of Jazwares' outstanding equity, bringing our equity ownership to 80 percent and, as of that date, the results of Jazwares have been included in our consolidated results. Prior to April 15, 2016, Jazwares was accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

W&WAFCO Steel. On April 28, 2017, we acquired W&WAFCO Steel, a structural steel fabricator and erector, headquartered in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. And,

Wilbert. On August 1, 2017, we acquired a 45 percent equity interest in Wilbert, a provider of products and services for the funeral and cemetery industries and precast concrete markets, headquartered in Overland Park, Kansas. Wilbert is accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

In addition, we own and manage properties in the Sacramento, California region through our wholly-owned subsidiary Alleghany Properties. We owned an approximately 15 percent equity interest in ORX Exploration, Inc., or ORX, a regional oil and gas exploration and production company, until it was sold on December 23, 2016. Our public equity investments are managed primarily through our wholly-owned subsidiary Roundwood.

As of December 31, 2017, we had total assets of \$25.4 billion and total stockholders' equity attributable to Alleghany stockholders of \$8.5 billion.

Our principal executive offices are located in leased office space at 1411 Broadway, 34th Floor, New York, New York, 10018, and our telephone number is (212) 752-1356. Our Annual Reports on Form 10-K, Quarterly Reports on Form

Table of Contents

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 of 1934, as amended, or the Exchange Act, are available, free of charge, on our website at www.alleghany.com, as soon as reasonably practicable after we electronically file this material with, or furnish it to, the SEC. Reports and other information we file with the SEC may also be viewed at the SEC's website at www.sec.gov or viewed or obtained at the SEC Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, District of Columbia 20549. Our Financial Personnel Code of Ethics, Employee Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, Director Code of Business Conduct and Ethics, Code of Business Conduct and Ethics for our Business Partners, Corporate Governance Guidelines and the charters for our Audit, Compensation and Nominating and Governance Committees are also available on our website. In addition, interested parties may obtain, free of charge, copies of any of the above reports or documents upon request to the Secretary of Alleghany.

Segment Information

Our segments are reported in a manner consistent with the way management evaluates the businesses. As such, we classify our business into two reportable segments—reinsurance and insurance. Other activities include Alleghany Capital and corporate activities. In addition, reinsurance and insurance underwriting activities are evaluated separately from investment and other activities.

The components of other activities are Alleghany Capital and corporate activities. Alleghany Capital consists of manufacturing and service operations, oil and gas operations and corporate operations and investments at the Alleghany Capital level. Manufacturing and service operations are conducted through Bourn & Koch, Kentucky Trailer, IPS, Jazwares, W&WIAFCO Steel and Alleghany Capital's investment in Wilbert. Oil and gas operations are conducted through SORC, and also included Alleghany Capital's investment in ORX until it was sold on December 23, 2016. Wilbert is, and ORX was, accounted for under the equity method of accounting. The primary components of corporate activities are Alleghany Properties and other activities at the Alleghany parent company.

See below and Note 13 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for an analysis of our underwriting results by segment and other activities, and Part II, Item 7, Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations—Consolidated Results of Operations.

Reinsurance Segment

General. The reinsurance segment consists of property and casualty reinsurance operations conducted by TransRe's reinsurance operating subsidiaries.

TransRe, through its principal wholly-owned subsidiaries Transatlantic Reinsurance Company, or TRC, TransRe London Ltd., or TRL, and TransRe Zurich Ltd., or TRZ, offers reinsurance capacity to reinsurance and insurance companies for property and casualty products. These products are distributed through brokers and on a direct basis in the domestic and foreign markets. TransRe is headquartered in New York, New York, with six other locations in the U.S. and has operations worldwide, including: Africa, Australia, Bermuda, Canada, five locations in Asia, three locations in Central and South America, and five locations in the U.K. and Europe. TRC is licensed, accredited or authorized or can serve as a reinsurer in all 50 states and the District of Columbia in the U.S. and in Puerto Rico and Guam. TRC is also licensed in Bermuda, Canada, Japan, the U.K., the Dominican Republic, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, Germany, Australia and Singapore. In addition, TRL is licensed as a reinsurer in the U.K. and TRZ is licensed as a reinsurer in Switzerland and Dubai.

The reinsurance segment is reported through two major product lines, property and casualty & other.

Property. TransRe's principal lines of business within property include fire, allied lines, auto physical damage and homeowners multiple peril (which include property catastrophe risks). In 2017, property reinsurance accounted for approximately 37 percent of TransRe's gross premiums written.

Casualty & other. TransRe's principal lines of business within casualty & other include liability (including directors' and officers' liability, errors and omissions liability and general liability), medical malpractice, ocean marine and aviation, auto liability (including non-standard risks), accident and health, surety and credit. In 2017, casualty & other reinsurance accounted for approximately 63 percent of TransRe's gross premiums written.

Table of Contents

Reinsurance contracts are generally classified as treaty or facultative contracts. TransRe offers reinsurance capacity on both a treaty and facultative basis. Treaty reinsurance is a contractual arrangement that provides for the automatic reinsuring of all or a portion of a specified class of risk underwritten by the ceding company. Facultative reinsurance is the reinsurance of individual risks. Rather than agreeing to reinsure all or a portion of a class of risk, the reinsurer separately rates and underwrites each risk. Facultative reinsurance is normally purchased for risks not covered by treaty reinsurance or for individual risks covered by reinsurance treaties that are in need of capacity beyond that provided by such treaties.

A ceding company's reinsurance program may involve pro rata and excess-of-loss reinsurance on both a treaty and facultative basis. TransRe provides pro rata and excess-of-loss reinsurance for most major lines of business. Under pro rata reinsurance (also referred to as proportional or quota share reinsurance), the ceding company and the reinsurer share the premiums as well as the losses and expenses in an agreed proportion, and such proportional sharing of losses may be subject to a predetermined limit. As pro rata business is a proportional sharing of premiums and losses between the ceding company and the reinsurer, generally the underwriting results of such business more closely reflect the underwriting results of the business ceded than do the results of excess-of-loss business. In pro rata reinsurance, the reinsurer generally pays the ceding company a ceding commission, which is generally based on the ceding company's cost of obtaining the business being reinsured, such as brokers' and agents' commissions, local taxes and administrative expenses. Under excess-of-loss reinsurance (also referred to as non-proportional reinsurance), the reinsurer indemnifies the ceding company for all or a portion of the losses in excess of a predetermined amount, usually up to a predetermined limit. Premiums paid by the ceding company to the reinsurer for excess-of-loss coverage are generally not proportional to the premiums that the ceding company receives because the reinsurer does not assume a proportionate risk. Often there is no ceding commission on excess-of-loss reinsurance and therefore the pricing mechanism used by reinsurers in those instances is a rate applicable to premiums of the individual policy or policies subject to the reinsurance agreement. Both pro rata and excess-of-loss reinsurance may provide for aggregate limits of indemnification.

In July 2016, TransRe entered into an initial five-year agreement with General Reinsurance Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Berkshire Hathaway Inc., for TransRe to act as exclusive underwriting manager on behalf of General Reinsurance Corporation for U.S. and Canadian property and casualty treaty reinsurance business produced by brokers and intermediaries. Fees earned under this agreement are included in other revenue in the Consolidated Statements of Earnings and Comprehensive Income.

As of December 31, 2017, the statutory surplus of TRC was \$5.0 billion, as determined in accordance with statutory accounting principles, or SAP, and the consolidated equity of TransRe was \$5.2 billion, as determined in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the U.S., or GAAP.

Distribution. TransRe provides property and casualty reinsurance capacity through brokers as well as directly to insurance and reinsurance companies in domestic and foreign markets. In 2017, approximately 85 percent of TransRe's gross premiums written were written through brokers with the balance written directly with ceding company clients. In the reinsurance brokerage industry, brokers are engaged by the ceding companies to place reinsurance on their behalf. In 2017, companies controlled by Aon plc, TigerRisk Partners, LLC and Marsh & McLennan Companies, Inc. were TransRe's largest brokerage sources of business, accounting for approximately 24 percent, 19 percent and 16 percent, respectively, of gross premiums written. The reinsurance brokerage industry is dominated by certain of these brokers. Due to the substantial percentages of premiums written through these brokers, the loss of business from any one of them could have a material adverse effect on TransRe's business.

Underwriting. TransRe's underwriting process emphasizes a team approach among TransRe's underwriters, actuaries, claims staff and senior management, as appropriate. Treaties are reviewed for compliance with TransRe's underwriting

guidelines and objectives, and most treaties are evaluated in part based upon actuarial analyses conducted by TransRe. TransRe's actuarial models used in such analyses are tailored in each case to the exposures and experience underlying the specific treaty and the loss experience for the risks covered. Property catastrophe-exposed treaties are generally evaluated using industry standard models, as well as proprietary TransRe models. These models are used as a guide for risk assessment and portfolio optimization and are continually updated. TransRe also frequently conducts underwriting and claims audits at the offices of a ceding company before and after entering into major treaties, because reinsurers, including TransRe, do not separately evaluate each of the individual risks assumed under their treaties and, consequently, are largely dependent on the original underwriting decisions made by the ceding company. Such dependence subjects TransRe, and reinsurers in general, to the possibility that the ceding companies have not adequately evaluated and priced the risks to be reinsured and, therefore, that the premiums ceded may not adequately compensate reinsurers for the risk assumed.

TransRe often seeks to lead treaty placements. The lead reinsurer on a treaty generally accepts one of the largest percentage shares of the treaty and takes the initiative in negotiating price, terms and conditions. TransRe believes that this

Table of Contents

strategy enables it to influence more effectively the terms and conditions of the treaties in which it participates. TransRe may decline any treaty business offered to it based upon its assessment of all relevant factors. Such factors include type and level of risk assumed; actuarial and underwriting judgment with respect to rate adequacy; various treaty terms; prior and anticipated loss experience (including exposure to natural and man-made catastrophes) on the treaty; prior business experience with the ceding company; overall financial position; operating results; ratings from credit rating agencies of the ceding company; and social, legal, regulatory, environmental and general economic conditions affecting the risks assumed or the ceding company.

Ratings. TRC, TRL and TRZ are rated A+ by Standard & Poor's Ratings Services, or S&P, and A+ (Superior) by A.M. Best Company, Inc., or A.M. Best, and TRC is rated A1 by Moody's Investors Service Inc., or Moody's, independent organizations that analyze the insurance industry and the financial positions of reinsurance and insurance companies. Additional information regarding ratings and the risks related to ratings from ratings agencies can be found on page 58 of this Form 10-K.

Insurance Segment

The insurance segment consists of property and casualty insurance operations conducted by AIHL through its insurance operating subsidiaries RSUI, headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia; CapSpecialty, headquartered in Middleton, Wisconsin; and, prior to December 31, 2017, PacificComp, headquartered in Westlake Village, California. AIHL Re, our Vermont-domiciled captive reinsurance company, provides reinsurance to our current and former insurance operating subsidiaries and affiliates. Unless we state otherwise, references to AIHL include the operations of RSUI, CapSpecialty, PacificComp and AIHL Re.

In 2017, property insurance accounted for approximately 33 percent, and casualty insurance accounted for approximately 67 percent, of AIHL's gross premiums written.

RSUI

General. RSUI, which includes the operations of its wholly-owned subsidiaries RSUI Indemnity Company, or RIC, Landmark American Insurance Company, or Landmark, and Covington Specialty Insurance Company, or Covington, underwrites specialty insurance coverages in the property, umbrella/excess liability, general liability, management liability and professional liability lines of business. RSUI also writes a modest amount of reinsurance business on an assumed basis, which is included in the insurance segment.

The market for specialty insurance coverages differs significantly from the market for standard insurance coverages. The specialty market provides coverage for hard-to-place risks that generally do not fit the underwriting criteria of the standard market which provides coverage for largely uniform and relatively predictable exposures and is highly regulated with respect to rates and forms.

RSUI writes specialty business on both an admitted and non-admitted basis. Insurers may market, sell and service insurance policies in the states where they are licensed. These insurers are referred to as admitted insurers. Admitted insurers are generally required to obtain regulatory approval of their policy forms and premium rates. Non-admitted insurance markets have developed to provide insurance that is otherwise unavailable from a state's admitted insurance markets. Non-admitted insurance is procured by either state-licensed surplus lines brokers who place risks with insurers not licensed in that state or by insureds' direct procurement from non-admitted insurers. Non-admitted insurance is subject to considerably less regulation with respect to policy rates and forms. RSUI writes specialty business in the admitted specialty market primarily through RIC, a New Hampshire-domiciled insurer, in the 50 states and the District of Columbia where RIC is licensed and subject to state form and rate regulations. Most of the risks in

the admitted specialty market are unique and hard-to-place in the standard market, but must remain with an admitted insurance company for regulatory and/or marketing reasons. As an admitted carrier, RIC is subject to more state regulation than a non-admitted carrier, particularly with regard to rate and form filing requirements, restrictions on the ability to exit lines of business, premium tax payments and membership in various state associations, such as state guaranty funds and assigned risk plans.

RSUI writes business on an approved, non-admitted basis primarily through Landmark, a New Hampshire-domiciled insurer. Landmark, as a non-admitted company, is not subject to state form and rate regulations and thus has more flexibility in its rates and coverages for specialized or hard-to-place risks. This typically results in coverages that are more restrictive and expensive than coverages written by a standard insurance company. As of December 31, 2017, Landmark was approved to write business on a non-admitted basis in 50 states.

Table of Contents

Covington, a New Hampshire-domiciled insurer, was formed in September 2007 to, among other things, support non-admitted business written primarily by RSUI's binding authority department, which writes small, specialized coverages pursuant to underwriting authority arrangements with managing general agents.

Pursuant to quota share arrangements, effective as of January 1, 2009, Landmark and Covington cede 90 percent of all their respective premiums and losses, gross of third-party reinsurance, to RIC.

As of December 31, 2017, the statutory surplus of RIC was approximately \$1.6 billion, the statutory surplus of Landmark was approximately \$185 million, the statutory surplus of Covington was approximately \$47 million, each as determined in accordance with SAP, and the consolidated equity of RSUI was \$1.7 billion, as determined in accordance with GAAP.

Distribution. As of December 31, 2017, RSUI conducted its insurance business through approximately 103 independent wholesale insurance brokers located throughout the U.S. and 23 managing general agents. RSUI's wholesale brokers are appointed on an individual basis based on management's appraisal of expertise, premium production potential, loss history with other insurance companies that they represent, and the size and experience of the agency, and only specific locations of a wholesale broker's operations may be appointed to distribute RSUI's products. Producer agreements which stipulate premium collection, payment terms and commission arrangements are in place with each wholesale broker. No wholesale broker holds underwriting, claims or reinsurance authority for RSUI. RSUI's top five producing wholesale brokers accounted for approximately 69 percent of gross premiums written by RSUI in 2017. RSUI's top two producing wholesale brokers, CRC Insurance Services, Inc. and AmWINS Group, Inc., accounted for, in the aggregate, approximately 43 percent of RSUI's gross premiums written in 2017. RSUI has entered into underwriting authority arrangements with 23 managing general agents for small, specialized coverages.

Underwriting. RSUI's underwriting philosophy is based on handling only product lines in which its underwriters have underwriting expertise. RSUI generally focuses on higher severity, lower frequency specialty risks that can be effectively desk underwritten without the need for inspection or engineering reviews. RSUI tracks underwriting results for each of its underwriters and believes that the underwriting systems and applications it has in place facilitate efficient underwriting and high productivity levels. Underwriting authority is delegated on a top-down basis ultimately to individual underwriters based on experience and expertise. This authority is in writing and addresses maximum limits, excluded classes and coverages and premium size referral. Referral to a product line manager is required for risks exceeding an underwriter's authority.

Ratings. RIC is rated A+ (Superior) by A.M. Best. Landmark and Covington are rated A+ (Superior) on a reinsured basis by A.M. Best, all three companies are rated A- by S&P, and RIC and Landmark are rated A2 by Moody's.

CapSpecialty

General. CapSpecialty, primarily through its wholly-owned subsidiaries Capitol Indemnity Corporation, or CIC, Capitol Specialty Insurance Corporation, or CSIC, and Platte River Insurance Company, or Platte River, operates in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. CapSpecialty also includes the operations and results of Professional Risk Management Services, Inc., which was acquired from TransRe effective January 1, 2014.

CIC conducts its property and casualty insurance business on an admitted basis throughout the U.S. CIC also writes surety products such as commercial surety bonds and contract surety bonds on a national basis. Commercial surety bonds include all surety bonds other than contract surety bonds and cover obligations typically required by law or regulation, such as licenses and permits. CIC offers contract surety bonds in the non-construction segment of the

market which secure performance under supply, service and maintenance contracts.

CSIC conducts substantially all of its business on an approved, non-admitted basis nationally and writes primarily specialty lines of property and casualty insurance, including the professional lines of business.

Platte River is licensed in the 50 states and the District of Columbia and operates in conjunction with CIC, primarily providing surety products and offering pricing flexibility in those jurisdictions where both CIC and Platte River are licensed.

Effective January 1, 2014, CapSpecialty was recapitalized pursuant to a series of transactions which included the exchange by AIHL of its common stock in CapSpecialty for Series A Convertible Preferred Stock carrying a five percent preference, or the Preferred Stock, and the subsequent sale by AIHL to TransRe of 24.9 percent of the Preferred Stock for a

Table of Contents

cash purchase price based on CapSpecialty's December 31, 2013 GAAP book value. At the same time, CapSpecialty reserved shares of restricted common stock, or the Restricted Stock, which are subordinate to the Preferred Stock, for issuance to the management of CapSpecialty pursuant to a restricted stock plan. To the extent all shares of Restricted Stock are vested and issued, the Restricted Stock will represent 20 percent of the value of CapSpecialty in excess of the Preferred Stock and its cumulative preference.

In the third quarter of 2015, AIHL Re and CapSpecialty (specifically, the insurance subsidiaries of CapSpecialty) entered into an intercompany reinsurance contract, effective July 1, 2015, pursuant to which AIHL Re provides CapSpecialty with coverage primarily for adverse development on certain net loss and allocated loss adjustment expenses, or LAE, in excess of its carried reserves at June 30, 2015. AIHL Re's commitments are intended to cover the statutory collateral requirements at CapSpecialty, if and when necessary, and AIHL Re's obligations are subject to an aggregate limit of \$50.0 million. See Note 5(e) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional detail on the reinsurance contract.

As of December 31, 2017, the statutory surplus of CIC was approximately \$265 million, which included the statutory surplus of CSIC of approximately \$59 million and the statutory surplus of Platte River of approximately \$48 million, each as determined in accordance with SAP. As of December 31, 2017, the consolidated equity of CapSpecialty was \$367.7 million, as determined in accordance with GAAP.

Distribution. CapSpecialty conducts its insurance business through independent wholesale brokerage and retail agents and general insurance agents located throughout the U.S. As of December 31, 2017, CapSpecialty had 66 general agents licensed to write property and casualty and surety coverages, approximately 109 brokers specializing in professional liability coverages and approximately 272 independent agents licensed only to write surety coverages. Certain independent agents have binding authority for specific business owner policy products, including property and liability coverages, and non-contract surety products.

Underwriting. Elements of CapSpecialty's underwriting process include prudent risk selection, appropriate pricing and coverage customization. All accounts are reviewed on an individual basis to determine underwriting acceptability. CapSpecialty is a subscriber to the Insurance Service Organization, or the ISO, and the Surety and Fidelity Association of America, or SFAA, insurance reference resources recognized by the insurance industry. CapSpecialty's underwriting procedures, rates and contractual coverage obligations are based on procedures and data developed by the ISO for property and casualty lines and by the SFAA for surety lines. Underwriting acceptability is determined by type of business, claims experience, length of time in business and business experience, age and condition of premises occupied and financial stability. Information is obtained from, among other sources, agent applications, financial reports and on-site loss control surveys. If an account does not meet pre-determined acceptability parameters, coverage is declined. If an in-force policy becomes unprofitable due to extraordinary claims activity or inadequate premium levels, a non-renewal notice is issued in accordance with individual state statutes and rules.

Ratings. CIC, CSIC and Platte River are rated A (Excellent) on a reinsured basis by A.M. Best.

PacificComp

General. PacificComp, a provider of workers' compensation insurance primarily in the state of California, had been a subsidiary of AIHL since July 2007.

Sale. On September 12, 2017, AIHL signed a definitive agreement to sell PacificComp to CopperPoint Mutual Insurance Company, or CopperPoint, for total cash consideration of approximately \$158 million. The transaction closed on December 31, 2017, at which time: (i) approximately \$442 million of PacificComp assets, consisting

primarily of debt securities, and approximately \$316 million of PacificComp liabilities, consisting primarily of loss and LAE reserves, were transferred; and (ii) AIHL recorded an after-tax gain of approximately \$16 million, which included a tax benefit. In connection with the transaction, AIHL Re will continue to provide adverse development reinsurance coverage on PacificComp's pre-acquisition claims, subject to certain terms and conditions. AIHL Re's obligations, which are guaranteed by Alleghany, are subject to: (i) an aggregate limit of \$150.0 million; and (ii) a final commutation and settlement as of December 31, 2024.

Table of Contents**Reserves**

Each of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries establishes reserves on its balance sheet for unpaid loss and LAE related to its property and casualty reinsurance and insurance contracts. The reserves for loss and LAE represent management's best estimate of the ultimate cost of all reported and unreported losses incurred through the balance sheet date. The process of estimating these reserves is inherently difficult and involves a considerable degree of judgment, especially in view of changing legal and economic environments that impact loss reserve development. Therefore, quantitative techniques have to be supplemented by subjective considerations and managerial judgment. In addition, conditions and trends that have affected development of liabilities in the past may not necessarily occur or affect liability development to the same degree in the future. See Part II, Item 7, Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations Critical Accounting Estimates of this Form 10-K for additional detail on our critical accounting estimates.

Information on prior year loss reserve development and incurred and paid loss and LAE development by segment can be found in Note 6(b) and Note 6(c), respectively, to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K.

The reconciliation between the aggregate net loss and LAE reserves of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reported in the annual statements filed with state insurance departments prepared in accordance with SAP and those reported in our consolidated financial statements prepared in accordance with GAAP for the last three years is presented below:

Reconciliation of Reserves for Loss and LAE from SAP Basis to GAAP Basis

	2017	As of December 31, 2016	2015
		(\$ in millions)	
Statutory reserves	\$ 9,633.4	\$ 9,339.8	\$ 9,137.0
Net reserves of non-U.S. subsidiaries ⁽¹⁾	587.8	511.2	492.9
Reinsurance recoverables ⁽²⁾	1,650.1	1,236.2	1,169.3
GAAP reserves	\$ 11,871.3	\$ 11,087.2	\$ 10,799.2

(1) TransRe's non-U.S. subsidiaries do not file annual statements with state insurance departments in the U.S.

(2) Reinsurance recoverables in this table include only unpaid ceded loss and LAE reserves.

Table of Contents

The reconciliation of beginning and ending aggregate reserves for unpaid loss and LAE of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries for the last three years is presented below:

Reconciliation of Reserves for Loss and LAE

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Reserves as of January 1	\$ 11,087.2	\$ 10,799.2	\$ 11,597.2
Less: reinsurance recoverables ⁽¹⁾	1,236.2	1,169.3	1,289.4
Net reserves as of January 1	9,851.0	9,629.9	10,307.8
Other adjustments	(293.7) ⁽²⁾	2.4	(1.9)
Incurred loss and LAE, net of reinsurance, related to:			
Current year	3,918.8	3,285.2	2,555.3
Prior years	(298.6)	(368.0)	(215.5)
Total incurred loss and LAE, net of reinsurance	3,620.2	2,917.2	2,339.8
Paid loss and LAE, net of reinsurance, related to:⁽³⁾			
Current year	853.2	734.3	417.6
Prior years	2,225.2	1,866.5	2,390.4
Total paid loss and LAE, net of reinsurance	3,078.4	2,600.8	2,808.0
Foreign exchange effect	122.1	(97.7)	(207.8)
Net reserves as of December 31	10,221.2	9,851.0	9,629.9
Reinsurance recoverables as of December 31 ⁽¹⁾	1,650.1	1,236.2	1,169.3
Reserves as of December 31	\$ 11,871.3	\$ 11,087.2	\$ 10,799.2

(1) Reinsurance recoverables in this table include only unpaid ceded loss and LAE reserves.

(2) Primarily represents the impact on net reserves arising from the sale of PacificComp on December 31, 2017.

(3) Includes paid losses, net of reinsurance, related to commutations.

Asbestos-Related Illness and Environmental Impairment Reserves

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries' reserves for loss and LAE include amounts for risks relating to asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment. The reserves carried for such claims, including the reserves for loss and LAE incurred but not yet reported, or IBNR, claims, are based upon known facts and current law at the respective balance sheet dates. However, significant uncertainty exists in determining the amount of ultimate liability for asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment losses. This uncertainty is due to, among other reasons, inconsistent and changing court resolutions and judicial interpretations with respect to underlying policy intent and coverage and uncertainties as to the allocation of responsibility for resultant damages. Further, possible future changes in statutes, laws, regulations, theories of liability and other factors could have a material effect on these liabilities and, accordingly, future earnings. Although we are unable at this time to determine whether additional reserves, which could have a material adverse effect upon our results of operations, may be necessary in the future, we believe that our asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment reserves were adequate as of December 31, 2017.

On November 30, 2015, TransRe entered into a commutation and release agreement with AIG Property Casualty, Inc., National Indemnity Company and Resolute Management, Inc. with respect to certain reinsurance contracts, or the Commutation Agreement, including contracts covering asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment liabilities for 1986 and prior years, or the Commuted A&E Liabilities. Pursuant to the Commutation Agreement, TransRe made a settlement payment of \$400.0 million in 2015 to terminate certain liabilities and obligations, including for the Commuted A&E Liabilities, which eliminated the vast majority of its asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment loss and LAE reserves.

Table of Contents

The following table presents the gross and net loss and LAE reserves for asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment liabilities as of December 31, 2017 and 2016:

	December 31, 2017		December 31, 2016	
	Gross	Net	Gross	Net
	(\$ in millions)			
TransRe	\$ 152.4	\$ 148.0	\$ 165.7	\$ 160.0
CapSpecialty	6.0	6.0	6.3	6.3
Total	\$ 158.4	\$ 154.0	\$ 172.0	\$ 166.3

At December 31, 2017 and December 31, 2016, the reserves for asbestos-related illness liabilities were approximately eight and nine times, respectively, the average paid claims for the respective prior three year period. At December 31, 2017 and December 31, 2016, the reserves for environmental impairment liabilities were approximately six and five times, respectively, the average paid claims for the respective prior three year period.

The reconciliation of the beginning and ending gross reserves for unpaid loss and LAE related to asbestos related illness and environmental impairment claims of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries for the years 2015 through 2017 is presented below:

Reconciliation of Asbestos-Related Illness Claims Reserves for Loss and LAE

	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Reserves as of January 1	\$ 47.2	\$ 43.2	\$ 444.3
Loss and LAE incurred	4.1	8.6	80.0
Paid losses ⁽¹⁾	(11.9)	(4.6)	(481.1)
Reserves as of December 31	\$ 39.4	\$ 47.2	\$ 43.2
Type of reserves			
Case	\$ 15.4	\$ 15.9	\$ 13.0
IBNR	24.0	31.3	30.2

Total	\$ 39.4	\$ 47.2	\$ 43.2
-------	---------	---------	---------

(1) Paid losses include commutations and legal settlements, as well as regular paid losses. Amounts for 2015 include amounts paid by TransRe pursuant to the Commutation Agreement for the Commuted A&E Liabilities. Paid losses relate to old accident years.

Reconciliation of Environmental Impairment Claims Reserves for Loss and LAE

	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Reserves as of January 1	\$ 124.8	\$ 140.4	\$ 158.4
Loss and LAE incurred	7.1	8.2	21.5
Paid losses ⁽¹⁾	(12.9)	(23.8)	(39.5)
Reserves as of December 31	\$ 119.0	\$ 124.8	\$ 140.4
Type of reserves			
Case	\$ 30.7	\$ 34.0	\$ 46.4
IBNR	88.3	90.8	94.0
Total	\$ 119.0	\$ 124.8	\$ 140.4

(1) Paid losses include commutations and legal settlements as well as regular paid losses. Amounts for 2015 include amounts paid by TransRe pursuant to the Commutation Agreement for the Commuted A&E Liabilities.

Table of Contents

Catastrophe Risk Management

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries' businesses expose them to losses from various catastrophe events. In a catastrophe event, losses from many insureds across multiple lines of business may result directly or indirectly from any such event. The extent of losses caused by catastrophes is a function of the amount and type of insured exposure in the area affected by the event, as well as the severity of the event, potentially mitigated by any reinsurance coverage purchased by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries take certain measures to mitigate the impact of catastrophe events through various means including considering catastrophe risks in their underwriting and pricing decisions, monitoring and modeling accumulated exposures and managing exposure in key geographic zones and product lines that are prone to catastrophe events. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries also use reinsurance to further limit their exposure to catastrophes, as is discussed in more detail under Reinsurance Protection below.

Natural disasters such as hurricanes, other windstorms, earthquakes and other catastrophes have the potential to materially and adversely affect our operating results. Other risks, such as an outbreak of a pandemic disease, a major terrorist event, the bankruptcy of a major company, or a marine or an aviation disaster, could also have a material adverse effect on our business and operating results.

We evaluate catastrophe events and assess the probability of occurrence and magnitude through the use of industry recognized models and other techniques. In addition, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries use modeled loss scenarios and internal analyses to set risk retention levels and help structure their reinsurance programs in an effort to ensure that the aggregate amount of catastrophe exposures conform to established risk tolerances and fit within the existing exposure portfolio. We supplement these models by interpreting and adjusting when appropriate the modeled output and monitoring our operations' exposure to risks. There is no single standard methodology to project possible losses from catastrophe exposures. Further, there are no industry standard assumptions used in projecting these losses, and the form and quality of the data obtained, including data obtained from insureds and ceding companies, and used in these models are not uniformly compatible with the data requirements of all models. Therefore, the use of different methodologies and assumptions could materially change our estimates of projected losses. Finally, these modeled losses may not be comparable with estimates made by other companies.

Reinsurance Protection

General

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reinsure portions of the risks they underwrite in order to reduce the effect of individual or aggregate exposure to losses, manage capacity, protect capital resources, reduce volatility in specific lines of business, improve risk-adjusted portfolio returns and enable them to increase gross premium writings and risk-capacity without requiring additional capital. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries purchase retrocessional and reinsurance coverages from highly-rated third-party reinsurers. However, if the assuming reinsurers are unable or unwilling to meet the obligations assumed under the applicable reinsurance agreements, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries would remain liable for such reinsurance portion not paid by these reinsurers. As such, funds, trust agreements and letters of credit are held to collateralize a portion of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries' reinsurance recoverables, and our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reinsure portions of the risks they underwrite or assume with multiple reinsurance programs.

TransRe enters into retrocession arrangements, including property catastrophe retrocession arrangements, in order to reduce the effect of individual or aggregate exposure to losses, reduce volatility in specific lines of business, improve risk-adjusted portfolio returns and increase gross premium writings and risk-capacity without requiring additional

capital.

RSUI reinsures its property lines of business through a program consisting of surplus share treaties, facultative placements, per risk and catastrophe excess-of-loss treaties. RSUI's catastrophe reinsurance program and property per risk reinsurance program run on an annual basis from May 1 to the following April 30 and portions expired on April 30, 2017. Both programs were renewed on May 1, 2017 with substantially similar terms as the expired programs.

Terrorism Act

With respect to potential losses arising from acts of terrorism, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, as extended and amended, most recently by the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015, which we collectively refer to as the Terrorism Act, established a program to provide federal assistance to the insurance industry in order to meet the needs of commercial insurance policyholders for coverages against losses due to certain acts of terrorism. The Terrorism

Table of Contents

Act fixes the insurer deductible at 20 percent of an insurer's direct earned premium of the preceding calendar year. The Terrorism Act also initially fixed the federal share of compensation at 85 percent of insured losses that exceed insurer deductibles. As provided in the Terrorism Act, beginning on January 1, 2016, the federal share began to decrease by 1 percentage point per calendar year and will continue to decrease on that basis until the federal share is equal to 80 percent. The Terrorism Act is administered by the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury.

The Terrorism Act applies to foreign or domestic acts of terrorism occurring within the U.S. (including in the U.S. territorial sea and the Outer Continental Shelf), at U.S. missions abroad or on U.S. flag vessels or aircraft. In return for requiring insurers writing certain lines of property and casualty insurance to offer coverage to commercial insurance policyholders against specified acts of terrorism, the Terrorism Act requires the U.S. federal government to reimburse such insurers for the federal share (82 percent, as of January 1, 2018) of insured losses during a program year resulting from such acts of terrorism above a statutorily-defined deductible. In addition, federal reimbursement will only be paid under the Terrorism Act if the aggregate industry insured losses resulting from a covered act of terrorism exceed \$160.0 million for insured losses occurring in 2018, but no payment will be made for any portion of aggregate industry insured losses that exceeds \$100.0 billion during a particular calendar year. The Terrorism Act program trigger gradually increases from \$140.0 million to \$200.0 million by 2020.

In general, TransRe does not provide coverage for certified acts of terrorism, as defined by the Terrorism Act, but it is nonetheless exposed to potential losses from both certified and uncertified acts of terrorism in the U.S. or elsewhere, such as from terrorism-specific treaty coverages offered to ceding companies or terrorism risk pools outside of the U.S. on a limited basis, and with respect to other lines of business from the assumption of terrorism risk in marine, aviation and other casualty treaties. Although TransRe assumes such terrorism risk after careful underwriting consideration and, in many cases, with limitations, a major terrorist event could have a material adverse impact on TransRe and us.

Approximately 10 percent of all policies and approximately 13 percent of property policies written by RSUI in 2017 contained coverage for domestic and foreign acts of terrorism. RSUI uses various underwriting strategies to mitigate its exposure to terrorism losses. In addition, its casualty reinsurance programs provide coverage for domestic and foreign acts of terrorism. RSUI's property reinsurance programs provide coverage only for domestic acts of terrorism and, as a result, RSUI is liable for losses under property policies that provide coverage for foreign acts of terrorism, subject to potential Terrorism Act reimbursement.

Reinsurance Security Committee

We have established a Reinsurance Security Committee, which includes certain of our officers and the chief financial officers of each of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries, which meets to track, analyze and manage the use of reinsurance by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. The Reinsurance Security Committee considers and oversees the limits on the maximum amount of unsecured reinsurance recoverables that should be outstanding from any particular reinsurer, the lines of business that should be ceded to a particular reinsurer and, where applicable, the types of collateral that should be posted by a reinsurer. As of December 31, 2017, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries had total reinsurance recoverables of \$1,746.5 million, consisting of \$1,650.1 million of ceded outstanding loss and LAE and \$96.4 million of recoverables on paid losses. The reinsurance purchased by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries does not relieve them from their obligations to their policyholders and cedants, and therefore, the financial strength of their reinsurers is important. Approximately 78 percent of our reinsurance recoverables balance as of December 31, 2017 was due from reinsurers having an A.M. Best financial strength rating of A (Excellent) or higher. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries had no allowance for uncollectible reinsurance as of December 31, 2017. Information related to concentration of reinsurance recoverables can be found in Part II, Item 7, Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations—Reinsurance

Recoverables of this Form 10-K and Note 5(b) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K. Information regarding the risks faced by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries with respect to their use of reinsurance can be found on pages 57 and 58 of this Form 10-K.

Competition

The reinsurance and insurance industry is highly competitive, and industry consolidation has created an even more competitive business environment. Competition in the businesses of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries is based on many factors, including the perceived financial strength of the company, premiums charged, other terms and conditions

Table of Contents

offered, services provided, commissions paid to producers, ratings assigned by independent rating agencies, speed of claims payment and reputation and experience in the lines of business to be written.

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries compete with a large number of major U.S. and non-U.S. reinsurers and insurers in their selected lines of business, including regional companies, mutual companies, specialty insurance companies, underwriting agencies, government-owned or subsidized facilities, European underwriting syndicates and diversified financial services companies. In our reinsurance segment, TransRe's property and casualty businesses compete on a worldwide basis. In our insurance segment, RSUI's property and casualty businesses, and CapSpecialty's admitted property and casualty businesses and surety and non-admitted specialty businesses, compete on a national basis. Some of these competitors have significantly more premiums, capital and resources than our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries.

In addition to competition from the reinsurance industry, TransRe faces competition from the capital markets, as well as some traditional reinsurers, which from time to time produce alternative products or reinsurance vehicles (such as collateralized reinsurance, reinsurance securitizations, catastrophe bonds and various derivatives, such as swaps and sidecars) that may compete with certain types of reinsurance, such as property catastrophe. Hedge funds also provide reinsurance and retrocessional protections through captive companies or other alternative transactions on a fully collateralized basis for property and energy catastrophe business. Over time, these initiatives could significantly affect supply, pricing and competition in the reinsurance industry.

A discussion of the risks faced by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries due to competition within, and the cyclicity of, the reinsurance and insurance business can be found on pages 56 and 57 of this Form 10-K.

Employees

As of December 31, 2017, we employed a total of 4,402 persons, as presented below:

TransRe	617
AIHL and subsidiaries	708
Total reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries	1,325
Alleghany Capital and subsidiaries ⁽¹⁾	3,055
Other subsidiaries	5
Parent company	17
Total Alleghany and subsidiaries	4,402

(1) Primarily consisting of 1,021 employees at IPS, 934 employees at W&WIAFCO Steel and 748 employees at Kentucky Trailer.

Regulation

General

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are subject to extensive supervision and regulation in the jurisdictions in which they operate and are required to comply with a wide range of laws and regulations applicable to insurance and reinsurance companies, although the degree and type of regulation varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. We expect the scope and extent of regulation globally, as well as regulatory oversight generally, to continue to increase.

U.S. Regulation

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are regulated in all U.S. jurisdictions in which they are licensed to conduct business. The extent of this regulation varies, but state insurance laws and regulations generally govern the financial condition of reinsurers and insurers, including standards of solvency, types and concentrations of permissible investments, establishment and maintenance of reserves, credit for reinsurance and requirements of capital adequacy. In addition, state insurance laws and regulations govern the business conduct of insurers, including marketing and sales practices and claims handling and require the approval of nearly all rates, policy forms and related materials for lines of insurance. We anticipate

Table of Contents

that U.S. jurisdictions will continue to make some movement towards a harmonized regulatory environment at the state level through solvency regulation modernization efforts.

Through state credit for reinsurance laws, our reinsurance companies are indirectly subject to the effects of regulatory requirements imposed by the states in which their ceding insurers are domiciled and/or licensed. In general, an insurer that obtains reinsurance from a reinsurer that is licensed, accredited, authorized or approved by the state in which the insurer files statutory financial statements is permitted to take a credit on its statutory financial statements in an aggregate amount equal to all of the reinsurance recoverable on paid losses and the liabilities for unearned premiums and loss and LAE reserves ceded to the reinsurer, subject to certain limitations. Additionally, certain states allow credit to be taken for the amount ceded to a non-U.S. reinsurer domiciled in a country recognized as a qualified jurisdiction (based upon an assessment of the strength of such jurisdiction's supervisory structure) that is designated by the state as a certified reinsurer. In such instances the ceding company is permitted to take a credit on its statutory financial statements in an aggregate amount equal to all of the reinsurance recoverable on paid losses and the liabilities for unearned premiums and loss and LAE reserves ceded to the reinsurer, subject to certain limitations provided the reinsurer posts acceptable security in an amount that varies in proportion to the reinsurer's ratings (A.M. Best, S&P, Moody's and/or Fitch Ratings Inc., or Fitch). Finally, for reinsurance ceded to reinsurers that are not licensed, accredited, authorized, approved or certified in the ceding company's jurisdiction, the reinsurer must agree to post 100 percent qualified security, either in the form of a deposit, trust or letter of credit, in order that the ceding insurer be allowed to take full credit on its statutory financial statements in an aggregate amount equal to all or a portion of the reinsurance recoverable on paid losses and the liabilities for unearned premiums and loss and LAE reserves ceded to such reinsurers.

As described in more detail below, in September 2017, U.S. federal authorities signed a covered agreement with the European Union, or the EU, on matters including reinsurance collateral. Such covered agreement requires U.S. states to adopt, over the next several years, laws removing reinsurance collateral requirements for reinsurance ceded to a qualifying non-U.S. reinsurer domiciled in an EU jurisdiction. We cannot currently predict the impact of these changes to the law or whether any other covered agreements will be successfully adopted, and cannot currently estimate the impact of these changes to the law and any such adopted covered agreements on our business, financial condition or operating results.

Insurance Holding Company Regulation. As an insurance holding company, we and our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are subject to regulation under the insurance holding company laws enacted in those states where our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled or where they conduct business. These laws generally require an insurance holding company and its reinsurer and insurer subsidiaries to register with their respective insurance regulators and to file with those regulators certain reports, including information concerning their capital structure, ownership, financial condition, certain intercompany transactions, including dividends and distributions and general business operations. The insurance holding company laws of some states, including with respect to the payment of dividends and distributions, may be more restrictive than the insurance holding company laws of other states.

Under the insurance holding company laws and regulations, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries may not pay an extraordinary dividend or distribution without the approval of state insurance regulators. In general, an extraordinary dividend or distribution is defined as a dividend or distribution that, together with other dividends and distributions made within the preceding 12 months, exceeds the lesser (or, in some jurisdictions, the greater) of (i) 10 percent of the statutory surplus of the reinsurer or insurer as of the end of the prior calendar year (or, in certain states, as of the end of the prior quarter) and (ii) statutory net income during the prior calendar year (or, in certain states, the adjusted statutory net investment income). In addition, certain states where Alleghany's reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled prohibit a domestic insurance company from paying dividends except out of earned surplus.

In addition, insurance holding company laws and regulations to which we and our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are subject generally require prior notification and approval or non-disapproval by the applicable insurance regulators of certain other significant transactions, including sales, loans, reinsurance agreements and service agreements between an insurer subsidiary, on the one hand, and its holding company or other subsidiaries of the holding company, on the other hand.

Insurance holding company laws and regulations to which we and our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are subject also generally require the ultimate controlling person of the reinsurer or insurer to comply with certain informational requirements with the purpose of protecting such reinsurer or insurer from enterprise risk, including requiring an annual

Table of Contents

enterprise risk report by the ultimate controlling person of the reinsurer or insurer that identifies the material risks within the insurance holding company system that could pose enterprise risk to the reinsurer or insurer.

The insurance holding company laws and regulations of the states in which our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled also generally require that, before a person can acquire direct or indirect control of a reinsurer or an insurer domiciled in the state, prior written approval must be obtained from the insurer's domiciliary state insurance regulator. The state insurance regulators are required to consider various factors, including the financial strength of the acquirer, the integrity and management experience of the acquirer's board of directors and executive officers, and the acquirer's plans for the future operations of the reinsurer or insurer. Pursuant to applicable laws and regulations, control over a reinsurer or an insurer is generally presumed to exist if any person, directly or indirectly, owns, controls, holds the power to vote or holds proxies representing 10 percent or more of the voting securities of that reinsurer or insurer. Indirect ownership includes ownership of the shares of the ultimate controlling person's common stock.

The acquisition of control laws described above may discourage potential acquisition proposals and may delay, deter or prevent an acquisition of control of us, including through transactions, and in particular unsolicited transactions, that some or all of our stockholders might consider to be desirable.

Risk Management and ORSA. State insurance laws enacted in nearly all U.S. states (including all of the states where our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled) require reinsurers and insurers that exceed specified premium thresholds to maintain a framework for managing the risks associated with their entire holding company group, including non-insurance companies. In addition these laws require that, at least annually, the reinsurer or insurer must prepare a summary report, or the ORSA Report, regarding its internal assessment of risk management and capital adequacy for the entire holding company group. The ORSA Report is filed, on a confidential basis, with the insurance holding company group's lead regulator and made available to other domiciliary regulators within the holding company group.

Corporate Governance. In November 2014, the NAIC adopted the Corporate Governance Annual Disclosure Model Act and the Corporate Governance Annual Disclosure Model Regulation, or the Corporate Governance Model Act and Regulation, which, following enactment at the state level, will require insurers and reinsurers to disclose detailed information regarding their governance practices. As of December 31, 2017, the Corporate Governance Model Act and Regulation had been adopted in full or in substantial part in approximately 19 states, including some of the states where our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled, and legislation was pending or under consideration in certain other states. Because the NAIC has adopted a requirement that the provisions of the Corporate Governance Model Act and Regulation be adopted by the states in order for them to maintain their NAIC accreditation, the Corporate Governance Model Act and Regulation is expected to be adopted in full or substantial part by all or most of the states over the next several years.

Group Supervision and Group Capital. In response to international developments, the NAIC has established procedures for the supervision of domestic and international insurance groups, including those groups with both insurance and non-insurance entities. In December 2014, the NAIC also adopted amendments to the Model Insurance Holding Company System Regulatory Act and Regulation, or the Model Holding Company Act and Regulation, which, following enactment at the state level, would authorize U.S. regulators to lead or participate in the group-wide supervision of certain international insurance groups. As of December 31, 2017, these amendments had been adopted by approximately 24 states, including some of the states where our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled. It is possible that the NAIC will seek to require that these amendments to the Model Holding Company Act and Regulation be adopted by the states in order for them to maintain their NAIC accreditation, and, if so, these amendments will likely be adopted in full or substantial part by all or most of the states over the next several years.

The NAIC previously designated certain states as the respective group supervisors for all reporting domestic insurance groups. Additionally, the NAIC is continuing the development of a methodology for the calculation of group capital for all entities in an insurance holding company system. The goal is to provide U.S. regulators with a simple method to aggregate the available capital and the minimum capital of each entity in a group in a way that applies to all companies regardless of their structure. The NAIC has stated that the calculation will be a regulatory tool and does not constitute a requirement or standard. While it is still under discussion, it is anticipated that this new methodology will incorporate existing risk-based capital requirements, or the RBC, which is used in the U.S. (discussed in further detail below).

Cybersecurity. The NAIC has adopted an Insurance Data Security Model Law, which, when adopted by the states, will require insurers, insurance producers and other entities required to be licensed under state insurance laws to comply with

Table of Contents

certain requirements under state insurance laws, such as developing and maintaining a written information security program, conducting risk assessments and overseeing the data security practices of third-party vendors. In addition, certain state insurance regulators are developing or have developed regulations that may impose regulatory requirements relating to cybersecurity on insurance and reinsurance companies (potentially including insurance and reinsurance companies that are not domiciled, but are licensed, in the relevant state). For example, the New York State Department of Financial Services has adopted a regulation pertaining to cybersecurity for all banking and insurance entities under its jurisdiction, effective as of March 1, 2017, which applies to us. We cannot predict the impact these laws and regulations will have on our business, financial condition or results of operations, but our insurance and reinsurance companies could incur additional costs resulting from compliance with such laws and regulations.

Rates and Policy Forms. The policy forms and various premium rates and rates for property or casualty or surety insurance policies of our insurance subsidiaries are subject to regulation in every state in which they conduct business. In many states, rates and policy forms must be filed with the applicable insurance regulator prior to their use, and in some states, rates and forms must be affirmatively approved by the applicable insurance regulator prior to use.

The rates and coverage terms of reinsurance agreements with non-affiliates are generally not subject to regulation by any governmental authority. As a practical matter, however, the rates charged by primary insurers and the policy terms of primary insurance agreements may affect the rates charged and the policy terms under associated reinsurance agreements.

Market Conduct Examinations. The insurance laws and regulations to which our insurance companies are subject govern their marketplace activities, affecting the form and content of disclosure to consumers, product illustrations, advertising, product replacement, sales and underwriting practices and complaint and claims handling. These provisions are generally enforced through periodic market conduct examinations. Such insurance laws and regulations also govern the licensing of insurance companies and agents and regulate trade practices.

Periodic Financial Reporting and Risk-Based Capital. Reinsurance and insurance companies in the U.S. are required to report their financial condition and results of operations in accordance with SAP prescribed or permitted by state insurance regulators in conjunction with the NAIC. State insurance regulators also prescribe the form and content of statutory financial statements, perform periodic financial examinations of reinsurers and insurers, set minimum reserve and loss ratio requirements, establish standards for permissible types and amounts of investments and require minimum capital and surplus levels. These statutory capital and surplus requirements include RBC rules promulgated by the NAIC. These RBC standards are intended to assess the level of risk inherent in a reinsurance or an insurance company's business and consider items such as asset risk, credit risk, underwriting risk and other business risks relevant to its operations. In accordance with RBC formulas, a company's RBC requirements are calculated and compared with its total adjusted capital to determine whether the company may be undercapitalized and whether regulatory intervention is warranted. As of December 31, 2017, the total adjusted capital of our U.S. domiciled reinsurance and insurance companies exceeded the minimum levels required under RBC rules, and each had excess capacity to write additional premiums in relation to these requirements. Specifically, as of December 31, 2017, the amount of statutory capital and surplus necessary to satisfy regulatory requirements was not significant in relation to the actual statutory capital and surplus of our reinsurance and insurance companies in the U.S.

The NAIC annually calculates certain statutory financial ratios for most reinsurance and insurance companies in the U.S. These calculations are known as the Insurance Regulatory Information System, or IRIS, ratios. There presently are thirteen IRIS ratios, with each ratio having an established usual range of results. The IRIS ratios assist state insurance departments in executing their statutory mandate to oversee the financial condition of insurance companies. A ratio falling outside the usual range is not considered a failing result; rather, unusual values are viewed as part of the regulatory early monitoring system. Furthermore, in some years, it may not be unusual for financially sound

companies to have several ratios with results outside the usual ranges. The NAIC reports the ratios to state insurance departments who may then contact a company if four or more of its ratios fall outside the NAIC's usual ranges.

Guarantee Associations and Similar Arrangements. Certain U.S. insurance companies are required under the guaranty fund laws of most states in which they transact business to pay assessments up to certain prescribed limits to fund policyholder losses or liabilities of insolvent insurance companies. Our U.S. insurance companies also are required to participate in various involuntary pools, principally involving windstorms.

Statutory Accounting Principles. State insurance regulators have developed SAP as a basis of accounting used to monitor and regulate the solvency of reinsurers and insurers. SAP is primarily concerned with measuring a reinsurer's or

Table of Contents

insurer's surplus to policyholders. Accordingly, SAP focuses on valuing assets and liabilities of a reinsurer or insurer at financial reporting dates in accordance with applicable insurance laws and regulations in the state in which such reinsurer or insurer is domiciled. SAP determines, among other things, the amount of statutory surplus and statutory net income of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries and thus determines, in part, the amount of funds they have available to pay as dividends.

GAAP is concerned with a company's solvency, but it is also concerned with other financial measurements, such as income and cash flows. Accordingly, GAAP gives more consideration to appropriate matching of revenue and expenses and accounting for management's stewardship of assets than does SAP. Due to differences in methodology between SAP and GAAP, the values for assets, liabilities and equity reflected in financial statements prepared in accordance with GAAP are materially different from those reflected in financial statements prepared in accordance with SAP.

Legislative and Regulatory Initiatives. As discussed in more detail under *Reinsurance Protection* above, the Terrorism Act established a federal assistance program to help the commercial property and casualty insurance industry cover claims arising from terrorism-related losses and regulates the terms of insurance relating to the terrorism coverage provided by our insurance companies.

On July 21, 2010, President Barack H. Obama signed into law the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, or the *Dodd-Frank Act*. The *Dodd-Frank Act* made extensive changes to the laws regulating financial services firms and requires various federal agencies to adopt a broad range of new implementing rules and regulations. In addition to introducing sweeping reform of the U.S. financial services industry, the *Dodd-Frank Act* adopts certain changes to U.S. insurance regulation in general, and to non-admitted insurance and reinsurance in particular. While the *Dodd-Frank Act* does not result in the federal regulation of insurance, it does establish federal measures that will impact the reinsurance and insurance business and preempt certain state insurance measures. For example, the *Dodd-Frank Act* incorporates the *Non-Admitted and Reinsurance Reform Act*, or the *NRRA*, which became effective on July 21, 2011. Among other things, the *NRRA* establishes national uniform standards on how states may regulate and tax surplus lines insurance (and also sets national standards concerning the regulation of reinsurance). In particular, the *NRRA* gives regulators in the state where an insurer is domiciled exclusive authority to regulate and tax surplus lines insurance transactions, and regulators in a ceding insurer's state of domicile are given the sole responsibility for regulating the balance sheet credit that the ceding insurer may take for reinsurance recoverables. At the present time, it remains unclear how certain provisions of the *Dodd-Frank Act* will be implemented in practice. It is also difficult to predict whether legislative or executive action will amend the *Dodd-Frank Act*, as described below.

The *Dodd-Frank Act* created the *Financial Stability Oversight Council*, or the *FSOC*, to identify and respond to risks to the financial stability of the U.S. and to promote market discipline. The *FSOC* is authorized to designate a nonbank financial company as *systemically significant* if its material financial distress could threaten the financial stability of the U.S. Between 2013 and 2014, the *FSOC* designated four nonbank financial companies, including three insurance groups, as *systemically significant*. One of the insurance group designations was rescinded by *FSOC* in September 2017, while another of the insurance group designations was successfully challenged in federal court. The entities designated by the *FSOC* as *systemically significant* are subject to supervision by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as well as enhanced prudential standards, including stress tests, liquidity requirements, annual resolution plans or *living wills*, and enhanced public disclosures. The *FSOC*'s potential recommendation of measures to address systemic risk in the insurance industry could affect our insurance and reinsurance operations as could a determination that we or our counterparties are *systemically significant*.

The *Dodd-Frank Act* also created the *Federal Insurance Office*, or the *FIO*, within the U.S. Department of the Treasury, which is designed to promote national coordination within the insurance sector and which has the authority,

in part, to monitor all aspects of the insurance industry, including identifying issues or gaps in the regulation of reinsurers and insurers that could contribute to a systemic crisis in the insurance industry or the U.S. financial system. Although the FIO is intended principally to exercise a monitoring and information gathering role, it does have the authority to assist the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Treasury in negotiating covered agreements with regulatory authorities outside the U.S. with respect to certain agreements with foreign governments regarding the supervision and regulation of the global reinsurance and insurance markets. In implementing such international agreements, the FIO has the authority to preempt state law if it is determined that state law is inconsistent with the agreement and treats a non-U.S. reinsurer or insurer less favorably than a U.S. reinsurer or insurer.

Table of Contents

In January 2017, the U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative announced their successful completion of negotiations of a covered agreement with the EU. The covered agreement addresses three areas of prudential insurance and reinsurance supervision: reinsurance, group supervision and the exchange of information between the U.S. and EU. The covered agreement was thereafter signed on September 22, 2017, and now each party will begin the process of completing its internal requirements and procedures (such as amending or promulgating appropriate statutes and regulations) in order for the covered agreement to enter into force. In terms of reinsurance, the covered agreement eliminates collateral and local presence requirements for EU and U.S. reinsurers operating in each other's markets. In connection with an alien reinsurer's assumption of insurance business from a U.S. cedent, the covered agreement gives the U.S. states five years to remove the existing reinsurance collateral requirements for such alien, non-admitted reinsurers domiciled in the EU that meet certain standards. These standards include, among others, minimum capital and risk-based capital, confirmation of financial condition by the reinsurer's domestic regulator and claims payment standards. If the U.S. states do not remove such reinsurance collateral requirements, they will face federal pre-emption determinations. The Trump administration has also issued a U.S. policy statement providing guidance on implementation, which encourages each state to promptly adopt credit for reinsurance laws and regulations consistent with the covered agreement, and to implement the required phase-out collateral requirements. In addition, the covered agreement establishes group supervision practices that apply only to U.S. and EU insurance groups operating in both territories. For instance, the covered agreement provides that U.S. insurance groups with operations in the EU will be supervised at the worldwide level only by U.S. insurance regulators, and precludes EU insurance supervisors from exercising solvency and capital requirements over the worldwide operations of U.S. insurers. We cannot currently predict the impact of these changes to the law or whether any other covered agreements will be successfully adopted, and cannot currently estimate the impact of these changes to the law and any such adopted covered agreements on our business, financial condition or operating results.

The Dodd-Frank Act gave federal agencies significant discretion in drafting the rules and regulations to implement the Dodd-Frank Act. In addition, the Dodd-Frank Act mandated multiple studies and reports for the U.S. Congress, which could result in additional legislative or regulatory action. We cannot predict the requirements of the regulations ultimately adopted under the Dodd-Frank Act or any related additional legislation, the additional costs resulting from compliance with such regulations or legislation or any changes to our operations that may be necessary to comply with the Dodd-Frank Act.

However, President Donald J. Trump and the majority party have expressed goals to amend the Dodd-Frank Act, which may present risks to our business. For example, on February 3, 2017, President Trump issued an Executive Order that calls for a comprehensive review of laws, treaties, regulations, policies and guidance regulating the U.S. financial system, and requires the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Treasury to consult with the heads of the member agencies of FSOC to identify any laws, regulations or requirements that inhibit federal regulation of the financial system in a manner consistent with the core principles identified in the Executive Order. On June 8, 2017, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Financial CHOICE Act of 2017, which proposes to amend or repeal various sections of Dodd-Frank. This proposed legislation is now being considered by the U.S. Senate. We are not able to predict whether any such legislation or any other amendments to the Dodd-Frank Act would have a material effect on our business operations and cannot currently identify the risks, if any, that may be posed to our businesses as a result of changes to, or legislative replacements for, the Dodd-Frank Act.

International Regulation

General. TransRe is regulated in various foreign jurisdictions where it conducts business. In certain jurisdictions, TransRe operates through branches or representative offices of TRC and in other jurisdictions TransRe has local reinsurance or insurance subsidiaries, such as TRL in the U.K. and TRZ in Switzerland.

The extent of the regulation varies by foreign jurisdiction, but generally governs licensing requirements, solvency, currency, amount and type of security deposits, amount and type of reserves and amount and type of local investments. International operations and assets held abroad may be materially and adversely affected by economic, political and other developments in foreign countries and the U.S., including possible changes in foreign and U.S. laws and regulations, nationalization and changes in regulatory policy, unexpected financial restrictions that foreign governments may impose and potential costs and difficulties in complying with a wide variety of foreign laws and regulations, as well as by the consequences of international hostilities and unrest. The risks of such occurrences and their overall effect upon us vary from country to country and cannot easily be predicted. International operations are also subject to risks related to complying, or

Table of Contents

monitoring compliance, with the requirements of anti-corruption laws, such as the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and the U.K. Bribery Act, the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, or OFAC, Solvency II, and the economic and trade sanctions laws of the U.S., including but not limited to the regulations administered by the OFAC and sanctions laws implemented by other countries in which TransRe operates. Further, regulations governing technical reserves and remittance of balances in some countries may hinder remittance of profits and repatriation of assets. A discussion of risks unique to international operations faced by TransRe's offices that operate in jurisdictions outside the U.S. can be found on pages 59 through 62 of this Form 10-K.

U.K. Regulation. Prior to December 2013, TransRe's operations in the U.K. were conducted through a branch of TRC. Since December 2013, TransRe's operations in the U.K. have been conducted by TRL and TRC's branch in the U.K. TRL and TRC's operations in the U.K. are supervised by the Prudential Regulatory Authority, or the PRA, which is responsible, among other things, for regulating the solvency of insurance and reinsurance companies, and the Financial Conduct Authority, or the FCA, which is responsible, among other things, for regulating market conduct. The PRA and FCA have extensive powers to intervene in the affairs of a regulated entity, including the power to enforce and take disciplinary measures in respect of breaches of its rules by authorized firms and approved persons. TRL and TRC's branch in the U.K. is required to maintain a margin of solvency at all times in respect of the business conducted in accordance with PRA and FCA rules. The calculation of the margin of solvency depends on the type and amount of reinsurance business written, the type and amount of reserves held and other risk-related factors, including market risk, counterparty default risk and operational risk.

Swiss Regulation. TRZ is licensed to carry on reinsurance business in Switzerland. As a result, TRZ is required to comply with the Federal Insurance Supervision Act, the Federal Insurance Supervision Ordinance and the regulations and guidance issued by the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority, or FINMA. Some of the significant aspects of the Swiss regulatory framework include complying with capital and solvency, corporate governance, risk management and internal control requirements. In addition, TRZ is subject to annual reporting requirements enacted by FINMA.

Branch Regulation. TRC operates in a number of other jurisdictions through a series of foreign branches, including branches in Australia, Bermuda, Canada, France, Germany, Japan, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the U.K., Switzerland and Singapore, and TRZ operates in Dubai through a branch. As a result, TRC and TRZ are required, among other things, to meet local licensing, reserve, currency, investment and capital requirements for these branches.

Legislative and Regulatory Initiatives. Our insurance business throughout the EU is subject to an EU directive known as Solvency II, and its implementing rules, which have been in effect since January 1, 2016. The implementation of Solvency II represented a fundamental revision to the European regulatory regime that sought to enhance transparency and risk management and encourage a proactive approach to company solvency. It is built on a risk-based approach to setting capital requirements for reinsurers and insurers. TransRe could be materially impacted by Solvency II and a key risk is that Solvency II rules may reduce TRL's and/or TRC's branch's regulatory solvency position by, for example, increased capital requirements or a reduction in eligible funds. Solvency II could also materially impact TransRe, given that Solvency II affects the calculation of the solvency of international groups which, like TransRe, conduct reinsurance and insurance operations both inside and outside of the EU. Other risks include more complex and intensive regulatory reporting burdens, regulatory requirements that conflict with requirements in other jurisdictions, and shortages of skilled staff in critical areas such as the actuarial function, all of which may have a negative impact on the results of TRL, the branches of TRC and the TransRe group. In addition, we could be required to undertake a significant amount of additional work if compliance with the Solvency II regime came into question which in turn may divert finite resources from other business related tasks.

Within the EU, EU member states, or Member States, are required to adopt common standards for authorizing and supervising reinsurance companies that are head quartered in a Member State. TRC operates within the EU as a Third Country Reinsurer under Solvency II through a series of foreign branches and on a cross-border basis. Each branch of TRC in the EU is separately authorized by the relevant regulator in the Member State in which it is established. Currently, TRC continues to conduct business within the EU through its foreign branches with no significant impact on its operations. However, TransRe could be materially and adversely affected by rules adopted by a Member State relating to Third Country Reinsurers. For example, TRC may be required to post additional collateral in EU countries or may need to consider restructuring its business in order to comply with the rules adopted in EU countries relating to Third Country Reinsurers.

Table of Contents

Since 2013, TransRe has been working to mitigate the risks associated with being a Third Country Reinsurer by migrating business originating in the EU from TransRe branches to TRL.

The referendum on the U.K.'s membership in the EU was held on June 23, 2016 and resulted in a vote in favor of the withdrawal of the U.K. from the EU, or Brexit. As a result of Brexit, our U.K. operations could lose their European Economic Area financial services passporting rights. Additional information on the uncertainty surrounding the implementation and effect of Brexit can be found on pages 59 through 62 of this Form 10-K.

In addition, as described above, in January 2017, the U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative announced the successful completion of their negotiations of a covered agreement with the EU. The covered agreement could result in the elimination of local presence and reinsurance collateral requirements for EU domiciled reinsurers operating in the U.S. and for U.S.-domiciled reinsurers operating in the EU. The covered agreement could also limit the ability of EU jurisdictions to impose group supervision (including governance, solvency and capital, and reporting) requirements on U.S. insurance and reinsurance groups. While on the face of it, this development would appear to be beneficial to TransRe, we cannot currently predict whether the covered agreement between the U.S. and the EU will be successfully adopted, nor, if it is adopted, what its application to the U.K. will be post-Brexit.

In Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, People's Republic of China and India, emerging markets where TransRe underwrites business on a cross-border basis, local regulations have recently been adopted that may operate to limit, restrict or increase the costs of TransRe's access to these markets. If this trend continues to spread to other jurisdictions, TransRe's ability to operate globally may be materially and adversely affected.

In addition to regulation within the U.S., by the EU and by the various jurisdictions outside the U.S. where TransRe operates, we may be affected by regulatory policies adopted by the International Association of Insurance Supervisors, or the IAIS. Regulators in more than 200 jurisdictions and approximately 140 countries, representing both established and emerging markets, are working with the IAIS to consider changes to reinsurer and insurer solvency standards and group supervision of companies in a holding company system, including non-insurance companies. Current IAIS initiatives include development of a Common Framework for the Supervision of Internationally Active Insurance Groups, or ComFrame, which has been in progress since 2010. ComFrame is intended to provide a framework of basic standards for internationally active insurance groups, or IAIGs, and a process for supervisors to cooperate in the supervision of IAIGs. A fourth draft of ComFrame was published during 2014, to be followed by field testing. Since the field testing is expected to result in further modifications to ComFrame, IAIS currently anticipates that ComFrame will be adopted in 2018 and implemented in 2019. In October 2013, IAIS announced that it intends to develop a risk-based group-wide global insurance capital standard which will be included within ComFrame. When adopted and implemented, ComFrame may impose additional and duplicative supervisory and regulatory costs on our reinsurance and insurance companies.

Regulatory Convergence

Regulators within and outside the U.S. are increasingly coordinating the regulation of multinational insurers by conducting a supervisory college. A supervisory college, as defined by the IAIS, is a forum for cooperation and communication between the involved supervisors established for the fundamental purpose of facilitating the effectiveness of supervision of entities which belong to an insurance group; facilitating both the supervisor of the group as a whole on a group-wide basis and improving the legal entity supervision of the entities within the insurance group. We continue to assess the impact, if any, such coordination may have on insurance regulation and our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries.

Other Activities

Alleghany Capital

We source, execute, manage and monitor our private investments primarily through our wholly-owned subsidiary Alleghany Capital. Alleghany Capital's private investments include:

SORC. In June 2011, we formed SORC, an exploration and production company focused on enhanced oil recovery, headquartered in Golden, Colorado. From formation through December 31, 2017, we have invested \$281.8 million in SORC. The \$281.8 million includes \$45.2 million for SORC's January 2015 acquisition of the Teapot Dome Oilfield, known officially as Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 3, located in the State of Wyoming. As of December 31, 2017, SORC's stockholder's equity was \$143.3 million.

Table of Contents

Bourn & Koch. On April 26, 2012, we acquired Bourn & Koch, a manufacturer/remanufacturer of specialty machine tools and supplier of replacement parts, accessories and services for a variety of cutting technologies, headquartered in Rockford, Illinois. As of December 31, 2017, we owned approximately 89 percent of Bourn & Koch. In October 2016, Bourn & Koch acquired a manufacturer of waterjet orifices and nozzles.

Kentucky Trailer. On August 30, 2013, we invested in Kentucky Trailer, a manufacturer of custom trailers and truck bodies for the moving and storage industry and other markets, headquartered in Louisville, Kentucky, for a controlling equity interest. On January 2, 2014, we exercised our option to increase our common equity interest in Kentucky Trailer to approximately 80 percent as well as increase our preferred equity interest, for an additional investment. As of December 31, 2017, we owned approximately 79 percent of the common equity of Kentucky Trailer. The results of Kentucky Trailer have been included in our consolidated results beginning August 30, 2013. Since 2014, Kentucky Trailer has acquired several manufacturers of specialty trailers and mobile solutions.

IPS. On October 31, 2015, we acquired IPS, a technical engineering-focused service provider focused on the global pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries, headquartered in Blue Bell, Pennsylvania. The results of IPS have been included in our consolidated results beginning October 31, 2015. As of December 31, 2017, we owned approximately 84 percent of IPS.

Jazwares. On July 31, 2014, we invested in Jazwares, a global toy, entertainment and musical instrument company, headquartered in Sunrise, Florida for a 30 percent interest. On April 15, 2016, we acquired an additional 50 percent of Jazwares outstanding equity, bringing our equity ownership to 80 percent and, as of that date, the results of Jazwares have been included in our consolidated results. Prior to April 15, 2016, Jazwares was accounted for under the equity method of accounting. In July 2016, Jazwares acquired a musical products business. As of December 31, 2017, we owned approximately 80 percent of Jazwares.

W&WIAFCO Steel. On April 28, 2017, we acquired W&WIAFCO Steel, a structural steel fabricator and erector, headquartered in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. As of December 31, 2017, we owned approximately 80 percent of W&WIAFCO Steel. And,

Wilbert. On August 1, 2017, we acquired a 45 percent equity interest in Wilbert, a provider of products and services for the funeral and cemetery industries and precast concrete markets, headquartered in Overland Park, Kansas. Wilbert is accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

Prior to the second quarter of 2016, Alleghany Capital owned approximately 40 percent of ORX, a regional gas and oil exploration and production company, headquartered in New Orleans, Louisiana. We sold our equity interest in ORX on December 23, 2016. ORX was accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

Corporate Activities

At the parent level, we seek out attractive investment opportunities, including strategic investments in operating companies, delegate responsibilities to competent and motivated managers at the operating business level, set goals

for our operating businesses, assist managers in the achievement of these goals, define risk parameters and appropriate incentives for our operating businesses and monitor progress against their long-term objectives.

Roundwood. Our public equity investments are managed primarily by our indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary Roundwood. For a discussion of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries' investment results, see pages 95 and 96 of this Form 10-K.

Alleghany Properties. We own and manage properties in the Sacramento, California region through our wholly-owned subsidiary Alleghany Properties. These properties include primarily improved and unimproved commercial land, as well as residential lots. As of December 31, 2017, Alleghany Properties owned approximately 226 acres of property in various land use categories ranging from multi-family residential to commercial. In late 2010, Alleghany Properties began making investments in California low income housing tax credit limited liability companies. As of December 31, 2017, Alleghany Properties held investments in three such companies.

Table of Contents

Item 1A. Risk Factors.

Our operating businesses and investments are subject to a number of risks and uncertainties, including those discussed below, which could have a material and adverse effect on our businesses, results of operations or financial condition. Our businesses may also be materially and adversely affected by risks and uncertainties not currently known to us or that we currently consider immaterial.

Risk Factors Relating to our Business

The reserves for loss and LAE of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are estimates and may not be adequate, which would require our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to establish additional reserves.

Gross reserves for loss and LAE reported on our balance sheet as of December 31, 2017 were approximately \$11.9 billion. These loss and LAE reserves reflect management's best estimates of the cost of settling all claims and related expenses with respect to insured events that have occurred. Reserves do not represent an exact calculation of liability, but rather an estimate of what management expects the ultimate settlement and claims administration will cost for events that have occurred, whether known or unknown. These reserve estimates, which generally involve actuarial projections, are based on management's assessment of facts and circumstances currently known and assumptions about anticipated loss emergence patterns, including expected future trends in claims severity and frequency, inflation, court resolutions and judicial interpretations, reinsurance coverage, legislative changes and other factors.

The inherent uncertainties of estimating reserves are greater for certain types of liabilities, where long periods of time elapse before a definitive determination of liability is made and settlement is reached. Our liabilities for loss and LAE can generally be categorized into two distinct groups, short-tail business and long-tail business. Short-tail business refers to lines of business, such as property, for which losses are usually known and paid relatively soon after the loss actually occurs. Long-tail business describes lines of business for which specific losses may not be known and reported for some period and losses take much longer to emerge. Given the time frame over which long-tail exposures are ultimately settled, there is greater uncertainty and volatility in these lines than in short-tail lines of business. Our long-tail coverages consist of most casualty lines of business including professional liability, directors' and officers' liability, general liability, umbrella/excess liability and certain workers' compensation exposures. Some factors that contribute to the uncertainty and volatility of long-tail casualty business, and thus require a significant degree of judgment in the reserving process, include the inherent uncertainty as to the length of reporting and payment development patterns, the possibility of judicial interpretations or legislative changes that might impact future loss experience relative to prior loss experience and the potential lack of comparability of the underlying data used in performing loss reserve analyses. In general, reinsurance business for any particular line of business is longer-tailed and, by its nature, losses are more difficult to estimate than they are for comparable insurance business.

In periods with increased economic volatility, it becomes more difficult to accurately predict claims costs. It is especially difficult to estimate the impact of inflation on loss reserves given the current economic environment and related government actions. Reserve estimates are continually refined in an ongoing process as experience develops and further claims are reported and settled. Adjustments to reserves are reflected in the results of the periods in which the adjustments are made. Because setting reserves is inherently uncertain, our current reserves could prove to be too low or too high in light of subsequent events. Should our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries need to increase or decrease their reserves, our pre-tax income for the period would decrease or increase, respectively, by a corresponding amount. Although current reserves reflect our best estimate of the costs of settling claims, we cannot assure you that our reserve estimates will not change, perhaps by a material amount, in the future.

Because our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are property and casualty reinsurers and insurers, we face losses from natural and man-made catastrophes. Property and casualty reinsurers and insurers are subject to claims arising out of catastrophes that may have a significant effect on their results of operations, liquidity and financial condition. Catastrophe losses, or the absence thereof, have historically had a significant impact on our results.

Natural or man-made catastrophes can be caused by various events, including hurricanes, other windstorms, earthquakes and floods, as well as terrorist activities. The frequency and severity of catastrophes in any short period of time are inherently unpredictable. The extent of gross losses from a catastrophe event is a function of both the total amount of insured exposure in the area affected by the event and the severity of the event, potentially mitigated by any reinsurance coverage purchased by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. Most catastrophes are restricted to limited geographic areas; however, hurricanes, other windstorms, earthquakes and floods may produce significant damage when those areas are heavily populated. It is therefore possible that a catastrophic event or multiple catastrophic events could produce significant losses and have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

Table of Contents

In addition, longer-term natural catastrophe trends may be changing due to climate change, a phenomenon that has been associated with extreme weather events linked to rising temperatures, and includes effects on global weather patterns, greenhouse gases, sea, land and air temperatures, sea levels, rain and snow. Climate change, to the extent it produces rising temperatures and changes in weather patterns, could impact the frequency or severity of weather events such as hurricanes, tornado activity and other windstorms. To the extent climate change increases the frequency and severity of such weather events, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries, particularly TransRe and RSUI, may face increased claims, particularly with respect to properties located in coastal areas. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries take certain measures to mitigate the impact of such events by considering these risks in their underwriting and pricing decisions, including their management of aggregate exposure levels and through the purchase of reinsurance. To the extent broad environmental factors, exacerbated by climate change or otherwise, lead to increases in insured losses, particularly if those losses exceed the expectations of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries, our financial condition and results of operations could be materially and adversely affected.

With respect to terrorism, to the extent that reinsurers have excluded coverage for certain terrorist acts or have priced this coverage at rates that make purchasing such coverage uneconomic, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries will not have reinsurance protection and are exposed to potential losses as a result of any acts of terrorism. To the extent an act of terrorism is certified by the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, we may be covered under the Terrorism Act. This coverage under the Terrorism Act does not apply to reinsurers. Information regarding the Terrorism Act and its impact on our insurance subsidiaries can be found on pages 44 and 45 of this Form 10-K.

In general, TransRe does not provide coverage for certified acts of terrorism, as defined by the Terrorism Act, but it is nonetheless exposed to potential losses from both certified and uncertified acts of terrorism in the U.S. or elsewhere, such as from terrorism-specific treaty coverages offered to ceding companies or terrorism risk pools outside of the U.S. on a limited basis, and with respect to other lines of business from the assumption of terrorism risk in marine, aviation and other casualty treaties. Although TransRe assumes such terrorism risk after careful underwriting consideration and, in many cases, with limitations, a major terrorist event could have a material adverse impact on TransRe and us.

Finally, other catastrophes, such as an outbreak of a pandemic disease, the bankruptcy of a major company or a marine or aviation disaster, could also have a materially adverse effect on our business and operating results.

Significant competitive pressures may prevent our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries from retaining existing business or writing new business at adequate rates. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries compete with a large number of other companies in their selected lines of business. They compete, and will continue to compete, with major U.S. and non-U.S. reinsurers and insurers, other regional companies, mutual companies, specialty insurance companies, underwriting agencies, government-owned or subsidized facilities, European underwriting syndicates and diversified financial services companies. Many competitors have considerably more financial resources, greater experience and may offer more products or services than our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. Except for regulatory considerations, there are virtually no barriers to entry into the reinsurance and insurance industry.

Additionally, the reinsurance and insurance industry continues to consolidate and, accordingly, competition for customers will continue to increase. As a result, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries may incur greater customer retention and acquisition expense, which would affect the profitability of existing and new business. Further, as the industry continues to consolidate, reinsurance and insurance companies that merge could have increased market size and capital resources with which to negotiate price reductions and retain more risk, decreasing pricing and demand for reinsurance.

Competition in the businesses of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries is based on many factors, including the perceived financial strength of a company, premiums charged, other terms and conditions offered, services provided, commissions paid to producers, ratings assigned by independent rating agencies, speed of claims payment and reputation and experience in the lines to be written. Such competition could cause the supply or demand for insurance to change, which could affect the ability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to price their products at adequate rates. If our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are unable to retain existing business or write new business at adequate rates, our results of operations could be materially and adversely affected.

In addition to competition from the reinsurance industry, TransRe faces competition from the capital markets, as well as some traditional reinsurers, which from time to time produce alternative products or reinsurance vehicles (such as collateralized reinsurance, reinsurance securitizations, catastrophe bonds and various derivatives, such as swaps and sidecars) that may compete with certain types of reinsurance, such as property catastrophe. Hedge funds may also provide reinsurance and retrocessional protections through captive companies or other alternative transactions on a fully collateralized basis for

Table of Contents

property and energy catastrophe business. Over time, these initiatives could significantly affect supply, pricing and competition in the reinsurance industry.

Our results may fluctuate as a result of many factors, including cyclical changes in the reinsurance and insurance industries. Historically, the performance of the property and casualty reinsurance and insurance industries has tended to fluctuate in cyclical periods of price competition and excess underwriting capacity, followed by periods of high premium rates and shortages of underwriting capacity. Although an individual reinsurance and insurance company's performance is dependent on its own specific business characteristics, the profitability of most property and casualty reinsurance and insurance companies tends to follow this market cycle. Further, this cyclical market pattern can be more pronounced in the reinsurance market in which TransRe competes and in the excess and surplus market in which RSUI primarily competes than in the standard insurance market. In addition, compared with historical cyclical periods, a cycle of increased price competition and excess underwriting capacity may continue for a prolonged period of time as new and existing reinsurance and insurance market participants and products continue to enter the reinsurance and insurance markets. Unfavorable market conditions may affect the ability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to write business at rates they consider appropriate relative to the risk assumed. If we cannot write business at appropriate rates, our business would be significantly and adversely affected.

When premium rates are high and there is a shortage of capacity in the standard insurance market, growth in the excess and surplus market can be significantly more rapid than growth in the standard insurance market. Similarly, when there is price competition and excess underwriting capacity in the standard insurance market, many customers that were previously driven into the excess and surplus market may return to the standard insurance market, exacerbating the effects of price competition.

Demand for reinsurance is influenced significantly by underwriting and investment results in both the standard insurance and the excess and surplus markets and market conditions. The supply of reinsurance is related to prevailing prices, the levels of insured losses and the levels of reinsurance industry surplus, among other factors, that, in turn, may fluctuate in response to changes in rates of return on investments being earned in the reinsurance industry. In addition, the supply of reinsurance is affected by a reinsurer's confidence in its ability to accurately assess the probability of expected underwriting outcomes, particularly with respect to catastrophe losses.

Since cyclicity is due in large part to the collective actions of insurers, reinsurers and general economic conditions and the occurrence of unpredictable events, we cannot predict the timing or duration of changes in the market cycle. These cyclical patterns cause our revenues and net earnings to fluctuate. In addition, our results may fluctuate as a result of changes in economic, legal, political and social factors, among others.

We cannot guarantee that the reinsurers used by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries will pay in a timely fashion, if at all, and, as a result, we could experience losses even if reinsured. As part of their overall risk and capacity management strategy, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries purchase reinsurance by transferring or ceding part of the risk that they have underwritten to a reinsurance company in exchange for part of the premium received by our subsidiaries in connection with that risk. Although reinsurance makes the reinsurer liable to our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to the extent the risk is transferred or ceded to the reinsurer, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries remain liable for amounts not paid by a reinsurer. Reinsurers may not pay the reinsurance recoverables that they owe to our subsidiaries or they may not pay these recoverables on a timely basis. This risk may increase significantly if these reinsurers experience financial difficulties as a result of catastrophes, investment losses or other events. Accordingly, we bear credit risk with respect to our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries' reinsurers, and if they fail to pay, our financial results would be adversely affected. As of December 31, 2017, reinsurance recoverables reported on our balance sheet were \$1.7 billion.

If market conditions cause reinsurance to be more costly or unavailable, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries may be required to bear increased risks or reduce the level of their underwriting commitments. As part of their overall risk management strategy, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries purchase reinsurance for certain amounts of risk underwritten by them, including catastrophe risks. The reinsurance programs purchased by our subsidiaries are generally subject to annual renewal. Market conditions beyond their control determine the availability and cost of the reinsurance protection they purchase, which may affect the level of their business written and thus their profitability. If our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are unable to renew their expiring facilities or to obtain new reinsurance facilities, which could result as the number of companies offering reinsurance coverage declines due to industry consolidation, either their net exposures on future policies or reinsurance contracts would increase, which could increase the volatility of their results or, if they are unwilling or unable to bear an increase in net exposures, they would have to reduce the level of their underwriting commitments, especially catastrophe-exposed risks, which may reduce their revenues and net earnings. In certain reinsurance contracts, a cedant, to the extent it exhausts its original coverage under a reinsurance contract during a

Table of Contents

single coverage period (typically a single twelve-month period), can pay a reinsurance reinstatement premium to restore coverage during such coverage period. If our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries exhaust their original and, if applicable, reinstated coverage under their third-party reinsurance contracts during a single coverage period, they will not have any reinsurance coverage available for losses incurred as a result of additional loss events during that coverage period. The exhaustion of such reinsurance coverage could have a material adverse effect on the profitability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries in any given period and on our results of operations.

TransRe and RSUI attempt to manage their exposure to catastrophe risk partially through the use of catastrophe modeling software. The failure of this software to accurately gauge the catastrophe-exposed risks they write could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows.

As part of their approach to managing catastrophe risk, TransRe and RSUI use a number of tools, including third-party catastrophe modeling software, to help evaluate potential losses. TransRe and RSUI use modeled loss scenarios and internal analyses to set their level of risk retention and help structure their reinsurance programs. Modeled loss estimates, however, have not always accurately predicted their ultimate losses with respect to catastrophe events. Accordingly, TransRe and RSUI periodically review their catastrophe exposure management approach, which may result in the implementation of new monitoring tools and a revision of their underwriting guidelines and procedures. However, these efforts may not be successful in sufficiently mitigating risk exposures and losses resulting from future catastrophes.

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are rated by rating agencies and a decline in these ratings could affect the standings of these units in the reinsurance and insurance industries and cause their premium volume and earnings to decrease. Ratings have become an increasingly important factor in establishing the competitive positions of reinsurance and insurance companies. Some of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are rated by A.M. Best, S&P and/or Moody's, which we collectively refer to as the Rating Agencies. The Rating Agencies' financial strength ratings reflect their opinions of a reinsurance or an insurance company's financial strength, operating performance, strategic position and ability to meet its obligations to policyholders, and are neither an evaluation directed to investors of a security nor a recommendation to buy, sell or hold a security. These ratings are subject to periodic review, and we cannot assure you that any of our reinsurance or insurance companies will be able to retain their current ratings. If the ratings of our reinsurance or insurance companies are reduced from their current levels by the Rating Agencies, their competitive positions could suffer and it would be more difficult for them to market their products. A significant downgrade could result in a substantial loss of business as customers move to other companies with higher financial strength ratings.

In addition, in general, if the financial strength ratings of TransRe's operating subsidiaries from the Rating Agencies fall below A-, a significant portion of TransRe's operating subsidiaries' contracts that contain rating agency triggers would allow customers to elect to take a number of actions such as terminating the contracts on a run-off or cut-off basis, requiring TransRe's operating subsidiaries to post collateral for all or a portion of the obligations or requiring commutation under the contracts. Some of these contracts, however, contain dual triggers, such as requiring both a ratings downgrade below A- and a significant decline in the statutory surplus of TransRe's operating subsidiaries before such cancellation or collateralization rights would be exercisable. Contracts may contain one or both of the aforementioned contractual provisions, or certain other collateralization or cancellation triggers. Whether a ceding company would exercise any of these cancellation rights would depend on, among other factors, the reason and extent of such downgrade or surplus reduction, the prevailing market conditions and the pricing and availability of replacement reinsurance coverage. We cannot predict the extent to which these contractual rights would be exercised, if at all, or what effect such exercises would have on our financial condition or future operations, but such effect potentially could be materially adverse to us.

TransRe may also enter into agreements with ceding companies that require it to provide collateral for its obligations, including where TransRe's obligations to these ceding companies exceed negotiated thresholds. These thresholds may vary depending on the ratings of TransRe's operating subsidiaries, and a ratings downgrade or a failure to achieve a certain rating may increase the amount of collateral TransRe is required to provide. An increase in the amount of collateral TransRe is obligated to provide to secure its obligations may have an adverse impact on, among other things, TransRe's ability to write additional reinsurance.

A limited number of brokers account for a large portion of TransRe's premiums; the loss of all or a substantial portion of the business provided by them may have an adverse effect on us. The great majority of TransRe's premiums are written through brokers. Several large international brokers dominate the reinsurance brokerage industry, and TransRe derives a significant portion of its premiums from these brokers. Further, TransRe may become increasingly reliant on these brokers due to continued consolidation in the broker sector. The loss of all or a substantial portion of the business provided by these brokers could have a material adverse effect on us.

Difficult and volatile conditions in the global capital and credit markets and in the overall economy could materially and adversely affect the results of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. Disruption and volatility in

Table of Contents

the global capital and credit markets and in the overall economy affects our business in a number of ways, including the following:

disruption in the capital and credit markets may increase claims activity in our reinsurance business, such as directors and officers liability, errors and omissions liability and trade credit lines;

volatility in the capital and credit markets makes it more difficult to access those markets, if necessary, to maintain or improve financial strength and credit ratings of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries or to generate liquidity;

disruption in the overall economy may reduce demand for reinsurance and insurance products; and

increases in inflation could result in higher losses on reinsurance contracts, particularly in longer-tailed lines of business, increased operating costs and a decrease in the fair value of our investment portfolio.

It is difficult to predict when and how long these types of conditions may exist and how our markets, business and investments will be adversely affected. Accordingly, these conditions could have a material adverse effect on our consolidated financial condition or results of operations in future periods.

The businesses of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are heavily regulated, and changes in regulation may limit their ability to pay dividends, reduce their profitability and limit their growth. Our reinsurance and insurance operating subsidiaries are subject to extensive regulation and supervision in the jurisdictions in which they conduct business, both in the U.S. and other countries. This regulation is generally designed to protect the interests of policyholders and not necessarily the interests of insurers, their stockholders or other investors. The regulation relates to authorization for lines of business, capital and surplus requirements, investment limitations, underwriting limitations, transactions with affiliates, dividend limitations, changes in control, premium rates and a variety of other financial and non-financial components of a reinsurance or insurance company's business. Moreover, insurance laws and regulations, among other things: establish solvency requirements, including minimum reserves and capital and surplus requirements; limit the amount of dividends, tax distributions, intercompany loans and other payments our insurance subsidiaries can make without prior regulatory approval; and impose restrictions on the amount and type of investments we may hold. The application of these laws could affect our liquidity and ability to pay dividends, interest and other payments on securities, among other things.

Virtually all states in which our insurance operating subsidiary companies conduct their business require them, together with other insurers licensed to do business in that state, to bear a portion of the loss suffered by some insureds as the result of impaired or insolvent insurance companies. In addition, in various states, our insurance operating subsidiary companies must participate in mandatory arrangements to provide various types of insurance coverage to individuals or other entities that otherwise are unable to purchase that coverage from private insurers. A few states require our insurance operating subsidiary companies to purchase reinsurance from a mandatory reinsurance fund. Such reinsurance funds can create a credit risk for insurers if not adequately funded by the state and, in some cases, the existence of a reinsurance fund could affect the prices charged for the policies issued by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. The effect of these and similar arrangements could reduce the profitability of our insurance operating subsidiaries in any given period or limit their ability to grow their business.

In recent years, the state insurance regulatory framework has come under increased scrutiny, and some state legislatures have considered or enacted laws that may alter or increase state authority to regulate insurance companies and insurance holding companies. Further, the NAIC and state insurance regulators are continually reexamining existing laws and regulations, specifically focusing on modifications to statutory accounting principles, interpretations of existing laws and the development of new laws and regulations. On the federal level, the Dodd-Frank Act, signed into law on July 2010, mandated significant changes to the regulation of U.S. insurance effective as of July 21, 2011. We cannot predict the requirements of the regulations ultimately adopted under the Dodd-Frank Act or the impact such regulations will have on our business. In addition, we cannot predict the impact on our business, if any, of any potential roll back or dismantling of the Dodd-Frank Act. These regulations, and any proposed or future state or federal legislation or NAIC initiatives, if adopted, may be more restrictive on the ability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to conduct business than current regulatory requirements or may result in higher costs. Information regarding the impact of regulation and current regulatory changes on our reinsurance and insurance operating subsidiaries can be found on pages 46 through 53 of this Form 10-K.

TransRe's offices that operate in jurisdictions outside the U.S. are subject to certain limitations and risks that are unique to foreign operations. TransRe's international operations are also regulated in various jurisdictions with respect to licensing requirements, solvency, currency, amount and type of security deposits, amount and type of reserves, amount

Table of Contents

and type of local investments and other matters. International operations and assets held abroad are subject to significant legal, market, operational, compliance and regulatory risks, including risks related to:

economic, political and other developments in foreign countries;

changes in foreign or U.S. laws and regulations;

nationalization and changes in regulatory policy;

unexpected financial restrictions that foreign governments may impose;

the potential costs and difficulties in complying with a wide variety of foreign laws and regulations;
and

the consequences of international hostilities and unrest.

The risks of such occurrences and their overall effect upon us vary from country to country and cannot be predicted. In addition, our results of operations and net unrealized currency translation gain or loss (a component of accumulated other comprehensive income) are subject to volatility as the value of the foreign currencies fluctuate relative to the U.S. dollar. Further, regulations governing technical reserves and remittance balances in some countries may hinder remittance of profits and repatriation of assets.

TransRe's international operations are also subject to risks related to complying, or monitoring compliance, with the requirements of anti-corruption laws, such as the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and the U.K. Bribery Act, and the economic and trade sanctions laws of the U.S., including but not limited to the regulations administered by OFAC and sanctions laws implemented by other countries in which TransRe operates. The international and U.S. laws and regulations that are applicable to TransRe's operations are complex and may increase the costs of regulatory compliance, limit or restrict TransRe's reinsurance business or subject TransRe to regulatory actions or proceedings in the future. Although TransRe attempts to comply with all applicable laws and regulations and seeks licenses to undertake various activities where appropriate, there can be no assurance that TransRe is, or will be, in full compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, or interpretations of these laws and regulations, at all times. In addition, it is TransRe's policy to continually monitor compliance with, and voluntarily report to appropriate regulatory authorities any potential violations of, all applicable laws and regulations where it is deemed appropriate, including anti-corruption and trade sanction laws and any failure to comply with any such laws and regulations may subject TransRe to investigations, sanctions or other remedies, including fines, injunctions, increased scrutiny or oversight by regulatory authorities. The cost of compliance or the consequences of non-compliance, including reputational damage, could have a material adverse effect on our consolidated financial condition or results of operations in future periods.

On January 16, 2016, following implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or Implementation Day, the trade sanctions laws of the EU and the United Nations restricting dealings with Iran and Iranian entities were substantially eased. However, the relief of such trade sanctions laws provided by the U.S. was largely limited to certain restrictions on individuals and entities outside of the U.S. On Implementation Day, OFAC also authorized

foreign companies owned or controlled by U.S. persons, such as TRL and TRZ, to engage in certain transactions with Iran and Iranian entities, or General License H. General License H imposes several significant prohibitions, including the involvement of TRC or other U.S. persons with such transactions. As the failure to comply with trade sanctions prohibitions could subject TransRe to investigations, significant fines and other penalties, TRC additionally applied for and subsequently received from OFAC a specific license for TRL and TRZ to enter into certain global reinsurance contracts in compliance with General License H that may have incidental exposure to Iranian risks while allowing TRC to provide certain oversight and support functions pursuant to authorizations, restrictions and compliance requirements specified by OFAC in the specific license. TransRe has implemented processes and procedures to comply with General License H as augmented by the specific license, but the cost of compliance or the consequences of non-compliance with such licenses, including reputational damage, could have a material adverse effect on our consolidated financial condition or results of operations.

With regards to TransRe's operations within the EU, TRC operates within the EU as a Third Country Reinsurer under Solvency II through a series of foreign branches and on a cross-border basis. Each branch of TRC in the EU that is required to be authorized is separately authorized by the relevant regulator in the Member State in which it is established. Currently, TRC continues to conduct business within the EU through its foreign branches with no significant impact on its operations. However, TransRe could be materially and adversely affected by rules adopted by a Member State relating to Third Country Reinsurers. For example, TRC may be required to post additional collateral in EU countries or may need to consider further restructuring its business in order to comply with the rules adopted in EU countries relating to Third Country Reinsurers.

Table of Contents

Solvency II, which is a fundamental revision to the European regulatory regime that seeks to enhance transparency and risk management and encourages a proactive approach to company solvency, came into effect on January 1, 2016. It is built on a risk-based approach to setting capital requirements for reinsurers and insurers. TransRe could be materially impacted by the implementation of Solvency II depending on the costs associated with implementation by each EU country, any increased capitalization requirements and any costs associated with adjustments to TransRe's corporate operating structure. Any of the effects of Brexit, and other similar market changes, which cannot be anticipated, could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations. Solvency II may affect the way in which TransRe's international group, including TRL and TRC's branches in the EU operate and may have a negative impact on our results. Solvency II may reduce TRL's and/or TRC's EU branches' regulatory solvency position, for example, by increased capital requirements or a reduction in eligible funds. Solvency II could also materially impact the group, since Solvency II affects the calculation of the solvency of international groups which, like TransRe, conduct reinsurance and insurance operations both inside and outside of the EU. The changes also require an accelerated quarterly close process across the group to allow TRL and TRC's EU branches to meet the regulatory disclosure timetable under Solvency II. Other risks include more complex and intensive regulatory reporting burdens, regulatory requirements that conflict with requirements in other jurisdictions, and shortages of skilled staff in critical areas such as the actuarial function, all of which may have a negative impact on the results of TRL, the branches of TRC and the TransRe group. In addition, we could be required to undertake a significant amount of additional work to comply with the Solvency II regime, which in turn may divert finite resources from other business related tasks.

Although Solvency II is now in force, uncertainty remains as to how the Solvency II regime will be enforced or amended and the effectiveness of the coordination and cooperation of information sharing among supervisory bodies and regulators or the effect, if any, these developments may have on the TransRe group's operations and financial condition. This uncertainty has increased as a result of the Brexit referendum which will lead to the U.K. leaving the EU at a yet to be determined date. Following Brexit, the U.K. would be free to determine its own regulatory regime. We cannot currently predict whether the U.K.'s regulatory regime will be deemed equivalent to Solvency II or the impact on TRL and TRC if the future U.K. regulatory regime is not found to be equivalent to Solvency II.

The uncertainty has also increased as a result of the announcement in January 2017 by the U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative that the covered agreement with the EU has been successfully negotiated. For example, the covered agreement provides for the elimination of local presence and reinsurance collateral requirements for EU-domiciled reinsurers operating in the U.S. and for U.S.-domiciled reinsurers operating in the EU. Further, the covered agreement includes certain provisions limiting the ability of EU jurisdictions to impose group supervision (including governance, solvency and capital, and reporting) requirements on U.S. insurance and reinsurance groups. While this development would appear to be beneficial to TransRe, we cannot currently predict whether the covered agreement between the U.S. and the EU will be successfully adopted, nor, if adopted, what its application to the U.K. will be post-Brexit. Our Solvency II implementation approach is based on our current understanding of the Solvency II requirements and any material changes thereto could have a material adverse effect on our business.

The vote in favor of the U.K.'s exit from the EU could have an adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations. A referendum on the U.K.'s membership of the EU was held on June 23, 2016 and resulted in a majority of 52 percent in favor of the withdrawal of the U.K. from the EU. The Brexit vote means that insurance and reinsurance carriers operating in the U.K. now face a period of regulatory uncertainty as the U.K. and the EU enter into a complex and potentially protracted process to redefine the U.K.'s economic and political relationships with the EU. Brexit can only be formally implemented by a notification to the EU under Article 50 of the Treaty on EU, or Article 50. The U.K. will remain a Member State of the EU until it negotiates and reaches an agreement in relation to the withdrawal from the EU or, if earlier, upon the expiration of a two year period following the Article 50 notification. The Prime Minister of the U.K. recently announced that she would trigger Article 50 by the end of March

2017. However, the U.K. High Court ruled that Parliament must pass an act of Parliament in order for the U.K. to give an Article 50 notice and that such notice could not be given by the U.K. government using prerogative powers. The U.K. Supreme Court upheld the U.K. High Court's decision on January 24, 2017, which may delay when the Prime Minister of the U.K. has authority to trigger Article 50. It is currently unclear if and when the Article 50 notice will be submitted to the European Council and what type of agreements will be concluded between the U.K. and the EU and if the U.K. will continue to have access to the single market of the EU. It is possible that the withdrawal process may last significantly longer than the two year period envisaged by the Treaty on EU.

The uncertainty surrounding the implementation and effect of Brexit, including the commencement of the exit negotiation period, the terms and conditions of such exit, the uncertainty in relation to the legal and regulatory framework that would apply to the U.K. and its relationship with the remaining members of the EU (including in relation to trade and services) during a withdrawal

Table of Contents

process and after any Brexit is effected, has caused and is likely to cause increased economic volatility and market uncertainty globally, in particular volatility of currency exchange rates, interest rates and credit spreads. It has already led, and may continue to lead, to disruptions for the European and global financial markets, such as the decrease in the value of the British Pound and of market values of listed EU companies, in particular from the financial services and insurance sector, and the recent downgrade of the credit ratings for the U.K. by S&P, Moody's and Fitch (each with a negative outlook).

The long-term effect of Brexit on the value of our investment portfolio at this time is uncertain and such volatility and uncertainty will likely continue as negotiations progress to determine the future terms of the U.K.'s relationship with the EU.

Brexit could lead to potentially divergent national laws and regulations as the U.K. determines which EU laws to replace or replicate. We may have to review our underwriting platforms and incur additional regulatory and transactional costs as a result. For example, depending on the outcome of the negotiations referred to above, TRL could lose its EEA financial services passport which provides it the license to operate across borders within the single EU market without obtaining any required local regulatory approval where insurers and cedants are located. In addition, depending on the terms of Brexit, the U.K.'s regulatory regime in terms of Solvency II regulation and governance could also diverge and no longer be equivalent.

Depending on the terms of Brexit, the U.K. could also lose tariff-free access to the single EU market and to the global trade deals negotiated by the EU on behalf of its Member States. Any consequential decline in trade could affect the attractiveness of the U.K. as a global investment center and, as a result, could have a detrimental impact on U.K. growth, we could be adversely affected by reduced growth and greater volatility in the U.K. economy.

In Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, India and the People's Republic of China, emerging markets where TransRe underwrites business on a cross-border basis, local regulations have recently been adopted that may operate to limit, restrict or increase the costs of TransRe's access to these markets. If this trend continues to spread to other jurisdictions, TransRe's ability to operate globally may be materially and adversely affected.

The loss of key personnel at our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries could adversely affect our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows. We rely upon the knowledge and talent of the employees of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to successfully conduct their business. Changes in local employment legislation, taxation and the approach of regulatory bodies to compensation practice within our operating jurisdictions may impact our ability to recruit and retain senior employees or the cost to us of doing so. A loss of key personnel, especially the loss of underwriters or underwriting teams, could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows in future periods. Our success has depended, and will continue to depend in substantial part, upon our ability to attract and retain teams of underwriters in various business lines at our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries. The loss of key services of any members of current underwriting teams at our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries may adversely affect our business and results of operations.

There are significant hazards associated with oil exploration and production activities, some of which may not be fully covered by insurance. The business of exploring for, producing, storing and transporting oil is subject to risks and hazards, including environmental hazards, construction risks, industrial accidents, the encountering of unusual or unexpected geological formations, cave-ins, blowouts, fires, explosions, craterings, pipeline ruptures and spills, flooding, earthquakes and other natural disasters. These occurrences could result in personal injury or death, environmental damage, damage to, or destruction of, mineral properties or production facilities or other physical assets, monetary losses and possible legal liability. Although we maintain insurance against some of these risks, insurance fully covering many of these risks is not generally available to us or if it is, we may elect not to obtain it due

to the high premium costs or commercial impracticality. Any liabilities that we may incur for these risks and hazards could be significant and could have a material adverse effect on our reputation, financial condition and results of operations.

We are subject to risks related to our use of information technology. We rely on information technology in virtually all aspects of our business. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries in particular depend on the proper functioning and availability of their information technology platforms, including communications and data processing systems, in operating their businesses. These systems consist of software programs that are integral to the efficient operation of the businesses of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries, including programs for proprietary pricing and exposure management, processing payments and claims, filing and making changes to records and providing customer support. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are also required to effect electronic transmissions with third parties including brokers, clients, vendors and others with whom they do business.

A significant disruption or failure of our information technology systems may have a significant impact on our operations, potentially resulting in service interruptions, security violations, regulatory compliance failures and other operational difficulties. In

Table of Contents

addition, any attack perpetrated against our information systems including through a system failure, security breach or disruption by malware or other damage, could similarly impact our operations and result in loss or misuse of information, litigation and potential liability. Although we have taken steps intended to mitigate the risks presented by potential cyber incidents, it is not possible to protect against every potential power loss, telecommunications failure, cybersecurity attack or similar event that may arise. Moreover, the safeguards we use are subject to human implementation and maintenance and to other uncertainties. Any of these cyber incidents may result in a violation of applicable laws or regulations (including privacy and other laws), damage our reputation, cause a loss of customers and give rise to monetary fines and other penalties, which could be significant. Such events could have an adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity.

Risk Factors Relating to our Investments and Assets

The valuation of our investments includes methodologies, estimates and assumptions which are subject to differing interpretations or judgments; a change in interpretations or judgments could result in changes to investment valuations that may adversely affect our results of operations or financial condition. The vast majority of our investments are measured at fair value using methodologies, estimates and assumptions which are subject to differing interpretations or judgments. Financial instruments with quoted prices in active markets generally have more price observability and less judgment is used in measuring fair value. Conversely, financial instruments traded in other-than-active markets or that do not have quoted prices have less observability and are measured at fair value using valuation models or other pricing techniques that require more judgment. Investments recorded at fair value in the consolidated balance sheet are classified in a hierarchy for disclosure purposes consisting of three levels based on the observability of inputs available in the market used to measure the fair values.

Securities that are less liquid are more difficult to value and trade. During periods of market disruption, including periods of significantly rising or high interest rates, rapidly widening credit spreads or illiquidity, it may be difficult to value certain of the securities in our investment portfolio if trading becomes less frequent or market data becomes less observable. Certain asset classes in active markets with significant observable data may become illiquid due to changes in the financial environment. In such cases, valuing these securities may require more subjectivity and judgment. In addition, prices provided by third-party pricing services and broker quotes can vary widely even for the same security.

As such, valuations may include inputs and assumptions that are less observable or require greater estimation as well as valuation methods which are more sophisticated, thereby resulting in values which may be greater or less than the value at which the investments may be ultimately sold. Further, rapidly changing or strained credit and equity market conditions could materially impact the value of securities as reported within our consolidated financial statements and the period-to-period changes in value could vary significantly. Decreases in value may have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial condition.

Our investments in debt and equity securities are subject to market fluctuations. As of December 31, 2017, our investments in debt securities were approximately \$12.7 billion, or approximately 68 percent of our total investment portfolio, and our investments in equity securities had a fair value of approximately \$4.1 billion, which represented approximately 22 percent of our investment portfolio. The fair value of these assets and the investment income from these assets fluctuate depending on general economic and market conditions.

With respect to our investments in debt securities, a rise in interest rates would decrease unrealized gains and/or increase unrealized losses on our debt securities portfolio and potentially produce a net unrealized loss position, offset by our ability to earn higher rates of return on reinvested funds. Conversely, a decline in interest rates would increase unrealized gains and/or decrease unrealized losses on our debt securities portfolio, offset by lower rates of return on

reinvested funds. Based upon the composition and duration of our investment portfolio as of December 31, 2017, a 100 basis point increase in interest rates would result in an approximate \$555.9 million decrease in the fair value of our debt securities portfolio. In addition, some debt securities, such as mortgage-backed and other asset-backed securities, carry prepayment risk, the risk that principal will be returned more rapidly or slowly than expected, as a result of interest rate fluctuations.

With respect to our investments in equity securities, we hold our equity securities as available-for-sale, and any changes in the fair value of these securities, net of tax, would be reflected directly in stockholders' equity or in the statement of earnings. If there is an increase in value or if a decline in the value of a particular equity security is deemed to be temporary, we record the change as an unrealized gain or loss in stockholders' equity. If the decline is deemed to be other

Table of Contents

than temporary, we write its cost-basis down to the fair value of the security and record an other than temporary impairment loss in our statement of earnings, which may be material to our operating results. A severe or prolonged downturn in equity markets could give rise to significant impairment charges.

Defaults, downgrades or other events impairing the value of our debt securities portfolio may reduce our earnings. We are subject to the risk that the issuers of debt securities we own may default on principal and interest payments they owe us. The occurrence of a major economic downturn, acts of corporate malfeasance, widening risk spreads or other events that adversely affect the issuers of these debt securities could cause the value of our debt securities portfolio and our net earnings to decline and the default rate of the debt securities in our investment portfolio to increase. In addition, with economic uncertainty, the credit quality of issuers could be adversely affected and a ratings downgrade of the issuers of the debt securities we own could also cause the value of our debt securities portfolio and our net earnings to decrease. Any event reducing the value of these securities other than on a temporary basis could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations and financial condition. We continually monitor the difference between cost and the estimated fair value of our investments in debt securities. If a decline in the value of a particular debt security is deemed to be temporary, we record the decline as an unrealized loss in stockholders' equity. If the decline is deemed to be other than temporary, we write it down to the carrying value of the investment and record an other than temporary impairment loss in our statement of earnings, which may be material to our operating results.

Changes in foreign currency exchange rates could impact the value of our assets and liabilities denominated in foreign currencies. A principal exposure to foreign currency risk is our obligation to settle claims denominated in foreign currencies in the subject foreign currencies. The possibility exists that we may incur foreign currency exchange gains or losses when we ultimately settle these claims. To mitigate this risk, we maintain investments denominated in certain foreign currencies in which the claims payments will be made and we have recently initiated a hedging program that is designed to mitigate this risk for a portion of our exposure to certain currencies. To the extent we do not seek to hedge our foreign currency risk or our hedges prove ineffective, the resulting impact of a movement in foreign currency exchange rates could materially and adversely affect our results of operations or financial condition. For example, stockholders' equity attributable to Alleghany stockholders was increased by \$26.6 million during 2017 from the impact of changes in foreign currency exchange rates.

If any of our businesses do not perform well, we may be required to recognize an impairment of our assets, including goodwill or other intangible assets or to establish a valuation allowance against the deferred income tax asset, which could adversely affect our results of operations or financial condition. Goodwill represents the excess of the amount we paid to acquire subsidiaries and other businesses over the fair value of their net assets as of the date of acquisition. We test goodwill at least annually for impairment. Impairment testing is performed based upon estimates of the fair value of the operating subsidiary to which the goodwill relates. The fair value of the operating subsidiary is impacted by the performance of the business. The performance of our businesses may be adversely impacted by prolonged market declines. If we determine the goodwill has been impaired, we must write down the goodwill by the amount of the impairment, with a corresponding charge to net earnings. Such write-downs could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial position. A decrease in the expected future earnings of an operating subsidiary could lead to an impairment of some or all of the goodwill or other long-lived intangible assets associated with such operating subsidiaries in future periods.

Deferred income tax represents the tax effect of the differences between the book and tax basis of assets and liabilities. Deferred tax assets are assessed periodically by management to determine if they are recoverable. Factors in management's determination include the performance of the business including the ability to generate capital gains. If it is more likely than not that the deferred income tax asset will not be realized based on available information then a valuation allowance must be established with a corresponding charge to net earnings. Net earnings charges and

reduced value of our net deferred tax assets could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial position.

Deterioration of financial market conditions could result in the impairment of long-lived intangible assets and the establishment of a valuation allowance on our deferred income tax assets.

Oil and gas prices are volatile and a prolonged reduction in these prices could adversely affect the value of our investments in energy-related businesses. As of December 31, 2017, we had holdings in energy-related businesses of \$977.6 million, comprised of \$349.3 million of debt securities, \$485.0 million of equity securities and \$143.3 million of our equity attributable to SORC. The results and prospects of these energy-related businesses tend to depend highly upon the prices of oil and gas. Historically, the markets for oil and gas have been volatile and are likely to continue to be volatile in the future. A prolonged reduction in the prices of oil and gas may adversely affect the results and prospects of, and the potentially the value of our investments in, these energy-related businesses.

Table of Contents**Risks Relating to our Senior Notes and the Credit Agreement**

Our failure to comply with restrictive covenants contained in the indentures governing the Senior Notes (as defined on page 114 of this Form 10-K) or any other indebtedness, including indebtedness under our revolving credit facility and any future indebtedness, could trigger prepayment obligations, which could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations. The indentures governing the Senior Notes contain covenants that impose restrictions on Alleghany and TransRe with respect to, among other things, the incurrence of liens on the capital stock of certain of our subsidiaries. In addition, the indentures governing the Senior Notes contain certain other covenants, including covenants to timely pay principal and interest, and the Credit Agreement (as defined on page 112 of this Form 10-K) also requires us to comply with certain covenants. Our failure to comply with such covenants could result in an event of default under the indentures, under the Credit Agreement or under any other debt agreement we may enter into in the future, which could, if not cured or waived, result in us being required to repay the Senior Notes, the indebtedness under the Credit Agreement or any other future indebtedness. As a result, our business, financial condition, results of operations and liquidity could be adversely affected.

To service our debt, we will require a significant amount of cash, which may not be available to us. Our ability to make payments on, or repay or refinance, our debt, including the Senior Notes, will depend largely upon the future performance and use of our investment portfolio and our future operating performance, including the operating performance of our subsidiaries. Our future performance, to a certain extent, is subject to general economic, financial, competitive, legislative, regulatory and other factors that are beyond our control. In addition, our ability to borrow funds in the future will depend on the satisfaction of the covenants in the indentures governing the Senior Notes, in the Credit Agreement and in other debt agreements we may enter into in the future. Under the Credit Agreement, we also need to maintain certain financial ratios. We cannot assure you that our business, including the operating performance of our subsidiaries, will generate sufficient cash flow from operations or that future borrowings will be available to us under the Credit Agreement or from other sources in an amount sufficient to enable us to pay our debt, including the Senior Notes, or to fund our other liquidity needs.

Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments.

None.

Item 2. Properties.

The principal executive offices of Alleghany, Alleghany Capital and Roundwood are located in leased office space in New York, New York. TransRe leases office space in New York, New York for its headquarters and office space in almost all of its locations around the world. RSUI leases office space in Atlanta, Georgia for its headquarters and office space in Sherman Oaks, California. CapSpecialty leases office space in Middleton, Wisconsin for its headquarters and office space in its other locations throughout the U.S. Bourn & Koch owns its principal offices and manufacturing facilities, which are located in Rockford, Illinois and leases certain offices and manufacturing facilities, which are located in Olympia, Washington. Kentucky Trailer leases its principal offices and manufacturing facilities, which are located in Louisville, Kentucky. SORC leases office space in Golden, Colorado for its headquarters and owns facilities, mineral rights and land in other locations in the Midwestern and Southeastern U.S. IPS leases office space in Blue Bell, Pennsylvania for its headquarters and office space in its locations around the world. Jazwares leases office space in Sunrise, Florida for its headquarters and office space in its locations around the world. W&WIAFCO Steel owns its principal office in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, for its headquarters and owns its principal facilities, which are located in Arkansas, Colorado, Oklahoma and Texas. Alleghany Properties leases office space in Sacramento, California. Management considers its facilities suitable and adequate for the current level of operations. See Note 12(b) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and

Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our leases.

Item 3. Legal Proceedings.

Certain of our subsidiaries are parties to pending litigation and claims in connection with the ordinary course of their businesses. Each such subsidiary makes provisions for estimated losses to be incurred in such litigation and claims, including legal costs. We believe such provisions are adequate and do not believe that any pending litigation will have a material adverse effect on our consolidated results of operations, financial position or cash flows.

Table of Contents**Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures.**

The information concerning mine safety violations or other regulatory matters required by SEC regulations is included in Exhibit 95 to this Form 10-K.

PART II**Item 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities.****Market Information, Holders and Dividends**

Our common stock trades on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol **Y**. The following table presents quarterly high and low sales prices per share of our common stock, as reported on the New York Stock Exchange Composite Index, during the periods indicated.

Quarter Ended:	2017		2016	
	High	Low	High	Low
March 31	\$ 667.19	\$ 598.20	\$ 497.15	\$ 450.94
June 30	623.80	559.72	549.58	487.39
September 30	630.48	521.07	551.89	515.02
December 31	596.11	586.72	616.13	512.10

As of February 11, 2018, there were approximately 600 holders of record of our common stock. This figure does not represent the actual number of beneficial owners of our common stock because such stock is frequently held in street name by securities dealers and others for the benefit of individual owners who may vote the shares.

Our Board of Directors determined not to declare a dividend for 2017 or 2016. Any future determination to pay dividends to holders of our common stock will be at the discretion of our Board of Directors and will be dependent upon many factors, including our earnings, financial condition, business needs and growth objectives, capital and surplus requirements of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries, regulatory restrictions, rating agency considerations and other factors.

Repurchases of Equity Securities

The following table presents our common stock repurchases in the quarter ended December 31, 2017:

Total Number of Shares Repurchased	Average Price Paid per Share	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs ⁽¹⁾	Approximate Dollar Value of Shares That May Yet be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs ⁽¹⁾ (in millions)

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

October 1 to October 31	13,788	\$ 543.84	13,788	\$ 363.2
November 1 to November 30	-	-	-	363.2
December 1 to December 31	-	-	-	363.2
Total	13,788	543.84	13,788	

(1) In November 2015, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of shares of common stock, at such times and at prices as management determines to be advisable, up to an aggregate of \$400.0 million.

Table of Contents

Performance Graph

The following information is not deemed to be soliciting material or to be filed with the SEC or subject to the liabilities of Section 18 of the Exchange Act, and the information shall not be deemed to be incorporated by reference in any filing by us under the Securities Act of 1933 or the Exchange Act, whether made before or after the date hereof and irrespective of any general incorporation language in any such filing.

The following graph presents (i) the cumulative total stockholder return on our common stock; (ii) the cumulative total return on the Standard & Poor's 500 Stock Index, or the S&P 500 Index; (iii) the cumulative total return on the Standard & Poor's 500 Property and Casualty Insurance Index, or the S&P 500 P&C Index, and (iv) the cumulative total return on the BI Global P&C Reinsurance Competitive Peer Group Index, or the Bloomberg Reinsurance Index, for the five year period beginning on December 31, 2012 through December 31, 2017. The graph assumes that the value of the investment was \$100.00 on December 31, 2012.

In the past, we had compared our performance to the S&P 500 P&C Index, consisting of Allstate Corporation, Chubb Ltd, Cincinnati Financial Corporation, Progressive Corporation, The Travelers Companies Inc. and XL Group Ltd. However, with the exception of Cincinnati Financial Corporation and XL Group Ltd., these companies' market capitalizations are not comparable to ours. Further, except for XL, the companies in this index consist of large multiline insurers with significant personal line writings. Currently, Alleghany is primarily a holding company whose most significant asset is TransRe, a global reinsurer. Therefore, we have determined to use the Bloomberg Reinsurance Index for comparison purposes. The Bloomberg Reinsurance Index consists of Alleghany, Arch Capital Group Ltd., Aspen Group Holdings Ltd, Axis Capital Holdings Limited, Berkshire Hathaway Inc., Everest Re, Fairfax Financial Holdings Ltd, Greenlight Capital Re Ltd, Hannover Life RE, Munich Reinsurance Company, RenaissanceRe Holdings Ltd, SCOR US, Swiss Reinsurance Company Ltd, Third Point Reinsurance Ltd., Validus Holdings Ltd and XL Group Ltd.

Table of Contents

INDEXED RETURNS

	Base		Year Ending				
	Period		12/31/2012	12/31/2013	12/31/2014	12/31/2015	12/31/2016
Alleghany	\$100.00	\$119.24	\$138.18	\$142.49	\$181.30	\$177.71	
S&P 500 Index	\$100.00	\$132.37	\$150.48	\$152.55	\$170.78	\$208.05	
S&P 500 P&C Index	\$100.00	\$138.29	\$160.06	\$175.32	\$202.85	\$248.26	
Bloomberg Reinsurance Index	\$100.00	\$133.53	\$142.89	\$153.24	\$178.57	\$184.70	

The graph above is based on the assumption that cash dividends are reinvested on the ex-dividend date in respect of such dividend.

Item 6. Selected Financial Data.**Alleghany Corporation and Subsidiaries⁽¹⁾**

	Year Ended December 31,				
	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
	(\$ in millions, except per share and share amounts)				
Operating Data					
Revenue	\$ 6,424.7	\$ 6,131.1	\$ 4,999.5	\$ 5,231.8	\$ 4,971.7
Net earnings ⁽²⁾	\$ 90.1	\$ 456.9	\$ 560.3	\$ 679.2	\$ 628.4
Basic earnings per share of common stock ⁽²⁾	\$ 5.85	\$ 29.60	\$ 35.14	\$ 41.40	\$ 37.44
Average number of shares of common stock	15,410,034	15,436,286	15,871,055	16,405,388	16,786,608

	As of December 31,				
	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
	(\$ in millions, except per share amounts)				
Balance Sheet					
Total assets	\$ 25,384.3	\$ 23,756.6	\$ 22,839.1	\$ 23,481.6	\$ 23,356.3
Senior Notes and other debt	\$ 1,484.9	\$ 1,476.5	\$ 1,419.4	\$ 1,795.3	\$ 1,800.9

Common stockholders equity ⁽²⁾	\$	8,514.1	\$	7,939.9	\$	7,554.7	\$	7,473.4	\$	6,923.8
Common stockholders equity per share of common stock ⁽²⁾	\$	553.20	\$	515.24	\$	486.02	\$	465.51	\$	412.96

(1) On April 28, 2017, we acquired W&WIAFCO Steel; on April 15, 2016, we acquired Jazwares; on October 31, 2015, we acquired IPS; on August 30, 2013, we acquired Kentucky Trailer; and on April 26, 2012, we acquired Bourn & Koch. On December 31, 2017, we sold PacificComp.

(2) Attributable to Alleghany stockholders.

Table of Contents**Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations.**

The following is a discussion and analysis of our financial condition and results of operations for the twelve months ended December 31, 2017, 2016 and 2015. This discussion and analysis should be read in conjunction with our audited consolidated financial statements and Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8,

Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K. This discussion contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties and that are not historical facts, including statements about our beliefs and expectations. Our actual results could differ materially from those anticipated in these forward-looking statements as a result of various factors, including those discussed below and particularly under the headings Risk Factors,

Business and Note on Forward-Looking Statements contained in Item 1A, Item 1, and Part I of this Form 10-K, respectively.

Comment on Non-GAAP Financial Measures

Throughout this Form 10-K, our analysis of our financial condition and results of operations is based on our consolidated financial statements which have been prepared in accordance with GAAP. Our results of operations have been presented in the way that we believe will be the most meaningful and useful to investors, analysts, rating agencies and others who use financial information in evaluating our performance. This presentation includes the use of underwriting profit and Adjusted EBITDA, which are non-GAAP financial measures, as such term is defined in Item 10(e) of Regulation S-K promulgated by the SEC. The presentation of these financial measures is not intended to be considered in isolation or as a substitute for, or superior to, financial information prepared and presented in accordance with GAAP. These measures may also be different from non-GAAP financial measures used by other companies, limiting their usefulness for comparison purposes. A discussion of our calculation and use of these financial measures is provided below.

Underwriting profit is a non-GAAP financial measure for our reinsurance and insurance segments. Underwriting profit represents net premiums earned less net loss and LAE and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses, all as determined in accordance with GAAP and does not include: (i) net investment income; (ii) net realized capital gains; (iii) other than temporary impairment, or OTTI losses; (iv) other revenue; (v) other operating expenses; (vi) corporate administration; (vii) amortization of intangible assets; and (viii) interest expense. We use underwriting profit as a supplement to earnings before income taxes, the most comparable GAAP financial measure, to evaluate the performance of our reinsurance and insurance segments and believe that underwriting profit provides useful additional information to investors because it highlights net earnings attributable to our reinsurance and insurance segments' underwriting performance. Earnings before income taxes may show a profit despite an underlying underwriting loss, and when underwriting losses persist over extended periods, a reinsurance or an insurance company's ability to continue as an ongoing concern may be at risk. A reconciliation of underwriting profit to earnings before income taxes is presented within Consolidated Results of Operations.

Adjusted EBITDA is a non-GAAP financial measure for our non-insurance operating subsidiaries and investments held by Alleghany Capital. Adjusted EBITDA represents other revenue less certain other expenses and does not include: (i) depreciation expense (a component of other operating expenses); (ii) amortization of intangible assets; (iii) interest expense; (iv) net realized capital gains; (v) OTTI losses; and (vi) income taxes. Because Adjusted EBITDA excludes interest, income taxes, net realized capital gains, OTTI losses, depreciation and amortization, it provides an indication of economic performance that is not affected by levels of debt, interest rates, effective tax rates or levels of depreciation and amortization resulting from acquisition accounting. We use Adjusted EBITDA as a supplement to earnings before income taxes, the most comparable GAAP financial measure, to evaluate the performance of certain of our non-insurance operating subsidiaries and investments. A reconciliation of Adjusted EBITDA to earnings before income taxes is presented within Consolidated Results of Operations.

Table of Contents

Overview

The following overview does not address all of the matters covered in the other sections of Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations or contain all of the information that may be important to our stockholders or the investing public. This overview should be read in conjunction with the other sections of Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations.

Net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders were \$90.1 million in 2017, compared with \$456.9 million in 2016 and \$560.3 million in 2015.

Earnings before income taxes were \$36.7 million in 2017, compared with \$647.8 million in 2016 and \$757.4 million in 2015.

Net investment income increased by 2.9 percent in 2017 from 2016, and 2016 approximated net investment income in 2015.

Net premiums written decreased by 2.5 percent in 2017 from 2016, and increased by 13.4 percent in 2016 from 2015.

Our underwriting loss was \$316.4 million in 2017, compared with an underwriting profit of \$401.3 million in 2016 and \$466.6 million in 2015.

The combined ratio for our reinsurance and insurance segments was 106.4 percent in 2017, compared with 91.9 percent in 2016 and 89.0 percent in 2015.

Catastrophe losses, net of reinsurance, were \$818.1 million in 2017, compared with \$226.0 million in 2016 and \$62.0 million in 2015.

Net favorable prior accident year loss reserve development was \$298.6 million in 2017, compared with \$368.0 million in 2016 and \$215.5 million in 2015.

Sales revenues for Alleghany Capital were \$906.9 million in 2017, compared with \$687.1 million in 2016 and \$241.0 million in 2015.

Earnings before income taxes for Alleghany Capital were \$21.9 million in 2017, compared with losses before income taxes of \$105.7 million in 2016 and \$43.1 million in 2015. Adjusted EBITDA was \$53.4 million in 2017, compared with \$25.1 million in 2016 and \$0.4 million in 2015.

As of December 31, 2017, we had total assets of \$25.4 billion and total stockholders' equity attributable to Alleghany stockholders of \$8.5 billion. As of December 31, 2017, we had consolidated total investments of approximately \$18.8 billion, consisting of \$12.7 billion invested in debt securities, \$4.1 billion invested in equity securities, \$0.6 billion invested in short-term investments, \$0.7 billion invested in commercial mortgage loans and \$0.7 billion invested in other invested assets.

We incurred significant catastrophe losses in 2017, primarily arising from three major hurricanes. Hurricane Harvey caused widespread property damage and flooding in August 2017, primarily in the State of Texas. Hurricane Irma caused widespread property damage and flooding in September 2017, primarily in the State of Florida. Hurricane Maria caused widespread property damage and flooding in September 2017, primarily in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Our loss estimates for these catastrophes are based on an analysis of reported claims, an underwriting review of in-force contracts, estimates of losses resulting from wind and other perils, including storm surge and flooding to the extent covered by applicable policies, and other factors requiring considerable judgment. The ultimate amount of our actual losses from these catastrophes may be materially different from these estimates due to the size and complexity of the events and the preliminary nature of the information available to prepare the estimates.

Table of Contents

The following table presents the impact of our catastrophe losses, net of reinsurance, for 2017:

Year Ended December 31, 2017	Reinsurance Segment	Insurance Segment (\$ in millions)	Total Segments
Net loss and LAE:			
Hurricane Harvey	\$ 130.9	\$ 86.8 ⁽¹⁾	\$ 217.7
Hurricane Irma	154.3	97.8 ⁽²⁾	252.1
Hurricane Maria	196.7	20.1 ⁽³⁾	216.8
Other	99.2 ⁽⁴⁾	32.3	131.5
Total net loss and LAE	581.1	237.0	818.1
Net reinstatement premiums (earned) ⁽⁵⁾	(34.5)	-	(34.5)
Losses before income taxes	546.6	237.0	783.6
Income taxes	191.3	83.0	274.3
Net losses attributable to Alleghany stockholders	\$ 355.3	\$ 154.0	\$ 509.3

(1) Includes \$86.6 million attributable to RSUI and \$0.2 million attributable to CapSpecialty.

(2) Includes \$97.6 million attributable to RSUI and \$0.2 million attributable to CapSpecialty.

(3) All attributable to RSUI.

(4) Attributable to wildfires in the State of California and earthquakes in Mexico.

(5) Represents an increase to net premiums earned.

Our catastrophe losses are more fully described on pages 84, 85 and 92.

Consolidated Results of Operations

The following table presents our consolidated revenues, costs and expenses and earnings.

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Revenues			
Net premiums earned	\$ 4,955.0	\$ 4,975.8	\$ 4,230.3
Net investment income	451.0	438.5	438.8
Net realized capital gains	107.2	63.2	213.9
Other than temporary impairment losses	(16.9)	(45.2)	(133.9)
Other revenue	928.3	698.8	250.4
Total revenues	6,424.6	6,131.1	4,999.5

Costs and Expenses

Net loss and loss adjustment expenses	3,620.2	2,917.2	2,339.8
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	1,651.2	1,657.3	1,423.9
Other operating expenses	967.1	765.2	342.3
Corporate administration	47.0	43.0	46.5
Amortization of intangible assets	19.4	19.0	(2.2)
Interest expense	83.0	81.6	91.8
Total costs and expenses	6,387.9	5,483.3	4,242.1
Earnings before income taxes	36.7	647.8	757.4
Income taxes	(63.8)	187.1	195.2
Net earnings	100.5	460.7	562.2
Net earnings attributable to noncontrolling interest	10.4	3.8	1.9
Net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders	\$ 90.1	\$ 456.9	\$ 560.3

Table of Contents

Alleghany's segments are reported in a manner consistent with the way management evaluates the businesses. As such, we classify our businesses into two reportable segments—reinsurance and insurance. Other activities include Alleghany Capital and corporate activities. See Note 13 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional detail on our segments and other activities. The tables below present the results for our segments and for other activities for the 2017, 2016 and 2015:

Year Ended December 31, 2017	Reinsurance Segment	Segments Insurance Segment	Total Segments	Other Activities Alleghany Capital Corporate Activities ⁽¹⁾		Consolidated
				(\$ in millions)		
Gross premiums written	\$ 4,210.6	\$ 1,509.6	\$ 5,720.2	\$ -	\$ (23.3)	\$ 5,696.9
Net premiums written	3,810.1	1,155.8	4,965.9	-	-	4,965.9
Net premiums earned	3,808.7	1,146.3	4,955.0	-	-	4,955.0
Net loss and LAE:						
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	2,453.8	646.9	3,100.7	-	-	3,100.7
Current year catastrophe losses	581.1	237.0	818.1	-	-	818.1
Prior years	(249.5)	(49.1)	(298.6)	-	-	(298.6)
Total net loss and LAE	2,785.4	834.8	3,620.2	-	-	3,620.2
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	1,286.7	364.5	1,651.2	-	-	1,651.2
Underwriting (loss) ⁽²⁾	\$ (263.4)	\$ (53.0)	(316.4)	-	-	(316.4)
Net investment income			434.6	2.7	13.7	451.0
Net realized capital gains			85.7	18.2	3.3	107.2
Other than temporary impairment losses			(16.9)	-	-	(16.9)
Other revenue			15.5	906.9	5.9	928.3
Other operating expenses			82.8	881.0	3.3	967.1
Corporate administration			1.7	-	45.3	47.0
Amortization of intangible assets			(1.5)	20.9	-	19.4
Interest expense			26.9	4.0	52.1	83.0
Earnings (losses) before income taxes			\$ 92.6	\$ 21.9	\$ (77.8)	\$ 36.7
Loss ratio ⁽³⁾ :						
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	64.3%	56.4%	62.6%			
Current year catastrophe losses	15.3%	20.7%	16.5%			
Prior years	(6.5%)	(4.3%)	(6.0%)			
Total net loss and LAE	73.1%	72.8%	73.1%			

Expense ratio ⁽⁴⁾	33.8%	31.8%	33.3%
Combined ratio ⁽⁵⁾	106.9%	104.6%	106.4%

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2016	Reinsurance Segment	Segments Insurance Segment	Total Segments	Other Activities Alleghany Capital	Corporate Activities ⁽¹⁾	Consolidated
(\$ in millions)						
Gross premiums written	\$ 4,330.3	\$ 1,462.7	\$ 5,793.0	\$ -	\$ (25.9)	\$ 5,767.1
Net premiums written	3,969.4	1,122.4	5,091.8	-	-	5,091.8
Net premiums earned	3,845.0	1,130.8	4,975.8	-	-	4,975.8
Net loss and LAE:						
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	2,440.3	618.9	3,059.2	-	-	3,059.2
Current year catastrophe losses	138.6	87.4	226.0	-	-	226.0
Prior years	(293.5)	(74.5)	(368.0)	-	-	(368.0)
Total net loss and LAE	2,285.4	631.8	2,917.2	-	-	2,917.2
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	1,299.0	358.3	1,657.3	-	-	1,657.3
Underwriting profit ⁽²⁾	\$ 260.6	\$ 140.7	401.3	-	-	401.3
Net investment income			433.1	(2.3)	7.7	438.5
Net realized capital gains			159.9	(86.0)	(10.7)	63.2
Other than temporary impairment losses			(45.2)	-	-	(45.2)
Other revenue			4.4	687.1	7.3	698.8
Other operating expenses			80.6	680.5	4.1	765.2
Corporate administration			1.0	-	42.0	43.0
Amortization of intangible assets			(3.1)	22.1	-	19.0
Interest expense			27.2	1.9	52.5	81.6
Earnings (losses) before income taxes			\$ 847.8	\$ (105.7)	\$ (94.3)	\$ 647.8
Loss ratio ⁽³⁾ :						
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	63.5%	54.8%	61.5%			
Current year catastrophe losses	3.6%	7.7%	4.5%			
Prior years	(7.6%)	(6.6%)	(7.4%)			
Total net loss and LAE	59.5%	55.9%	58.6%			
Expense ratio ⁽⁴⁾	33.8%	31.7%	33.3%			
Combined ratio ⁽⁵⁾	93.3%	87.6%	91.9%			

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2015	Reinsurance Segment	Segments Insurance Segment	Total Segments (\$ in millions)	Other Activities Alleghany Capital	Corporate Activities ⁽¹⁾	Consolidated
Gross premiums written	\$ 3,662.1	\$ 1,488.1	\$ 5,150.2	\$ -	\$ (28.0)	\$ 5,122.2
Net premiums written	3,387.3	1,101.9	4,489.2	-	-	4,489.2
Net premiums earned	3,115.5	1,114.8	4,230.3	-	-	4,230.3
Net loss and LAE:						
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	1,895.4	597.9	2,493.3	-	-	2,493.3
Current year catastrophe losses	31.6	30.4	62.0	-	-	62.0
Prior years	(208.3)	(7.2)	(215.5)	-	-	(215.5)
Total net loss and LAE	1,718.7	621.1	2,339.8	-	-	2,339.8
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	1,069.8	354.1	1,423.9	-	-	1,423.9
Underwriting profit ⁽²⁾	\$ 327.0	\$ 139.6	466.6	-	-	466.6
Net investment income			427.6	5.4	5.8	438.8
Net realized capital gains			242.6	(25.6)	(3.1)	213.9
Other than temporary impairment losses			(125.5)	-	(8.4)	(133.9)
Other revenue			6.5	241.0	2.9	250.4
Other operating expenses			80.4	259.3	2.6	342.3
Corporate administration			0.9	-	45.6	46.5
Amortization of intangible assets			(5.3)	3.1	-	(2.2)
Interest expense			38.3	1.5	52.0	91.8
Earnings (losses) before income taxes			\$ 903.5	\$ (43.1)	\$ (103.0)	\$ 757.4
Loss ratio ⁽³⁾ :						
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	60.9%	53.6%	58.9%			
Current year catastrophe losses	1.0%	2.7%	1.5%			
Prior years	(6.7%)	(0.6%)	(5.1%)			
Total net loss and LAE	55.2%	55.7%	55.3%			
Expense ratio ⁽⁴⁾	34.3%	31.8%	33.7%			
Combined ratio ⁽⁵⁾	89.5%	87.5%	89.0%			

- (1) Includes elimination of minor reinsurance activity between segments.
- (2) Underwriting profit represents net premiums earned less net loss and LAE and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses, all as determined in accordance with GAAP, and does not include net investment income, net realized capital gains, OTTI losses, other revenue, other operating expenses, corporate administration, amortization of intangible assets and interest expense. Underwriting profit is a non-GAAP financial measure and does not replace earnings before income taxes determined in accordance with GAAP as a measure of profitability. See Comment on Non-GAAP Financial Measures herein for additional detail on the presentation of our results of operations.
- (3) The loss ratio is derived by dividing the amount of net loss and LAE by net premiums earned, all as determined in accordance with GAAP.
- (4) The expense ratio is derived by dividing the amount of commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses by net premiums earned, all as determined in accordance with GAAP.
- (5) The combined ratio is the sum of the loss ratio and the expense ratio, all as determined in accordance with GAAP. The combined ratio represents the percentage of each premium dollar a reinsurance or an insurance company has to spend on net loss and LAE, and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses.

Table of Contents**Comparison of 2017, 2016 and 2015**

Premiums. The following table presents our consolidated premiums.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 5,696.9	\$ 5,767.1	\$ 5,122.2	(1.2%)	12.6%
Net premiums written	4,965.9	5,091.8	4,489.2	(2.5%)	13.4%
Net premiums earned	4,955.0	4,975.8	4,230.3	(0.4%)	17.6%

2017 vs 2016. The decrease in gross and net premiums written in 2017 from 2016 is primarily attributable to a decrease at our reinsurance segment, partially offset by an increase at our insurance segment, reflecting continued growth at CapSpecialty and PacificComp. The decrease at our reinsurance segment is primarily related to cancellations, non-renewals and reduced participations in certain treaties, the impact of rate pressures and increased retentions by cedants, partially offset by gross and net premiums written in 2017 related to reinstatement premiums written on treaties impacted by catastrophe losses. The decrease at our reinsurance segment in gross and net premiums written also reflects lower premiums related to a large whole account quota share treaty entered into in the fourth quarter of 2015, or the Quota Share Treaty. Premiums related to the Quota Share Treaty were \$780.9 million and \$854.3 million in 2017 and 2016, respectively. Premiums related to the Quota Share Treaty in 2016 reflect elevated premiums written in the first quarter of 2016 due to differences between initial premium estimates at contract inception, which were recorded in the fourth quarter of 2015, and actual data subsequently reported. As a consequence of this change in estimate, premiums written in the fourth quarter of 2015 were understated and premiums written in the first quarter of 2016 were correspondingly increased. In general, when actual data has not been reported by ceding companies, premiums written are estimated based on historical patterns and other relevant factors. Any differences between these estimates and actual data subsequently reported are recorded in the period when actual data becomes available.

The decrease in net premiums earned in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects a decrease at our reinsurance segment due mainly to a decrease in net premiums written in recent quarters, partially offset by an increase at our insurance segment, reflecting continued growth of premiums written at CapSpecialty and PacificComp.

2016 vs 2015. The increase in gross and net premiums written in 2016 from 2015 is primarily attributable to an increase at our reinsurance segment, primarily reflecting \$854.3 million of premiums in 2016 related to the Quota Share Treaty compared with \$221.6 million of such premiums in 2015, partially offset by the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates.

The increase in net premiums earned in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects an increase at our reinsurance segment for the reason discussed above.

A detailed comparison of premiums by segment for 2017, 2016 and 2015 is contained on pages 82, 83 and 90.

Table of Contents

Net loss and LAE. The following table presents our consolidated net loss and LAE.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 3,100.7	\$ 3,059.2	\$ 2,493.3	1.4%	22.7%
Current year catastrophe losses	818.1	226.0	62.0	262.0%	264.5%
Prior years	(298.6)	(368.0)	(215.5)	(18.9%)	70.8%
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 3,620.2	\$ 2,917.2	\$ 2,339.8	24.1%	24.7%

Loss ratio:

Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	62.6%	61.5%	58.9%
Current year catastrophe losses	16.5%	4.5%	1.5%
Prior years	(6.0%)	(7.4%)	(5.1%)
Total net loss and LAE	73.1%	58.6%	55.3%

2017 vs 2016. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects a significant increase in catastrophe losses at our reinsurance and insurance segments. The catastrophe losses in 2017 include \$217.7 million related to Hurricane Harvey, \$252.1 million related to Hurricane Irma and \$216.8 million related to Hurricane Maria, as well as losses from wildfires in the State of California and earthquakes in Mexico.

2017 reinsurance segment net loss and LAE includes \$24.4 million of unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development arising from the U.K. Ministry of Justice's decision to significantly reduce the discount rate, referred to as the Ogden rate, used to calculate lump-sum bodily injury payouts in personal injury insurance claims in the U.K.

2016 vs 2015. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects an increase at our reinsurance segment due primarily to higher net premiums earned, as discussed above, higher catastrophe losses, as well as higher non-catastrophe losses in the 2016 accident year related to the Quota Share Treaty, partially offset by an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development.

A detailed comparison of net loss and LAE by segment for 2017, 2016 and 2015 is contained on pages 84 through 86 and pages 91 through 93.

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses. The following table presents our consolidated commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015

(\$ in millions)

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 1,651.2	\$ 1,657.3	\$ 1,423.9	(0.4%)	16.4%
--	------------	------------	------------	--------	-------

Expense ratio	33.3%	33.3%	33.7%
---------------	-------	-------	-------

2017 vs 2016. The slight decrease in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects a decrease at our reinsurance segment from the impact of lower net premiums earned and the impact of losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria on short-term incentive compensation expense accruals, largely offset by the impact of an increase at our insurance segment due to the impact of higher net premiums earned at CapSpecialty and PacificComp.

2016 vs 2015. The increase in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects an increase at our reinsurance segment due primarily to higher net premiums earned, as discussed above, partially offset by a slight decrease in employee-related overhead expenses.

Table of Contents

A detailed comparison of commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses by segment for 2017, 2016 and 2015 is contained on pages 86, 87, 93 and 94.

Underwriting profit. The following table presents our consolidated underwriting (loss) profit.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Underwriting (loss) profit	\$ (316.4)	\$ 401.3	\$ 466.6	(178.8%)	(14.0%)
Combined ratio	106.4%	91.9%	89.0%		

2017 vs 2016. The underwriting loss in 2017 compared with the underwriting profit in 2016 primarily reflects significant catastrophe losses from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria at our reinsurance and insurance segments, as discussed above.

2016 vs 2015. The decrease in underwriting profit in 2016 from 2015 reflects a decrease at our reinsurance segment due primarily to higher catastrophe and non-catastrophe losses in the 2016 accident year, partially offset by an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, all as discussed above.

A detailed comparison of underwriting profits by segment for 2017, 2016 and 2015 is contained on pages 87 and 94.

Investment results. The following table presents our consolidated investment results.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Net investment income	\$ 451.0	\$ 438.5	\$ 438.8	2.9%	(0.1%)
Net realized capital gains	107.2	63.2	213.9	69.6%	(70.5%)
Other than temporary impairment losses	(16.9)	(45.2)	(133.9)	(62.6%)	(66.2%)

2017 vs 2016. The increase in net investment income in 2017 from 2016 primarily relates to higher interest income, partially offset by a decrease in income from other invested assets. The increase in interest income primarily reflects growth in funds withheld and commercial mortgage loan balances, higher yields on short term investments and floating-rate debt securities, as well as the fact that interest income in the fourth quarter of 2016 was reduced by approximately \$7 million of adjustments made to more accurately reflect premium amortization associated with certain bonds. The decrease in income from other invested assets primarily reflects losses incurred on our equity interests in Pillar Capital Holdings Limited and related funds, or Pillar Investments, arising from catastrophe losses incurred in August and September 2017 and to a \$12.6 million charge on our equity investment in Ares Management LLC, or Ares in early 2017. The charge on our equity investment in Ares reflects our share of a one-time payment recorded by Ares related to an acquisition by its affiliated entity. In connection with this acquisition, Ares agreed to make certain transaction support payments to the sellers of the acquired entity. Ares expects to receive future management fees derived from the assets under management of the acquired entity.

The increase in net realized capital gains in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects a \$98.8 million capital loss due to an impairment charge from a write-down of certain SORC assets as of December 31, 2016, as more fully described in the

following pages, partially offset by lower net realized capital gains from the sale of equity securities.

The decrease in OTTI losses in 2017 from 2016 reflects decreases in OTTI losses related to debt securities.

2016 vs 2015. Net investment income in 2016 approximated net investment income in 2015, primarily reflecting lower dividend income and lower income from other invested assets, offset by higher interest income from funds withheld by cedants. Interest income was reduced in the fourth quarter of 2016 by approximately \$7 million of adjustments made to more accurately reflect premium amortization associated with certain bonds.

The decrease in net realized capital gains in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects a \$98.8 million capital loss due to an impairment charge from a write-down of certain SORC assets as of December 31, 2016 and lower gains from the sales of equity securities, partially offset by a \$13.2 million realized gain recorded on April 15, 2016 by Alleghany Capital, as more fully described in the following pages, and a \$25.8 million capital loss due to an impairment charge from a write-off of our

Table of Contents

investment in ORX recorded on December 31, 2015. Realized capital gains from equity securities for 2015 includes the sales of certain equity securities resulting from a partial restructuring of the equity portfolio, as well as the sales of certain equity securities which had their cost basis reduced in earlier periods for the recognition of OTTI losses.

The decrease in OTTI losses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the absence of losses on equity securities in the energy, pharmaceutical, gaming and airline sectors which were significant in 2015.

A detailed comparison of investment results for 2017, 2016 and 2015 is contained on pages 95 through 99.

Other revenue and expenses. The following table presents our consolidated other revenue and expenses.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Other revenue	\$ 928.3	\$ 698.8	\$ 250.4	32.8%	179.1%
Other operating expenses	967.1	765.2	342.3	26.4%	123.5%
Corporate administration	47.0	43.0	46.5	9.3%	(7.5%)
Amortization of intangible assets	19.4	19.0	(2.2)	2.1%	(963.6%)
Interest expense	83.0	81.6	91.8	1.7%	(11.1%)

Other revenue and Other operating expenses. Other revenue and other operating expenses primarily include sales revenues and expenses associated with Alleghany Capital. Other operating expenses also include the long-term incentive compensation of our reinsurance and insurance segments, which totaled \$72.9 million, \$76.1 million and \$77.6 million in 2017, 2016 and 2015, respectively. The decrease in long-term incentive compensation at our reinsurance and insurance segments in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria, partially offset by the impact of an increase in unrealized appreciation on our equity and, to a lesser extent, bond portfolios, on long-term incentive compensation expense accruals at TransRe and RSUI. See Note 14 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information.

The increase in other revenue in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the acquisition of W&WIAFCO Steel. The increase in other operating expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the acquisition of W&WIAFCO Steel and finder's fees, legal and accounting costs and other transaction-related expenses at the Alleghany Capital level, partially offset by a decrease in the long-term incentive compensation of our reinsurance and insurance segments. On April 28, 2017, Alleghany Capital acquired approximately 80 percent of the equity in W&WIAFCO Steel for \$164.5 million, including \$163.9 million in cash paid on May 1, 2017 and \$0.6 million of estimated purchase price adjustments.

The increase in other revenue and other operating expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the acquisition of IPS on October 31, 2015, the inclusion of Jazwares in our consolidated results as of April 15, 2016 and, to a lesser extent, growth at Kentucky Trailer. On April 15, 2016, Alleghany Capital acquired an additional 50 percent of Jazwares outstanding equity, bringing its equity ownership interest to 80 percent and, as of that date, the results of Jazwares have been included in our consolidated results. Prior to April 15, 2016, Jazwares was accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

Corporate administration. The increase in corporate administration expense in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects higher long-term incentive compensation expense accruals at Alleghany, driven by the impact of unrealized

appreciation on our equity and, to a lesser extent, bond portfolios, partially offset by losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. The decrease in corporate administration expense in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects lower long-term incentive compensation expense accruals due mainly to the impact of less favorable financial results, partially offset by a rise in the price per share of our common stock during 2016.

Amortization of intangible assets. The increase in amortization expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the amortization of net intangible assets related to the acquisition of W&WIAFCO Steel, partially offset by a decrease in amortization expense at IPS, as certain of IPS' s intangible assets were fully amortized as of December 31, 2016. Amortization expenses in 2016 reflect the amortization of net intangible assets, including intangible assets related to the acquisitions of IPS and Jazwares. Negative amortization expense in 2015 reflects the amortization of intangible liabilities acquired in our merger with TransRe in 2012, partially offset by the amortization of intangible assets. Amortization of intangible assets in 2015 also reflects the acquisition of IPS on October 31, 2015.

Interest expense. The increase in interest expense in 2017 from 2016 reflects new or increased borrowings at Jazwares, IPS and Bourn & Koch and borrowings at W&WIAFCO Steel. The decrease in interest expense in 2016 from 2015

Table of Contents

primarily reflects lower interest expense at our reinsurance segment resulting from the maturity and repayment of TransRe's 5.75% senior notes due on December 14, 2015, or the 2015 Senior Notes, on December 14, 2015. See Note 8 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information.

Income taxes. The following table presents our consolidated income tax expense.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Income taxes	\$ (63.8)	\$ 187.1	\$ 195.2	(134.1%)	(4.1%)
Effective tax rate	(173.9%)	28.9%	25.8%		

2017 vs 2016. The income tax benefit in 2017 compared with income tax expenses in 2016 reflects the impact of taxable losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. In addition, income taxes in 2016 include prior period income tax expense adjustments. The effective tax rate in 2017 compared with 2016 primarily reflects income tax benefits from taxable losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria in 2017 and, to a lesser extent, a tax benefit associated with the December 31, 2017 sale of PacificComp, as well as prior period income tax expense adjustments in 2016, which include \$16.1 million of out-of-period reductions to current and deferred TransRe tax assets recorded in 2016 that relate primarily to periods prior to our merger with TransRe in 2012.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, or the Tax Act, was signed into law on December 22, 2017. Among other provisions, the Tax Act reduced the corporate federal income tax rate from 35.0 percent to 21.0 percent, effective January 1, 2018 for the 2018 tax year and, as a consequence, the value of our deferred tax assets and liabilities as of December 31, 2017 was reduced. The net impact of this reduction to our consolidated 2017 tax expense was not material. There currently exists a degree of uncertainty as to how certain provisions in the Tax Act will be interpreted and implemented in practice in the future.

2016 vs 2015. The decrease in income taxes in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects a decrease in earnings before income taxes partially offset by prior period income tax expense adjustments. The increase in the effective tax rate in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects larger prior period income tax adjustments, higher state income taxes and lower tax-exempt interest income arising from municipal bond securities. Prior period income tax expense adjustments for 2016 include \$16.1 million of out-of-period reductions to current and deferred TransRe tax assets recorded in 2016 that relate primarily to periods prior to our merger with TransRe in 2012.

Earnings. The following table presents our consolidated earnings.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Earnings before income taxes	\$ 36.7	\$ 647.8	\$ 757.4	(94.3%)	(14.5%)
Net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders	90.1	456.9	560.3	(80.3%)	(18.5%)

2017 vs 2016. The decrease in earnings before income taxes and net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects significant catastrophe losses from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria at our reinsurance and insurance segments, as discussed above.

2016 vs 2015. The decrease in earnings before income taxes and net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects lower net realized capital gains and underwriting profits, partially offset by lower OTTI losses, all as discussed above.

Reinsurance Segment Underwriting Results

The reinsurance segment is comprised of TransRe's property and casualty & other lines of business. TransRe also writes a modest amount of property and casualty insurance business, which is included in the reinsurance segment. For a more detailed description of our reinsurance segment, see Part I, Item 1, "Business Segment Information - Reinsurance Segment" of this Form 10-K.

Table of Contents

The underwriting results of the reinsurance segment are presented below.

Year Ended December 31, 2017	Property	Casualty & Other ⁽¹⁾	Total
		(\$ in millions)	
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,557.8	\$ 2,652.8	\$ 4,210.6
Net premiums written	1,233.1	2,577.0	3,810.1
Net premiums earned	1,181.9	2,626.8	3,808.7
Net loss and LAE:			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	658.3	1,795.5	2,453.8
Current year catastrophe losses	516.3	64.8	581.1
Prior years	(94.5)	(155.0)	(249.5)
Total net loss and LAE	1,080.1	1,705.3	2,785.4
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	383.4	903.3	1,286.7
Underwriting (loss) profit ⁽²⁾	\$ (281.6)	\$ 18.2	\$ (263.4)
Loss ratio ⁽³⁾ :			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	55.7%	68.3%	64.3%
Current year catastrophe losses	43.7%	2.5%	15.3%
Prior years	(8.0%)	(5.8%)	(6.5%)
Total net loss and LAE	91.4%	65.0%	73.1%
Expense ratio ⁽⁴⁾	32.4%	34.4%	33.8%
Combined ratio ⁽⁵⁾	123.8%	99.4%	106.9%

Year Ended December 31, 2016	Property	Casualty & Other ⁽¹⁾	Total
		(\$ in millions)	
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,515.5	\$ 2,814.8	\$ 4,330.3
Net premiums written	1,237.2	2,732.2	3,969.4
Net premiums earned	1,168.0	2,677.0	3,845.0
Net loss and LAE:			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	547.4	1,892.9	2,440.3
Current year catastrophe losses	136.7	1.9	138.6
Prior years	(105.7)	(187.8)	(293.5)
Total net loss and LAE	578.4	1,707.0	2,285.4

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	376.2	922.8	1,299.0
Underwriting profit ⁽²⁾	\$ 213.4	\$ 47.2	\$ 260.6
Loss ratio⁽³⁾:			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	46.9%	70.7%	63.5%
Current year catastrophe losses	11.7%	0.1%	3.6%
Prior years	(9.0%)	(7.0%)	(7.6%)
Total net loss and LAE	49.6%	63.8%	59.5%
Expense ratio ⁽⁴⁾	32.2%	34.5%	33.8%
Combined ratio ⁽⁵⁾	81.8%	98.3%	93.3%

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2015	Property	Casualty & Other ⁽¹⁾ (\$ in millions)	Total
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,171.9	\$ 2,490.2	\$ 3,662.1
Net premiums written	953.6	2,433.7	3,387.3
Net premiums earned	887.4	2,228.1	3,115.5
Net loss and LAE:			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	343.9	1,551.5	1,895.4
Current year catastrophe losses	24.9	6.7	31.6
Prior years	(76.7)	(131.6)	(208.3)
Total net loss and LAE	292.1	1,426.6	1,718.7
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	295.6	774.2	1,069.8
Underwriting profit ⁽²⁾	\$ 299.7	\$ 27.3	\$ 327.0
Loss ratio ⁽³⁾ :			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	38.8%	69.6%	60.9%
Current year catastrophe losses	2.8%	0.3%	1.0%
Prior years	(8.6%)	(5.9%)	(6.7%)
Total net loss and LAE	33.0%	64.0%	55.2%
Expense ratio ⁽⁴⁾	33.3%	34.7%	34.3%
Combined ratio ⁽⁵⁾	66.3%	98.7%	89.5%

- (1) Primarily consists of the following assumed reinsurance lines of business: directors and officers liability; errors and omissions liability; general liability; medical malpractice; ocean marine and aviation; auto liability; accident and health; surety; and credit.
- (2) Underwriting profit represents net premiums earned less net loss and LAE and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses, all as determined in accordance with GAAP, and does not include net investment income, net realized capital gains, OTTI losses, other revenue, other operating expenses, corporate administration, amortization of intangible assets and interest expense. Underwriting profit is a non-GAAP financial measure and does not replace earnings before income taxes determined in accordance with GAAP as a measure of profitability. See Comment on Non-GAAP Financial Measures herein for additional detail on the presentation of our results of operations.
- (3) The loss ratio is derived by dividing the amount of net loss and LAE by net premiums earned, all as determined in accordance with GAAP.
- (4) The expense ratio is derived by dividing the amount of commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses by net premiums earned, all as determined in accordance with GAAP.
- (5) The combined ratio is the sum of the loss ratio and the expense ratio, all as determined in accordance with GAAP. The combined ratio represents the percentage of each premium dollar a reinsurance or an insurance company has to spend on net loss and LAE, and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses.

Table of Contents

Reinsurance Segment: Premiums. The following table presents premiums for the reinsurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Property					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,557.8	\$ 1,515.5	\$ 1,171.9	2.8%	29.3%
Net premiums written	1,233.1	1,237.2	953.6	(0.3%)	29.7%
Net premiums earned	1,181.9	1,168.0	887.4	1.2%	31.6%
Casualty & other					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 2,652.8	\$ 2,814.8	\$ 2,490.2	(5.8%)	13.0%
Net premiums written	2,577.0	2,732.2	2,433.7	(5.7%)	12.3%
Net premiums earned	2,626.8	2,677.0	2,228.1	(1.9%)	20.1%
Total					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 4,210.6	\$ 4,330.3	\$ 3,662.1	(2.8%)	18.2%
Net premiums written	3,810.1	3,969.4	3,387.3	(4.0%)	17.2%
Net premiums earned	3,808.7	3,845.0	3,115.5	(0.9%)	23.4%

Property. The increase in gross premiums written in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects reinstatement premiums written on treaties impacted by catastrophe losses and an increase in gross premiums written related to the Quota Share Treaty, partially offset by cancellations, non-renewals and reduced participations in certain international treaties. Gross premiums written related to the Quota Share Treaty were \$364.3 million and \$353.2 million in 2017 and 2016, respectively. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign currency exchange rates, gross premiums written increased 2.7 percent in 2017 from 2016. The increase in net premiums earned in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects increased premiums earned related to the Quota Share Treaty and \$30.2 million of net reinstatement premiums earned on treaties impacted by catastrophe losses, partially offset by higher ceded premiums earned due to an increase in retrocessional coverage purchased in 2017. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign currency exchange rates, net premiums earned increased 1.2 percent in 2017 from 2016.

The increase in gross premiums written in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects \$353.2 million of property-related premiums in 2016 compared with \$64.7 million in 2015 related to the Quota Share Treaty, and to a lesser extent, increases arising from certain other large whole account quota share treaties. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates, gross premiums written increased 29.5 percent in 2016 from 2015. The increase in net premiums earned in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects net premiums earned related to the Quota Share Treaty, partially offset by higher ceded premiums earned due to an increase in retrocessional coverage purchased in 2016. There were no net premiums earned in 2015 related to the Quota Share Treaty. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates, net premiums earned increased 31.9 percent in 2016 from 2015.

Casualty & other. The decrease in gross premiums written in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects cancellations, non-renewals and reduced participations in certain treaties, as well as the impact of rate pressures and increased retentions by cedants and a decrease in casualty-related premiums written related to the Quota Share Treaty, partially

offset by reinstatement premiums written on treaties impacted by catastrophe losses. Gross premiums written related to the Quota Share Treaty were \$416.6 million and \$501.1 million in 2017 and 2016, respectively. Premiums related to the Quota Share Treaty in 2016 reflect elevated premiums written in the first quarter of 2016 due to differences between initial premium estimates at contract inception, which were recorded in the fourth quarter of 2015, and actual data subsequently reported. As a consequence of this change in estimate, premiums written in the fourth quarter of 2015 were understated and premiums written in the first quarter of 2016 were correspondingly increased. In general, when actual data has not been reported by ceding companies, premiums written are estimated based on historical patterns and other relevant factors. Any differences between these estimates and actual data subsequently reported are recorded in the period when actual data becomes available. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign currency exchange rates, gross premiums written decreased 5.6 percent in 2017 from 2016. The decrease in net premiums earned in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the decline in net premiums written in

Table of Contents

recent quarters and the impact of changes in foreign currency exchange rates, partially offset by \$4.3 million of net reinstatement premiums earned on treaties impacted by catastrophe losses. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign currency exchange rates, net premiums earned decreased 1.5 percent in 2017 from 2016.

The increase in gross premiums written in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects \$501.1 million of casualty-related premiums in 2016 compared with \$156.9 million in 2015 related to the Quota Share Treaty, partially offset by the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates. Premiums related to the Quota Share Treaty in 2016 reflect elevated premiums written in the first quarter of 2016 due to differences between initial premium estimates at contract inception, which were recorded in the fourth quarter of 2015, and actual data subsequently reported. As a consequence of this change in estimate, premiums written in the fourth quarter of 2015 were understated and premiums written in the first quarter of 2016 were correspondingly increased. In general, when actual data has not been reported by ceding companies, premiums written are estimated based on historical patterns and other relevant factors. Any differences between these estimates and actual data subsequently reported are recorded in the period when actual data becomes available. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates, gross premiums written increased 14.5 percent in 2016 from 2015. The increase in net premiums earned in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects net premiums earned related to the Quota Share Treaty. There were no net premiums earned in 2015 related to the Quota Share Treaty. Excluding the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates, net premiums earned increased 21.7 percent in 2016 from 2015.

Table of Contents

Reinsurance Segment: Net loss and LAE. The following table presents net loss and LAE for the reinsurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
(\$ in millions)					
Property					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 658.3	\$ 547.4	\$ 343.9	20.3%	59.2%
Current year catastrophe losses	516.3	136.7	24.9	277.7%	449.0%
Prior years	(94.5)	(105.7)	(76.7)	(10.6%)	37.8%
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 1,080.1	\$ 578.4	\$ 292.1	86.7%	98.0%
Loss ratio:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	55.7%	46.9%	38.8%		
Current year catastrophe losses	43.7%	11.7%	2.8%		
Prior years	(8.0%)	(9.0%)	(8.6%)		
Total net loss and LAE	91.4%	49.6%	33.0%		
Casualty & other					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 1,795.5	\$ 1,892.9	\$ 1,551.5	(5.1%)	22.0%
Current year catastrophe losses	64.8	1.9	6.7	3,310.5%	(71.6%)
Prior years	(155.0)	(187.8)	(131.6)	(17.5%)	42.7%
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 1,705.3	\$ 1,707.0	\$ 1,426.6	(0.1%)	19.7%
Loss ratio:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	68.3%	70.7%	69.6%		
Current year catastrophe losses	2.5%	0.1%	0.3%		
Prior years	(5.8%)	(7.0%)	(5.9%)		
Total net loss and LAE	65.0%	63.8%	64.0%		
Total					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 2,453.8	\$ 2,440.3	\$ 1,895.4	0.6%	28.7%
Current year catastrophe losses	581.1	138.6	31.6	319.3%	338.6%
Prior years	(249.5)	(293.5)	(208.3)	(15.0%)	40.9%
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 2,785.4	\$ 2,285.4	\$ 1,718.7	21.9%	33.0%

Loss ratio:			
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	64.3%	63.5%	60.9%
Current year catastrophe losses	15.3%	3.6%	1.0%
Prior years	(6.5%)	(7.6%)	(6.7%)
Total net loss and LAE	73.1%	59.5%	55.2%

Property. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects higher catastrophe losses. Catastrophe losses in 2017 include \$110.8 million related to Hurricane Harvey in August 2017, \$128.1 million related to Hurricane Irma in September 2017, \$181.3 million related to Hurricane Maria in September 2017, \$69.2 million related to wildfires in the State of California in the fourth quarter of 2017, and \$26.9 million related to earthquakes in Mexico in September 2017. The catastrophe losses in 2016 relate to wildfire losses in Alberta, Canada, earthquake losses in Japan,

Table of Contents

earthquake losses in Ecuador, all of which occurred in the second quarter, typhoon and flood losses in China in the third quarter, earthquake losses from an earthquake in New Zealand in the fourth quarter and \$21.8 million of losses from Hurricane Matthew, which caused property damage and flooding in the Southeast Coast of the U.S. in October.

The increase in net loss and LAE in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, higher catastrophe losses, as well as higher non-catastrophe property losses in the 2016 accident year in connection with the Quota Share Treaty, partially offset by an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development. The catastrophe losses in 2016 relate to wildfire losses in Alberta, Canada, earthquake losses in Japan, earthquake losses in Ecuador, all of which occurred in the second quarter, typhoon and flood losses in China in the third quarter, earthquake losses from an earthquake in New Zealand in the fourth quarter and \$21.8 million of losses from Hurricane Matthew, which caused property damage and flooding in the Southeast Coast of the U.S. in October. Catastrophe losses for 2015 relate to the chemical explosion in Tianjin, China in August.

Net loss and LAE in 2017, 2016 and 2015 include (favorable) unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development as presented in the table below:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Catastrophe events	\$ (22.2) ⁽¹⁾	\$ (14.2) ⁽²⁾	\$ (28.0) ⁽³⁾
Non-catastrophe	(72.3) ⁽⁴⁾	(91.5) ⁽⁵⁾	(48.7) ⁽⁶⁾
Total	\$ (94.5)	\$ (105.7)	\$ (76.7)

(1) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development from several catastrophes that occurred primarily in the 2016 accident year.

(2) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development from several catastrophes that occurred in the 2010 through 2015 accident years.

(3) Includes favorable prior accident year loss reserve development of (\$27.7) million from Super Storm Sandy in 2012 and various smaller amounts on catastrophes that occurred in the 2010, 2011, 2013 and 2014 accident years, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year development from the New Zealand earthquake in 2010.

(4) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development primarily related to the 2011 through 2016 accident years.

(5) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development primarily related to the 2011 through 2015 accident years.

(6) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development primarily related to the 2013 and 2014 accident years.

The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017, 2016 and 2015 reflects favorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods. The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017 did not impact assumptions used in estimating TransRe's loss and LAE liabilities for business earned in 2017.

Casualty & other. Net loss and LAE in 2017 approximated those in 2016, primarily reflecting higher catastrophe losses and less favorable prior accident year loss reserve development being offset by the impact of lower net

premiums earned and lower non-catastrophe losses in the 2017 accident year. Catastrophe losses in 2017 relate primarily to the marine lines of business, and include \$20.1 million related to Hurricane Harvey in August 2017, \$26.2 million related to Hurricane Irma in September 2017, \$15.4 million related to Hurricane Maria in September 2017, \$1.6 million related to wildfires in the State of California in the fourth quarter of 2017, and \$1.5 million related to earthquakes in Mexico in September 2017. The modest catastrophe losses in 2016 relate primarily to earthquake losses in Ecuador.

The increase in net loss and LAE in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned and higher losses in the 2016 accident year related to the Quota Share Treaty, partially offset by the impact of increases in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development. The modest catastrophe losses in 2016 relate primarily to earthquake losses in Ecuador. The catastrophe losses for 2015 relate to the chemical explosion in Tianjin, China in August 2015.

Table of Contents

Net loss and LAE in 2017, 2016 and 2015 include (favorable) unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development as presented in the table below:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Malpractice Treaties ⁽¹⁾	\$ (5.0)	\$ (10.8)	\$ (12.1)
Ogden rate impact ⁽²⁾	24.4	-	-
Commuted A&E Liabilities ⁽³⁾	-	-	38.2
Other	(174.4) ⁽⁴⁾	(177.0) ⁽⁵⁾	(157.7) ⁽⁶⁾
Total	\$ (155.0)	\$ (187.8)	\$ (131.6)

- (1) Represents certain medical malpractice treaties, or the Malpractice Treaties, pursuant to which the increased underwriting profits created by the favorable prior accident year loss reserve development are largely retained by the cedants. As a result, the favorable prior accident year loss reserve development is largely offset by an increase in profit commission expense incurred when such favorable prior accident year loss reserve development occurs.
- (2) Represents unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development arising from the U.K. Ministry of Justice's decision to significantly reduce the discount rate, referred to as the Ogden rate, used to calculate lump-sum bodily injury payouts in personal injury insurance claims in the U.K. As of March 20, 2017, the Ogden rate changed from 2.50 percent to negative 0.75 percent.
- (3) Represents unfavorable prior accident year development on Commuted A&E Liabilities related to the Commutation Agreement, as discussed above.
- (4) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in: (i) longer-tailed professional liability and general liability lines of business related to the 2003 through 2012 accident years; and (ii) shorter-tailed casualty lines of business related to the 2010 through 2014 accident years; partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in shorter-tailed casualty lines of business in the 2015 and 2016 accident years.
- (5) Generally reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development reserves in a variety of casualty & other lines of business primarily from the 2003 through 2015 accident years.
- (6) Generally reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in a variety of casualty & other lines of business primarily from the 2005 through 2014 accident years, including (\$30.7) million of favorable prior accident year development related to French medical malpractice loss reserves commuted in the fourth quarter of 2015 with a European cedant, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year development from the 2004 and prior accident years.

The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017, 2016 and 2015 reflects favorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods. The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017 did not impact assumptions used in estimating TransRe's loss and LAE liabilities for business earned in 2017.

Reinsurance Segment: Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses. The following table presents commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses for the reinsurance segment.

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
(\$ in millions)					
Property					
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 383.4	\$ 376.2	\$ 295.6	1.9%	27.3%
Expense ratio	32.4%	32.2%	33.3%		
Casualty & other					
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 903.3	\$ 922.8	\$ 774.2	(2.1%)	19.2%
Expense ratio	34.4%	34.5%	34.7%		
Total					
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 1,286.7	\$ 1,299.0	\$ 1,069.8	(0.9%)	21.4%
Expense ratio	33.8%	33.8%	34.3%		

Property. The increase in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned and an increase in commission rates, partially offset by lower short-term incentive compensation expense accruals arising from the significant catastrophe losses that occurred in 2017. The increase in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, partially offset by a slight decrease in employee-related overhead expenses.

Table of Contents

Casualty & other. The decrease in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects lower short-term incentive compensation expense accruals arising from the significant catastrophe losses that occurred in 2017, the impact of lower net premiums earned and a decrease in profit commissions related to the Malpractice Treaties. The increase in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, partially offset by a slight decrease in employee-related overhead expenses.

Reinsurance Segment: Underwriting profit. The following table presents our underwriting (loss) profit for the reinsurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Property					
Underwriting (loss) profit	\$ (281.6)	\$ 213.4	\$ 299.7	(232.0%)	(28.8%)
Combined ratio	123.8%	81.7%	66.3%		
Casualty & other					
Underwriting profit	\$ 18.2	\$ 47.2	\$ 27.3	(61.4%)	72.9%
Combined ratio	99.4%	98.3%	98.7%		
Total					
Underwriting (loss) profit	\$ (263.4)	\$ 260.6	\$ 327.0	(201.1%)	(20.3%)
Combined ratio	106.9%	93.3%	89.5%		

Property. The underwriting loss in 2017 compared with the underwriting profit in 2016 primarily reflects significant catastrophe losses from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria, as discussed above. The decrease in underwriting profit in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects an increase in catastrophe losses, partially offset by an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, all as discussed above.

Casualty & other. The decrease in underwriting profit in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects significant catastrophe losses from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria, as well as less favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, as discussed above. The increase in underwriting profit in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve developments, as discussed above.

Table of Contents**Insurance Segment Underwriting Results**

The insurance segment is comprised of AIHL's RSUI, CapSpecialty and PacificComp (prior to its sale on December 31, 2017) operating subsidiaries. RSUI also writes a modest amount of assumed reinsurance business, which is included in the insurance segment. For a more detailed description of our insurance segment, see Part I, Item 1, Business Segment Information Insurance Segment of this Form 10-K.

The underwriting results of the insurance segment are presented below.

Year Ended December 31, 2017	RSUI	CapSpecialty	PacificComp	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,056.8	\$ 290.2	\$ 162.6	\$ 1,509.6
Net premiums written	724.4	271.2	160.2	1,155.8
Net premiums earned	721.7	260.9	163.7	1,146.3
Net loss and LAE:				
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	380.7	142.7	123.5	646.9
Current year catastrophe losses	232.4	4.6	-	237.0
Prior years	(43.2)	(3.4)	(2.5)	(49.1)
Total net loss and LAE	569.9	143.9	121.0	834.8
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	208.9	112.7	42.9	364.5
Underwriting (loss) profit ⁽¹⁾	\$ (57.1)	\$ 4.3	\$ (0.2)	\$ (53.0)
Loss ratio ⁽²⁾ :				
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	52.8%	54.7%	75.4%	56.4%
Current year catastrophe losses	32.2%	1.8%	- %	20.7%
Prior years	(6.0%)	(1.4%)	(1.5%)	(4.3%)
Total net loss and LAE	79.0%	55.1%	73.9%	72.8%
Expense ratio ⁽³⁾	28.9%	43.2%	26.2%	31.8%
Combined ratio ⁽⁴⁾	107.9%	98.3%	100.1%	104.6%

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2016	RSUI	CapSpecialty	PacificComp	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,056.4	\$ 266.5	\$ 139.8	\$ 1,462.7
Net premiums written	734.1	250.0	138.3	1,122.4
Net premiums earned	754.5	237.5	138.8	1,130.8
Net loss and LAE:				
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	391.4	122.8	104.7	618.9
Current year catastrophe losses	80.7	6.7	-	87.4
Prior years	(68.3)	(4.2)	(2.0)	(74.5)
Total net loss and LAE	403.8	125.3	102.7	631.8
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	212.3	107.3	38.7	358.3
Underwriting (loss) profit ⁽¹⁾	\$ 138.4	\$ 4.9	\$ (2.6)	\$ 140.7
Loss ratio ⁽²⁾ :				
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	51.9%	51.7%	75.4%	54.8%
Current year catastrophe losses	10.7%	2.8%	- %	7.7%
Prior years	(9.1%)	(1.8%)	(1.4%)	(6.6%)
Total net loss and LAE	53.5%	52.7%	74.0%	55.9%
Expense ratio ⁽³⁾	28.1%	45.2%	27.9%	31.7%
Combined ratio ⁽⁴⁾	81.6%	97.9%	101.9%	87.6%

Year Ended December 31, 2015	RSUI	CapSpecialty	PacificComp	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,148.4	\$ 236.6	\$ 103.1	\$ 1,488.1
Net premiums written	779.4	220.6	101.9	1,101.9
Net premiums earned	809.8	205.0	100.0	1,114.8
Net loss and LAE:				
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	414.6	106.7	76.6	597.9
Current year catastrophe losses	26.1	4.3	-	30.4
Prior years	(11.9)	4.7	-	(7.2)
Total net loss and LAE	428.8	115.7	76.6	621.1
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	222.9	94.3	36.9	354.1
Underwriting (loss) profit ⁽¹⁾	\$ 158.1	\$ (5.0)	\$ (13.5)	\$ 139.6
Loss ratio ⁽²⁾ :				

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	51.2%	52.1%	76.6%	53.6%
Current year catastrophe losses	3.2%	2.1%	- %	2.7%
Prior years	(1.5%)	2.3%	- %	(0.6%)
Total net loss and LAE	52.9%	56.5%	76.6%	55.7%
Expense ratio ⁽³⁾	27.5%	46.1%	36.9%	31.8%
Combined ratio⁽⁴⁾	80.4%	102.6%	113.5%	87.5%

(1) Underwriting profit represents net premiums earned less net loss and LAE and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses, all as determined in accordance with GAAP, and does not include net investment income, net realized capital gains, OTTI losses, other revenue, other operating expenses, corporate administration, amortization of intangible assets and interest expense. Underwriting profit is a non-GAAP financial measure and does not replace earnings before income taxes determined in accordance with GAAP as a measure of profitability. See Comment on Non-GAAP Financial Measures herein for additional detail on the presentation of our results of operations.

Table of Contents

- (2) The loss ratio is derived by dividing the amount of net loss and LAE by net premiums earned, all as determined in accordance with GAAP.
- (3) The expense ratio is derived by dividing the amount of commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses by net premiums earned, all as determined in accordance with GAAP.
- (4) The combined ratio is the sum of the loss ratio and the expense ratio, all as determined in accordance with GAAP. The combined ratio represents the percentage of each premium dollar a reinsurance or an insurance company has to spend on net loss and LAE, and commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses.

Insurance Segment: Premiums. The following table presents premiums for the insurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
RSUI					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,056.8	\$ 1,056.4	\$ 1,148.4	- %	(8.0%)
Net premiums written	724.4	734.1	779.4	(1.3%)	(5.8%)
Net premiums earned	721.7	754.5	809.8	(4.3%)	(6.8%)
CapSpecialty					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 290.2	\$ 266.5	\$ 236.6	8.9%	12.6%
Net premiums written	271.2	250.0	220.6	8.5%	13.3%
Net premiums earned	260.9	237.5	205.0	9.9%	15.9%
PacificComp					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 162.6	\$ 139.8	\$ 103.1	16.3%	35.6%
Net premiums written	160.2	138.3	101.9	15.8%	35.7%
Net premiums earned	163.7	138.8	100.0	17.9%	38.8%
Total					
Premiums written:					
Gross premiums written	\$ 1,509.6	\$ 1,462.7	\$ 1,488.1	3.2%	(1.7%)
Net premiums written	1,155.8	1,122.4	1,101.9	3.0%	1.9%
Net premiums earned	1,146.3	1,130.8	1,114.8	1.4%	1.4%

RSUI. Gross premiums written in 2017 approximated those from 2016, primarily reflecting declines in the property and most casualty lines of business in the first nine months of 2017 arising from an increase in competition, offset by 2017 fourth quarter growth, due to an increase in business opportunities and improved general market conditions, particularly in the property lines of business. The decrease in gross premiums written in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects declines in the property lines of business and, to a lesser extent, declines in RSUI's other lines of business, all due to an increase in competition and a reduction in pricing.

The decreases in net premiums earned in 2017 from 2016 and in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflect a general trend of declining gross premiums written prior to the fourth quarter of 2017.

CapSpecialty. The increase in gross premiums written in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects growth in the professional liability and miscellaneous medical lines of business due to CapSpecialty's distribution initiatives and expanded product offerings. The increase in gross premiums written in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects strong growth in the professional, environmental and construction lines of business due to CapSpecialty's distribution initiatives and, to a lesser extent, an increase in the surety lines of business.

The increases in net premiums earned in 2017 from 2016 and in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflect increases in gross premiums written.

PacificComp. The increases in gross premiums written and net premiums earned in 2017 from 2016 and in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflect premium growth due to PacificComp's distribution initiatives and growth in targeted segments of the workers' compensation market in the State of California.

Table of Contents

Insurance Segment: Net loss and LAE. The following table presents net loss and LAE for the insurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
(\$ in millions)					
RSUI					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 380.7	\$ 391.4	\$ 414.6	(2.7%)	(5.6%)
Current year catastrophe losses	232.4	80.7	26.1	188.0%	209.2%
Prior years	(43.2)	(68.3)	(11.9)	(36.7%)	473.9%
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 569.9	\$ 403.8	\$ 428.8	41.1%	(5.8%)
Loss ratio:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	52.8%	51.9%	51.2%		
Current year catastrophe losses	32.2%	10.7%	3.2%		
Prior years	(6.0%)	(9.1%)	(1.5%)		
Total net loss and LAE	79.0%	53.5%	52.9%		
CapSpecialty					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 142.7	\$ 122.8	\$ 106.7	16.2%	15.1%
Current year catastrophe losses	4.6	6.7	4.3	(31.3%)	55.8%
Prior years	(3.4)	(4.2)	4.7	(19.0%)	(189.4%)
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 143.9	\$ 125.3	\$ 115.7	14.8%	8.3%
Loss ratio:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	54.7%	51.7%	52.1%		
Current year catastrophe losses	1.8%	2.8%	2.1%		
Prior years	(1.4%)	(1.8%)	2.3%		
Total net loss and LAE	55.1%	52.7%	56.5%		
PacificComp					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 123.5	\$ 104.7	\$ 76.6	18.0%	36.7%
Current year catastrophe losses	-	-	-	-	-
Prior years	(2.5)	(2.0)	-	25.0%	-
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 121.0	\$ 102.7	\$ 76.6	17.8%	34.1%
Loss ratio:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	75.4%	75.4%	76.6%		
Current year catastrophe losses	- %	- %	- %		

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

Prior years	(1.5%)	(1.4%)	- %		
Total net loss and LAE	73.9%	74.0%	76.6%		
Total					
Net loss and LAE:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	\$ 646.9	\$ 618.9	\$ 597.9	4.5%	3.5%
Current year catastrophe losses	237.0	87.4	30.4	171.2%	187.5%
Prior years	(49.1)	(74.5)	(7.2)	(34.1%)	934.7%
Total net loss and LAE	\$ 834.8	\$ 631.8	\$ 621.1	32.1%	1.7%
Loss ratio:					
Current year (excluding catastrophe losses)	56.4%	54.8%	53.6%		
Current year catastrophe losses	20.7%	7.7%	2.7%		
Prior years	(4.3%)	(6.6%)	(0.6%)		
Total net loss and LAE	72.8%	55.9%	55.7%		

Table of Contents

RSUI. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects higher catastrophe losses. The decrease in net loss and LAE in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development and the impact of lower net premiums earned, partially offset by higher catastrophe losses.

Catastrophe losses in 2017 include \$86.6 million related to Hurricane Harvey in August 2017, \$97.6 million related to Hurricane Irma in September 2017 and \$20.1 million related to Hurricane Maria in September 2017. Catastrophe losses in 2017 also reflect losses from flooding in the State of California and severe weather primarily in the Southeastern and Midwestern U.S. Catastrophe losses in 2016 primarily reflect losses from flooding and severe weather primarily in the State of Texas in April and May, losses from wildfires in Alberta, Canada in May, losses from flooding and severe weather primarily in the State of Louisiana and the Midwestern U.S. in the third quarter, losses from wildfires in the State of Tennessee in November and \$26.8 million of losses from Hurricane Matthew, which caused property damage and flooding in the Southeast Coast of the U.S. in October. Catastrophe losses in 2015 primarily reflect several occurrences of severe weather in the Southeastern and Midwestern U.S.

Net loss and LAE in 2017, 2016 and 2015 include (favorable) unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development as presented in the table below:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Casualty	\$ (38.9) ⁽¹⁾	\$ (35.3) ⁽²⁾	\$ (2.9) ⁽³⁾
Property and other	(4.3) ⁽⁴⁾	(33.0) ⁽⁵⁾	(9.0) ⁽⁶⁾
Total	\$ (43.2)	\$ (68.3)	\$ (11.9)

- (1) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the umbrella/excess lines of business related to the 2005 through 2011 accident years.
- (2) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the umbrella/excess, general liability and professional liability lines of business related to the 2006 through 2012 accident years.
- (3) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the umbrella/excess, general liability and professional liability lines of business related to the 2006 through 2011 accident years, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the directors and officers liability lines of business related to the 2011 through 2014 accident years.
- (4) Primarily reflects favorable catastrophe prior accident year loss reserve development related to the 2016 accident year, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year property loss reserve development in the binding authority lines of business primarily related to the 2015 and 2016 accident years.
- (5) Includes favorable prior accident year loss reserve development of (\$20.6) million from Super Storm Sandy in 2012 and various other smaller amounts primarily from non-catastrophe property lines of business in recent accident years.
- (6) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year development of (\$4.1) million from Super Storm Sandy in 2012, net of reinsurance, and favorable prior accident year loss reserve development related to unallocated LAE reserves. The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017, 2016 and 2015 reflects favorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods. The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017 did not impact assumptions used in estimating RSUI's loss and LAE liabilities for business

earned in 2017.

CapSpecialty. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, higher 2017 accident year losses and less favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017. Catastrophe losses in 2017 include \$0.2 million related to Hurricane Harvey in August 2017 and \$0.2 million related to Hurricane Irma in September 2017. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, partially offset by favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2016 compared with unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2015.

Table of Contents

Net loss and LAE in 2017, 2016 and 2015 include (favorable) unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development as presented in the table below:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Ongoing lines of business	\$ (3.4) ⁽¹⁾	\$ (0.3)	\$ 11.0 ⁽²⁾
Terminated Program ⁽³⁾	-	(1.9)	(6.3)
Asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment liability	-	(2.0)	-
Total	\$ (3.4)	\$ (4.2)	\$ 4.7

(1) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the casualty lines of business related to the 2010, 2014, 2015 and 2016 accident years.

(2) Primarily reflects unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development related to the casualty lines of business from the 2011 through 2013 accident years.

(3) Represents certain specialty lines of business written through a program administrator in connection with a terminated program related to the 2010 and 2009 accident years and reflects (favorable) loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods for such business.

The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017 and 2016 reflects favorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods. The unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2015 reflects unfavorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods. The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017 did not impact assumptions used in estimating CapSpecialty's loss and LAE liabilities for business earned in 2017.

PacificComp. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, partially offset by an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development. The increase in net loss and LAE in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned, partially offset by favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2016.

The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017 relates primarily to the 2013 and prior accident years, and reflects favorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods. The favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2016 related primarily to the 2012 and prior accident years, and reflects favorable loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods.

Insurance Segment: Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses. The following table presents commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses for the insurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change 2017 vs 2016
	2017	2016	2015	
	(\$ in millions)			2016 vs 2015

RSUI

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 208.9	\$ 212.3	\$ 222.9	(1.6%)	(4.8%)
--	----------	----------	----------	--------	--------

Expense ratio	28.9%	28.1%	27.5%		
---------------	-------	-------	-------	--	--

CapSpecialty

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 112.7	\$ 107.3	\$ 94.3	5.0%	13.8%
--	----------	----------	---------	------	-------

Expense ratio	43.2%	45.2%	46.1%		
---------------	-------	-------	-------	--	--

PacificComp

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 42.9	\$ 38.7	\$ 36.9	10.9%	4.9%
--	---------	---------	---------	-------	------

Expense ratio	26.2%	27.9%	36.9%		
---------------	-------	-------	-------	--	--

Total

Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	\$ 364.5	\$ 358.3	\$ 354.1	1.7%	1.2%
--	----------	----------	----------	------	------

Expense ratio	31.8%	31.7%	31.8%		
---------------	-------	-------	-------	--	--

Table of Contents

RSUI. The decrease in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of lower net premiums earned and the impact of losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria on short-term incentive compensation expense accruals. The decrease in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of lower net premiums earned and relatively stable overhead expenses.

As decreases in net premiums earned exceeded the decreases in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses, RSUI's expense ratio increased in 2017 from 2016 and in 2016 from 2015.

CapSpecialty. The increases in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2017 from 2016 and in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflect the impact of higher net premiums earned and relatively stable overhead expenses.

PacificComp. The increase in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned and relatively stable overhead expenses. The increase in commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned and relatively stable overhead expenses, partially offset by the deferral of certain acquisition costs for new business commencing in 2016.

Insurance Segment: Underwriting profit. The following table presents our underwriting (loss) profit for the insurance segment.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
RSUI					
Underwriting (loss) profit	\$ (57.1)	\$ 138.4	\$ 158.1	(141.3%)	(12.5%)
Combined ratio	107.9%	81.6%	80.4%		
CapSpecialty					
Underwriting profit (loss)	\$ 4.3	\$ 4.9	\$ (5.0)	(12.2%)	(198.0%)
Combined ratio	98.3%	97.9%	102.6%		
PacificComp					
Underwriting loss	\$ (0.2)	\$ (2.6)	\$ (13.5)	(92.3%)	(80.7%)
Combined ratio	100.1%	101.9%	113.5%		
Total					
Underwriting (loss) profit	\$ (53.0)	\$ 140.7	\$ 139.6	(137.7%)	0.8%
Combined ratio	104.6%	87.6%	87.5%		

RSUI. The underwriting loss in 2017 compared with the underwriting profit in 2016 primarily reflects the impact of significant catastrophe losses from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria, as discussed above. The decrease in underwriting profit in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects higher catastrophe losses and the impact of lower net premiums earned, partially offset by an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, all as

discussed above.

CapSpecialty. The slight decrease in underwriting profit in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of higher 2017 accident year losses and less favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2017, partially offset by the impact of growing net premiums earned, all as discussed above. The underwriting profit in 2016 compared with the underwriting loss in 2015 primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2016, compared with unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2015, and the impact of higher net premiums earned, all as discussed above.

PacificComp. PacificComp reported underwriting losses in 2017, 2016 and 2015 primarily as a result of its expenses relative to comparatively low premiums earned. The decrease in underwriting loss in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the impact of growing net premiums earned and, to a lesser extent, an increase in favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, all as discussed above. The decrease in underwriting losses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the impact of growing net premiums earned, favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in 2016 and, to a lesser extent, the deferral of certain acquisition costs for new business commencing in 2016, all as discussed above.

Table of Contents**Total Reinsurance and Insurance Segments Investment Results**

The following table presents the investment results for our reinsurance and insurance segments.

	Year Ended December 31,			Percent Change	
	2017	2016	2015	2017 vs 2016	2016 vs 2015
	(\$ in millions)				
Net investment income	\$ 434.6	\$ 433.1	\$ 427.6	0.3%	1.3%
Net realized capital gains	85.7	159.9	242.6	(46.4%)	(34.1%)
Other than temporary impairment losses	(16.9)	(45.2)	(125.5)	(62.6%)	(64.0%)

Net Investment Income. The slight increase in net investment income in 2017 from 2016 primarily relates to higher interest income, partially offset by a decrease in income from other invested assets. The increase in interest income primarily reflects growth in funds withheld and commercial mortgage loan balances, higher yields on short term investments and floating-rate debt securities, as well as the fact that interest income in the fourth quarter of 2016 was reduced by approximately \$7 million of adjustments made to more accurately reflect premium amortization associated with certain bonds. The decrease in income from other invested assets primarily reflects losses incurred on our equity interests in Pillar arising from catastrophe losses incurred in August and September 2017 and a \$12.6 million charge on our equity investment in Ares. The charge on our equity investment in Ares reflects our share of a one-time payment recorded by Ares in early 2017 related to an acquisition by its affiliated entity. In connection with this acquisition, Ares agreed to make certain transaction support payments to the sellers of the acquired entity. Ares expects to receive future management fees derived from the assets under management of the acquired entity.

The slight increase in net investment income in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects higher interest income from funds withheld by cedants, partially offset by lower dividend income and lower income from other invested assets. Interest income was reduced in the fourth quarter of 2016 by approximately \$7 million of adjustments made to more accurately reflect premium amortization associated with certain bonds.

Net Realized Capital Gains. The decrease in net realized capital gains in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects lower gains for the equity and bond portfolio and a \$7.9 million write-down of certain Reinsurance Segment assets, partially offset by gains on the sale of certain exchange-traded funds in 2017 and an \$8.4 million pre-tax gain realized on the sale of PacificComp on December 31, 2017.

The decrease in net realized capital gains in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects lower gains from the sales of equity securities. Realized capital gains in 2015 include the sales of certain equity securities resulting from a partial restructuring of the equity securities portfolio, as well as the sales of certain equity securities which had their cost basis reduced in earlier periods for the recognition of OTTI losses.

Other Than Temporary Impairment Losses. OTTI losses in 2017 reflect \$16.9 million of unrealized losses that were deemed to be other than temporary and, as such, were required to be charged against earnings. Of the \$16.9 million of OTTI losses, \$15.1 million related to equity securities, primarily in the retail sector, and \$1.8 million related to debt securities. The determination that unrealized losses on equity and debt securities were other than temporary was primarily due to the duration of the decline in the fair value of equity and debt securities relative to their costs.

OTTI losses in 2016 reflect \$45.2 million of unrealized losses that were deemed to be other than temporary and, as such, were required to be charged against earnings. Of the \$45.2 million of OTTI losses, \$23.3 million related to equity securities, primarily in the retail, financial service, technology, chemical and entertainment sectors, and

\$21.9 million related to debt securities, primarily in the energy sector. The determination that unrealized losses on equity and debt securities were other than temporary was primarily due to the severity and duration of the decline in the fair value of equity and debt securities relative to their costs.

OTTI losses in 2015 reflect \$125.5 million of unrealized losses that were deemed to be other than temporary and, as such, were required to be charged against earnings. Of the \$125.5 million of OTTI losses, \$107.2 million related to equity securities, primarily in the energy, pharmaceutical, gaming and airline sectors, and \$18.3 million related to debt securities, primarily in the energy and financial service sectors. The determination that unrealized losses on equity and debt securities were other than temporary was primarily based on the fact that we lacked the intent to hold the securities for a period of time sufficient to allow for an anticipated recovery and, to a lesser extent, the duration of the decline in the fair value of equity securities relative to their costs.

Upon the ultimate disposition of the securities for which OTTI losses have been recorded, a portion of the loss may be recoverable depending on market conditions at the time of disposition. After adjusting the cost basis of securities for the recognition of OTTI losses, the remaining gross unrealized investment losses for debt and equity securities as of December 31, 2017 were deemed to be temporary, based on, among other factors: (i) the duration of time and the relative magnitude to which the fair values of these securities had been below cost were not indicative of an OTTI loss; (ii) the

Table of Contents

absence of compelling evidence that would cause us to call into question the financial condition or near-term business prospects of the issuers of the securities; and (iii) our ability and intent to hold the securities for a period of time sufficient to allow for any anticipated recovery.

See Note 4 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional detail on gross unrealized investment losses for debt and equity securities as of December 31, 2017.

Alleghany Capital Results

Alleghany Capital consists of: (i) manufacturing and service operations conducted through Bourn & Koch, Kentucky Trailer, IPS, Jazwares, W&WIAFCO Steel, beginning April 28, 2017, and a 45 percent equity interest in Wilbert, beginning August 1, 2017; (ii) oil and gas operations conducted through SORC and Alleghany Capital's investment in ORX until it was sold on December 23, 2016; and (iii) corporate operations and investments at the Alleghany Capital level.

On August 1, 2017, Alleghany Capital acquired a 45 percent equity interest in Wilbert. Wilbert is accounted for under the equity method of accounting and is included in other invested assets.

On April 28, 2017, Alleghany Capital acquired approximately 80 percent of the equity in W&WIAFCO Steel.

In July 2014, Alleghany Capital acquired a 30 percent equity interest in Jazwares. On April 15, 2016, Alleghany Capital acquired an additional 50 percent of Jazwares' outstanding equity, bringing its equity ownership interest to 80 percent and, as of that date, the results of Jazwares have been included in our consolidated results. Prior to April 15, 2016, Jazwares was accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

In October 2015, Alleghany Capital acquired a majority interest in IPS.

ORX was accounted for under the equity method of accounting.

The results of Alleghany Capital for 2017, 2016 and 2015 are presented below.

Year Ended December 31, 2017	Mfg. & Svcs.	Oil & Gas	Corp. & other	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Net investment income	\$ 1.7	\$ -	\$ 1.0	\$ 2.7
Net realized capital gains	2.1	(4.8)	20.9	18.2
Other than temporary impairment losses	-	-	-	-
Other revenue	896.1	10.0	0.8	906.9
Other operating expenses	829.8	36.1	15.1	881.0
Corporate administration	-	-	-	-
Amortization of intangible assets	20.9	-	-	20.9
Interest expense	4.0	-	-	4.0
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	\$ 45.2	\$ (30.9)	\$ 7.6	\$ 21.9

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

Adjusted EBITDA ⁽¹⁾	\$ 81.3	\$ (14.6)	\$ (13.3)	\$ 53.4
Less: depreciation expense	(10.9)	(11.5)	-	(22.4)
Less: amortization of intangible assets	(20.9)	-	-	(20.9)
Less: interest expense	(4.0)	-	-	(4.0)
Add: net realized capital gains	2.1	(4.8)	20.9	18.2
Adjustments to equity in earnings of Wilbert	(2.4)	-	-	(2.4)
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	\$ 45.2	\$ (30.9)	\$ 7.6	\$ 21.9

Table of Contents

Year Ended December 31, 2016	Mfg. & Svcs.	Oil & Gas	Corp. & other	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Net investment income	\$ 0.3	\$ -	\$ (2.6)	\$ (2.3)
Net realized capital gains	(0.4)	(98.8)	13.2	(86.0)
Other than temporary impairment losses	-	-	-	-
Other revenue	678.3	9.3	(0.5)	687.1
Other operating expenses	633.9	37.4	9.2	680.5
Corporate administration	-	-	-	-
Amortization of intangible assets	22.1	-	-	22.1
Interest expense	1.8	-	0.1	1.9
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	\$ 20.4	\$ (126.9)	\$ 0.8	\$ (105.7)
Adjusted EBITDA ⁽¹⁾	\$ 51.5	\$ (14.1)	\$ (12.3)	\$ 25.1
Less: depreciation expense	(6.8)	(14.0)	-	(20.8)
Less: amortization of intangible assets	(22.1)	-	-	(22.1)
Less: interest expense	(1.8)	-	(0.1)	(1.9)
Add: net realized capital gains	(0.4)	(98.8)	13.2	(86.0)
Adjustments to equity in earnings of Jazwares and ORX	-	-	-	-
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	\$ 20.4	\$ (126.9)	\$ 0.8	\$ (105.7)
Year Ended December 31, 2015	Mfg. & Svcs.	Oil & Gas	Corp. & other	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Net investment income	\$ 10.5	\$ (6.3)	\$ 1.2	\$ 5.4
Net realized capital gains	0.2	(25.8)	-	(25.6)
Other than temporary impairment losses	-	-	-	-
Other revenue	232.7	8.2	0.1	241.0
Other operating expenses	217.2	36.5	5.6	259.3
Corporate administration	-	-	-	-
Amortization of intangible assets	3.1	-	-	3.1
Interest expense	1.3	0.2	-	1.5
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	\$ 21.8	\$ (60.6)	\$ (4.3)	\$ (43.1)
Adjusted EBITDA ⁽¹⁾	\$ 30.0	\$ (25.3)	\$ (4.3)	\$ 0.4
Less: depreciation expense	(3.8)	(8.6)	-	(12.4)
Less: amortization of intangible assets	(3.1)	-	-	(3.1)
Less: interest expense	(1.3)	(0.2)	-	(1.5)
Add: net realized capital gains	0.2	(25.8)	-	(25.6)
Adjustments to equity in earnings of Jazwares and ORX	(0.2)	(0.7)	-	(0.9)

Earnings (losses) before income taxes	\$ 21.8	\$ (60.6)	\$ (4.3)	\$ (43.1)
---------------------------------------	---------	-----------	----------	-----------

(1) Adjusted EBITDA is a non-GAAP financial measure and does not replace earnings before income taxes determined in accordance with GAAP as a measure of profitability. See Comment on Non-GAAP Financial Measures herein for additional detail on the presentation of our results of operations. Adjusted EBITDA represents other revenue less certain other expenses, and does not include: (i) depreciation expense (a component of other operating expenses); (ii) amortization of intangible assets; (iii) interest expense; (iv) net realized capital gains; (v) OTTI impairment; and (vi) income taxes.

Table of Contents

The changes in Alleghany Capital's equity for 2017, 2016 and 2015 are presented below:

	Mfg. & Svcs.	Oil & Gas	Corp. & other	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
Equity as of December 31, 2014	\$ 164.3	\$ 169.1	\$ 20.1	\$ 353.5
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	21.8	(60.6)	(4.3)	(43.1)
Income taxes ⁽¹⁾	(1.2)	9.2	9.7	17.7
Net earnings attributable to noncontrolling interest	(1.9)	-	-	(1.9)
Capital contributions (returns of capital) and other	92.8	88.3	(9.1)	172.0
Equity as of December 31, 2015	275.8	206.0	16.4	498.2
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	20.4	(126.9)	0.8	(105.7)
Income taxes ⁽¹⁾	(0.1)	44.8	(6.1)	38.6
Net earnings attributable to noncontrolling interest	(3.8)	-	-	(3.8)
Capital contributions (returns of capital) and other ⁽²⁾	161.1	25.3	(23.2)	163.2
Equity as of December 31, 2016	453.4	149.2	(12.1)	590.5
Earnings (losses) before income taxes	45.2	(30.9)	7.6	21.9
Income taxes ⁽¹⁾	0.8	12.5	(10.8)	2.5
Net earnings attributable to noncontrolling interest	(10.4)	-	-	(10.4)
Capital contributions (returns of capital) and other ⁽³⁾	205.9	12.5	26.5	244.9
Equity as of December 31, 2017	\$ 694.9	\$ 143.3	\$ 11.2	\$ 849.4

(1) Income taxes for certain Alleghany Capital subsidiaries are incurred at the Alleghany Capital level.

(2) For 2016, includes the purchase of an additional 50 percent of Jazwares' outstanding equity on April 15, 2016.

(3) For 2017, primarily reflects the acquisition of W&WIAFCO Steel and the investment in Wilbert.

Net investment income. The increase in net investment income in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects Alleghany Capital's earnings from its Wilbert investment. The decrease in net investment income in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects a cessation of equity method income from Jazwares upon our acquisition of a majority interest on April 15, 2016 and losses on other invested assets in 2016, partially offset by the absence of losses from ORX in 2016.

Net realized capital gains. Net realized capital gains in 2017 primarily reflect a \$20.9 million capital gain due to a bulk settlement of certain contingent consideration obligations that were made by Alleghany Capital in connection with its acquisition Jazwares' outstanding equity, or the Jazwares Settlement Gain, partially offset by a \$4.8 million loss realized from the sale of a SORC legacy oil field on December 29, 2017. Net realized capital losses in 2016 primarily reflect a \$98.8 million capital loss due to an impairment charge from a write-down of certain SORC assets, partially offset by a gain of \$13.2 million recognized by Alleghany Capital on April 15, 2016 in connection with its

acquisition of an additional 50 percent equity ownership in Jazwares, when its pre-existing 30 percent equity ownership was remeasured at estimated fair value, or the Jazwares Remeasurement Gain.

The SORC assets that were written-down in 2016 relate specifically to SORC's acquisition of a certain legacy oil field for the sole purpose of applying enhanced oil recovery techniques. After completing construction of its underground facility in 2014, SORC commenced its drilling program in 2015. The drilling program, however, was delayed by third-party equipment problems that were subsequently corrected as well as a longer than expected trial-and-error process determining the optimum well completion technique for the reservoir, and efforts to address a lack of vertical permeability in the reservoir formation. SORC engaged a third-party petroleum engineering firm to provide an assessment of its oil-recovery prospects and based on this assessment and other factors including oil prices, SORC wrote-down its legacy oil field assets to estimated fair value as of December 31, 2016. On December 29, 2017, SORC sold this legacy oil field and recorded a realized capital loss of \$4.8 million.

Net realized capital losses in 2015 primarily reflect a \$25.8 million capital loss related to an impairment charge related to a write-off of our investment in ORX.

Other revenue and Other operating expenses. The increase in other revenue and other operating expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects the acquisition of W&WIAFCO Steel. The increase in other operating expenses in 2017 from

Table of Contents

2016 also reflects finder's fees, legal and accounting costs and other transaction-related expenses at the Alleghany Capital level. The increase in other revenue and other operating expenses in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the acquisition of IPS on October 31, 2015, the inclusion of Jazwares in our consolidated results as of April 15, 2016 and, to a lesser extent, growth at Kentucky Trailer.

Amortization of intangible assets. The decrease in amortization expenses in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects a decrease in amortization expense at IPS, as certain of IPS's intangible assets were fully amortized as of December 31, 2016, partially offset by amortization of net intangible assets related to the acquisition of W&WIAFCO Steel. The increase in amortization of intangible assets in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the amortization of intangible assets from the acquisitions of IPS and Jazwares.

Interest expense. The increase in interest expense in 2017 from 2016 reflects new or increased borrowings at Jazwares, IPS and Bourn & Koch and borrowings at W&WIAFCO Steel. Interest expense in 2016 approximated interest expense in 2015.

Earnings (losses) before income taxes. The earnings before income taxes in 2017 compared with the loss before income taxes in 2016 primarily reflects the Jazwares Settlement Gain, and the impairment charge from the write-down of certain SORC assets in 2016, partially offset by the Jazwares Remeasurement Gain, all as discussed above. Earnings before income taxes in 2017 also reflect higher margins of the manufacturing and service operations, the inclusion of W&WIAFCO Steel and our investment in Wilbert. The increase in losses before income taxes in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the large impairment charge from a write-down of certain SORC assets, partially offset by the acquisitions of IPS and Jazwares, growth at Kentucky Trailer, the Jazwares Remeasurement Gain in 2016 and the impairment charge related to a write-off of our investment in ORX in 2015, all as discussed above.

Corporate Activities Results

The primary components of corporate activities are Alleghany Properties and activities at the Alleghany parent company. The following table presents the results for corporate activities.

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Net premiums earned	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Net investment income	13.7	7.7	5.8
Net realized capital gains	3.3	(10.7)	(3.1)
Other than temporary impairment losses	-	-	(8.4)
Other revenue	5.9	7.3	2.9
Total revenues	22.9	4.3	(2.8)
Net loss and loss adjustment expenses	-	-	-
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	-	-	-
Other operating expenses	3.3	4.1	2.6
Corporate administration	45.3	42.0	45.6

Amortization of intangible assets	-	-	-
Interest expense	52.1	52.5	52.0
(Losses) earnings before income taxes	\$ (77.8)	\$ (94.3)	\$ (103.0)

Net investment income. The increase in net investment income in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects higher income from new investments in other invested assets resulting from the purchase of certain non-marketable equity investments at the Alleghany parent company. The increase in net investment income in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects higher income from other invested assets.

Net realized capital gains. The net realized capital gains in 2017 primarily reflect gains on the sale of certain exchange-traded funds. Net realized capital losses in 2016 primarily reflect the sale at a loss of equity securities in the mining and health care sectors. Net realized capital losses in 2015 primarily reflect the sale at a loss of equity securities in the energy sector.

Other than temporary impairment losses. OTTI losses in 2015 reflect unrealized losses related to equity securities held at the Alleghany parent company that were deemed to be other than temporary and, as such, were required to be charged against earnings.

Table of Contents

Other revenue. The decrease in other revenue in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects lower real estate sales activity at Alleghany Properties. The increase in other revenue in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects a gain on the sale of a retail shopping center by Alleghany Properties in 2016.

Corporate administration. The increase in corporate administration expense in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects higher long-term incentive compensation expense accruals at Alleghany, driven by the impact of unrealized appreciation on our equity and, to a lesser extent, bond portfolios, partially offset by losses arising from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. The decrease in corporate administration expense in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects lower long-term incentive compensation expense accruals due mainly to the impact of less favorable financial results, partially offset by the impact of an increase in the price per share of our common stock during 2016.

Interest expense. Interest expense in 2017, 2016 and 2015 was approximately the same.

(Losses) earnings before income taxes. The decrease in losses before income taxes in 2017 from 2016 primarily reflects realized capital gains in 2017, compared with realized capital losses in 2016, as well as higher net investment income, partially offset by an increase in corporate administration, all as discussed above. The decrease in losses before income taxes in 2016 from 2015 primarily reflects the absence of OTTI losses in 2016 which were significant in 2015, an increase in other revenue and a decrease in corporate administration, partially offset by an increase in realized capital losses, all as discussed above.

Reserve Review Process

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries analyze, at least quarterly, liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE established in prior years and adjust their expected ultimate cost, where necessary, to reflect favorable or unfavorable development in loss experience and new information, including, for certain catastrophe events, revised industry estimates of the magnitude of a catastrophe. Adjustments to previously recorded liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE, both favorable and unfavorable, are reflected in our financial results in the periods in which these adjustments are made and are referred to as prior accident year loss reserve development. The following table presents the reserves established in connection with the loss and LAE of our reinsurance and insurance segments on a gross and net basis by line of business. These reserve amounts represent the accumulation of estimates of ultimate loss (including for IBNR) and LAE.

	As of December 31, 2017			As of December 31, 2016			As of
	Gross Loss and LAE Reserves	Reinsurance Recoverables on Unpaid Losses	Net Loss and LAE Reserves	Gross Loss and LAE Reserves	Reinsurance Recoverables on Unpaid Losses (\$ in millions)	Net Loss and LAE Reserves	Gross Loss and LAE Reserves
Reinsurance Segment							
Property	\$ 1,758.0	\$ (493.7)	\$ 1,264.3	\$ 952.7	\$ (106.7)	\$ 846.0	\$ 884.7
Casualty & other ⁽¹⁾	7,370.0	(251.0)	7,119.0	7,324.4	(226.0)	7,098.4	7,283.5
	9,128.0	(744.7)	8,383.3	8,277.1	(332.7)	7,944.4	8,168.2

Insurance Segment							
Property	545.9	(225.9)	320.0	362.2	(186.8)	175.4	285.9
Casualty ⁽²⁾	2,078.6	(671.8)	1,406.8	2,083.1	(696.0)	1,387.1	2,033.0
Workers							
Compensation	1.5	-	1.5	241.2	(1.8)	239.4	190.1
All other ⁽³⁾	185.1	(75.5)	109.6	192.1	(87.4)	104.7	192.9
	2,811.1	(973.2)	1,837.9	2,878.6	(972.0)	1,906.6	2,701.9
Eliminations	(67.8)	67.8	-	(68.5)	68.5	-	(70.9)
Total	\$ 11,871.3	\$ (1,650.1)	\$ 10,221.2	\$ 11,087.2	\$ (1,236.2)	\$ 9,851.0	\$ 10,799.2

- (1) Primarily consists of the following reinsurance lines of business: directors and officers liability; errors and omissions liability; general liability; medical malpractice; ocean marine and aviation; auto liability; accident and health; surety; asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment liability; and credit.
- (2) Primarily consists of the following direct lines of business: umbrella/excess; directors and officers liability; professional liability; and general liability.
- (3) Primarily consists of commercial multi-peril and surety lines of business, as well as loss and LAE reserves for terminated lines of business and loss reserves acquired in connection with prior acquisitions for which the sellers provided loss reserve guarantees.

Table of Contents

Changes in Gross and Net Loss and LAE Reserves between December 31, 2017 and December 31, 2016. Gross and net loss and LAE reserves, and reinsurance recoverables as of December 31, 2017 increased from December 31, 2016, primarily reflecting significant catastrophe losses, partially offset by the sale of PacificComp, which closed on December 31, 2017. Catastrophe losses, net of reinsurance, in 2017 included \$217.7 million related to Hurricane Harvey in August 2017, \$252.1 million related to Hurricane Irma in September 2017, and \$216.8 million related to Hurricane Maria in September 2017, all as discussed above.

Changes in Gross and Net Loss and LAE Reserves between December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015. Gross and net loss and LAE reserves as of December 31, 2016 increased from December 31, 2015, reflecting increases in our reinsurance and insurance segments. The increase in gross and net loss and LAE reserves at our reinsurance segment primarily reflects the impact of higher net premiums earned and higher catastrophe losses, partially offset by favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, all as discussed above. The increase in gross and net loss and LAE reserves at our insurance segment primarily reflects higher 2016 accident year losses and higher catastrophe losses, partially offset by favorable prior accident year loss reserve development, all as discussed above.

Reinsurance Recoverables

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reinsure portions of the risks they underwrite in order to reduce the effect of individual or aggregate exposure to losses, manage capacity, protect capital resources, reduce volatility in specific lines of business, improve risk-adjusted portfolio returns and enable them to increase gross premium writings and risk capacity without requiring additional capital. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries purchase reinsurance and retrocessional coverages from highly-rated third-party reinsurers. If the assuming reinsurers are unable or unwilling to meet the obligations assumed under the applicable reinsurance agreements, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries would remain liable for such reinsurance portion not paid by these reinsurers. As such, funds, trust agreements and letters of credit are held to collateralize a portion of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries' reinsurance recoverables, and our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reinsure portions of the risks they underwrite or assume with multiple reinsurance programs.

As of December 31, 2017, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries had total reinsurance recoverables of \$1,746.5 million, consisting of \$1,650.1 million of ceded outstanding loss and LAE and \$96.4 million of recoverables on paid losses. See Part I, Item 1, Business Reinsurance Protection of this Form 10-K for additional information on the reinsurance purchased by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries.

Table of Contents

The following table presents information regarding concentration of our reinsurance recoverables and the ratings profile of our reinsurers as of December 31, 2017:

Reinsurer ⁽¹⁾	Rating ⁽²⁾	Amount (\$ in millions)	Percentage
Swiss Reinsurance Company	A+ (Superior)	\$ 154.2	8.8%
Syndicates at Lloyd's of London	A (Excellent)	133.8	7.7%
PartnerRe Ltd	A (Excellent)	119.4	6.8%
Fairfax Financial Holdings Ltd ⁽³⁾	A (Excellent)	101.5	5.8%
RenaissanceRe Holdings Ltd	A+ (Superior)	97.3	5.6%
W.R. Berkley Corporation	A+ (Superior)	88.2	5.1%
Chubb Corporation	A++ (Superior)	86.0	4.9%
Kane SAC Ltd ⁽⁴⁾	not rated	75.5	4.3%
Liberty Mutual	A (Excellent)	74.0	4.2%
Hannover Ruck SE	A+ (Superior)	55.4	3.2%
All other reinsurers		761.2	43.6%
Total reinsurance recoverables ⁽⁵⁾		\$ 1,746.5	100.0%
Secured reinsurance recoverables ⁽⁴⁾		\$ 525.7	30.1%

- (1) Reinsurance recoverables reflect amounts due from one or more reinsurance subsidiaries of the listed company.
 - (2) Represents the A.M. Best financial strength rating for the applicable reinsurance subsidiary or subsidiaries from which the reinsurance recoverable is due.
 - (3) In July 2017, Fairfax Financial Holdings Ltd acquired Allied World Assurance Company Holdings, AG.
 - (4) Represents reinsurance recoverables secured by funds held, trust agreements or letters of credit.
 - (5) Approximately 78 percent of our reinsurance recoverables balance as of December 31, 2017 was due from reinsurers having an A.M. Best financial strength rating of A (Excellent) or higher.
- We had no allowance for uncollectible reinsurance as of December 31, 2017.

Critical Accounting Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions about future events that directly affect our reported financial condition and operating performance. More specifically, these estimates and assumptions affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities as of the date of the financial statements, as well as the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. We rely on historical experience and on various other assumptions that we believe to be reasonable under the circumstances to make judgments about the carrying value of assets and liabilities that are not readily apparent from other sources. Actual results may differ materially from reported results to the extent that estimates and assumptions prove to be inaccurate.

We believe our most critical accounting estimates are those with respect to the liability for unpaid loss and LAE reserves, fair value measurements of certain financial assets, OTTI losses on investments, goodwill and other intangible assets and reinsurance premium revenues, as they require management's most significant exercise of judgment on both a quantitative and qualitative basis. The accounting estimates that result require the use of assumptions about certain matters that are highly uncertain at the time of estimation. To the extent actual experience differs from the assumptions used, our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows would be affected, possibly materially.

Unpaid Loss and LAE

Overview. The estimation of the liability for unpaid loss and LAE is inherently difficult and subjective, especially in view of changing legal and economic environments that impact the development of loss reserves, and therefore, quantitative techniques frequently have to be supplemented by subjective considerations and managerial judgment. In addition, trends that have affected development of liabilities in the past may not necessarily occur or affect liability development to the same degree in the future.

Table of Contents

Each of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries establishes reserves on its balance sheet for unpaid loss and LAE related to its property and casualty reinsurance and insurance contracts. As of any balance sheet date, there are claims that have not yet been reported, and some claims may not be reported for many years after the date a loss occurs. As a result of this historical pattern, the liability for unpaid loss and LAE includes significant estimates for IBNR claims. Additionally, reported claims are in various stages of the settlement process. Each claim is settled individually based upon its merits, and certain claims may take years to settle, especially if legal action is involved. As a result, the liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE include significant judgments, assumptions and estimates made by management relating to the actual ultimate losses that will arise from the claims. Due to the inherent uncertainties in the process of establishing these liabilities, the actual ultimate loss from a claim is likely to differ, perhaps materially, from the liability initially recorded.

As noted above, as of any balance sheet date, not all claims that have occurred have been reported to us, and if reported may not have been settled. The time period between the occurrence of a loss and the time it is settled is referred to as the claim tail. In general, actuarial judgments for shorter-tailed lines of business normally have much less of an effect on the determination of the loss reserve amount than when those same judgments are made regarding longer-tailed lines of business. Reported losses for the shorter-tailed classes, such as property classes, generally reach the ultimate level of incurred losses in a relatively short period of time. Rather than having to rely on actuarial assumptions for many accident years, these assumptions are generally only relevant for the more recent accident years. Therefore, these assumptions tend to be less critical and the reserves calculated pursuant to these assumptions are subject to less variability for the shorter-tailed lines of business.

For short-tail lines, loss reserves primarily consist of reserves for reported claims. The process of recording quarterly and annual liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE for short-tail lines is primarily focused on maintaining an appropriate reserve level for reported claims and IBNR. Specifically, we assess the reserve adequacy of IBNR in light of such factors as the current levels of reserves for reported claims and expectations with respect to reporting lags, catastrophe events, historical data, legal developments, and economic conditions, including the effects of inflation.

Standard actuarial methodologies employed to estimate ultimate losses incorporate the inherent lag from the time claims occur to when they are reported to an insurer and, if applicable, to when an insurer reports the claims to a reinsurer. Certain actuarial methodologies may be more appropriate than others in instances where this lag may not be consistent from period to period. Consequently, additional actuarial judgment is employed in the selection of methodologies to best incorporate the potential impact of this situation.

Our insurance operating subsidiaries provide coverage on both a claims-made and occurrence basis. Claims-made policies generally require that claims occur and be reported during the coverage period of the policy. Occurrence policies allow claims which occur during a policy's coverage period to be reported after the coverage period, and as a result, these claims can have a very long claim tail, occasionally extending for decades. Casualty claims can have a very long claim tail, in certain situations extending for many years. In addition, casualty claims are more susceptible to litigation and the legal environment and can be significantly affected by changing contract interpretations, all of which contribute to extending the claim tail. For long-tail casualty lines of business, estimating the ultimate liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE is a more complex process and depends on a number of factors, including the line and volume of the business involved. For these reasons, our insurance operating subsidiaries will generally use actuarial projections in setting reserves for all casualty lines of business.

While the reserving process is difficult for insurance business, the inherent uncertainties of estimating loss reserves are even greater for reinsurance business, due primarily to the longer-tailed nature of most of the reinsurance business, the diversity of development patterns among different types of reinsurance contracts, the necessary reliance on the ceding companies for information regarding reported claims and differing reserving practices among ceding

companies, which can be subject to change without notice. TransRe writes a significant amount of non-proportional assumed casualty reinsurance as well as proportional assumed reinsurance of excess liability business for classes such as medical malpractice, directors and officers liability, errors and omissions liability and general liability. Claims from such classes can exhibit greater volatility over time than most other classes due to their low frequency, high severity nature and loss cost trends that are more difficult to predict.

The estimation of unpaid loss and LAE for our reinsurance operations is principally based on reports and individual case estimates received from ceding companies. Data received from cedants is audited periodically by TransRe's claims and underwriting personnel, to help ensure that reported data is supported by proper documentation and conforms to contract terms, and is analyzed, as appropriate, by its underwriting and actuarial personnel. Such analysis often includes a detailed review of reported data to assess the underwriting results of assumed reinsurance and to explain any significant departures from expected performance. Over time, reported loss information is ultimately corroborated when the underlying claims are paid.

Table of Contents

In addition, the estimation of unpaid loss and LAE, including IBNR, for our reinsurance operations also takes into account assumptions with respect to many factors that will affect ultimate loss costs but are not yet known. The process by which actual carried reserves are determined considers not only actuarial estimates but a myriad of other factors. Such factors, both internal and external, which contribute to the variability and unpredictability of loss costs, include trends relating to jury awards, social trends, medical inflation, worldwide economic conditions, tort reforms, judicial interpretations of coverages, the regulatory environment, underlying policy pricing, terms and conditions and claims handling, among others. In addition, information gathered through underwriting and claims audits is also considered. We assess the reasonableness of our unpaid loss and LAE for our reinsurance operations using various actuarial methodologies, principally the paid development method, the reported loss development method and the Bornhuetter-Ferguson method as described below.

In conformity with GAAP, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are not permitted to establish reserves for catastrophe losses that have not occurred. Therefore, losses related to a significant catastrophe, or accumulation of catastrophes, in any reporting period could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition during that period.

We believe that the reserves for unpaid loss and LAE established by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are adequate as of December 31, 2017; however, additional reserves, which could have a material impact upon our financial condition, results of operations and cash flows, may be necessary in the future.

Methodologies and Assumptions. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries use a variety of techniques that employ significant judgments and assumptions to establish the liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE recorded at the balance sheet date. These techniques include detailed statistical analyses of past claims reporting, settlement activity, claims frequency, internal loss experience, changes in pricing or coverages and severity data when sufficient information exists to lend statistical credibility to the analyses. More subjective techniques are used when statistical data is insufficient or unavailable. These liabilities also reflect implicit or explicit assumptions regarding the potential effects of future inflation, court resolutions and judicial interpretations, reinsurance coverage, legislative changes and recent trends in such factors, as well as a number of actuarial assumptions that vary across our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries and across lines of business. This data is analyzed by line of business, coverage, accident year or underwriting year and reinsurance contract type, as appropriate.

Our loss reserve review processes use actuarial methods that vary by operating subsidiary and line of business and produce point estimates for each class of business. The actuarial methods used include the following methods:

Reported Loss Development Method: a reported loss development pattern is calculated based on historical loss development data, and this pattern is then used to project the latest evaluation of cumulative reported losses for each accident year or underwriting year, as appropriate, to ultimate levels;

Paid Development Method: a paid loss development pattern is calculated based on historical paid loss development data, and this pattern is then used to project the latest evaluation of cumulative paid losses for each accident year or underwriting year, as appropriate, to ultimate levels;

Expected Loss Ratio Method: expected loss ratios are applied to premiums earned, based on historical company experience, or historical insurance industry results when company experience is deemed not to be sufficient; and

Bornhuetter-Ferguson Method: the results from the Expected Loss Ratio Method are essentially blended with either the Reported Loss Development Method or the Paid Development Method.

The primary actuarial assumptions used by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries include the following:

Expected loss ratios represent management's expectation of losses, in relation to earned premium, at the time business is written, before any actual claims experience has emerged. This expectation is a significant determinant of the estimate of loss reserves for recently written business where there is little paid or incurred loss data to consider. Expected loss ratios are generally derived from historical loss ratios adjusted for the impact of rate changes, loss cost trends and known changes in the type of risks underwritten. For certain longer-tailed reinsurance business that are typically lower frequency, high severity classes, expected loss ratios are often used for the last several accident years or underwriting years, as appropriate.

Rate of loss cost inflation (or deflation) represents management's expectation of the inflation associated with the costs we may incur in the future to settle claims. Expected loss cost inflation is particularly important for longer-tailed classes.

Table of Contents

Reported and paid loss emergence patterns represent management's expectation of how losses will be reported and ultimately paid in the future based on the historical emergence patterns of reported and paid losses and are derived from past experience of our subsidiaries, modified for current trends. These emergence patterns are used to project current reported or paid loss amounts to their ultimate settlement value.

In the absence of sufficiently credible internally-derived historical information, each of the above actuarial assumptions may also incorporate data from the insurance or reinsurance industries as a whole, or peer companies writing substantially similar coverages. Data from external sources may be used to set expectations, as well as assumptions regarding loss frequency or severity relative to an exposure unit or claim, among other actuarial parameters. Assumptions regarding the application or composition of peer group or industry reserving parameters require substantial judgment.

Loss Frequency and Severity. Loss frequency and severity are measures of loss activity that are considered in determining the key assumptions described above. Loss frequency is a measure of the number of claims per unit of insured exposure, and loss severity is a measure of the average size of claims. Factors affecting loss frequency include the effectiveness of loss controls and safety programs, changes in economic conditions or weather patterns. Factors affecting loss severity include changes in policy limits, retentions, rate of inflation and judicial interpretations. Another factor affecting estimates of loss frequency and severity is the loss reporting lag, which is the period of time between the occurrence of a loss and the date the loss is reported to our reinsurance or insurance operating subsidiary. The length of the loss reporting lag affects their ability to accurately predict loss frequency, which are more predictable for lines with short reporting lags, as well as the amount of reserves needed for IBNR. If the actual level of loss frequency and severity is higher or lower than expected, the ultimate losses will be different than management's estimates. A small percentage change in an estimate can result in a material effect on our reported earnings. The following table presents the impact of changes, which could be favorable or unfavorable, in frequency and severity on our loss estimates for claims occurring in 2017:

Severity	Frequency		
	1.0%	5.0%	10.0%
	(\$ in millions)		
1.0%	\$ 78.7	\$ 237.0	\$ 434.8
5.0%	237.0	401.5	607.2
10.0%	434.8	607.2	822.7

Our net reserves for loss and LAE of \$10.2 billion as of December 31, 2017 relate to multiple accident years. Therefore, the impact of changes in frequency or severity for more than one accident year could be higher or lower than the amounts reflected above. We believe the above analysis provides a reasonable benchmark for sensitivity, as we believe it is within historical variation for our reserves. Currently, none of the scenarios is believed to be more likely than the other. See Note 1(k) and Note 6 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our loss and LAE.

Table of Contents

Prior Year Development. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries continually evaluate the potential for changes, both favorable and unfavorable, in their estimates of loss and LAE liabilities and use the results of these evaluations to adjust both recorded liabilities and underwriting criteria. With respect to liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE established in prior years, these liabilities are periodically analyzed and their expected ultimate cost adjusted, where necessary, to reflect favorable or unfavorable development in loss experience and new information, including, for certain catastrophic events, revised industry estimates of the magnitude of a catastrophe. Adjustments to previously recorded liabilities for unpaid loss and LAE, both favorable and unfavorable, are reflected in our financial results in the periods in which these adjustments are made and are referred to as prior accident year reserve development. We adjusted our prior year loss and LAE reserve estimates during 2017, 2016 and 2015 based on current information that differed from previous assumptions made at the time such loss and LAE reserves were previously estimated. The following table presents the (favorable) unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development for 2017, 2016 and 2015:

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
Reinsurance Segment			
Property:			
Catastrophe events	\$ (22.2) ⁽¹⁾	\$ (14.2) ⁽²⁾	\$ (28.0) ⁽³⁾
Non-catastrophe	(72.3) ⁽⁴⁾	(91.5) ⁽⁵⁾	(48.7) ⁽⁶⁾
Total property	(94.5)	(105.7)	(76.7)
Casualty & other:			
Malpractice Treaties ⁽⁷⁾	(5.0)	(10.8)	(12.1)
Ogden rate impact ⁽⁸⁾	24.4	-	-
Commuted A&E Liabilities ⁽⁹⁾	-	-	38.2
Other	(174.4) ⁽¹⁰⁾	(177.0) ⁽¹¹⁾	(157.7) ⁽¹²⁾
Total casualty & other	(155.0)	(187.8)	(131.6)
Total Reinsurance Segment	(249.5)	(293.5)	(208.3)
Insurance Segment			
RSUI:			
Casualty	(38.9) ⁽¹³⁾	(35.3) ⁽¹⁴⁾	(2.9) ⁽¹⁵⁾
Property and other	(4.3) ⁽¹⁶⁾	(33.0) ⁽¹⁷⁾	(9.0) ⁽¹⁸⁾
Total RSUI	(43.2)	(68.3)	(11.9)
CapSpecialty:			
Ongoing lines of business	(3.4) ⁽¹⁹⁾	(0.3)	11.0 ⁽²⁰⁾
Terminated Program ⁽²¹⁾	-	(1.9)	(6.3)
	-	(2.0)	-

Asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment liability			
Total CapSpecialty	(3.4)	(4.2)	4.7
PacificComp	(2.5) ⁽²²⁾	(2.0) ⁽²³⁾	-
Total incurred related to prior years	\$ (298.6)	\$ (368.0)	\$ (215.5)

- (1) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development from several catastrophes that occurred primarily in the 2016 accident year.
- (2) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development from several catastrophes that occurred in the 2010 through 2015 accident years.
- (3) Includes favorable prior accident year loss reserve development of (\$27.7) million from Super Storm Sandy in 2012 and various smaller amounts on catastrophes that occurred in the 2010, 2011, 2013 and 2014 accident years, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year development from the New Zealand earthquake in 2010.
- (4) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development primarily related to the 2011 through 2016 accident years.
- (5) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development primarily related to the 2011 through 2015 accident years.
- (6) Reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development primarily related to the 2013 and 2014 accident years.

Table of Contents

- (7) Represents the Malpractice Treaties pursuant to which the increased underwriting profits created by the favorable prior accident year loss reserve development are largely retained by the cedants. As a result, the favorable prior accident year loss reserve development is largely offset by an increase in profit commission expense incurred when such favorable prior accident year loss reserve development occurs.
- (8) Represents unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development arising from the U.K. Ministry of Justice's decision to significantly reduce the discount rate, referred to as the Ogden rate, used to calculate lump-sum bodily injury payouts in personal injury insurance claims in the U.K. As of March 20, 2017, the Ogden rate changed from 2.50 percent to negative 0.75 percent.
- (9) Represents unfavorable prior accident year development on Commuted A&E Liabilities related to the Commutation Agreement, as discussed above.
- (10) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in: (i) longer-tailed professional liability and general liability lines of business related to the 2003 through 2012 accident years; and (ii) shorter-tailed casualty lines of business related to the 2010 through 2014 accident years; partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in shorter-tailed casualty lines of business in the 2015 and 2016 accident years.
- (11) Generally reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development reserves in a variety of casualty & other lines of business primarily from the 2003 through 2015 accident years.
- (12) Generally reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in a variety of casualty & other lines of business primarily from the 2005 through 2014 accident years, including (\$30.7) million of favorable prior accident year development related to French medical malpractice loss reserves commuted in the fourth quarter of 2015 with a European cedant, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year development from the 2004 and prior accident years.
- (13) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the umbrella/excess lines of business related to the 2005 through 2011 accident years.
- (14) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the umbrella/excess, general liability and professional liability lines of business related to the 2006 through 2012 accident years.
- (15) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the umbrella/excess, general liability and professional liability lines of business related to the 2006 through 2011 accident years, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the directors' and officers' liability lines of business related to the 2011 through 2014 accident years.
- (16) Primarily reflects favorable catastrophe prior accident year loss reserve development related to the 2016 accident year, partially offset by unfavorable prior accident year property loss reserve development in the binding authority lines of business primarily related to the 2015 and 2016 accident years.
- (17) Includes favorable prior accident year loss reserve development of (\$20.6) million from Super Storm Sandy in 2012 and various other smaller amounts primarily from non-catastrophe property lines of business in recent accident years.
- (18) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year development of (\$4.1) million from Super Storm Sandy in 2012, net of reinsurance, and favorable prior accident year loss reserve development related to unallocated LAE reserves.
- (19) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development in the casualty lines of business related to the 2010, 2014, 2015 and 2016 accident years.
- (20) Primarily reflects unfavorable prior accident year loss reserve development related to the casualty lines of business from the 2011 through 2013 accident years.
- (21) Represents certain specialty lines of business written through a program administrator in connection with a terminated program related to the 2010 and 2009 accident years and reflects (favorable) loss emergence compared with loss emergence patterns assumed in earlier periods for such business.
- (22) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development related to the 2013 and prior accident years.

(23) Primarily reflects favorable prior accident year loss reserve development related to the 2012 and prior accident years.

Asbestos-Related Illness and Environmental Impairment Reserves. Loss and LAE include amounts for risks relating to asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment. The reserves carried for such claims, including the IBNR portion, are based upon known facts and current law at the respective balance sheet dates. However, significant uncertainty exists in determining the amount of ultimate liability for asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment losses. This uncertainty is due to, among other reasons, inconsistent and changing court resolutions and judicial interpretations with respect to underlying policy intent and coverage and uncertainties as to the allocation of responsibility for resultant damages, among other reasons. Further, possible future changes in statutes, laws, regulations, theories of liability and other factors could have a material effect on these liabilities and, accordingly, future earnings. Although we are unable at this time to determine whether additional reserves, which could have a material adverse effect upon our results of operations, may be necessary in the future, we believe that our asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment reserves are adequate as of December 31, 2017. See Note 12(c) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data and pages 42 and 43 of this Form 10-K for additional information on loss and LAE for risks relating to asbestos-related illness and environmental impairment.

Reinsurance. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries reinsure portions of the risks they underwrite in order to reduce the effect of individual or aggregate exposure to losses, manage capacity, protect capital resources, reduce volatility in specific lines of business, improve risk-adjusted portfolio returns and enable them to increase gross premium writings and risk capacity without requiring additional capital. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries purchase reinsurance and retrocessional coverages from highly-rated third-party reinsurers. If the assuming reinsurers are unable or unwilling to meet the obligations assumed under the applicable reinsurance agreements, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries would remain liable for such reinsurance portion not paid by these reinsurers. Recoverables recorded with respect to claims ceded to reinsurers under reinsurance contracts are predicated in large part on the estimates for unpaid losses and, therefore, are also subject to a significant degree of uncertainty. In addition to the factors cited above, reinsurance recoverables may prove uncollectible if a reinsurer is unable or unwilling to perform under a contract. Reinsurance purchased by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries does not relieve them of their obligations to their own policyholders or cedants. Additional information regarding the use of, and risks related to the use of reinsurance by our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries can be found on pages 44, 45, 57 and 58 of this Form 10-K. Also see Note 1(f) and Note 5 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our reinsurance recoverables.

Table of Contents***Fair Value Measurement of Certain Financial Assets***

Fair value is defined as the price that would be received upon the sale of an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between willing, able and knowledgeable market participants at the measurement date. Fair value measurements are not adjusted for transaction costs. In addition, a three-tiered hierarchy for inputs is used in management's determination of fair value of financial instruments that emphasizes the use of observable inputs over the use of unobservable inputs by requiring that the observable inputs be used when available. Observable inputs are market participant assumptions based on market data obtained from sources independent of the reporting entity. Unobservable inputs are the reporting entity's own assumptions about market participant assumptions based on the best information available under the circumstances. In assessing the appropriateness of using observable inputs in making our fair value determinations, we consider whether the market for a particular security is active or not based on all the relevant facts and circumstances. A market may be considered to be inactive if there are relatively few recent transactions or if there is a significant decrease in market volume. Furthermore, we consider whether observable transactions are orderly or not. We do not consider a transaction to be orderly if there is evidence of a forced liquidation or other distressed condition; as such, little or no weight is given to that transaction as an indicator of fair value.

A three-tiered hierarchy for inputs is used in management's determination of fair value of financial instruments that emphasizes the use of observable inputs over the use of unobservable inputs by requiring that the observable inputs be used when available. Assets classified as Level 3 principally include certain residential mortgage-backed securities, or RMBS, commercial mortgage-backed securities, or CMBS, other asset-backed securities (primarily, collateralized loan obligations), U.S. and foreign corporate bonds (including privately issued securities), partnership investments and non-marketable equity investments. The valuation of Level 3 assets requires the greatest degree of judgment, as these valuations are based on techniques that use significant inputs that are unobservable. These measurements may be made under circumstances in which there is little, if any, market activity for the asset. Our assessment of the significance of a particular input to the fair value measurement in its entirety requires judgment. In making the assessment, we consider factors specific to the asset.

Mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities are initially valued at the transaction price. Subsequently, we use widely accepted valuation practices that produce a fair value measurement. The vast majority of fair values are determined using an income approach. The income approach primarily involves developing a discounted cash flow model using the future projected cash flows of the underlying collateral, as well as other inputs described below. A few Level 3 valuations are based entirely on non-binding broker quotes. These securities consist primarily of mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities where reliable pool and loan level collateral information cannot be reasonably obtained, and as such, an income approach is not feasible.

Since Level 3 valuations are based on techniques that use significant inputs that are unobservable with little or no market activity, the fair values under the market approach for Level 3 securities are less credible than under the income approach; however, the market approach, where feasible, is used to corroborate the fair values determined by the income approach. The market approach primarily relies on the securities' relationships to quoted transaction prices for similarly structured instruments. To the extent that transaction prices for similarly structured instruments are not available for a particular security, other market approaches are used to corroborate the fair values determined by the income approach, including option adjusted spread analyses.

Unobservable inputs, significant to the measurement and valuation of mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities, are generally used in the income approach, and include assumptions about prepayment speed and collateral performance, including default, delinquency and loss severity rates. Significant changes to any one of these inputs, or combination of inputs, could significantly change the fair value measurement for these securities.

The impact of prepayment speeds on fair value is dependent on a number of variables including whether the securities were purchased at a premium or discount. A decrease in interest rates generally increases the assumed rate of prepayments, and an increase in interest rates generally decreases the assumed speed of prepayments. Increased prepayments increase the yield on securities purchased at a discount and reduce the yield on securities purchased at a premium. In a decreasing prepayment environment, yields on securities purchased at a discount are reduced but are increased for securities purchased at a premium. Changes in default assumptions on underlying collateral are generally accompanied by directionally similar changes in other collateral performance factors, but generally result in a directionally opposite change in prepayment assumptions.

Fair values for partnership and non-marketable equity investments are initially valued at the transaction price. Subsequently, fair value is based on the performance of the portfolio of investments or results of operations of the investee. Significant improvements or disruptions in the financial markets may result in directionally similar or opposite changes to the portfolio of the investee, depending on how management of the investee has correlated the portfolio of investments to the

Table of Contents

market. Also, any changes made by the investee to the investment strategy of the non-marketable equity investments could result in significant changes to fair value that have a positive or negative correlation to the performance observed in the equity markets. For those investments whose performance is based on the results of operations within a specific industry, significant events impacting that industry could materially impact fair value. Also, decisions and changes to strategy made by management of the investee could result in positive or negative outcomes, which could significantly impact the results of operations of the investee and subsequently fair value.

See Notes 1(b), 1(c), 3 and 4 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our investments and fair value.

Investment Impairment

The determination that an investment has incurred an OTTI loss in value requires the judgment of management and consideration of the fundamental condition of the issuer, its near-term business prospects and all the relevant facts and circumstances.

We hold our equity and debt securities as available-for-sale, or AFS, and as such, these securities are recorded at fair value. We continually monitor the difference between cost and the estimated fair value of our equity and debt investments, which involves uncertainty as to whether declines in value are temporary in nature. The analysis of a security's decline in value is performed in its functional currency. If the decline is deemed temporary, we record the decline as an unrealized loss in stockholders' equity. If the decline is deemed to be other than temporary, we write our cost-basis or amortized cost-basis down to the fair value of the security and record an OTTI loss on our statement of earnings. In addition, any portion of such decline related to a debt security that is believed to arise from factors other than credit is recorded as a component of other comprehensive income rather than charged against earnings.

Management's assessment of equity securities initially involves an evaluation of all securities that are in an unrealized loss position, regardless of the duration or severity of the loss, as of the applicable balance sheet date. Such initial review consists primarily of assessing whether: (i) there has been a negative credit or news event with respect to the issuer that could indicate the existence of an OTTI; and (ii) we have the ability and intent to hold an equity security for a period of time sufficient to allow for an anticipated recovery (generally considered to be 12 months from the balance sheet date).

To the extent that an equity security in an unrealized loss position is not impaired based on the initial review described above, we then further evaluate such equity security and deem it to be other than temporarily impaired if it has been in an unrealized loss position for 12 months or more or if its unrealized loss position is greater than 50 percent of its cost, absent compelling evidence to the contrary.

We then evaluate those equity securities where the unrealized loss is at least 20 percent of cost as of the balance sheet date or that have been in an unrealized loss position continuously for six months or more preceding the balance sheet date. This evaluation takes into account quantitative and qualitative factors in determining whether such securities are other than temporarily impaired including: (i) market valuation metrics associated with the equity security (such as dividend yield and price-to-earnings ratio); (ii) current views on the equity security, as expressed by either our internal stock analysts and/or by third-party stock analysts or rating agencies; and (iii) credit or news events associated with a specific issuer, such as negative news releases and rating agency downgrades with respect to the issuer of the equity security.

Debt securities in an unrealized loss position are evaluated for OTTI if they meet any of the following criteria: (i) they are trading at a discount of at least 20 percent to amortized cost for an extended period of time (nine consecutive

months or more); (ii) there has been a negative credit or news event with respect to the issuer that could indicate the existence of an OTTI; or (iii) we intend to sell or it is more likely than not that we will sell the debt security before recovery of its amortized cost basis.

If we intend to sell or it is more likely than not that we will sell a debt security before recovery of its amortized cost basis, the total amount of the unrealized loss position is recognized as an OTTI loss in earnings. To the extent that a debt security that is in an unrealized loss position is not impaired based on the preceding, we will consider a debt security to be impaired when we believe it to be probable that we will not be able to collect the entire amortized cost basis. For debt securities in an unrealized loss position as of the end of each quarter, we develop a best estimate of the present value of expected cash flows. If the results of the cash flow analysis indicate that we will not recover the full amount of its amortized cost basis in the debt security, we record an OTTI loss in earnings equal to the difference between the present value of expected cash flows and the amortized cost basis of the debt security. If applicable, the difference between the total unrealized loss position on the debt security and the OTTI loss recognized in earnings is the non-credit related portion, which is recorded as a component of other comprehensive income.

In developing the cash flow analyses for debt securities, we consider various factors for the different categories of debt securities. For municipal bonds, we take into account the taxing power of the issuer, source of revenue, credit risk and

Table of Contents

enhancements and pre-refunding. For mortgage and asset-backed securities, we discount our best estimate of future cash flows at an effective rate equal to the original effective yield of the security or, in the case of floating rate securities, at the current coupon. Our models include assumptions about prepayment speeds, default and delinquency rates, underlying collateral (if any), credit ratings, credit enhancements and other observable market data. For corporate bonds, we review business prospects, credit ratings and available information from asset managers and rating agencies for individual securities.

We may ultimately record a realized loss after having originally concluded that the decline in value was temporary. Risks and uncertainties are inherent in the methodology. Our methodology for assessing other than temporary declines in value contains inherent risks and uncertainties which could include, but are not limited to, incorrect assumptions about financial condition, liquidity or future prospects, inadequacy of any underlying collateral and unfavorable changes in economic conditions or social trends, interest rates or credit ratings.

See Note 1(b) and Note 4(e) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our investments and investment impairments.

Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets

Goodwill and other intangible assets, net of amortization, are recorded as a consequence of business acquisitions. Goodwill represents the excess, if any, of the amount paid to acquire subsidiaries and other businesses over the fair value of their net assets as of the date of acquisition. Other intangible assets are recorded at their fair value as of the acquisition date. A significant amount of judgment is needed to determine the fair value as of the date of acquisition of other intangible assets and the net assets acquired in a business acquisition. The determination of the fair value of other intangible assets and net assets often involves the use of valuation models and other estimates, which involve many assumptions and variables and are inherently subjective. Other intangible assets that are not deemed to have an indefinite useful life are amortized over their estimated useful lives. Goodwill and intangible assets that have an indefinite useful life are not subject to amortization.

Goodwill and other intangible assets deemed to have an indefinite useful life are tested annually in the fourth quarter of every year for impairment. Goodwill and other intangible assets are also tested whenever events and changes in circumstances suggest that the carrying amount may not be recoverable. A significant amount of judgment is required in performing goodwill and other intangible asset impairment tests. These tests may include estimating the fair value of our subsidiaries, which include Alleghany Capital's operating subsidiaries, and other intangible assets. If it is determined that an asset has been impaired, the asset is written down by the amount of the impairment, with a corresponding charge to net earnings. Subsequent reversal of any impairment charge is not permitted.

With respect to goodwill, a qualitative assessment is first made to determine whether it is necessary to perform quantitative testing. This initial assessment includes, among other factors, consideration of: (i) past, current and projected future earnings and equity; (ii) recent trends and market conditions; and (iii) valuation metrics involving similar companies that are publicly-traded and acquisitions of similar companies, if available. If this initial qualitative assessment indicates that the fair value of an operating subsidiary of ours may be less than its carrying amount, a second step is taken, involving a comparison between the estimated fair values of our operating subsidiary with its respective carrying amount including goodwill. Under GAAP, fair value refers to the amount for which the entire operating subsidiary may be bought or sold. The methods for estimating the fair value of an operating subsidiary values include asset and liability fair values and other valuation techniques, such as discounted cash flows and multiples of earnings or revenues. All of these methods involve significant estimates and assumptions. If the carrying value exceeds estimated fair value, there is an indication of potential impairment, and a third step is performed to

measure the amount of impairment. The third step involves calculating an implied fair value of goodwill by measuring the excess of the estimated fair value of the operating subsidiary over the aggregate estimated fair value of the individual assets less liabilities. If the carrying value of goodwill exceeds the implied fair value of goodwill, an impairment charge is recorded for the excess.

Our consolidated balance sheet as of December 31, 2017 includes goodwill of \$334.9 million related primarily to W&WIAFCO Steel, Jazwares, IPS, RSUI, CapSpecialty, Bourn & Koch and Kentucky Trailer, and intangible assets, net of amortization, of \$459.0 million related primarily to TransRe, W&WIAFCO Steel, Jazwares, IPS, RSUI, CapSpecialty, Bourn & Koch and Kentucky Trailer. See Note 1(i) and Note 2 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our goodwill and other intangible assets.

Table of Contents***Reinsurance Premium Revenues***

We must make certain judgments in the determination of assumed reinsurance premiums written and earned. For pro rata contracts, premiums written and earned are generally based on reports received from ceding companies. For excess-of-loss contracts, premiums are generally recorded as written based on contract terms and are earned ratably over the periods the related coverages are provided. Unearned premiums and ceded unearned premiums represent the portion of gross premiums written and ceded premiums written, respectively, relating to the unexpired periods of such coverages. The relationship between net premiums written and net premiums earned will, therefore, generally vary depending on the volume and inception dates of the business assumed and ceded and the mix of such business between pro rata and excess-of-loss reinsurance.

Premiums written and earned, along with related costs, for which data have not been reported by the ceding companies, are estimated based on historical patterns and other relevant factors. Such estimates of premiums earned are considered when establishing the IBNR portion of loss reserves. The differences between these estimates and actual data subsequently reported, which may be material as a result of the diversity of cedants and reporting practices and the inherent difficulty in estimating premium inflows, among other factors, are recorded in the period when actual data become available and such differences may materially affect our results of operations.

Other Accounting Estimates

In addition to the policies described above which contain critical accounting estimates, our other accounting policies are described in Note 1 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K. The accounting policies described in Note 1 require us to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses, and related disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities that do not meet the level of materiality required for a determination that the accounting policy includes critical accounting estimates. On an ongoing basis, we evaluate our estimates, including those related to the value of deferred acquisition costs, incentive compensation, income taxes, pension benefits and contingencies and litigation. Our estimates are based on historical experience and on various other assumptions that are believed to be reasonable under the circumstances. Our actual results may differ from these estimates under different assumptions or conditions.

Financial Condition***Parent Level***

General. In general, we follow a policy of maintaining a relatively liquid financial condition at our unrestricted holding companies. This policy has permitted us to expand our operations through internal growth at our subsidiaries and through acquisitions of, or substantial investments in, operating companies. As of December 31, 2017, we held total marketable securities and cash of \$1,383.4 million, compared with \$1,047.4 million as of December 31, 2016. The increase in 2017 primarily reflects cash consideration received in connection with the sale of PacificComp, as further described below, and the receipt of dividends from TransRe and RSUI, partially offset by contributions to Alleghany Capital to fund the acquisition of approximately 80 percent of the equity in W&WIAFCO Steel and the 45 percent equity interest in Wilbert, as well as the purchase of certain non-marketable equity investments at the Alleghany parent company. The \$1,383.4 million is comprised of \$577.8 million at the Alleghany parent company, \$721.6 million at AIHL and \$84.0 million at the TransRe holding company. We also hold certain non-marketable investments at our unrestricted holding companies. We believe that we have and will have adequate internally generated funds, cash resources and unused credit facilities to provide for the currently foreseeable needs of our business, and we had no material commitments for capital expenditures as of December 31, 2017.

Stockholders' equity attributable to Alleghany stockholders was approximately \$8.5 billion as of December 31, 2017, compared with approximately \$7.9 billion as of December 31, 2016. The increase in stockholders' equity in 2017 primarily reflects an increase in unrealized appreciation on our equity and, to a lesser extent, bond portfolios, as well as net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders in 2017. Net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders in 2017 were reduced by significant catastrophe losses from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria at our reinsurance and insurance segments, as discussed above. As of December 31, 2017, we had 15,390,500 shares of our common stock outstanding, compared with 15,410,164 shares of our common stock outstanding as of December 31, 2016.

Table of Contents

Sale of Subsidiary. On September 12, 2017, AIHL signed a definitive agreement to sell PacificComp to CopperPoint for total cash consideration of approximately \$158 million. The transaction closed on December 31, 2017, at which time: (i) approximately \$442 million of PacificComp assets, consisting primarily of debt securities, and approximately \$316 million of PacificComp liabilities, consisting primarily of loss and LAE reserves, were transferred; and (ii) AIHL recorded an after-tax gain of approximately \$16 million, which included a tax benefit. In connection with the transaction, AIHL Re will continue to provide adverse development reinsurance coverage on PacificComp's pre-acquisition claims, subject to certain terms and conditions. AIHL Re's obligations, which are guaranteed by Alleghany, are subject to: (i) an aggregate limit of \$150.0 million; and (ii) a final commutation and settlement as of December 31, 2024.

Debt. On September 9, 2014, we completed a public offering of \$300.0 million aggregate principal amount of our 4.90% senior notes due on September 15, 2044, or the 2044 Senior Notes. The 2044 Senior Notes are unsecured and unsubordinated general obligations of Alleghany. Interest on the 2044 Senior Notes is payable semi-annually on March 15 and September 15 of each year. The terms of the 2044 Senior Notes permit redemption prior to their maturity. The indenture under which the 2044 Senior Notes were issued contains covenants that impose conditions on our ability to create liens on, or engage in sales of, the capital stock of AIHL, TransRe or RSUI. The 2044 Senior Notes were issued at approximately 99.3 percent of par, resulting in proceeds after underwriting discount, commissions and other expenses of \$294.3 million and an effective yield of approximately 5.0 percent.

On June 26, 2012, we completed a public offering of \$400.0 million aggregate principal amount of our 4.95% senior notes due on June 27, 2022, or the 2022 Senior Notes. The 2022 Senior Notes are unsecured and unsubordinated general obligations of Alleghany. Interest on the 2022 Senior Notes is payable semi-annually on June 27 and December 27 of each year. The terms of the 2022 Senior Notes permit redemption prior to their maturity. The indenture under which the 2022 Senior Notes were issued contains covenants that impose conditions on our ability to create liens on, or engage in sales of, the capital stock of AIHL, TransRe or RSUI. The 2022 Senior Notes were issued at approximately 99.9 percent of par, resulting in proceeds after underwriting discount, commissions and other expenses of \$396.0 million and an effective yield of approximately 5.05 percent.

On September 20, 2010, we completed a public offering of \$300.0 million aggregate principal amount of our 5.625% senior notes due on September 15, 2020, or the 2020 Senior Notes. The 2020 Senior Notes are unsecured and unsubordinated general obligations of Alleghany. Interest on the 2020 Senior Notes is payable semi-annually on March 15 and September 15 of each year. The terms of the 2020 Senior Notes permit redemption prior to their maturity. The indenture under which the 2020 Senior Notes were issued contains covenants that impose conditions on our ability to create liens on, or engage in sales of, the capital stock of AIHL, TransRe or RSUI. The 2020 Senior Notes were issued at approximately 99.6 percent of par, resulting in proceeds after underwriting discount, commissions and other expenses of \$298.9 million and an effective yield of approximately 5.67 percent.

On April 13, 2015, S&P upgraded Alleghany's issuer credit rating to BBB+ from BBB, on January 27, 2016, Moody's upgraded Alleghany's issuer credit ratings to Baa1 from Baa2 and on August 19, 2016, A.M. Best upgraded Alleghany's issuer credit rating to a- from bbb+.

Credit Agreement. On July 31, 2017, we entered into a five-year credit agreement, or the Credit Agreement, with certain lenders party thereto, which provides for an unsecured revolving credit facility in an aggregate principal amount of up to \$300.0 million. The credit facility is scheduled to expire on July 31, 2022, unless earlier terminated. Borrowings under the Credit Agreement will be available for working capital and general corporate purposes, including permitted acquisitions and repurchases of Common Stock. Borrowings under the Credit Agreement bear a floating rate of interest based in part on our credit rating, among other factors. The Credit Agreement contains representations, warranties and covenants customary for bank loan facilities of this nature. There were no borrowings

under the Credit Agreement from July 31, 2017 through December 31, 2017.

The Credit Agreement contains representations, warranties and covenants customary for bank loan facilities of this nature and substantially similar to the Prior Credit Agreement. In this regard, the Credit Agreement requires Alleghany to, among other things, (x) maintain consolidated net worth of not less than the sum of (i) \$5.3 billion plus (ii) 50% of the cumulative consolidated net income earned in each fiscal quarter thereafter (if positive) commencing with the fiscal quarter ending June 30, 2017 and (y) maintain a ratio of consolidated total indebtedness to consolidated capital as of the end of each fiscal quarter of not greater than 0.35 to 1.0. Additionally, the Credit Agreement contains various negative covenants with which Alleghany must comply, including, but not limited to, limitations respecting: the creation of liens on any property or asset; the incurrence of indebtedness; mergers, consolidations, liquidations and dissolutions; change of business; sales of assets; transactions with affiliates; and other provisions customary in similar types of agreements.

If an event of default occurs, then, to the extent permitted in the Credit Agreement, the lenders may direct the administrative agent to, or the administrative agent may, with the consent of lenders holding more than 50% of the aggregate

Table of Contents

outstanding principal amount of the loans, as applicable, terminate the commitments, accelerate the repayment of any outstanding loans and exercise all rights and remedies available to such lenders under the Credit Agreement and applicable law. In the case of an event of default that exists due to the occurrence of certain involuntary or voluntary bankruptcy, insolvency or reorganization events of Alleghany, the commitments will automatically terminate and the repayment of any outstanding loans shall be automatically accelerated.

The Credit Agreement replaced our previous four-year credit agreement, or the Prior Credit Agreement, which provided for an unsecured revolving credit facility in an aggregate principal amount of up to \$200.0 million. The Prior Credit Agreement was terminated on July 31, 2017 in advance of its scheduled October 15, 2017 expiration date. There were no borrowings under the Prior Credit Agreement in the seven months ended July 31, 2017.

Dividends from Subsidiaries. As of December 31, 2017, approximately \$6.6 billion of our total equity of \$8.5 billion was unavailable for dividends or advances to us from our subsidiaries. The remaining \$1.9 billion was available for dividends or advances to us from our subsidiaries, or was retained at the Alleghany parent level and, as such, was available to pay dividends to Alleghany's stockholders as of December 31, 2017.

The ability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to pay dividends or other distributions is subject to the laws and regulations applicable to each subsidiary, as well as each subsidiary's need to maintain capital requirements adequate to maintain its operations and financial strength ratings issued by independent rating agencies.

In the U.S., our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are subject to insurance laws and regulations that restrict the amount and timing of dividends they may pay without the prior approval of regulatory authorities. Under the insurance holding company laws and regulations, our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries may not pay an extraordinary dividend without the approval of state insurance regulators. In general, an extraordinary dividend or distribution is defined as a dividend or distribution that, together with other dividends and distributions made within the preceding 12 months, exceeds the lesser (or, in some jurisdictions, the greater) of (i) 10 percent of the statutory surplus of the reinsurer or insurer as of the end of the prior calendar year (or, in certain states, as of the end of the prior quarter) and (ii) the net income during the prior calendar year (or, in certain states, the adjusted statutory net investment income). In addition, certain states where Alleghany's reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries are domiciled prohibit a domestic insurance company from paying dividends except out of earned surplus.

TransRe's operations are also regulated in various foreign jurisdictions with respect to currency, amount and type of security deposits, amount and type of reserves and amount and type of local investment. Regulations governing constitution of technical reserves and remittance balances in some countries may hinder remittance of profits and repatriation of assets. International operations and assets held abroad may also be adversely affected by political and other developments in foreign countries, including possible tax changes, nationalization and changes in regulatory policy, as well as by consequences of hostilities and unrest. The risks of such occurrences and their overall effect upon TransRe vary from country to country and cannot easily be predicted.

The following table presents the dividends paid to Alleghany by its reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries in 2017, 2016 and 2015:

	2017 ⁽¹⁾	As of December 31, 2016	2015
	(\$ in millions)		
TransRe ⁽²⁾	\$ 225.0	\$ 375.0	\$ 250.0

RSUI		75.0	100.0	150.0
Total	\$	300.0	\$ 475.0	\$ 400.0

(1) Dividends to Alleghany were reduced as a consequence of significant TransRe and RSUI catastrophe losses in the third quarter of 2017.

(2) In 2017, 2016 and 2015, TRC paid dividends of \$270.0 million, \$350.0 million and \$400.0 million, respectively, to the TransRe holding company.

As of December 31, 2017, a maximum amount of \$37.1 million was available for dividends by TRC without prior approval of the applicable regulatory authorities.

Common Stock Repurchases. In July 2014, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of shares of our common stock at such times and at prices as management determines to be advisable, up to an aggregate of \$350.0 million, or the

Table of Contents

2014 Repurchase Program. In November 2015, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase, upon the completion of the 2014 Repurchase Program, of additional shares of our common stock, at such times and at prices as management determines to be advisable, up to an aggregate of \$400.0 million, or the 2015 Repurchase Program. In the first quarter of 2016, we completed the 2014 Repurchase Program and subsequent repurchases have been made pursuant to the 2015 Repurchase Program. As of December 31, 2017, we had \$363.2 million remaining under our share repurchase authorization.

The following table presents the shares of our common stock that we repurchased in 2017, 2016 and 2015 pursuant to the 2014 Repurchase Program and the 2015 Repurchase Program, as applicable:

	As of December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
Shares repurchased	29,704	142,186	520,466
Cost of shares repurchased (in millions)	\$ 16.0	\$ 68.3	\$ 243.8
Average price per share repurchased	\$ 540.25	\$ 480.49	\$ 468.45

Dividends. From 1999 through 2011, we declared stock dividends in lieu of cash dividends every year. Our Board of Directors determined not to declare a dividend, cash or stock, for 2012 through 2017.

Capital Contributions. From time to time, we make capital contributions to our subsidiaries. In 2017, we made a \$4.0 million contribution to PacificComp prior to its sale on December 31, 2017, and we also made aggregate capital contributions of \$248.7 million to Alleghany Capital to: (i) acquire approximately 80 percent of the equity in W&WIAFCO Steel for \$163.9 million (excluding amounts for transaction costs and estimates of future amounts payable); (ii) acquire a 45 percent equity interest in Wilbert for \$72.3 million; and (iii) contribute \$12.5 million to SORC for purposes of ongoing operations. In 2016, we made capital contributions of \$24.0 million to PacificComp to provide additional capital support and an aggregate of \$147.4 million to Alleghany Capital to: (i) acquire an additional 50 percent of Jazwares outstanding equity for \$122.1 million (excluding amounts for transaction costs and estimates of future amounts payable); and (ii) make \$25.3 million of capital contributions to SORC for purposes of ongoing operations. In 2015, we made an aggregate of \$178.1 million capital contributions to Alleghany Capital to: (i) make \$88.2 million of capital contributions to SORC for purposes of funding an acquisition and ongoing operations; and (ii) make an \$89.9 million investment in IPS (excluding amounts for transaction costs and estimates of future amounts payable). We expect that we will continue to make capital contributions to our subsidiaries from time to time in the future for similar or other purposes.

Contractual Obligations. We have certain obligations to make future payments under contracts and credit-related financial instruments and commitments. The following table presents certain long-term aggregate contractual obligations and credit-related financial commitments as of December 31, 2017:

Contractual Obligations	Total	Within 1 Year	More than 1	More than 3	More than 5
			Year but Within 3 Years	Year but Within 5 Years	
	\$ 11,871.3	\$ 3,197.7	\$ 3,621.0	\$ 1,916.6	\$ 3,136.0

(\$ in millions)

Loss and LAE

Senior Notes ⁽¹⁾ and other debt and related interest	2,603.3	86.0	538.5	527.4	1,451.4
Operating lease obligations	314.3	37.6	67.6	52.4	156.7
Investments ⁽²⁾	96.5	20.9	37.8	37.8	-
Other long-term liabilities ⁽³⁾	367.8	113.8	58.7	28.4	166.9
Total	\$ 15,253.2	\$ 3,456.0	\$ 4,323.6	\$ 2,562.6	\$ 4,911.0

(1) Senior Notes refers to: (i) the Alleghany Senior Notes, consisting of the 2020 Senior Notes, the 2022 Senior Notes and the 2044 Senior Notes; and (ii) TransRe's 8.00% senior notes due on November 30, 2039. See Note 8 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on the Senior Notes and other debt.

(2) Primarily reflect capital commitments to investment partnerships.

(3) Primarily reflect employee pension obligations, certain retired executive pension obligations and obligations under certain incentive compensation plans.

Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries have obligations to make certain payments for loss and LAE pursuant to insurance policies and reinsurance contracts they issue. These future payments are reflected as reserves on our consolidated financial statements. With respect to loss and LAE, there is typically no minimum contractual commitment associated with insurance policies and reinsurance contracts, and the timing and ultimate amount of actual claims related to these reserves is uncertain.

Table of Contents

Investments in Certain Other Invested Assets. In December 2012, TransRe obtained an ownership interest in Pillar Capital Holdings Limited, or Pillar Holdings, a Bermuda-based insurance asset manager focused on collateralized reinsurance and catastrophe insurance-linked securities. Additionally, TransRe invested \$175.0 million and AIHL invested \$25.0 million in limited partnership funds managed by Pillar Holdings, or the Funds. The objective of the Funds is to create portfolios with attractive risk-reward characteristics and low correlation with other asset classes, using the extensive reinsurance and capital market experience of the principals of Pillar Holdings. We have concluded that the Pillar Investments represent variable interest entities and that we are not the primary beneficiary, as we do not have the ability to direct the activities that most significantly impact each entity's economic performance. Therefore, the Pillar Investments are not consolidated and are accounted for under the equity method of accounting. Our potential maximum loss in the Pillar Investments is limited to our cumulative net investment. As of December 31, 2017, our carrying value in the Pillar Investments, as determined under the equity method of accounting, was \$217.9 million, which is net of returns of capital received from the Pillar Investments.

In July 2013, AIHL invested \$250.0 million in Ares in exchange for a 6.25 percent equity stake in Ares, with an agreement to engage Ares to manage up to \$1.0 billion in certain investment strategies. In May 2014, Ares completed an initial public offering of its common units. Upon completion of the initial public offering, Alleghany's equity investment in Ares converted to limited partner interests in certain Ares subsidiaries that are convertible into an aggregate 5.9 percent interest in Ares common units. These interests may be converted at any time at our discretion. Until we determine to convert our limited partner interests into Ares common units, we classify our investment in Ares as a component of other invested assets and we account for our investment using the equity method of accounting. As of December 31, 2017, AIHL's carrying value in Ares was \$212.4 million, which is net of returns of capital received from Ares.

Investments in Commercial Mortgage Loans. As of December 31, 2017, the carrying value of our commercial mortgage loan portfolio was \$658.4 million, representing the unpaid principal balance on the loans. As of December 31, 2017, there was no allowance for loan losses. The commercial mortgage loan portfolio consists primarily of first mortgages on commercial properties in major metropolitan areas in the U.S. The loans earn interest at fixed- and floating-rates, mature in two to ten years from loan origination and the principal amounts of the loans were no more than approximately two-thirds of the property's appraised value at the time the loans were made.

Energy Holdings. As of December 31, 2017, we had holdings in energy sector businesses of \$977.6 million, comprised of \$349.3 million of debt securities, \$485.0 million of equity securities and \$143.3 million of Alleghany's equity attributable to SORC.

Subsidiaries

Financial strength is also a high priority of our subsidiaries, whose assets stand behind their financial commitments to their customers and vendors. We believe that our subsidiaries have and will have adequate internally generated funds, cash resources and unused credit facilities to provide for the currently foreseeable needs of their businesses. Our subsidiaries had no material commitments for capital expenditures as of December 31, 2017.

The obligations and cash outflow of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries include claim settlements, commission expenses, administrative expenses, purchases of investments, and interest and principal payments on TransRe's 8.00% senior notes due on November 30, 2039. In addition to premium collections, cash inflow is obtained from interest and dividend income and maturities and sales of investments. Because cash inflow from premiums is received in advance of cash outflow required to settle claims, our reinsurance and insurance operating units accumulate funds which they invest pending the need for liquidity. As the cash needs of a reinsurance or an insurance company can be unpredictable due to the uncertainty of the claims settlement process, the portfolios of our reinsurance and insurance

subsidiaries consist primarily of debt securities and short-term investments to ensure the availability of funds and maintain a sufficient amount of liquid securities.

On December 14, 2015, the remaining \$367.0 million outstanding aggregate principal amount of TransRe's 2015 Senior Notes matured and was repaid.

With respect to our non-insurance operating subsidiaries, SORC has relied on Alleghany almost entirely to support its operations. From its formation in 2011 through December 31, 2017, we have invested \$281.8 million in SORC.

Included in other activities is debt associated with Alleghany Capital's operating subsidiaries, which totaled \$101.0 million as of December 31, 2017. The \$101.0 million includes \$38.2 million of borrowings by W&WIAFCO Steel under its available credit facility and term loans, \$33.3 million of borrowings by Jazwares under its available credit facility, \$15.1 million of term loans at Bourn & Koch related to borrowings to finance an acquisition, \$10.1 million of debt at

Table of Contents

Kentucky Trailer related primarily to a mortgage loan, borrowings to finance small acquisitions and borrowings under its available credit facility, and \$4.3 million of borrowings by IPS under its available credit facility. None of these liabilities are guaranteed by Alleghany or Alleghany Capital.

Consolidated Investment Holdings

Investment Strategy and Holdings. Our investment strategy seeks to preserve principal and maintain liquidity while trying to maximize our risk-adjusted, after-tax rate of return. Our investment decisions are guided mainly by the nature and timing of expected liability payouts, management's forecast of cash flows and the possibility of unexpected cash demands, for example, to satisfy claims due to catastrophe losses. Our consolidated investment portfolio currently consists mainly of highly rated and liquid debt and equity securities listed on national securities exchanges. The overall credit quality of the debt securities portfolio is measured using the lowest rating of S&P, Moody's or Fitch. In this regard, the overall weighted-average credit quality rating of our debt securities portfolio as of December 31, 2017 and 2016 was AA-. Although many of our debt securities, which consist predominantly of municipal bonds, are insured by third-party financial guaranty insurance companies, the impact of such insurance was not significant to the debt securities credit quality rating as of December 31, 2017. The following table presents the ratings of our debt securities as of December 31, 2017:

	Ratings as of December 31, 2017					
	AAA / Aaa	AA / Aa	A	BBB / Baa	Below BBB / Baa or Not-Rated ⁽¹⁾	Total
	(\$ in millions)					
U.S. Government obligations	\$ -	\$ 948.0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 948.0
Municipal bonds	377.1	2,436.5	744.3	122.8	1.4	3,682.1
Foreign government obligations	442.4	340.3	211.8	11.4	0.7	1,006.6
U.S. corporate bonds	10.8	97.7	822.3	942.7	559.5	2,433.0
Foreign corporate bonds	332.0	149.9	576.2	341.7	100.0	1,499.8
Mortgage and asset-backed securities:						
RMBS	15.2	950.7	-	21.7	8.0	995.6
CMBS	158.9	317.1	73.9	1.3	0.5	551.7
Other asset-backed securities	573.0	308.5	374.7	345.4	3.0	1,604.6
Total debt securities	\$ 1,909.4	\$ 5,548.7	\$ 2,803.2	\$ 1,787.0	\$ 673.1	\$ 12,721.4
Percentage of debt securities	15.0%	43.6%	22.0%	14.1%	5.3%	100.0%

(1) Consists of \$210.1 million of securities rated BB / Ba, \$304.0 million of securities rated B, \$56.5 million of securities rated CCC, \$5.8 million of securities rated CC, \$4.7 million of securities rated below CC and \$92.0 million of not-rated securities.

Our debt securities portfolio has been designed to enable management to react to investment opportunities created by changing interest rates, prepayments, tax and credit considerations or other factors, or to circumstances that could result in a mismatch between the desired duration of debt securities and the duration of liabilities, and, as such, is classified as AFS.

Effective duration measures a portfolio's sensitivity to changes in interest rates. In this regard, as of December 31, 2017, our debt securities portfolio had an effective duration of approximately 4.4 years compared with 4.5 years as of December 31, 2016. As of December 31, 2017, approximately \$3.5 billion, or 27.3 percent, of our debt securities portfolio represented securities with maturities of five years or less. See Note 4(b) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional detail on the contractual maturities of our consolidated debt securities portfolio. We may increase the proportion of our debt securities portfolio held in securities with maturities of more than five years should the yields of these securities provide, in our judgment, sufficient compensation for their increased risk. We do not believe that this strategy would reduce our ability to meet ongoing claim payments or to respond to significant catastrophe losses.

In the event paid losses accelerate beyond the ability of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries to fund these paid losses from current cash balances, current operating cash flow, dividend and interest receipts and security maturities, we would need to liquidate a portion of our investment portfolio, make capital contributions to our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries, and/or arrange for financing. Strains on liquidity could result from: (i) the occurrence of several significant

Table of Contents

catastrophe events in a relatively short period of time; (ii) the sale of investments into a depressed marketplace to fund these paid losses; (iii) the uncollectibility of reinsurance recoverables on these paid losses; (iv) the significant decrease in the value of collateral supporting reinsurance recoverables; or (v) a significant reduction in our net premium collections.

We may, from time to time, make significant investments in the common stock of a public company, subject to limitations imposed by applicable regulations.

On a consolidated basis, our invested assets increased to approximately \$18.8 billion as of December 31, 2017 from approximately \$18.1 billion as of December 31, 2016, primarily reflecting the impact of an increase in unrealized appreciation on our equity and, to a lesser extent, our bond portfolio, partially offset by the net impact on invested asset balances arising from the sale of PacificComp and the acquisition of approximately 80 percent of the equity in W&WIAFCO Steel.

Fair Value. The following table presents the carrying values and estimated fair values of our consolidated financial instruments as of December 31, 2017 and 2016:

	December 31, 2017		December 31, 2016	
	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Carrying Value	Fair Value
	(\$ in millions)			
Assets				
Investments (excluding equity method investments and loans) ⁽¹⁾	\$ 17,406.5	\$ 17,406.5	\$ 16,899.2	\$ 16,899.2
Liabilities				
Senior Notes and other debt ⁽²⁾	\$ 1,484.9	\$ 1,614.6	\$ 1,476.5	\$ 1,584.3

(1) This table includes AFS investments (debt and equity securities, as well as partnership and non-marketable equity investments carried at fair value that are included in other invested assets). This table excludes investments accounted for using the equity method and commercial mortgage loans that are carried at unpaid principal balance. The fair value of short-term investments approximates amortized cost. The fair value of all other categories of investments is discussed below.

(2) See Note 8 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on the Senior Notes and other debt.

Fair value is defined as the price that would be received upon the sale of an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between willing, able and knowledgeable market participants at the measurement date. Fair value measurements are not adjusted for transaction costs. In addition, a three-tiered hierarchy for inputs is used in management's determination of fair value of financial instruments that emphasizes the use of observable inputs over the use of unobservable inputs by requiring that the observable inputs be used when available. Observable inputs are market participant assumptions based on market data obtained from sources independent of the reporting entity. Unobservable inputs are the reporting entity's own assumptions about market participant assumptions based on the best information available under the circumstances. In assessing the appropriateness of using observable inputs in making our fair value determinations, we consider whether the market for a particular security is active or not based on all the relevant facts and circumstances. A market may be considered to be inactive if there are relatively few recent transactions or if there is a significant decrease in market volume. Furthermore, we consider whether observable

transactions are orderly or not. We do not consider a transaction to be orderly if there is evidence of a forced liquidation or other distressed condition; as such, little or no weight is given to that transaction as an indicator of fair value.

Although we are responsible for the determination of the fair value of our financial assets and the supporting methodologies and assumptions, we employ third-party valuation service providers to gather, analyze and interpret market information and derive fair values based upon relevant methodologies and assumptions for individual instruments. When those providers are unable to obtain sufficient market observable information upon which to estimate the fair value for a particular security, fair value is determined either by requesting a quote, which is generally non-binding, from brokers who are knowledgeable about these securities or by employing widely accepted internal valuation models.

Valuation service providers typically obtain data about market transactions and other key valuation model inputs from multiple sources and, through the use of widely accepted internal valuation models, provide a single fair value measurement for individual securities for which a fair value has been requested under the terms of service agreements. The inputs used by the valuation service providers include, but are not limited to, market prices from recently completed transactions and transactions of comparable securities, interest rate yield curves, credit spreads, currency rates and other market observable information, as applicable. The valuation models take into account, among other things, market observable information as of the measurement date as well as the specific attributes of the security being valued including its term, interest rate, credit rating, industry sector and, when applicable, collateral quality and other issue or issuer specific

Table of Contents

information. When market transactions or other market observable data is limited, the extent to which judgment is applied in determining fair value is greatly increased.

The three-tiered hierarchy used in management's determination of fair value is broken down into three levels based on the reliability of inputs as follows:

Level 1: Valuations are based on unadjusted quoted prices in active markets that we have the ability to access for identical, unrestricted assets and do not involve any meaningful degree of judgment. An active market is defined as a market where transactions for the financial instrument occur with sufficient frequency and volume to provide pricing information on an ongoing basis. Our Level 1 assets include publicly traded common stocks and mutual funds (which are included on the balance sheet in equity securities) where our valuations are based on quoted market prices.

Level 2: Valuations are based on direct and indirect observable inputs other than quoted market prices included in Level 1. Level 2 inputs include quoted prices for similar assets in active markets and inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset, such as the terms of the security and market-based inputs. Terms of the security include coupon, maturity date and any special provisions that may, for example, enable the investor, at its election, to redeem the security prior to its scheduled maturity date (such provisions may apply to all debt securities except U.S. Government obligations). Market-based inputs include interest rates and yield curves that are observable at commonly quoted intervals and current credit rating(s) of the security. Market-based inputs may also include credit spreads of all debt securities except U.S. Government obligations, and currency rates for certain foreign government obligations and foreign corporate bonds denominated in foreign currencies. Fair values are determined using a market approach that relies on the securities' relationships to quoted prices for similar assets in active markets, as well as the other inputs described above. In determining the fair values for the vast majority of CMBS and other asset-backed securities, as well as a small portion of RMBS, an income approach is used to corroborate and further support the fair values determined by the market approach. The income approach primarily involves developing a discounted cash flow model using the future projected cash flows of the underlying collateral, and the terms of the security. Level 2 assets generally include short-term investments and most debt securities. Our Level 2 liabilities consist of the Senior Notes.

Level 3: Valuations are based on techniques that use significant inputs that are unobservable. The valuation of Level 3 assets requires the greatest degree of judgment. These measurements may be made under circumstances in which there is little, if any, market activity for the asset. Our assessment of the significance of a particular input to the fair value measurement in its entirety requires judgment. In making the assessment, we consider factors specific to the asset. In certain cases, the inputs used to measure fair value may fall into different levels of the fair value hierarchy. In such cases, the level in the fair value hierarchy within which the fair value measurement is classified is determined based on the lowest level input that is significant to the fair value measurement in its entirety. Assets classified as Level 3 principally include certain RMBS, CMBS, other asset-backed securities (primarily, collateralized loan obligations), U.S. and foreign corporate bonds (including privately issued securities), partnership investments and non-marketable equity investments.

Mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities are initially valued at the transaction price. Subsequently, we use widely accepted valuation practices that produce a fair value measurement. The vast majority of fair values are determined using an income approach. The income approach primarily involves developing a discounted cash flow model using the future projected cash flows of the underlying collateral, as well as other inputs described below. A few Level 3 valuations are based entirely on non-binding broker quotes. These securities consist primarily of mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities where reliable pool and loan level collateral information cannot be reasonably obtained, and as such, an income approach is not feasible.

Since Level 3 valuations are based on techniques that use significant inputs that are unobservable with little or no market activity, the fair values under the market approach for Level 3 securities are less credible than under the income approach; however, the market approach, where feasible, is used to corroborate the fair values determined by the income approach. The market approach primarily relies on the securities' relationships to quoted transaction prices for similarly structured instruments. To the extent that transaction prices for similarly structured instruments are not available for a particular security, other market approaches are used to corroborate the fair values determined by the income approach, including option adjusted spread analyses.

Unobservable inputs, significant to the measurement and valuation of mortgage-backed and asset-backed securities, are generally used in the income approach, and include assumptions about prepayment speed and

Table of Contents

collateral performance, including default, delinquency and loss severity rates. Significant changes to any one of these inputs, or combination of inputs, could significantly change the fair value measurement for these securities.

The impact of prepayment speeds on fair value is dependent on a number of variables including whether the securities were purchased at a premium or discount. A decrease in interest rates generally increases the assumed rate of prepayments, and an increase in interest rates generally decreases the assumed speed of prepayments. Increased prepayments increase the yield on securities purchased at a discount and reduce the yield on securities purchased at a premium. In a decreasing prepayment environment, yields on securities purchased at a discount are reduced but are increased for securities purchased at a premium. Changes in default assumptions on underlying collateral are generally accompanied by directionally similar changes in other collateral performance factors, but generally result in a directionally opposite change in prepayment assumptions.

Our Level 3 liabilities consist of the debt of Alleghany Capital's operating subsidiaries.

We employ specific control processes to determine the reasonableness of the fair values of our financial assets and liabilities. Our processes are designed to ensure that the values received or internally estimated are accurately recorded and that the data inputs and the valuation techniques used are appropriate, consistently applied and that the assumptions are reasonable and consistent with the objective of determining fair value. We assess the reasonableness of individual security values received from valuation service providers through various analytical techniques. In addition, we validate the reasonableness of fair values by comparing information obtained from our valuation service providers to other third-party valuation sources for selected securities. We also validate prices obtained from brokers for selected securities through reviews by those who have relevant expertise and who are independent of those charged with executing investing transactions.

In addition to such procedures, we review the reasonableness of our classification of securities within the three-tiered hierarchy to ensure that the classification is consistent with GAAP.

Table of Contents

The following tables present the estimated fair values of our financial instruments measured at fair value and the level of the fair value hierarchy of inputs used as of December 31, 2017 and 2016:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
As of December 31, 2017				
Equity securities:				
Common stock	\$ 4,090.7	\$ 3.8	\$ -	\$ 4,094.5
Preferred stock	-	3.1	1.9	5.0
Total equity securities	4,090.7	6.9	1.9	4,099.5
Debt securities:				
U.S. Government obligations	-	948.0	-	948.0
Municipal bonds	-	3,682.1	-	3,682.1
Foreign government obligations	-	1,006.6	-	1,006.6
U.S. corporate bonds	-	2,173.0	260.0	2,433.0
Foreign corporate bonds	-	1,424.6	75.2	1,499.8
Mortgage and asset-backed securities:				
RMBS ⁽¹⁾	-	833.8	161.8	995.6
CMBS	-	550.1	1.6	551.7
Other asset-backed securities ⁽²⁾	-	503.3	1,101.3	1,604.6
Total debt securities	-	11,121.5	1,599.9	12,721.4
Short-term investments	-	578.1	-	578.1
Other invested assets ⁽³⁾	-	-	7.5	7.5
Total investments (excluding equity method investments and loans)	\$ 4,090.7	\$ 11,706.5	\$ 1,609.3	\$ 17,406.5
Senior Notes and other debt	\$ -	\$ 1,513.6	\$ 101.0	\$ 1,614.6

Table of Contents

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total
	(\$ in millions)			
As of December 31, 2016				
Equity securities:				
Common stock	\$ 3,105.2	\$ -	\$ 4.3	\$ 3,109.5
Preferred stock	-	-	-	-
Total equity securities	3,105.2	-	4.3	3,109.5
Debt securities:				
U.S. Government obligations	-	1,243.3	-	1,243.3
Municipal bonds	-	4,185.8	-	4,185.8
Foreign government obligations	-	1,047.1	-	1,047.1
U.S. corporate bonds	-	2,120.2	72.9	2,193.1
Foreign corporate bonds	-	1,088.4	0.4	1,088.8
Mortgage and asset-backed securities:				
RMBS ⁽¹⁾	-	994.5	5.9	1,000.4
CMBS	-	730.5	4.3	734.8
Other asset-backed securities ⁽²⁾	-	586.1	903.8	1,489.9
Total debt securities	-	11,995.9	987.3	12,983.2
Short-term investments	-	778.4	-	778.4
Other invested assets ⁽³⁾	-	-	28.1	28.1
Total investments (excluding equity method investments and loans)	\$ 3,105.2	\$ 12,774.3	\$ 1,019.7	\$ 16,899.2
Senior Notes and other debt	\$ -	\$ 1,491.5	\$ 92.8	\$ 1,584.3

(1) Primarily includes government agency pass-through securities guaranteed by a government agency or government sponsored enterprise, among other types of RMBS.

(2) Includes \$1,101.3 million and \$903.8 million of collateralized loan obligations as of December 31, 2017 and 2016, respectively.

(3) Includes partnership and non-marketable equity investments accounted for on an AFS basis, and excludes investments accounted for using the equity method.

Municipal Bonds. The following table provides the fair value of our municipal bonds as of December 31, 2017, categorized by state and revenue source. Special revenue bonds are debt securities for which the payment of principal and interest is available solely from the cash flows of the related projects. As issuers of revenue bonds do not have the ability to draw from tax revenues or levy taxes to fund obligations, revenue bonds may carry a greater risk of default than general obligation bonds.

Education	Hospital	Housing	Lease Revenue	Special Revenue	Special Tax	Transit	Utilities	All Other Sources	Total Special	Total General	T
-----------	----------	---------	---------------	-----------------	-------------	---------	-----------	-------------------	---------------	---------------	---

	(\$ in millions)								Revenue	Obligation
	\$ 18.3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 116.7	\$ 108.5	\$ 79.3	\$ 17.9	\$ 340.7	\$ 14.8
	32.8	-	0.2	-	13.0	93.8	80.2	2.4	222.4	85.8
	8.7	46.3	-	7.8	1.3	36.1	115.6	5.4	221.2	86.4
etts	28.3	11.7	6.9	-	30.9	38.4	28.6	2.9	147.7	79.7
n	-	-	1.7	-	12.2	13.4	64.5	2.3	94.1	64.7
	45.1	0.6	0.1	-	2.1	-	40.0	3.2	91.1	33.5
Columbia	4.8	-	-	-	65.5	13.3	8.6	-	92.2	15.0
nia	2.4	1.5	10.6	-	-	29.2	1.2	15.2	60.1	38.4
	25.8	16.5	-	10.4	8.3	11.7	6.3	-	79.0	19.0
	-	1.2	-	-	-	33.9	11.0	-	46.1	45.5
ates	181.1	114.7	27.4	58.3	90.7	90.9	168.5	201.0	932.6	258.0
	\$ 347.3	\$ 192.5	\$ 46.9	\$ 76.5	\$ 340.7	\$ 469.2	\$ 603.8	\$ 250.3	\$ 2,327.2	\$ 740.8

nce refunded / escrowed maturity bonds

incipal bonds \$

Table of Contents***Catastrophe Exposure***

The business of our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries exposes them to losses from various catastrophe events. In a catastrophe event, losses from many insureds across multiple lines of business may result directly or indirectly from such single occurrence. Our reinsurance and insurance subsidiaries take certain measures to mitigate the impact of catastrophe events through various means including considering catastrophe risks in their underwriting and pricing decisions, purchasing reinsurance, monitoring and modeling accumulated exposures and managing exposure in key geographic zones and product lines that are prone to catastrophe events.

Natural disasters such as hurricanes, other windstorms, earthquakes and other catastrophes have the potential to materially and adversely affect our operating results. Other risks, such as an outbreak of a pandemic disease, a major terrorist event, the bankruptcy of a major company or a marine and/or aviation disaster, could also have a material adverse effect on our business and operating results.

We evaluate catastrophe events and assess the probability of occurrence and magnitude through the use of industry recognized models and other techniques. We supplement these models by judgmentally interpreting and adjusting when appropriate the modeled output and by periodically monitoring the exposure risks of our operations. There is no single standard methodology to project possible losses from catastrophe exposures. Further, there are no industry standard assumptions used in projecting these losses, and the form and quality of the data obtained, including data obtained from insureds and ceding companies, and used in these models are not uniformly compatible with the data requirements of all models. Therefore, the use of different methodologies and assumptions could materially change the projected losses. Finally, these modeled losses may not be comparable with estimates made by other companies.

Although the analytical tools used to estimate catastrophe exposure are useful in both pricing and monitoring catastrophe risk, the estimates derived by use of these techniques are inherently uncertain and do not reflect our maximum exposures to these events. Although the models are frequently updated, these projections are nevertheless inherently imprecise. It is highly likely that our losses will vary, perhaps materially, from these estimates.

Projections of potential catastrophe losses are typically expressed in terms of the probable maximum loss, or PML. We define PML as our anticipated maximum loss (taking into account contract limits) caused by a single catastrophe event at a specified estimated return period affecting a broad contiguous area. These modeled losses are estimated based upon contracts in force at January 1, 2018 for TransRe and December 1, 2017 for RSUI. Modeled results also reflect losses arising from certain of our invested assets that have specific catastrophe exposures.

The following is an overview of such modeled PMLs from property, engineering, marine and energy exposures and the associated natural perils that we deem most significant. The estimated amount of these modeled losses are presented for both a 100 year return period (having a likelihood of being exceeded in any single year of 1.0 percent), and a 250 year return period (having a likelihood of being exceeded in any single year of 0.4 percent), and are presented in two ways: (i) gross catastrophe losses; and (ii) after-tax net catastrophe costs (that is, gross losses, net of reinsurance, net reinstatement premiums and taxes). The reduction for reinsurance assumes that all reinsurers fulfill their obligations in accordance with contract terms.

100 Year Return Period		250 Year Return Period	
Gross Loss (before tax)	Net Loss (after tax)	Gross Loss (before tax)	Net Loss (after tax)

(\$ in billions)

Florida, Wind	\$ 1.5	\$ 0.5	\$ 2.2	\$ 0.7
California, Earthquake	1.2	0.4	2.0	0.6
Gulf Coast, Wind	0.8	0.3	1.5	0.5
Northeast U.S., Wind	0.8	0.3	1.5	0.5
Japan, Earthquake	0.6	0.2	1.0	0.3
Europe, Wind	0.6	0.2	0.8	0.2
Japan, Wind	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.2

Florida, Wind has the highest modeled after-tax net catastrophe costs for both a 100 and 250 year return period. These costs would represent approximately 6 percent and 8 percent, respectively, of stockholders' equity attributable to Alleghany as of December 31, 2017, compared with approximately 5 percent and 7 percent, respectively, of stockholders' equity attributable to Alleghany as of December 31, 2016. If multiple severe catastrophe events occur in any one year, or a

Table of Contents

single catastrophe event affects more than one geographic area, the potential economic cost to us could be materially higher than any one of the amounts shown above.

There is much uncertainty and imprecision in the compilation of these estimates at many stages in the process. Moreover, the makeup of our in-force business is constantly changing as new business is added and existing contracts terminate or expire, including contracts for reinsurance coverage purchased by us. In addition, these estimates take into account what we believe to be the most likely accumulation of territories, but there can be no assurance that we have captured every possible scenario in our analysis. As a result of these factors, among others, there can be no assurance that we will not experience after-tax net catastrophe costs from individual events that will exceed these estimates by a material amount. There also can be no assurance that we will not experience catastrophe events more frequently than the modeled probabilities would suggest. In any given year, catastrophe events could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition, results of operations, cash flows and liquidity.

Recent Accounting Standards***Recently Adopted***

In March 2017, the FASB issued guidance that reduces the amortization period for the premium on certain purchased callable debt securities to the earliest call date. The guidance applies specifically to noncontingent call features that are callable at a predetermined and fixed price and date. The accounting for purchased callable debt securities held at a discount is not affected. This guidance is effective in the first quarter of 2019 for public entities, with early adoption permitted. We have adopted this guidance in the fourth quarter of 2017, and recorded a cumulative effect reduction of approximately \$13 million directly to opening 2017 retained earnings and an offsetting increase in opening 2017 accumulated other comprehensive income. The implementation did not have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition.

In May 2015, the FASB issued guidance that requires disclosures related to short-duration insurance contracts. The guidance applies to property and casualty insurance and reinsurance entities, among others, and requires the following annual disclosure related to the liability for loss and LAE: (i) net incurred and paid claims development information by accident year for up to ten years; (ii) a reconciliation of incurred and paid claims development information to the aggregate carrying amount of the liability for loss and LAE; (iii) liabilities for IBNR by accident year and in total; (iv) a description of reserving methodologies (as well as any changes to those methodologies); (v) quantitative information about claim frequency by accident year; and (vi) the average annual percentage payout of incurred claims by age and by accident year. In addition, the guidance also requires insurance entities to disclose for annual and interim reporting periods a roll-forward of the liability for loss and LAE. This guidance was effective for annual periods beginning after December 15, 2015, and interim periods within annual periods beginning after December 15, 2016, with early adoption permitted. We adopted this guidance as of December 31, 2016 and the implementation did not have an impact on our results of operations and financial condition. See Note 1(k) and Note 6 to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K, for the new disclosures.

Future Application of Accounting Standards

In May 2014, the FASB, together with the International Accounting Standards Board, issued guidance on the recognition of revenue from contracts with customers. Under this guidance, revenue is recognized as the transfer of goods and services to customers takes place and in amounts that reflect the payment or payments that are expected to be received from the customers for those goods and services. This guidance also requires new disclosures about revenue. Revenues related to insurance and reinsurance contracts and revenues from investments are not impacted by

this guidance, whereas noninsurance revenues arising from the sale of manufactured goods and services is generally included within the scope of this guidance. This guidance is effective in the first quarter of 2018 for public entities, with early adoption permitted in 2017. We will adopt this guidance in the first quarter of 2018 using the modified retrospective transition approach. We have completed an analysis of our noninsurance revenues and have concluded that the implementation did not have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition.

In January 2016, the FASB issued guidance that changes the recognition and measurement of certain financial instruments. This guidance requires investments in equity securities (except those accounted for under the equity method of accounting) to be measured at fair value with changes in fair value recognized in net income. For equity securities that do not have readily determinable fair values, measurement may be at cost, adjusted for any impairment and changes resulting from observable price changes for a similar investment of the same issuer. This guidance also changes the presentation and disclosure of financial instruments by: (i) requiring that financial instrument disclosures of fair value use the exit price notion; (ii) requiring separate presentation of financial assets and financial liabilities by measurement category and form, either on the balance sheet or the accompanying notes to the financial statements; (iii) requiring separate presentation in other comprehensive income for the portion

Table of Contents

of the change in a liability's fair value resulting from instrument-specific credit risk when an election has been made to measure the liability at fair value; and (iv) eliminating the requirement to disclose the methods and significant assumptions used to estimate the fair value for financial instruments measured at amortized cost on the balance sheet. This guidance is effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017 for public entities, including interim periods within those fiscal years. Except for the change in presentation for instrument-specific credit risk, this guidance does not permit early adoption. We will adopt this guidance in the first quarter of 2018. As of January 1, 2018, approximately \$734 million of net unrealized gains of equity securities, net of deferred taxes, were reclassified from accumulated other comprehensive income to retained earnings. Subsequently, all changes in unrealized gains or losses of equity securities, net of deferred taxes, will be presented in the Consolidated Statements of Earnings rather than the Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income. The implementation did not have a material impact on our financial condition. See Note 4(a) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8,

Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our unrealized gains and losses of equity securities.

In February 2016, the FASB issued guidance on leases. Under this guidance, a lessee is required to recognize lease liabilities and corresponding right-of-use assets for leases with terms of more than one year, whereas under current guidance, a lessee is only required to recognize assets and liabilities for those leases qualifying as capital leases. This guidance also requires new disclosures about the amount, timing and uncertainty of cash flows arising from leases. The accounting by lessors is to remain largely unchanged. This guidance is effective in the first quarter of 2019 for public entities, with early adoption permitted. A modified retrospective transition approach is required for all leases in existence as of, or entered into after, the beginning of the earliest comparative period presented in the financial statements. We will adopt this guidance in the first quarter of 2019 and do not currently believe that the implementation will have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition. See Note 12(b) to Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements set forth in Part II, Item 8, Financial Statements and Supplementary Data of this Form 10-K for additional information on our leases.

In June 2016, the FASB issued guidance on credit losses. Under this guidance, a company is required to measure all expected credit losses on loans, reinsurance recoverables and other financial assets accounted for at cost or amortized cost, as applicable. Estimates of expected credit losses are to be based on historical experience, current conditions and reasonable and supportable forecasts. Credit losses for securities accounted for on an AFS basis are to be measured in a manner similar to GAAP as currently applied and cannot exceed the amount by which the fair value is less than the amortized cost. Credit losses for all financial assets are to be recorded through an allowance for credit losses. Subsequent reversals in credit loss estimates are permitted and are to be recognized in earnings. This guidance also requires new disclosures about the significant estimates and judgments used in estimating credit losses, as well as the credit quality of financial assets. This guidance is effective in the first quarter of 2020 for public entities, with early adoption permitted. We will adopt this guidance in the first quarter of 2020 and do not currently believe that the implementation will have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition.

In January 2017, the FASB issued guidance that simplifies the subsequent measurement of goodwill. Under this guidance, if an initial qualitative assessment indicates that the fair value of an operating subsidiary may be less than its carrying amount, an impairment charge is recognized for the amount by which the carrying amount of the operating subsidiary exceeds its estimated fair value. Any resulting impairment loss recognized cannot exceed the total amount of goodwill associated with the operating subsidiary. This guidance is effective in the first quarter of 2020 for public entities, with early adoption permitted. We will adopt this guidance in the first quarter of 2020 and do not currently believe that the implementation will have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition.

In August 2017, the FASB issued guidance that simplifies the requirements to achieve hedge accounting, better reflects the economic results of hedging in the financial statements and better aligns hedge accounting with a

company's risk management activities. This guidance is effective in the first quarter of 2019 for public entities, with early adoption permitted. We will adopt this guidance in the first quarter of 2019 and do not currently believe that the implementation will have a material impact on our results of operations and financial condition.

Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk.

Market risk is the risk of loss from adverse changes in market prices and rates. The primary market risk related to our debt securities is the risk of loss associated with adverse changes in interest rates. We also invest in equity securities which are subject to fluctuations in market value. We hold our equity securities and debt securities as AFS. Any changes in the fair value in these securities, net of tax, would be recorded as a component of other comprehensive income. However, if a decline

Table of Contents

in fair value relative to cost is believed to be other than temporary, a loss is generally recorded on our statement of earnings. In addition, significant portions of our assets (principally investments) and liabilities (principally loss and LAE reserves and unearned premiums) are exposed to changes in foreign currency exchange rates. The net change in the carrying value of assets and liabilities denominated in foreign currencies is generally recorded as a component of other comprehensive income.

The sensitivity analyses presented below provide only a limited, point-in-time view of the market risk of our financial instruments. The actual impact of changes in market interest rates, equity market prices and foreign currency exchange rates may differ significantly from those shown in these sensitivity analyses. The sensitivity analyses are further limited because they do not consider any actions we could take in response to actual and/or anticipated changes in equity market prices, market interest rates or foreign currency exchange rates. In addition, these sensitivity analyses do not provide weight to risks relating to market issues such as liquidity and the credit worthiness of investments.

Interest Rate Risk

The primary market risk for our debt securities is interest rate risk at the time of refinancing. We monitor the interest rate environment to evaluate reinvestment and refinancing opportunities. We generally do not use derivatives to manage market and interest rate risks. The table below presents a sensitivity analysis as of December 31, 2017 of our (i) consolidated debt securities and (ii) Senior Notes and other debt, which are sensitive to changes in interest rates. Sensitivity analysis is defined as the measurement of potential change in future earnings, fair values or cash flows of market sensitive instruments resulting from one or more selected hypothetical changes in interest rates over a selected time period. In the sensitivity analysis model below, we use a +/- 300 basis point range of change in interest rates to measure the hypothetical change in fair value of the financial instruments included in the analysis. The change in fair value is determined by calculating hypothetical December 31, 2017 ending prices based on yields adjusted to reflect a +/- 300 basis point range of change in interest rates, comparing these hypothetical ending prices to actual ending prices, and multiplying the difference by the par outstanding. The selected hypothetical changes in interest rates do not reflect what could be the potential best or worst case scenarios.

	-300	-200	-100	0	100	200	300
	(\$ in millions)						
Assets:							
Debt securities, fair value	\$ 14,147.5	\$ 13,849.8	\$ 13,291.3	\$ 12,721.4	\$ 12,165.5	\$ 11,631.2	\$ 11,127.4
Estimated change in fair value	1,426.1	1,128.4	569.9	-	(555.9)	(1,090.2)	(1,594.0)
Liabilities:							
Senior Notes and other debt, fair value	\$ 2,084.0	\$ 1,900.2	\$ 1,745.6	\$ 1,614.6	\$ 1,502.7	\$ 1,406.3	\$ 1,323.0
Estimated change in fair value	469.4	285.6	131.0	-	(111.9)	(208.3)	(291.6)

Equity Risk

Our equity securities are subject to fluctuations in market value. The table below presents our equity market price risk and reflects the effect of a hypothetical increase or decrease in market prices as of December 31, 2017 on the estimated fair value of our consolidated equity portfolio. The selected hypothetical price changes do not reflect what

could be the potential best or worst case scenarios.

As of December 31, 2017
(\$ in millions)

Estimated Fair Value	Hypothetical Price Change	Estimated Fair Value After Hypothetical Change in Price	Hypothetical Percentage Increase (Decrease) in Stockholders Equity
\$ 4,099.5	20% Increase	\$ 4,919.4	6.3%
	20% Decrease	\$ 3,279.6	(6.3%)

In addition to debt and equity securities, we invest in several partnerships which are subject to fluctuations in market value. Our partnership investments are included in other invested assets and are accounted for as AFS or using the equity method, and had a carrying value of \$344.4 million as of December 31, 2017.

Table of Contents**Foreign Currency Exchange Rate Risk**

Foreign currency exchange rate risk is the potential change in value arising from changes in foreign currency exchange rates. Our reinsurance operations located in foreign countries maintain some or all of their capital in their local currency and conduct business in their local currency, as well as the currencies of the other countries in which they operate. To mitigate this risk, we maintain investments denominated in certain foreign currencies in which the claims payments will be made. As of December 31, 2017, the largest foreign currency exposures for these foreign operations were the Euro, the Canadian Dollar, the Japanese Yen and the Australian Dollar. The table below presents our foreign currency exchange rate risk and shows the effect of a hypothetical increase or decrease in foreign currency exchange rates against the U.S. Dollar as of December 31, 2017 on the estimated net carrying value of our foreign currency denominated assets, net of our foreign currency denominated liabilities. The selected hypothetical changes do not reflect what could be the potential best or worst case scenarios.

As of December 31, 2017 (\$ in millions)				
Estimated Fair Value	Hypothetical Price Change	Estimated Fair Value After Hypothetical Change in Price	Hypothetical Percentage Increase (Decrease) in Stockholders' Equity	
\$ 274.6 ⁽¹⁾	20% Increase	\$ 329.5	0.4%	
	20% Decrease	\$ 219.7	(0.4%)	

(1) Denotes a net asset position as of December 31, 2017.

Table of Contents

Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data.

Index to Consolidated Financial Statements

Alleghany Corporation and Subsidiaries

Description	Page
<u>Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm</u>	128
<u>Consolidated Balance Sheets</u>	129
<u>Consolidated Statements of Earnings and Comprehensive Income</u>	130
<u>Consolidated Statements of Changes in Stockholders' Equity</u>	131
<u>Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows</u>	132
<u>Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements</u>	133
<u>Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm</u>	180

Table of Contents

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM

To the Stockholders and the Board of Directors of

Alleghany Corporation:

Opinion on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of Alleghany Corporation and subsidiaries (the Company) as of December 31, 2017 and 2016, and the related consolidated statements of earnings and comprehensive income, changes in stockholders' equity and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2017, and the related notes and the financial statement schedules listed in the Index at Item 15(a)(2) (collectively referred to as the financial statements). In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of Alleghany Corporation and subsidiaries at December 31, 2017 and 2016, and the consolidated results of their operations and their cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2017, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States) (PCAOB), Alleghany Corporation and subsidiaries' internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2017, based on criteria established in Internal Control-Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (2013 framework) and our report dated February 21, 2018 expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

Basis for Opinion

These financial statements are the responsibility of the Company's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Company's financial statements based on our audits. We are a public accounting firm registered with the PCAOB and are required to be independent with respect to the Company in accordance with the U.S. federal securities laws and the applicable rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the PCAOB.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, whether due to error or fraud. Our audits included performing procedures to assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to error or fraud, and performing procedures that respond to those risks. Such procedures included examining on a test basis, evidence regarding the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. Our audits also included evaluating the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

/s/ Ernst & Young LLP

We have served as the Company's auditor since 2012.

New York, New York

February 21, 2018

Table of Contents

ALLEGHANY CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

Consolidated Balance Sheets

	December 31,	
	2017	2016
	(\$ in thousands, except share amounts)	
Assets		
Investments:		
Available-for-sale securities at fair value:		
Equity securities (cost: 2017 \$3,170,673; 2016 \$2,816,572)	\$ 4,099,467	\$ 3,109,523
Debt securities (amortized cost: 2017 \$12,536,772; 2016 \$12,927,103)	12,721,399	12,983,213
Short-term investments	578,054	778,410
	17,398,920	16,871,146
Commercial mortgage loans	658,364	594,878
Other invested assets	743,358	645,245
Total investments	18,800,642	18,111,269
Cash	838,375	594,091
Accrued investment income	105,877	113,763
Premium balances receivable	797,346	743,692
Reinsurance recoverables	1,746,488	1,272,219
Ceded unearned premiums	190,252	201,023
Deferred acquisition costs	453,346	448,634
Property and equipment at cost, net of accumulated depreciation and amortization	125,337	112,920
Goodwill	334,905	284,974
Intangible assets, net of amortization	459,037	378,680
Current taxes receivable	31,085	25,950
Net deferred tax assets	136,489	354,852
Funds held under reinsurance agreements	706,042	591,602
Other assets	659,096	522,922
Total assets	\$ 25,384,317	\$ 23,756,591
Liabilities, Redeemable Noncontrolling Interests and Stockholders Equity		
Loss and loss adjustment expenses	\$ 11,871,250	\$ 11,087,199
Unearned premiums	2,182,294	2,175,498
Senior Notes and other debt	1,484,897	1,476,489
Reinsurance payable	156,376	90,659
Other liabilities	1,068,907	912,081
Total liabilities	16,763,724	15,741,926

Edgar Filing: ALLEGHANY CORP /DE - Form 10-K

Redeemable noncontrolling interests	106,530	74,720
Common stock (shares authorized: 2017 and 2016 22,000,000; shares issued: 2017 and 2016 17,459,961)	17,460	17,460
Contributed capital	3,612,109	3,611,993
Accumulated other comprehensive income	618,118	109,284
Treasury stock, at cost (2017 2,069,461 shares; 2016 2,049,797 shares)	(824,906)	(812,840)
Retained earnings	5,091,282	5,014,048
Total stockholders equity attributable to Alleghany stockholders	8,514,063	7,939,945
Total liabilities, redeemable noncontrolling interest and stockholders equity	\$ 25,384,317	\$ 23,756,591

See accompanying Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Table of Contents

ALLEGHANY CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

Consolidated Statements of Earnings and Comprehensive Income

	Year Ended December 31,		
	2017	2016	2015
	(\$ in thousands, except per share amounts)		
Revenues			
Net premiums earned	\$ 4,954,990	\$ 4,975,777	\$ 4,230,286
Net investment income	451,016	438,455	438,817
Net realized capital gains	107,222	63,205	213,897
Other than temporary impairment losses	(16,871)	(45,165)	(133,868)
Other revenue	928,298	698,747	250,346
Total revenues	6,424,655	6,131,019	4,999,478
Costs and Expenses			
Net loss and loss adjustment expenses	3,620,197	2,917,166	2,339,790
Commissions, brokerage and other underwriting expenses	1,651,177	1,657,251	1,423,889
Other operating expenses	967,104	765,226	342,361
Corporate administration	46,998	42,960	46,503
Amortization of intangible assets	19,419	19,012	(2,211)
Interest expense	83,070	81,599	91,778
Total costs and expenses	6,387,965	5,483,214	4,242,110
Earnings before income taxes	36,690	647,805	757,368
Income taxes	(63,802)	187,141	195,173
Net earnings	100,492	460,664	562,195
Net earnings attributable to noncontrolling interest	10,359	3,743	1,880
Net earnings attributable to Alleghany stockholders	\$ 90,133	\$ 456,921	\$ 560,315
Net earnings	\$ 100,492	\$ 460,664	\$ 562,195
Other comprehensive income:			
Change in unrealized gains (losses), net of deferred taxes of \$280,526, \$36,468 and (\$83,332) for 2017, 2016 and 2015, respectively	520,976	67,726	(154,759)
Less: reclassification for net realized capital gains and other than temporary impairment losses, net of taxes of (\$25,806), (\$36,281) and (\$37,044) for 2017, 2016 and 2015, respectively	(47,925)	(67,380)	(68,796)

Change in unrealized currency translation adjustment, net of deferred taxes of \$14,344, (\$3,889) and (\$7,940) for 2017, 2016 and 2015, respectively	26,639	(7,223)	(14,746)
Retirement plans	(3,755)	(112)	990
Comprehensive income	596,427	453,675	324,884
Comprehensive income attributable to noncontrolling interest	10,359	3,743	1,880
Comprehensive income attributable to Alleghany stockholders	\$ 586,068	\$ 449,932	\$ 323,004
Basic earnings per share attributable to Alleghany stockholders	\$ 5.85	\$ 29.60	\$ 35.14
Diluted earnings per share attributable to Alleghany stockholders	5.85	29.59	35.13

See accompanying Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Table of Contents

ALLEGHANY CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

Consolidated Statements of Changes in Stockholders' Equity

	Three Years Ended December 31, 2017					Total Stockholders Equity Attributable to Alleghany Shareholders	Redeemable non- controlling Interest
	Common Stock	Contributed Capital	Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (\$ in thousands, except share amounts)	Treasury Stock	Retained Earnings		
Balance as of December 31, 2014							
(17,459,961 shares of common stock issued; 1,405,638 in treasury)	\$ 17,460	\$ 3,610,717	\$ 353,584	\$ (507,699)	\$ 3,999,366	\$ 7,473,428	\$ 8,616
Add (deduct):							
Net earnings	-	-	-	-	560,315	560,315	1,880
Other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax:							
Retirement plans	-	-	990	-	-	990	-
Change in unrealized appreciation of investments, net	-	-	(223,555)	-	-	(223,555)	-
Change in unrealized currency translation adjustment, net	-	-	(14,746)	-	-	(14,746)	-
Comprehensive (loss) income	-	-	(237,311)	-	560,315	323,004	1,880
Dividends paid	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Treasury stock repurchase	-	-	-	(243,814)	-	(243,814)	-
Other, net	-	914	-	3,729	(2,554)	2,089	15,223

**Balance as of
December 31,
2015**

(17,459,961 shares of common stock issued; 1,915,884 in treasury)	17,460	3,611,631	116,273	(747,784)	4,557,127	7,554,707	25,719
Add (deduct):							
Net earnings	-	-	-	-	456,921	456,921	3,743
Other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax:							
Retirement plans	-	-	(112)	-	-	(112)	-
Change in unrealized appreciation of investments, net	-	-	346	-	-	346	-
Change in unrealized currency translation adjustment, net	-	-	(7,223)	-	-	(7,223)	-
Comprehensive (loss) income	-	-	(6,989)	-	456,921	449,932	3,743
Dividends paid	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Treasury stock repurchase	-	-	-	(68,320)	-	(68,320)	-
Other, net	-	362	-	3,264	-	3,626	45,258

**Balance as of
December 31,
2016**

(17,459,961 shares of common stock issued; 2,049,797 in treasury)	17,460	3,611,993	109,284	(812,840)	5,014,048	7,939,945	74,720
Add (deduct):							
Cumulative effect of adoption of new accounting pronouncements	-	-	12,899	-	(12,899)	-	-
Net earnings	-	-	-	-	90,133	90,133	10,359

Other comprehensive income (loss), net of tax:							
Retirement plans	-	-	(3,755)	-	-	(3,755)	-
Change in unrealized appreciation of investments, net	-	-	473,051	-	-	473,051	-
Change in unrealized currency translation adjustment, net	-	-	26,639	-	-	26,639	-
Comprehensive income	-	-	495,935	-	90,133	586,068	10,359