GREENLIGHT CAPITAL RE, LTD.
Form 10-K
February 22, 2016

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

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

For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2015

OR

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

For the transition period from to

Commission file number 001-33493

Greenlight Capital Re, Ltd.
(Exact Name of Registrant as Specified in Its Charter)

Cayman Islands	N/A
(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation or Organization)	(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

65 Market Street, Suite 1207, Camana Bay
P.O. Box 31110
Grand Cayman, KY1-1205
Cayman Islands
(Address of Principal Executive Offices)

Registrant’s telephone number, including area code: 345-943-4573

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

Title of Class	Name of Exchange on Which Registered
Class A ordinary shares, $0.10 par value per share	The Nasdaq Stock Market LLC

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

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

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

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 x No o

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

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. x

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of ''large accelerated filer,'' ''accelerated filer,'' and ''smaller reporting company'' in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act. (Check one):
Large accelerated filer x Accelerated filer o Non-accelerated filer o Smaller reporting company o

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

The aggregate market value of voting and non-voting Class A ordinary shares held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of June 30, 2015 was $869,305,700 based on the closing price of the registrant's Class A ordinary shares reported on the Nasdaq Global Select Market on June 30, 2015, the last business day of the registrant's most recently completed second fiscal quarter. Solely for the purpose of this calculation and for no other purpose, the non-affiliates of the registrant are assumed to be all shareholders of the registrant other than (i) directors of the registrant, (ii) executive officers of the registrant who are identified as ''named executives'' pursuant to Item 11 of this Form 10-K, (iii) any shareholder that beneficially owns 10% or more of the registrant's common shares and (iv) any shareholder that has one or more of its affiliates on the registrant's board of directors. Such exclusion is not intended, nor shall it be deemed, to be an admission that such persons are affiliates of the registrant.

Class A Ordinary Shares, $0.10 par value	30,829,333
Class B Ordinary Shares, $0.10 par value	6,254,895
(Class)	Outstanding as of February 19, 2016

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Portions of the proxy statement for the registrant's 2016 annual meeting of shareholders, to be filed subsequently with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the SEC, pursuant to Regulation 14A, under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, or the Exchange Act, relating to the registrant's annual general meeting of shareholders scheduled to be held on April 27, 2016 are incorporated by reference in Part III of this annual report on Form 10-K.

GREENLIGHT CAPITAL RE, LTD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Link to Table of Contents

PART I

Special Note About Forward-Looking Statements

Certain statements in Management’s Discussion and Analysis, other than purely historical information, including estimates, projections, statements relating to our business plans, objectives and expected operating results, and the assumptions upon which those statements are based, are "forward-looking statements" within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (the "Exchange Act"). These forward-looking statements generally are identified by the words "believe," "project," "predict," "expect," "anticipate," "estimate," "intend," "plan," "may," "should," "will," "would," "will be," "will continue," "will likely result," and similar expressions. Forward-looking statements are based on current expectations and assumptions that are subject to risks and uncertainties which may cause actual results to differ materially from the forward-looking statements. A detailed discussion of risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results and events to differ materially from such forward-looking statements is included in the section entitled "Risk Factors" (refer to Part I, Item 1A) and include but are not limited to:

- Our results will likely fluctuate from period to period and may not be indicative of our long-term prospects;
- If our losses and loss adjustment expenses greatly exceed our loss reserves, our financial condition may be significantly and negatively affected;
- Our investment portfolio may be concentrated in a few large positions which could result in large losses;
- The property and casualty reinsurance market may be affected by cyclical trends;
- The effect of emerging claim and coverage issues on our business is uncertain;
- Rating agencies may downgrade or withdraw either of our ratings;
- We depend on DME Advisors, LP ("DME Advisors"), to implement our investment strategy;
- Loss of key executives could adversely impact our ability to implement our business strategy; and
- Currency fluctuations could result in exchange rate losses and negatively impact our business.

We caution that the foregoing list of important factors is not intended to be and is not exhaustive. We undertake no obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events, or otherwise and all subsequent written and oral forward-looking statements attributable to us or individuals acting on our behalf are expressly qualified in their entirety by this paragraph. If one or more risks or uncertainties materialize, or if our underlying assumptions prove to be incorrect, actual results may vary materially from what we projected. Any forward-looking statements in this Form 10-K reflect our current view with respect to future events and are subject to these and other risks, uncertainties and assumptions relating to our operations, results of operations, growth, strategy and liquidity. Readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on the forward-looking statements which speak only to the dates on which they were made.

We intend to communicate certain events that we believe may have a material adverse impact on our operations or financial position, including property and casualty catastrophic events and material losses in our investment portfolio, in a timely manner through a public announcement. Other than as required by the Exchange Act, we do not intend to make public announcements regarding reinsurance or investments events that we do not believe, based on management's estimates and current information, will have a material adverse impact on our operations or financial position.

Link to Table of Contents

Item 1. BUSINESS

Unless otherwise indicated or unless the context otherwise requires, all references in this annual report on Form 10-K to "the Company," "we," "us," "our" and similar expressions are references to Greenlight Capital Re, Ltd. and its consolidated subsidiaries. Unless otherwise indicated or unless the context otherwise requires, all references in this annual report to entity names are as set forth in the following table:

Reference	Entity’s legal name
Greenlight Capital Re	Greenlight Capital Re, Ltd.
Greenlight Re	Greenlight Reinsurance, Ltd.
GRIL	Greenlight Reinsurance Ireland, Designated Activity Company [1]
Verdant	Verdant Holding Company, Ltd.

[1] During the year ended December 31, 2015, GRIL was re-registered and the entity's legal name was amended from Greenlight Reinsurance Ireland, Limited, to Greenlight Reinsurance Ireland, Designated Activity Company, in accordance with the requirements of the Companies Act 2014 of Ireland and as stipulated by the Central Bank of Ireland for all regulated insurance and reinsurance entities in Ireland.

Company Overview

Greenlight Capital Re is a holding company that was incorporated in July 2004 under the laws of the Cayman Islands. In August 2004, we raised gross proceeds of $212.2 million from private placements of Greenlight Capital Re’s Class A ordinary shares and Class B ordinary shares, or, collectively, the ordinary shares. On May 24, 2007, Greenlight Capital Re raised proceeds of $208.3 million, net of underwriting fees, in an initial public offering of Class A ordinary shares, as well as an additional $50.0 million from a private placement of Class B ordinary shares.

We are a Cayman Islands headquartered global specialist property and casualty reinsurer with a reinsurance and investment strategy that we believe differentiates us from most of our competitors. We conduct our reinsurance operations through two licensed and regulated reinsurance entities: Greenlight Re, based in the Cayman Islands, and GRIL, based in Dublin, Ireland. Greenlight Re provides multi-line property and casualty reinsurance globally, while GRIL focuses mainly on the European market and primarily serves clients located in Europe. Our goal is to build long-term shareholder value by selectively offering customized reinsurance solutions, in markets where capacity and alternatives are limited, which we believe will yield favorable long-term returns on equity.

We aim to complement our underwriting results with a non-traditional investment approach in order to achieve higher rates of return over the long term than reinsurance companies that employ more traditional, fixed-income investment strategies. We manage our investment portfolio according to a value-oriented philosophy, in which we take long positions in perceived undervalued securities and short positions in perceived overvalued securities.

In addition, from time to time, we may seek to form long-term strategic alliances with insurance companies and general agents to complement our property and casualty reinsurance business and our non-traditional investment approach. To facilitate such strategic alliances, we formed Verdant, which, among other activities, has made and may make strategic investments in a select group of property and casualty insurers and general agents in the United States.

Because we employ an opportunistic underwriting philosophy, period-to-period comparisons of our underwriting results may not be meaningful. In addition, our historical investment results may not necessarily be indicative of future performance. Due to the nature of our reinsurance and investment strategies, our operating results will likely fluctuate from period to period.

Description of Business

Greenlight Re is licensed and regulated by the Cayman Islands Monetary Authority ("CIMA") to write property and casualty reinsurance business as well as long term business (e.g., life insurance, long term disability, long term care, etc.); however, to date we have not written any long term business. GRIL is licensed and regulated by the Central Bank of Ireland ("CBI") to write property and casualty reinsurance business. Currently, we manage our business on the basis of one operating segment: property and casualty reinsurance. We currently offer excess of loss and quota share products in the property and casualty market. Our underwriting operations are designed to capitalize on inefficiencies that we perceive exist in the traditional

Link to Table of Contents

approach to underwriting. We believe that we conduct our business differently from traditional reinsurers in multiple ways, including:

- we focus on offering customized reinsurance solutions to select customers at times and in markets where capacity and alternatives are limited rather than primarily pursuing and participating in broadly available traditional property and casualty opportunities;

- we aim to build a reinsurance portfolio comprised principally of high frequency and low severity contracts with favorable ultimate economic results measured after all loss payments have been made rather than focusing on interim reported results when losses may be incurred but not yet reported or paid;

- we generally seek to act as the lead underwriter on a majority of the contracts we underwrite in an effort to obtain greater influence in negotiating pricing, terms and conditions. We may from time to time participate in contracts that have been negotiated and priced by another party. For example, on some longer duration casualty business that is comprised of larger, syndicated reinsurance placements, we may follow the market on these transactions;

- we maintain a small group of experienced generalist underwriters that are capable of underwriting many lines of property and casualty business rather than a large staff of underwriters, each with an individual, specific focus on certain lines of business;

- we implement a "cradle to grave" service philosophy where the same deal team underwrites and services each reinsurance contract rather than separating underwriting and servicing duties among many employees; and

- we compensate our management with a cash bonus structure largely dependent on our underwriting results over a multi-year period rather than on premium volume or preliminary underwriting results in any given financial accounting period.

Our investment strategy, like our reinsurance strategy, is designed to maximize returns over the long term while minimizing the risk of capital loss. Unlike the investment strategies of many of our traditional competitors, which invest primarily in fixed-income securities either directly or through fixed-fee arrangements with one or more investment managers, our investment strategy is to invest in long and short positions primarily in publicly-traded equity and corporate debt instruments exclusively through a joint venture with DME Advisors LLC ("DME"). Our investment advisor, DME Advisors, is compensated with a fixed annual fee based on assets under management and the joint venture participant, DME, is compensated on the positive performance of our portfolio, subject to a loss carry forward. DME Advisors, which makes investments on our behalf, is a value-oriented investment advisor that analyzes companies' available financial data, business strategies and prospects in an effort to identify undervalued and overvalued securities. DME Advisors and DME are both controlled by David Einhorn, the Chairman of our Board of Directors and the President of Greenlight Capital, Inc. DME Advisors has the contractual right to manage substantially all of our investable assets until December 31, 2016, and is required to follow our investment guidelines and to act in a manner that is fair and equitable in allocating investment opportunities to us. However, DME Advisors is not otherwise restricted with respect to the nature or timing of making investments for our account.

We measure our success by long-term growth in book value per share, which we believe is the most comprehensive gauge of the performance of our business. Accordingly, our incentive compensation plans are designed to align employee and shareholder interests. Compensation under our cash bonus plan is largely dependent on the ultimate underwriting returns of our business measured over a multi-year period, rather than premium targets or estimated underwriting profitability for the year in which we initially underwrote the business.

We characterize the reinsurance risks we assume as frequency or severity and aim to balance the risks and opportunities of our underwriting activities by creating a diversified portfolio of both types of businesses, although over the long term we generally have a preference for frequency business.

Frequency business is characterized as contracts containing a potentially large number of smaller losses emanating from multiple events. Clients generally buy this protection to increase their own underwriting capacity and typically select a reinsurer based upon the reinsurer's financial strength, service and expertise. We expect the results of frequency business to be less volatile than those of severity business from period to period due to its greater predictability. We also expect that over time the profit margins and return on equity of our frequency business will be lower than those of our severity business.

Severity business is typically characterized as contracts with the potential for significant losses emanating from one event or multiple events. Clients generally buy this protection to reduce volatility from their balance sheets, and accordingly, we

Link to Table of Contents

expect the results of severity business to be volatile from period to period. However, over the long term, we also expect that our severity business will generate higher profit margins and return on equity than our frequency business.

While we intend to continue to add to, and diversify, our portfolio, our allocation of risk will vary based on our perception of the opportunities available in each line of business. Moreover, our focus on certain lines will fluctuate based upon market conditions and we may only offer or underwrite a limited number of lines in any given period. We intend to continue to:

- target markets where capacity and alternatives are underserved or constrained;
- seek clients with appropriate expertise in their line of business;
- employ strict underwriting discipline;
- select reinsurance opportunities with favorable returns on capital over the life of the contract; and
- strengthen and expand relationships with existing clients.

The following table sets forth our gross premiums written by line of business:

	Year ended December 31					
	2015		2014		2013	
	($ in thousands)					
Property						
Aviation	$691	0.1 %	$391	0.1 %	$168	0.0 %
Commercial	16,667	3.3	11,529	3.6	9,999	1.9
Energy	2,009	0.4	2,131	0.6	659	0.1
Motor physical damage	34,529	6.9	24,008	7.4	57,952	10.8
Personal	57,495	11.5	64,479	19.9	145,807	27.2
Total Property	111,391	22.2	102,538	31.6	214,585	40.0
Casualty						
General liability [1]	28,355	5.6	11,639	3.6	(815)	(0.2)
Marine liability	9,283	1.8	5,120	1.6	1,956	0.4
Motor liability	203,624	40.6	127,858	39.5	253,698	47.4
Professional liability	72,217	14.4	27,009	8.4	29,901	5.6
Total Casualty	313,479	62.4	171,626	53.1	284,740	53.2
Specialty						
Financial	7,824	1.6	5,292	1.6	3,498	0.7
Health	56,784	11.3	43,837	13.5	37,094	6.9
Workers' compensation[1]	12,646	2.5	730	0.2	(4,215)	(0.8)
Total Specialty	77,254	15.4	49,859	15.3	36,377	6.8
	$502,124	100.0 %	$324,023	100.0 %	$535,702	100.0 %

(1) The negative balance represents reversal of premiums due to premium adjustments, termination of contracts or premiums returned upon novation or commutation of contracts.

Link to Table of Contents

The following table sets forth our gross premiums written by the geographic area of the risk insured:

	Year ended December 31								
	2015			2014			2013		
	($ in thousands)								
U.S. and Caribbean	$383,236	76.3	%	$275,402	85.0	%	$496,949	92.8	%
Worldwide [1]	104,336	20.8		31,106	9.6		9,821	1.8	
Europe	14,085	2.8		17,432	5.4		28,932	5.4	
Asia	467	0.1		83	—		—	—	
	$502,124	100.0	%	$324,023	100.0	%	$535,702	100.0	%

(1) "Worldwide" is comprised of contracts that reinsure risks in more than one geographic area and do not specifically exclude the U.S.

Additional information about our business is set forth in "Item 7 — Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" and Note 15 to our consolidated financial statements included herein.

Marketing and Distribution

A majority of our business is sourced through reinsurance brokers. Brokerage distribution channels provide us with access to an efficient, variable cost and global distribution system without the significant time and expense that would be incurred in creating a wholly-owned distribution network. We believe that our financial strength rating, unencumbered balance sheet and superior client service are essential for creating long-term relationships with clients and brokers.

We aim to build and strengthen long-term relationships with global reinsurance brokers. Our management team has significant relationships with most of the primary and specialty broker intermediaries in the reinsurance marketplace. We believe that by maintaining close relationships with brokers we will be able to continue to obtain access to a broad range of reinsurance clients and opportunities. We focus on the quality and financial strength of any brokerage firm with which we do business. Brokers do not have the authority to bind us to any reinsurance contract.

Reinsurance brokers receive a brokerage commission that is usually a percentage of gross premiums written. We seek to become the first choice of brokers and clients by providing:

- customized solutions that address the specific business needs of our clients;
- rapid and substantive responses to proposal and pricing quote requests;
- timely payment of claims;
- financial security; and
- clear indication of risks we will and will not underwrite.

The following table sets forth the premiums sourced from brokers who each accounted for more than 10% of our gross written premiums:

	Year ended December 31								
	2015			2014			2013		
	($ in thousands)								
Largest broker	$278,003	55.4	%	$161,405	49.8	%	$282,337	52.7	%
2nd largest broker	110,246	22.0		61,809	19.1		119,117	22.2	

3rd largest broker	—	—		40,773	12.6		—	—	
	$388,249	77.4	%	$263,987	81.5	%	$401,454	74.9	%

We believe that by maintaining close relationships with brokers, we are able to obtain access to a range of potential clients that meet our criteria. We meet frequently in the Cayman Islands, Ireland and elsewhere with brokers and senior

Link to Table of Contents

representatives of clients and prospective clients. All contract submissions are received, reviewed and approved in our executive offices in the Cayman Islands or Ireland. Due to our dependence on brokers, the inability to obtain business from them could adversely affect our business strategy. See "Item 1A. Risk Factors — Risks Related to Our Business — The inability to obtain business provided from brokers could adversely affect our business strategy and results of operations." In addition, we may assume a degree of credit risk of our reinsurance brokers. See "Item 1A. Risk Factors — Risks Related to Our Business — We may be subject to the credit risk of our brokers, cedents and agents."

We believe that diversity in our sources of business helps reduce any potential adverse effects arising out of the termination of any one of our business relationships.

Underwriting and Risk Management

We have established a small team of generalist underwriters and actuaries to operate our reinsurance business. We believe that our underwriters' experience, coupled with our approach to underwriting, allows us to deploy our capital in a variety of lines of business and to capitalize on opportunities that we believe offer favorable returns on equity over the long term. Our underwriters and actuaries have expertise in a number of lines of business and we also look to outside consultants on a fee-for-service basis to help us with niche areas of expertise when we deem it appropriate. We generally apply the following underwriting and risk management principles:

Economics of Results

Our primary goal is to build a reinsurance portfolio that has attractive economic results. We may underwrite a reinsurance contract that may not demonstrate immediate short-term accounting benefits if we believe it will provide a favorable return on capital over the life of the contract. In pricing our products, we assume investment returns that approximate the risk-free rate, which we review and adjust, if necessary, on an annual basis.

Actuarially Based Pricing

We have developed and use proprietary actuarial models and also use several commercially available tools to price our business. Our models not only consider conventional underwriting metrics, but also incorporate a component for risk aversion that places greater weight on scenarios that result in greater losses. We price each transaction based on our view of the merits and structure of the transaction.

Team Approach

Each transaction typically is assigned to a deal team comprised of at least an underwriter and an actuary to evaluate underwriting, structuring and pricing. Prior to committing capital to any transaction, the deal team creates a deal analysis memorandum that highlights the key components of the proposed transaction and presents the proposed transaction to a senior group of staff, including underwriting, actuarial, risk management and finance. This group is provided an opportunity to critically evaluate the proposed transaction. Additionally, our Chief Executive Officer or Chief Underwriting Officer must agree that the transaction meets our underwriting guidelines before we submit a firm proposal. Our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Underwriting Officer maintain the exclusive ultimate authority to bind contracts.

Act as Lead Underwriter

Typically, one reinsurer acts as the lead underwriter in negotiating principal policy terms and pricing of reinsurance contracts. We aim to act as the lead underwriter for the majority of the aggregate premiums that we underwrite. We believe that lead underwriting is an important factor in achieving long-term success, as lead underwriters typically have greater influence in negotiating pricing, terms and conditions. In addition, we believe that reinsurers that lead policies are generally solicited for a broader range of business and have greater access to attractive opportunities. However, we may from time to time participate in contracts that have been negotiated and priced by another party. For example, on some longer duration casualty business that is comprised of larger, syndicated reinsurance placements, we may follow the market on these transactions.

Alignment of Company and Client's Interests

We seek to ensure that each contract we underwrite aligns our interests with our client's interests. Specifically, depending upon the opportunity we may seek to:

Link to Table of Contents

- pay our clients a commission based upon a predetermined percentage of the profit we realize on the business, which we refer to as a profit commission;
- provide that the client pays a predetermined amount of all losses before our reinsurance policy incurs a loss payment, which we refer to as self-insured retentions;
- provide that the client pays a predetermined proportion of all losses above a predetermined amount, which we refer to as co-participation; and/or
- charge the client a premium for reinstatement of reinsurance coverage to the full amount, which we refer to as reinstatement premium, if coverage has been reduced as a result of a reinsurance loss payment.

We believe that through profit commissions, self-insured retentions, co-participation, reinstatement premiums and other terms within the contract, our clients are provided with an incentive to manage our interests. We believe that aligning our interests with our clients' interests promotes accurate reporting of information, timely settling and management of claims and limits the potential for disputes.

Integrated Underwriting Operations

We implement a "cradle to grave" service philosophy where the same deal team underwrites and oversees each reinsurance contract. We believe this method enables us to best understand the risks and likelihood of loss for any particular contract and to provide superior client service.

Detailed Contract Diligence

We are highly selective in the contracts we choose to underwrite and spend a significant amount of time with our clients and brokers to understand the risks and appropriately structure the contracts. Where necessary, we conduct or contract for on-site audits or reviews of the clients' underwriting files, systems and operations. We usually obtain significant amounts of data from our clients to conduct a thorough actuarial modeling analysis. As part of our pricing and underwriting process, we assess, among other factors:

- the client’s and industry's historical loss data;
- the expected duration for claims to fully develop;
- the client’s pricing and underwriting strategies;
- the geographic areas in which the client is doing business and its market share;
- the reputation and financial strength of the client;
- the reputation and expertise of the broker;
- the likelihood of establishing a long-term relationship with the client and the broker; and
- reports provided by independent industry specialists.

Underwriting Authorities

We use actuarial models that we produce and apply our underwriting guidelines to analyze each reinsurance opportunity before we commit capital. The Underwriting Committee of our Board of Directors, which we refer to as the Underwriting Committee, sets parameters for zonal and aggregate property catastrophic caps and limits for maximum loss potential under any individual contract. The Underwriting Committee must approve any exceptions to the established limits. Our approach to risk control imposes an absolute loss limit on our natural catastrophic exposures as well as an estimate of probable maximum losses, and we have also established zonal and aggregate limits. We manage all non-catastrophic exposures and other risks by analyzing our maximum loss potential on a contract-by-contract basis. The maximum underwriting authorities, as set by our Underwriting Committee, may be amended from time to time, including as and when our capital base changes.

Retrocessional Coverage

We may from time to time purchase retrocessional coverage for one or more of the following reasons: to manage our overall exposure, to reduce our net liability on individual risks, to obtain additional underwriting capacity and to balance our underwriting portfolio. Additionally, retrocession can be used as a mechanism to share the risks and rewards of business written and, therefore, can be used as a tool to align our interests with those of our counterparties.

Link to Table of Contents

The amount of retrocessional coverage that we purchase varies based on numerous factors, some of which include the inherent riskiness of the portfolio of business we write and the level of our capital base. Given our opportunistic approach to underwriting, which may change the composition and inherent riskiness of our underwriting portfolio on an annual basis, it is not possible to predict the level of retrocessional coverage that we will purchase in any given year. To date, our retrocessional coverage has been primarily used as a tool to align our interests with those of our counterparties.

We intend to only purchase uncollateralized retrocessional coverage from a reinsurer with a minimum financial strength rating of "A- (Excellent)" from A.M. Best Company, Inc. ("A.M. Best") or an equivalent rating from a recognized rating service. For non-rated reinsurers, we monitor and obtain collateral in the form of cash, funds withheld, letters of credit, regulatory trusts or other collateral in the form of guarantees. As of December 31, 2015, the aggregate amount due from reinsurers from retrocessional coverages represents 1.1% (2014: 4.4%) of our gross outstanding loss reserves. For further details please see Note 8 to the consolidated financial statements. We regularly evaluate the financial condition of our reinsurers to assess their ability to honor their obligations. At December 31, 2015 and 2014, no provision for uncollectible losses recoverable was considered necessary.

Capital Allocation

We allocate capital to each contract that we bind. Our capital allocation methodology uses the probability and magnitude of potential for economic loss. We allocate capital for the period from each contract’s inception until the risk is resolved. We have developed a proprietary return on equity capital allocation model to evaluate and price each reinsurance contract that we underwrite. We use different return on equity thresholds depending on the type and risk characteristics of the business we underwrite.

Claims Management

Our claims management process begins upon receipt of claims submissions from our clients, which the underwriter reviews for authorization prior to entry and settlement. Additionally, our in-house claims manager is responsible for overseeing the review of claims and providing approval for complex or large claim settlements. We believe this ensures that we pay claims consistently within the terms and conditions of each contract. Depending on the size of the claim payment, additional approvals for payment must be obtained from our executive officers.

Where necessary, we conduct or contract for on-site claims and underwriting audits at cedents and third party claims handlers, particularly for large accounts and for those whose performance differs from our expectations. Through these audits, we evaluate and monitor ceding companies’ claims-handling practices, including the organization of their claims departments, their fact-finding and investigation techniques, their loss notifications, the adequacy of their reserves, their negotiation and settlement practices and their adherence to claims-handling guidelines.

We recognize that fair interpretation of our reinsurance agreements with our clients and timely payment of covered claims are valuable services to our clients.

Reserves

Our reserving philosophy is to set reserves to our best estimate of the actual results that stem from the risks underwritten. Our actuaries provide reserving estimates on a quarterly basis calculated to meet our estimated future obligations. We reserve on a transaction by transaction basis. We engage independent external actuaries who review and provide an opinion on these estimates at least once a year. Due to the use of different assumptions, accounting treatment and loss experience, the amount we establish as reserves with respect to individual risks, transactions or classes of business may be greater or less than those established by clients or ceding companies. Reserves may also include unearned premiums, premium deposits, profit sharing earned but not yet paid, claims reported but not yet paid, claims incurred but not reported and claims in the process of settlement.

Reserves do not represent an exact calculation of liability. Rather, reserves represent our best estimate of the expected cost of the ultimate settlement and administration of the claim. Although the methods for establishing reserves are well-tested, some of the major assumptions about anticipated loss emergence patterns are subject to unanticipated fluctuation. We base these estimates on our assessment of facts and circumstances then known, as well as estimates of future trends in claim severity and frequency, judicial theories of liability and other factors, including the actions of third parties, which are beyond our control.

Link to Table of Contents

Collateral Arrangements and Letter of Credit Facilities

We are licensed and admitted as an insurer only in the Cayman Islands and the European Economic Area. Many jurisdictions, such as the United States, do not permit clients to take credit for reinsurance on their statutory financial statements if such reinsurance is obtained from unlicensed or non-admitted insurers without appropriate collateral. As a result, we anticipate that all of our U.S. clients and a portion of our non-U.S. clients will require us to provide collateral for the contracts we bind with them. We expect this collateral to take the form of funds withheld, trust arrangements or letters of credit. As of December 31, 2015, we had letter of credit facilities with an aggregate capacity of $720.0 million (2014: $760.0 million). As of December 31, 2015, we had issued letters of credit totaling $245.6 million (2014: $273.7 million) to clients. Additionally, as of December 31, 2015, we had pledged $78.6 million (2014: nil) as collateral through trust arrangements. The failure to maintain, replace or increase our letter of credit facilities and trust arrangements on commercially acceptable terms may significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy. See "Item 1A. Risk Factors — Risks Relating to Our Business — Our failure to maintain sufficient collateral arrangements or to increase our collateral capacity on commercially acceptable terms as we grow could significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy."

Competition

The reinsurance industry is highly competitive. We compete with major reinsurers, most of which are well established, have significant operating histories and strong financial strength ratings, and have developed long-standing client relationships.

Our competitors include ACE Limited, Everest Re, General Re Corporation, Hannover Re Group, Munich Reinsurance Company, PartnerRe Ltd., Swiss Reinsurance Company, Third Point Reinsurance Ltd. and Transatlantic Reinsurance Company, as well as smaller companies and other niche reinsurers. Although we seek to provide coverage where capacity and alternatives are limited, we directly compete with these larger companies due to the breadth of their coverage across the property and casualty market in substantially all lines of business.

While most of our competitors have had a longer operating history than us, we believe that our approach to underwriting allows us to be successful in underwriting transactions against more established competitors.

Ratings

Currently, our reinsurance subsidiaries, Greenlight Re and GRIL are both rated "A (Excellent)" by A.M. Best. On October 23, 2015, A.M. Best affirmed Greenlight Re's rating of "A (Excellent)" but revised the outlook from stable to negative. The "A (Excellent)" rating from A.M. Best is the third highest of 15 ratings. We believe that a strong rating is an important factor in the marketing of reinsurance products to clients and brokers. These ratings reflect the rating agency’s opinion of our reinsurance subsidiaries' financial strength, operating performance and ability to meet obligations. It is not an evaluation directed toward the protection of investors or a recommendation to buy, sell or hold our Class A ordinary shares.

The failure to maintain a strong rating may significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy. See "Item 1A. Risk Factors — Risks Relating to Our Business — A downgrade or withdrawal of either of our A.M. Best ratings may significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy successfully."

Regulations

Cayman Islands Insurance Regulation

The legislative framework for the carrying on of insurance and reinsurance business in and from within the Cayman Islands is comprised of The Insurance Law, 2010 and underlying regulations thereto (the "Law") which was brought into force in the Cayman Islands effective as of November 1, 2012.

Greenlight Re holds a Class D insurer license issued in accordance with the terms of the Law and is subject to regulation by CIMA.

As the holder of a Class D insurer license, Greenlight Re is permitted to carry on reinsurance business from the Cayman Islands, but, except with the prior written approval of CIMA, may not carry on any insurance or reinsurance business where the underlying risk originates and resides in the Cayman Islands.

Greenlight Re is required to comply with the following principal requirements under the Law:

Link to Table of Contents

to maintain capital and a margin of solvency in accordance with the capital and solvency requirements prescribed by the Law;

to carry on its business in accordance with the terms of the license application submitted to CIMA and to seek the prior approval of CIMA for any proposed change thereto;

to maintain adequate arrangements for the management of risks and a system of governance as approved by CIMA;

to maintain a minimum of at least two directors and to seek the prior approval of CIMA in respect of the appointment of directors and officers and to provide CIMA with information in connection therewith and notification of any changes thereto;

to have a place of business in the Cayman Islands and to maintain such resources, including staff and facilities, books and records as CIMA considers appropriate having regard for the nature and scale of the business of Greenlight Re;

to submit to CIMA an annual return in the prescribed form together with:
1. financial statements prepared in accordance with any internationally recognized accounting standards, audited by an independent auditor approved by CIMA;
2. an actuarial valuation of Greenlight Re's assets and liabilities, certified by an actuary approved by CIMA;
3. certification of solvency prepared by a person approved by CIMA in accordance with the prescribed requirements;
4. confirmation that the information contained in Greenlight Re's license application, as modified by any subsequent changes, remains correct; and
5. such other information as may be prescribed by CIMA; and

to pay an annual license fee.

It is the duty of CIMA:

to maintain a general review of insurance practices in the Cayman Islands;

to examine the affairs or business of any licensee or other person carrying on, or who has carried on, insurance business in order to ensure that the Law has been complied with and that the licensee is in a sound financial position and is carrying on its business in a fit and proper manner;

to examine and report on the annual returns delivered to CIMA in terms of the Law; and

to examine and make recommendations with respect to, among other things, proposals for the revocation of licenses and cases of suspected insolvency of licensed entities.

Where CIMA believes that a licensee is committing, or is about to commit or pursue, an act that is an unsafe or unsound business practice, CIMA may direct the licensee to cease or refrain from committing the act or pursuing the offending course of conduct. Failure to comply with such a CIMA direction may be punishable on summary conviction by a fine of up to 100,000 Cayman Islands dollars (which is approximately US$120,000) or to imprisonment for a term of five years or to both, and on conviction on indictment to a fine of 500,000 Cayman Islands dollars (which is approximately US$600,000) or to imprisonment for a term of ten years or to both and to an additional 10,000 Cayman Islands dollars (which is approximately US$12,000) for every day after conviction that the breach continues.

Whenever CIMA believes that a licensee is or may become unable to meet its obligations as they fall due, is carrying on business in a manner likely to be detrimental to the public interest or to the interest of its creditors or policyholders, has contravened the terms of the Law or has otherwise behaved in such a manner so as to cause CIMA to call into question the licensee's fitness, CIMA may take one of a number of steps, including requiring the licensee to take steps to rectify the matter, suspending the license of the licensee, revoking the license, imposing conditions upon the license and amending or revoking

Link to Table of Contents

any such condition, requiring the substitution of any director, manager or officer of the licensee, at the expense of the licensee, appointing a person to advise the licensee on the proper conduct of its affairs and to report to CIMA thereon, at the expense of the licensee, appointing a person to assume control of the licensee’s affairs or otherwise requiring such action to be taken by the licensee as CIMA considers necessary. To date, we have not been subject to any such actions from CIMA.

Other Regulations in the Cayman Islands

As Cayman Islands exempted companies, Greenlight Capital Re and Greenlight Re may not carry on business or trade locally in the Cayman Islands except in furtherance of their business outside the Cayman Islands, and are prohibited from soliciting the public of the Cayman Islands to subscribe for any of their securities or debt. We are further required to file a return with the Registrar of Companies in January of each year and to pay an annual registration fee at that time.

The Cayman Islands has no exchange controls restricting dealings in currencies or securities.

Ireland Insurance Regulations

Our Irish subsidiary, GRIL, is authorized as a non-life reinsurance undertaking by the CBI. The Solvency II Directive 2009/138/EC (known as "Solvency II") introduced a new European regulatory regime for insurers and reinsurers and has been transposed into Irish law by the European Union (Insurance and Reinsurance) Regulations 2015 (the "Irish Regulations"). GRIL is now authorized to conduct reinsurance business under provisions of the Irish Regulations which became effective on January 1, 2016. GRIL is required to comply at all times with the Irish Regulations, the Irish Insurance Acts 1909 to 2015, regulations relating to insurance business or reinsurance business promulgated under the European Communities Act 1972, the Irish Central Bank Acts 1942 to 2015 as amended, regulations promulgated thereunder and directions, guidelines and codes of conduct issued by CBI (collectively the "Irish Insurance Acts and Regulations"). In addition, GRIL is required to meet risk-based solvency requirements imposed under Solvency II on insurers and reinsurers across all member states, including Ireland. Solvency II, together with European Commission "delegated acts" and guidance issued by the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority, sets out classification and eligibility requirements, including the characteristics required for any capital contribution to qualify as regulatory capital.

Overview of Investments

Our investment portfolio is managed by DME Advisors, a value-oriented investment advisor that analyzes companies' available financial data, business strategies and prospects in an effort to identify undervalued and overvalued securities. DME Advisors is controlled by David Einhorn, the Chairman of our Board of Directors and the President of Greenlight Capital, Inc. Effective January 1, 2014 we entered into a second amended and restated agreement (the "venture agreement"), wherein the Company, Greenlight Re, GRIL, and DME have agreed to create a joint venture for the purposes of managing certain jointly held assets. The venture agreement, which replaces the previous agreement dated August 31, 2010, expires on December 31, 2016 and will renew automatically for successive three-year periods unless at least 90 days prior to the end of the then current term, DME notifies the other participants of its desire to terminate the venture agreement or any other participant notifies DME of its desire to withdraw from the venture agreement. Simultaneously with the venture agreement, we entered into an investment advisory agreement (the "advisory agreement") with DME Advisors to provide discretionary advisory services relating to the assets and liabilities of the venture. The advisory agreement term period mirrors that of the venture agreement.

Pursuant to the venture agreement and the advisory agreement, DME Advisors has the exclusive right to manage substantially all of our investable assets, subject to the investment guidelines adopted by the respective Boards of

Directors of Greenlight Re and GRIL, for so long as the venture agreement is in effect. DME Advisors receives a monthly management fee based on an annual rate of 1.5% of the capital account balance of each participant. In addition, DME receives a performance allocation based on the positive performance change in such participant’s capital account equal to 20% of net profits calculated per annum, subject to a loss carry forward provision.

The loss carry forward provision allows DME to earn a reduced performance allocation of 10% on profits in any year subsequent to the year in which a participant's capital account (other than DME) incurs a loss, until all the losses are recouped and an additional amount equal to 150% of the loss is earned. DME is not entitled to a performance allocation in a year in which such participant's capital account incurs a loss.

DME Advisors is required to follow our investment guidelines and act in a manner that it considers fair and equitable in allocating investment opportunities to us, but the advisory agreement does not otherwise impose any specific obligations or requirements concerning the allocation of time, effort or investment opportunities to us or any restrictions on the nature or timing of investments for our account, or other accounts that DME Advisors or its affiliates may manage. In addition, DME

Link to Table of Contents

Advisors can outsource to sub-advisors without our consent or approval. In the event that DME Advisors and any of its affiliates attempt to simultaneously invest in the same opportunity, the opportunity will be allocated pro-rata as reasonably determined by DME Advisors and its affiliates. Affiliates of DME Advisors presently serve as general partner or investment advisor of Greenlight Capital, L.P., Greenlight Capital Qualified, L.P., Greenlight Capital Offshore, Ltd., Greenlight Capital Offshore Qualified, Ltd., Greenlight Capital Offshore Partners, Greenlight Capital (Gold), L.P., Greenlight Capital Offshore (Gold), Ltd., Greenlight Capital Offshore Master (Gold), Ltd., Greenlight Masters, L.P., Greenlight Masters Qualified, L.P., Greenlight Masters Offshore, Ltd., Greenlight Masters Offshore I, Ltd., Greenlight Masters Offshore Partners and Greenlight Masters Partners (collectively the "Greenlight Funds").

We have agreed to use commercially reasonable efforts to cause all of our current and future subsidiaries to enter into substantially similar venture agreements, provided that any such agreement shall be terminable on the same date that the venture agreement is terminable.

We have agreed to release DME and DME Advisors and their affiliates from, and to indemnify and hold them harmless against, any liability arising out of the venture agreement and the advisory agreement, subject to certain exceptions. Furthermore, DME and DME Advisors and their affiliates have agreed to indemnify us against any liability incurred in connection with certain actions.

Greenlight Re or GRIL may also withdraw as a participant under the venture agreement prior to the expiration of its term at any time only ‘‘for cause,’’ which the venture agreement defines as:

- a material violation of applicable law relating to DME's or DME Advisors’ advisory business;

- DME's or DME Advisors' gross negligence, willful misconduct or reckless disregard of any of DME's obligations under the venture agreement or DME Advisors' obligations under the advisory agreement;

- a material breach by DME or DME Advisors of Greenlight Re’s or GRIL’s investment guidelines that is not cured within a 15-day period; or

- a material breach by DME or DME Advisors of its obligations to return and deliver assets as we may request.

In addition, GRIL may withdraw as a participant under the venture agreement prior to the expiration of its term due to unsatisfactory long term performance of DME Advisors, as determined solely by the Board of Directors of GRIL on each anniversary date of the venture agreement.

Investment Strategy

DME Advisors implements a value-oriented investment strategy by taking long positions in perceived undervalued securities and short positions in perceived overvalued securities. DME Advisors aims to achieve high absolute rates of return while minimizing the risk of capital loss. DME Advisors attempts to determine the risk/return characteristics of potential investments by analyzing factors such as the risk that expected cash flows will not be obtained, the volatility of the cash flows, the leverage of the underlying business and the security's liquidity, among others.

Our Board of Directors conducts reviews of our investment portfolio activities and oversees our investment guidelines to meet our investment objectives. We believe our investment approach, while less predictable than traditional fixed-income portfolios, complements our reinsurance business and will achieve higher rates of return over the long term than reinsurance companies that invest predominantly in fixed-income securities. Our investment guidelines are designed to maintain adequate liquidity to fund our reinsurance operations and to protect against unexpected events.

DME Advisors, which is contractually obligated to adhere to our investment guidelines, makes investment decisions on our behalf, which may include buying publicly listed equity securities and corporate debt, selling securities short and investing in private placements, futures, currencies, commodities, credit default swaps, interest rate swaps, sovereign debt, derivatives and other instruments. As of December 31, 2015, DME Advisors was in compliance with our investment guidelines.

Link to Table of Contents

Investment Guidelines

The investment guidelines adopted by the respective Boards of Directors of Greenlight Re and GRIL, which may be amended or modified from time to time, take into account restrictions imposed on us by regulators, our liability mix, requirements to maintain an appropriate claims paying rating by ratings agencies and requirements of lenders.

As of the date hereof, the investment guidelines for Greenlight Re currently state:

Composition of Investments: At least 80% of the assets in the investment portfolio will be held in debt or equity securities (including swaps) of publicly-traded companies (or their subsidiaries) and governments of the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development, (the "OECD"), high income countries, cash, cash equivalents and gold. No more than 10% of the assets in the investment portfolio will be held in private equity securities.

Concentration of Investments: Other than cash, cash equivalents, United States government obligations and gold, no single investment in the investment portfolio will constitute more than 20% of the portfolio.

Liquidity: Assets will be invested in such fashion that Greenlight Re has a reasonable expectation that it can meet any of its liabilities as they become due. Greenlight Re will review with the investment advisor the liquidity of the portfolio on a periodic basis.

Monitoring: Greenlight Re will require the investment advisor to re-evaluate each position in the investment portfolio and to monitor changes in intrinsic value and trading value and provide monthly reports on the investment portfolio to Greenlight Re as Greenlight Re may reasonably determine.

Leverage: The investment portfolio may not employ greater than 15% indebtedness for borrowed money, including net margin balances, for extended time periods. The investment advisor may employ, in the normal course of business, up to 30% indebtedness for periods of less than 30 days.

The investment guidelines for GRIL are identical to Greenlight Re's except for concentration of investments and leverage, which for GRIL are as follows:

Concentration of Investments: Other than cash, cash equivalents and United States government obligations, (1) no single investment in the investment portfolio will constitute more than 10% of the portfolio, (2) the 10 largest investments shall not constitute greater than 50% of the total investment portfolio, and (3) the investment portfolio shall at all times be comprised of a minimum of 50 debt or equity securities of publicly traded companies (or their subsidiaries).

Leverage: The investment portfolio may not employ greater than 5% indebtedness for borrowed money, including net margin balances, for extended time periods. The investment advisor may use, in the normal course of business, an aggregate of up to 20% net margin leverage for periods of less than 30 days.

Link to Table of Contents

Investment Results

Composition

The following table represents the fair value of the total long positions in our investment portfolio as reported in the consolidated financial statements:

	December 31					
	2015			2014		
	($ in thousands)					
Debt instruments	$39,087	3.3	%	$49,212	3.2	%
Equities – listed	890,653	76.2		1,246,427	82.4	
Exchange traded funds	15,341	1.3		19,748	1.3	
Commodities	98,046	8.4		96,872	6.4	
Private and unlisted equity securities	21,037	1.8		18,719	1.2	
	1,064,164	91.0		1,430,978	94.5	
Funds and cash held with brokers and swap counterparties	120,276	10.3		79,806	5.3	
Financial contracts, net	(15,030)	(1.3)		2,579	0.2	
Total long investments	$1,169,410	100.0	%	$1,513,363	100.0	%

The following table represents the fair value of our total short positions as reported in the consolidated financial statements:

	December 31					
	2015			2014		
	($ in thousands)					
Equities – listed	$796,054	90.2	%	$823,390	75.5	%
Exchange traded funds	12,427	1.4		10,838	1.0	
Corporate debt – U.S.	—	—		6,064	0.6	
Sovereign debt – Non U.S.	74,425	8.4		250,439	22.9	
Total short investments	$882,906	100.0	%	$1,090,731	100.0	%

DME Advisors also reports the composition of our managed portfolio on a delta adjusted and notional exposure basis, which it believes is the appropriate manner in which to assess the exposure and profile of investments and is the way in which it manages the portfolio. This exposure analysis does not include cash (U.S. dollar and foreign currencies), gold and other commodities, credit default swaps, sovereign debt, foreign currency derivatives, interest rate options and other macro positions. In addition, under this methodology, the exposure for total return swaps is reported at full notional amount. The notional amount of a derivative contract is the underlying value upon which payment obligations are computed. For an equity total return swap, for example, the notional amount is the number of shares underlying the swap multiplied by the market price of those shares. Options are reported at their delta adjusted basis. The delta of an option is the sensitivity of the option price to the underlying stock (or commodity) price. The delta adjusted basis is the number of shares underlying the option multiplied by the delta and the underlying stock (or commodity) price.

The following table represents the composition of our investment portfolio based on the percentage of assets in our investment account managed by DME Advisors:

	December 31							
	2015				2014			
	Long %		Short %		Long %		Short %	
Debt instruments	1.9	%	—	%	1.0	%	(2.8	)%

Equities & related derivatives	86.0	(74.0)	102.1	(64.1)
Private and unlisted equity securities	1.6	—	2.7	—
Total	89.5 %	(74.0)%	105.8 %	(66.9)%

16

Link to Table of Contents

As of December 31, 2015, our exposure to gold on a delta adjusted basis was 10.7% (2014: 6.8%).

The following table represents the composition of our investment portfolio, by industry sector, based on the percentage of assets in our investment account managed by DME Advisors as of December 31, 2015:

Sector	Long %	Short %	Net %
Basic Materials	7.7 %	(4.6)%	3.1 %
Consumer Cyclical	26.9	(9.9)	17.0
Consumer Non-Cyclical	0.7	(8.3)	(7.6)
Energy	8.2	(5.9)	2.3
Financial	11.8	(8.8)	3.0
Healthcare	5.0	(13.2)	(8.2)
Industrial	10.8	(9.8)	1.0
Technology	11.2	(13.5)	(2.3)
Utilities	7.2	—	7.2
Total	89.5 %	(74.0)%	15.5 %

The following table represents the composition of our investment portfolio, by the market capitalization of the underlying security, based on the percentage of assets in our investment account managed by DME Advisors as of December 31, 2015:

Capitalization	Long %	Short %	Net %
Mega Cap Equity (≥$25 billion)	25.5 %	(24.8)%	0.7 %
Large Cap Equity (≥$5 billion and <$25 billion)	29.1	(37.0)	(7.9)
Mid Cap Equity (≥$1 billion and <$5 billion)	26.8	(12.1)	14.7
Small Cap Equity (<$1 billion)	4.6	(0.1)	4.5
Debt Instruments	1.9	—	1.9
Other Investments	1.6	—	1.6
Total	89.5 %	(74.0)%	15.5 %

Investment Returns

A summary of our consolidated net investment income is as follows:

	Year ended December 31		
	2015	2014	2013
	($ in thousands)		
Realized gains (losses)	$22,227	$352,133	$122,568
Change in unrealized gains and losses	(265,401)	(187,753)	149,012
Investment related foreign exchange gains (losses)	(3,725)	14,797	44,492
Interest and dividend income, net of withholding taxes	15,313	31,423	22,265
Interest, dividend and other expenses	(31,092)	(38,892)	(47,665)
Investment advisor compensation	(19,246)	(49,133)	(72,532)
Net investment income (loss)	$(281,924)	$122,575	$218,140

Link to Table of Contents

Our investment return is based on the total assets in our investment account, which includes the majority of our equity capital and collected premiums. Investment returns, net of all fees and expenses, by quarter and for the last five years are as follows: [1]

Quarter	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
1st	(1.8)%	(0.7)%	5.8 %	6.5 %	(3.4)%
2nd	(1.5)	8.1	2.0	(3.3)	(1.9)
3rd	(14.2)	(3.7)	4.0	8.8	0.1
4th	(4.0)	5.3	6.6	(4.4)	7.6
Full Year	(20.2)%	8.7 %	19.6 %	7.1 %	2.1 %

[1] Investment returns are calculated monthly and compounded to calculate the quarterly and annual returns. Actual investment income may vary depending on cash flows into and out of the investment account. Past performance is not necessarily indicative of future results.

DME Advisors and its affiliates manage and expect to manage other client accounts besides ours, some of which have, or may have, objectives similar to ours. Because of the similarity or potential similarity of our investment portfolio to these other client accounts, and because, as a matter of ordinary course, DME Advisors and its affiliates provide their clients, including us, with results of their respective investment portfolios on the last day of each month, those other clients indirectly may have material non-public information regarding our investment portfolio. To address this issue, and to comply with Regulation FD, we present, prior to the start of trading on the first business day of each month, our largest disclosed long positions, a summary of our consolidated net investment returns, information on our long and short exposures and from time to time certain other material information relating to our investment portfolio, on our website, www.greenlightre.ky. DME Advisors may choose not to disclose certain positions to its clients in order to protect its investment strategy. Therefore, we present on our website the largest positions held by us that are disclosed by DME Advisors or its affiliates to their other clients.

Internal Risk Management

Our risk manager is responsible for the construct and review of our internal risk management function. We review our investment portfolio together with our reinsurance operations on a periodic basis to ensure that we have sufficient capital to withstand losses on either or both of our investment and reinsurance portfolios under stressed scenarios. With the assistance of DME Advisors, we periodically analyze both our assets and liabilities including the numerous components of risk in our portfolio, such as concentration risk and liquidity risk.

Information Technology

Our information technology infrastructure is currently housed in our corporate offices in Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands. We have implemented backup procedures to ensure that data is backed up on a daily basis and can be restored in an appropriate time frame as needed.

We have a disaster recovery plan with respect to our information technology infrastructure that includes data and systems replication between our Cayman Islands office and Dublin office and other off-site locations. We believe we can access our core systems with insignificant outages and restore operation of our secondary systems in the event that our primary systems are unavailable due to a disaster or otherwise.

Employees

As of December 31, 2015, we had 30 full-time employees, 25 of whom were based in Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands and 5 were based in Dublin, Ireland. We believe that our employee relations are good. None of our employees are subject to collective bargaining agreements, and we are not aware of any current efforts to implement such agreements.

Link to Table of Contents

Additional Information

Our website address is www.greenlightre.ky and we make available, free of charge, on or through our website, links to our annual reports on Form 10-K and quarterly reports on Form 10-Q including XBRL instance documents, current reports on Form 8-K and other documents we file with or furnish to the SEC, as soon as reasonably practicable after such material is electronically filed with or furnished to the SEC. In order to comply with Regulation FD, our investment returns are posted on our website on a monthly basis. Additionally, our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics is available on our website.

ITEM 1A. RISK FACTORS

Any of these factors could result in a significant or material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial condition. Additional risk factors not presently known to us or that we currently deem immaterial may also impair our business or results of operations.

Risks Relating to Our Business

Our results of operations will likely fluctuate from period to period and may not be indicative of our long-term prospects.

The performance of our reinsurance operations and our investment portfolio will likely fluctuate from period to period. Fluctuations will result from a variety of factors, including:

- reinsurance contract pricing;
- our assessment of the quality of available reinsurance opportunities;
- the volume and mix of reinsurance products we underwrite;
- loss experience on our reinsurance liabilities;
- the performance of our investment portfolio; and
- our ability to assess and integrate our risk management strategy properly.

In particular, we seek attractive opportunities to underwrite products and make investments to achieve favorable returns on equity over the long term. Our investment strategy to invest primarily in long and short positions in publicly-traded equity and debt instruments is subject to market volatility and is likely to be more volatile than traditional fixed-income portfolios that are comprised primarily of investment grade bonds. In addition, our differentiated strategy and focus on long-term growth in book value will result in fluctuations in total premiums written from period to period as we concentrate on underwriting contracts that we believe will generate better long-term, rather than short-term, results. Accordingly, our short-term results of operations may not be indicative of our long-term prospects.

Established competitors with greater resources may make it difficult for us to effectively market our products or offer our products at a profit.

The reinsurance industry is highly competitive. We compete with major reinsurers, many of which have substantially greater financial, marketing and management resources than we do. Competition in the types of business that we underwrite is based on many factors, including:

- premium charges;
- ability to obtain terms and conditions appropriate with the risk being assumed and in accordance with our underwriting guidelines;
- the general reputation and perceived financial strength of the reinsurer;

- relationships with reinsurance brokers;
- ratings assigned by independent rating agencies;
- speed of claims payment and reputation; and
- the experience and reputation of the members of our underwriting team in the particular lines of reinsurance we seek to underwrite.

Additionally, although the members of our underwriting team have general experience across many property and casualty lines, they may not have the requisite experience or expertise to compete for all transactions that fall within our strategy of offering customized frequency and severity contracts at times and in markets where capacity and alternatives may be limited.

Link to Table of Contents

Our competitors include ACE Limited, Everest Re, General Re Corporation, Hannover Re Group, Munich Reinsurance Company, PartnerRe Ltd., Swiss Reinsurance Company and Transatlantic Reinsurance Company. Although we seek to provide coverage where capacity and alternatives are limited, we directly compete with these larger companies due to the breadth of their coverage across the property and casualty market in substantially all lines of business. We also compete with other reinsurers, such as Third Point Reinsurance Ltd., which may have similar investment strategies and may seek similar underwriting opportunities.

Further, our ability to compete may be harmed if insurance industry participants continue to consolidate. Consolidated entities may try to use their enhanced market power to negotiate price reductions for our products and services. If competitive pressures reduce our prices, we would expect to write less business. If and when the insurance industry further consolidates, competition for customers may become more intense, and the importance of acquiring and properly servicing each customer may become greater. We could incur greater expenses relating to customer acquisition and retention, further reducing our operating margins. In addition, insurance companies that merge may be able to spread their risks across a consolidated, larger capital base so that they require less reinsurance. The number of companies offering retrocessional reinsurance may decline. Reinsurance intermediaries could also consolidate, potentially adversely impacting our ability to access business and distribute our products. We could also experience more robust competition from larger, better capitalized competitors. Any of the foregoing could significantly, and negatively, affect our business or our results of operations.

We cannot assure you that we will be able to compete successfully in the reinsurance market. Our failure to compete effectively could significantly and negatively affect our financial condition and results of operations and may increase the likelihood that we may be deemed to be a passive foreign investment company or an investment company. See "Item 1A. Risk Factors - Risks Relating to Insurance and Other Regulations — We are subject to the risk of possibly becoming an investment company under U.S. federal securities law."

If our losses and loss adjustment expenses greatly exceed our loss reserves, our financial condition may be significantly and negatively affected.

Our results of operations and financial condition depend upon our ability to assess accurately the potential losses and loss adjustment expenses associated with the risks we reinsure. Reserves are estimates at a given time of claims an insurer ultimately expects to pay, based upon facts and circumstances then known, predictions of future events, estimates of future trends in claim severity and other variable factors. The inherent uncertainties of estimating loss reserves generally are greater for reinsurance companies as compared to primary insurers, primarily due to:

- the lapse of time from the occurrence of an event to the reporting of the claim and the ultimate resolution or settlement of the claim;
- the diversity of development patterns among different types of reinsurance treaties; and
- the necessary reliance on the client for information regarding claims.

On the majority of premiums we underwrite, our estimation of reserves may be less reliable than the reserve estimations of a reinsurer with a greater volume of business and an established loss history. Actual losses and loss adjustment expenses paid may deviate substantially from the estimates of our loss reserves contained in our financial statements and could negatively affect our results of operations. If we determine our loss reserves to be inadequate, we will increase our loss reserves with a corresponding reduction in our net income and capital in the period in which we identify the deficiency, and such a reduction would also negatively affect our results of operations. If our losses and loss adjustment expenses greatly exceed our loss reserves, our financial condition may be significantly and negatively affected. For a summary of the effects of reserve re-estimation on prior year reserves and net income, see "Part II. Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations - Critical

Accounting Policies, Loss and Loss Adjustment Expense Reserves."

The effect of emerging claim and coverage issues on our business is uncertain.

As industry practices and legal, judicial and regulatory conditions change, unexpected issues related to claims and coverage may emerge. Various provisions of our contracts, such as limitations or exclusions from coverage or choice of forum, may be difficult to enforce in the manner we intend, due to, among other things, disputes relating to coverage and choice of legal forum. These issues may adversely affect our business by either extending coverage beyond the period that we intended or by increasing the number or size of claims. In some instances, these changes may not manifest themselves until many years after we have issued insurance or reinsurance contracts that are affected by these changes. As a result, we may not be able to ascertain the full extent

Link to Table of Contents

of our liabilities under our insurance or reinsurance contracts for many years following the issuance of our contracts. The effects of unforeseen development or substantial government intervention could adversely impact our ability to adhere to our goals.

A downgrade or withdrawal of either of our A.M. Best ratings may significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy successfully.

Companies, insurers and reinsurance brokers use ratings from independent rating agencies as an important means of assessing the financial strength and quality of reinsurers. In October 2015, A.M. Best reaffirmed our financial strength rating of "A (Excellent)" for each of Greenlight Re and GRIL, but amended the outlook from stable to negative. A (Excellent) is the third highest of 15 ratings that A.M. Best issues. These ratings reflect the rating agency’s opinion of our reinsurance subsidiaries' financial strength, operating performance and ability to meet obligations. It is not an evaluation directed toward the protection of investors or a recommendation to buy, sell or hold our Class A ordinary shares. A.M. Best periodically reviews our ratings and may revise one or more of our ratings downward or revoke them at its sole discretion based primarily on its analysis of our balance sheet strength, operating performance and business profile. Factors that may affect such an analysis include:

- if we change our business practices from our organizational business plan in a manner that no longer supports our A.M. Best ratings;
- if unfavorable financial or market trends impact us;
- if our actual losses significantly exceed our loss reserves;
- if A.M. Best alters its capital adequacy assessment methodology in a manner that would adversely affect the rating of either reinsurer;
- if we are unable to retain our senior management and other key personnel; or
- if our investment portfolio incurs significant losses.

If A.M. Best downgrades or withdraws either of our ratings, we could be severely limited or prevented from writing any new reinsurance contracts, which would significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy.

Some of our reinsurance contracts provide the client with the right to terminate the agreement if our A.M. Best ratings are downgraded below certain rating thresholds. We expect that similar provisions will also be included in some contracts in the future. See - "A downgrade in our ratings below specified levels or a significant decrease in our capital or surplus could enable certain clients to terminate reinsurance agreements or to require additional collateral."

The property and casualty reinsurance market may be affected by cyclical trends.

We write reinsurance in the property and casualty markets. The property and casualty reinsurance industry is cyclical. Primary insurers’ underwriting results, prevailing general economic and market conditions, liability retention decisions of companies and primary insurers and reinsurance premium rates influence the demand for property and casualty reinsurance. Prevailing prices and available surplus to support assumed business influence reinsurance supply. Supply may fluctuate in response to changes in return on capital realized in the reinsurance industry, the frequency and severity of losses and prevailing general economic and market conditions.

As a result, the reinsurance business historically has been a cyclical industry characterized by periods of intense price competition due to high levels of available underwriting capacity as well as periods when shortages of capacity have permitted favorable premium levels and changes in terms and conditions. The supply of available reinsurance capital has increased over the past several years and may increase further, either as a result of capital provided by new entrants or by the commitment of additional capital by existing insurers or reinsurers.

Continued increases in the supply of reinsurance may have consequences for the reinsurance industry generally and for us, including fewer contracts written, lower premium rates, increased expenses for customer acquisition and retention, less favorable policy terms and conditions and/or lower premium volume.

Link to Table of Contents

Unpredictable developments, including courts granting increasingly larger awards for certain damages, natural disasters (such as catastrophic hurricanes, windstorms, tornadoes, earthquakes, wildfires and floods), fluctuations in interest rates, changes in the investment environment that affect market prices of investments and inflationary pressures, affect the industry’s profitability. The effects of cyclicality could significantly and negatively affect our financial condition and results of operations.

The global economic downturns and any significant weakness in the U.S. economy could harm our business, our liquidity and financial condition and our stock price.

Weak economic conditions may adversely affect (among other aspects of our business) the demand for and claims made under our products, the ability of customers, counterparties and others to establish or maintain their relationships with us, our ability to access and efficiently use internal and external capital resources and our investment performance. Volatility in the U.S. and other securities markets may adversely affect our investment portfolio and our stock price.

A downgrade in our ratings below specified levels or a significant decrease in our capital or surplus could enable certain clients to terminate reinsurance agreements or to require additional collateral.

Certain of our assumed reinsurance contracts contain provisions that permit our clients to cancel the contract or require additional collateral in the event of a downgrade in our ratings below specified levels or a reduction of our capital or surplus below specified levels over the course of the agreement. Whether a client would exercise such cancellation rights would likely depend, among other things, on the reason the provision is triggered, the prevailing market conditions, the degree of unexpired coverage and the pricing and availability of replacement reinsurance coverage.

If any such provisions were to become exercisable, we cannot predict whether or how many of our clients would actually exercise such rights or the extent to which they would have a significant and negative effect on our financial condition, results of operations or future prospects but they could have a significant adverse effect on the operations of our Company.

If we lose or are unable to retain our senior management and other key personnel and are unable to attract qualified personnel, our ability to implement our business strategy could be delayed or hindered, which, in turn, could significantly and negatively affect our business.

Our future success depends, to a significant extent, on the efforts of our senior management and other key personnel to implement our business strategy. We believe there are only a limited number of available, qualified executives with substantial experience in our industry. We could face challenges attracting and retaining personnel in the Cayman Islands and/or in Dublin, Ireland. Accordingly, the loss of the services of one or more of the members of our senior management or other key personnel, or our inability to hire and retain other key personnel, could prevent us from continuing to implement our business strategy and, consequently, significantly and negatively affect our business.

We do not currently maintain key man life insurance with respect to any of our senior management, including our Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Underwriting Officer or Chief Actuarial Officer. If any member of senior management dies or becomes incapacitated, or leaves the Company to pursue employment opportunities elsewhere, we would be solely responsible for locating an adequate replacement for such senior management and for bearing any related cost. To the extent that we are unable to locate an adequate replacement or are unable to do so within a reasonable period of time, our business may be significantly and negatively affected.

Our ability to implement our business strategy could be adversely affected by Cayman Islands employment restrictions.

Under Cayman Islands law, persons who are not Caymanian, do not possess Caymanian status, or are not otherwise entitled to reside and work in the Cayman Islands pursuant to provisions of the Immigration Law (2015 Revision) of the Cayman Islands, which we refer to as the Immigration Law, may not engage in any gainful occupation in the Cayman Islands without an appropriate governmental work permit. Such a work permit may be granted or extended on a continuous basis for a maximum period of nine years (after having been legally and ordinarily resident in the Cayman Islands for a period of eight years a person may apply for permanent residence in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration Law) upon showing that, after proper public advertisement, no Caymanian or person of Caymanian status, or other person legally and ordinarily resident in the Cayman Islands who meets the minimum standards for the advertised position is available. The failure of these work permits to be granted or extended could prevent us from continuing to implement our business strategy.

Link to Table of Contents

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

Operational risks and losses can result from, among other things, fraud, errors, failure to document transactions properly or to obtain proper internal authorization, failure to comply with regulatory requirements, information technology failures or external events.

We believe that our modeling, underwriting and information technology and application systems are critical to our business. We utilize modeling tools to facilitate our pricing, reserving, and risk management tools to manage risks in our reinsurance portfolio. These models help us to control risk accumulation, inform management and other stakeholders of capital requirements and to improve the risk/return profile or minimize the amount of capital required to cover the risks in each reinsurance contract. However, given the inherent uncertainty of modeling techniques and the application of such techniques, these models and databases may not accurately address the emergence of a variety of matters which might be deemed to impact certain of our coverages. These models have been developed internally and in some cases they make use of third party software. The construction of these models and the selection of assumptions requires significant actuarial judgment. Furthermore, these models typically rely on either cedent or industry data, both of which may be incomplete or may be subject to errors. Accordingly, these models may understate the exposures we are assuming and our financial results may be adversely impacted, perhaps significantly.

Moreover, our information technology and application systems have been an important part of our underwriting process and our ability to compete successfully. We have also licensed certain systems and data from third parties. We cannot be certain that we will have access to these, or comparable, service providers, or that our information technology or application systems will continue to operate as intended. Like all companies, our information technology and application systems may be vulnerable to data breaches, interruptions or failures due to events that may be beyond our control, including, but not limited to, natural disasters, theft, terrorist attacks, malicious cyber-attacks, computer viruses, hackers and general technology failures. A major defect or failure in our internal controls or information technology and application systems could result in management distraction, result in a violation of applicable privacy or other laws, harm our reputation, cause a loss of customers or give rise to monetary fines or penalties or otherwise increase expenses. We believe appropriate controls and mitigation procedures are in place to prevent significant risk of data breaches, interruptions or failures in, information technology and application systems, but internal controls provide only a reasonable, not absolute, assurance as to the absence of errors or irregularities and any ineffectiveness of such controls and procedures could have a material adverse effect on our business.

Our failure to maintain sufficient collateral arrangements or to increase our collateral capacity on commercially acceptable terms as we grow could significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy.

We are not licensed or admitted as a reinsurer in any jurisdiction other than the Cayman Islands and the European Economic Area. Certain jurisdictions, including the United States, do not permit insurance companies to take credit for reinsurance obtained from unlicensed or non-admitted insurers on their statutory financial statements unless appropriate security measures are implemented. Consequently, certain clients will require us to provide collateral often in the form of a letter of credit, a trust agreement or funds withheld. When we provide collateral, we are customarily required to provide collateral to the letter of credit provider or beneficiary of the trust agreement. Our ability to provide collateral, and the costs at which we provide collateral, are primarily dependent on the composition of our investment portfolio.

Typically, letters of credit are collateralized and trust agreements are funded with fixed-income securities or cash. Banks may be willing to accept our investment portfolio as collateral, but on terms that may be less favorable to us than reinsurance companies that invest solely or predominantly in fixed-income securities. The inability to renew, maintain or obtain letters of credit collateralized by our investment portfolio or fund trust agreements may significantly limit the amount of reinsurance we can write or require us to modify our investment strategy.

Our investment portfolio is used to provide collateral so that letters of credit and trust agreements can be issued. In the event of a decline in the market value of our investment portfolio that results in a collateral shortfall, we have the right, at our option, to reduce the outstanding obligations under the applicable letter of credit facility or trust agreement, to deposit additional collateral or to change the collateral composition in order to cure the shortfall. If the shortfall is not cured within the prescribed time period, an event of default will immediately occur. We will be prohibited from issuing additional collateral until any shortfall is cured.

Our access to funds under our existing credit facilities is dependent on the ability of the banks that are parties to the facilities to meet their funding commitments. Those banks may not be able to meet their funding commitments if they experience shortages of capital and liquidity or if they experience excessive volumes of borrowing requests within a short period of time, and we might be forced to replace credit sources in a difficult market.

Link to Table of Contents

Any significant consolidation in the financial industry could lead to increased reliance on and exposure to particular institutions. If we cannot obtain adequate capital or sources of credit on favorable terms, or at all, our business, operating results and financial condition could be adversely affected. It is possible that, in the future, rating agencies may reduce our existing ratings. If one or more of our ratings were downgraded, we could incur higher borrowing costs and our ability to access the capital markets could be impacted. Our inability to obtain adequate capital could have a significant and negative effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We may need additional collateral capacity as we grow, and if we are unable to renew, maintain or increase our collateral facilities or are unable to do so on commercially acceptable terms we may need to liquidate all or a portion of our investment portfolio and invest in a fixed-income portfolio or other forms of investment acceptable to our clients and banks as collateral, which could significantly and negatively affect our ability to implement our business strategy.

Our failure to comply with restrictive covenants contained in our current or future credit facilities could trigger prepayment obligations, which could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Each of our credit facilities requires us and/or certain of our subsidiaries to comply with certain covenants, including restrictions on our ability to place a lien or charge on pledged assets, issue debt and in certain circumstances on the payment of dividends. Our failure to comply with these or other covenants could result in an event of default under one or more credit facilities or any credit facility we may enter into in the future, which, if not cured or waived, could result in us being required to repay the amounts outstanding under these facilities prior to maturity. As a result, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be significantly and negatively affected.

The inability to obtain business provided from brokers could adversely affect our business strategy and results of operations.

Since we began underwriting operations in April 2006, substantially all of our business has been placed through brokered transactions, which involve a limited number of reinsurance brokers which exposes us to concentration risk. In 2015, we had two brokers (2014: three brokers) who each accounted for more than 10% of our gross written premiums, and in the aggregate they accounted for approximately 77.4% (2014: 81.5%) of our gross premiums written. Because broker-produced business is concentrated with a small number of brokers, we are exposed to concentration risk. To lose or fail to expand all or a substantial portion of the business provided through brokers, many of whom may not be familiar with our Cayman Islands jurisdiction, could significantly and negatively affect our business and results of operations.

We may need additional capital in the future in order to operate our business, and such capital may not be available to us or may not be available to us on favorable terms.

We may need to raise additional capital in the future through public or private equity or debt offerings or otherwise in order to:

- fund liquidity needs caused by underwriting or investment losses;
- replace capital lost in the event of significant reinsurance losses or adverse reserve developments or significant investment losses;
- satisfy collateral requirements that may be imposed by our clients or by regulators;
- meet applicable statutory jurisdiction requirements;
- meet rating agency capital requirements; or
- respond to competitive pressures.

Additional capital may not be available on terms favorable to us, or at all. Further, any additional capital raised through the sale of equity could dilute existing ownership interest in our company and may cause the market price of our Class A ordinary shares to decline. Additional capital raised through the issuance of debt may result in creditors having rights, preferences and privileges senior or otherwise superior to those of our Class A ordinary shares.

Link to Table of Contents

Our property and property catastrophe reinsurance operations may make us vulnerable to losses from catastrophes and may cause our results of operations to vary significantly from period to period.

Certain of our reinsurance operations expose us to claims arising out of unpredictable catastrophic events, such as hurricanes, hailstorms, tornadoes, windstorms, severe winter weather, earthquakes, floods, droughts, fires, explosions, volcanic eruptions and other natural or man-made disasters such as acts of war or terrorism, cyber attacks, major aircraft crashes, riots or political unrest. The incidence and severity of catastrophes are inherently unpredictable but the loss experience of property catastrophe reinsurers has been generally characterized as low frequency and high severity. Claims from catastrophic events could reduce our earnings and cause substantial volatility in our results of operations for any fiscal quarter or year and adversely affect our financial condition. Corresponding reductions in our surplus levels could impact our ability to write new reinsurance policies.

Catastrophic losses are a function of the insured exposure in the affected area and the severity of the event. Because accounting regulations do not permit reinsurers to reserve for catastrophic events until they occur, claims from catastrophic events could cause substantial volatility in our financial results for any fiscal quarter or year and could significantly and negatively affect our financial condition and results of operations.

We depend on our clients' evaluations of the risks associated with their insurance underwriting, which may subject us to reinsurance losses.

In some of our proportional reinsurance business, in which we assume an agreed percentage of each underlying insurance contract being reinsured, or quota share contracts, we do not expect to separately evaluate each of the original individual risks assumed under these reinsurance contracts. Therefore, we will be largely dependent on the original underwriting decisions made by ceding companies. We will be subject to the risk that the clients may not have adequately evaluated the insured risks and that the premiums ceded may not adequately compensate us for the risks we assume. We also do not expect to separately evaluate each of the individual claims made on the underlying insurance contracts under quota share contracts. Therefore, we will be dependent on the original claims decisions made by our clients.

We could face unanticipated losses from political instability which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

We could be exposed to unexpected losses on our reinsurance contracts resulting from political instability and other politically driven events globally. These risks are inherently unpredictable and recent events may indicate an increased frequency and severity of losses. It is difficult to predict the timing of these events or to estimate the amount of loss that any given occurrence will generate. To the extent that losses from these risks occur, our financial condition and results of operations could be significantly and negatively affected.

Changing climate conditions may adversely affect our financial condition, profitability or cash flows.

Climate change, to the extent it produces extreme changes in temperatures and changes in weather patterns, could impact the frequency or severity of weather events and wildfires. Further, it could impact the affordability and availability of homeowners insurance, which could have an impact on pricing. Changes in weather patterns could also affect the frequency and severity of other natural catastrophe events to which we may be exposed.

We may be subject to the credit risk of our brokers, cedents and agents.

In accordance with industry practice, we frequently pay amounts owed on claims under our policies to reinsurance brokers, and these brokers, in turn, remit these amounts to the ceding companies that have reinsured a portion of their liabilities with us. In some jurisdictions, if a broker fails to make such a payment, we might remain liable to the client for the deficiency notwithstanding the broker's obligation to make such payment. Conversely, in certain jurisdictions, when the client pays premiums for policies to reinsurance brokers for payment to us, these premiums are considered to have been paid and the client will no longer be liable to us for these premiums, whether or not we have actually received them. Consequently, we assume a degree of credit risk associated with brokers around the world.

In addition, we are also exposed to the credit risk of our cedents and agents, who, pursuant to their contracts with us, may be required to pay us profit commission, additional premiums, reinstatement premiums, and adjustments to ceding commissions over a period of time, which in some cases may extend beyond the initial period of risk coverage. Insolvency, liquidity problems, distressed financial condition or the general effects of an economic recession may increase the risk that our cedents or agents may not pay a part of or the full amount of their obligations to us. To the extent our cedents or agents become

Link to Table of Contents

unable to pay us, we would be required to recognize a downward adjustment to our premiums receivable or reinsurance recoverables, as applicable, in our financial statements. While we generally seek to mitigate this risk through, among other things, collateral agreements, funds withheld, corporate guarantees and right of offset of receivables against any losses payable, an increased inability of customers to fulfill their obligations to us could have an adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.

Our reinsurance balances receivable at December 31, 2015 totaled $187.9 million, which included premiums and ceding commissions receivable, a majority of which are not collateralized. We cannot assure you that such receivables will be collected or that valuation allowances or write downs for uncollectible recoverable amounts will not be required in future periods.

We may be unable to purchase reinsurance for the liabilities we reinsure, and if we successfully purchase such reinsurance, we may be unable to collect, which could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

We purchase reinsurance for certain liabilities we reinsure, which we refer to as retrocessional coverage, in order to mitigate the effect of a potential concentration of losses upon our financial condition. The insolvency or inability or refusal of a retrocessionaire to make payments under the terms of its agreement with us could have an adverse effect on us because we remain liable to our client. From time to time, market conditions have limited, and in some cases have prevented, reinsurers from obtaining the types and amounts of retrocessional coverage that they consider necessary for their business needs. Accordingly, we may not be able to obtain our desired amounts of retrocessional coverage or negotiate terms that we deem appropriate or acceptable or obtain retrocessional coverage from entities with satisfactory creditworthiness. Our failure to establish adequate retrocessional arrangements or the failure of our retrocessional arrangements to protect us from overly concentrated risk exposure could significantly and negatively affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

The failure of any risk management and loss limitation methods we employ, as well as an unexpected accumulation of attritional losses, could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.
We seek to limit our loss exposure in a variety of ways, including by writing many of our reinsurance contracts on an excess of loss basis, adhering to maximum limitations on policies written in defined geographical zones, limiting program size for each client, establishing per risk and per occurrence limitations for each event, employing coverage restrictions and following prudent underwriting guidelines for each program written. In the case of proportional treaties, we generally seek per occurrence limitations or loss ratio caps to limit the impact of losses from any one event. We also seek to limit our loss exposure through geographic diversification. Notwithstanding these loss limitation techniques, one or more future catastrophic or other events could result in claims that substantially exceed our expectations in ways limiting the applicability of these techniques, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations.
Currency fluctuations could result in exchange rate losses and negatively impact our business.

Our functional currency is the U.S. dollar. However, we expect that we will write a portion of our business and receive premiums and pay claims in currencies other than the U.S. dollar. We may incur foreign currency exchange gains or losses as we ultimately receive premiums and settle claims in foreign currencies. In addition, DME Advisors may invest a portion of our portfolio in securities or cash denominated in currencies other than the U.S. dollar. Consequently, we may experience exchange rate losses to the extent any of our foreign currency exposure is not hedged, which could significantly and negatively affect our business. If we do seek to hedge our foreign currency exposure through the use of forward foreign currency exchange contracts or currency swaps, we will be subject to the risk that our counterparties to the arrangements fail to perform.

There are differences under Cayman Islands corporate law and Delaware corporate law with respect to interested party transactions which may benefit certain of our shareholders at the expense of other shareholders.

Under Cayman Islands corporate law, a director may vote on a contract or transaction where the director has an interest as a shareholder, director, officer or employee provided such interest is disclosed. None of our contracts will be deemed to be void because any director is an interested party in such transaction and interested parties will not be held liable for monies owed to the Company.

Under Delaware law, interested party transactions are voidable.

Link to Table of Contents

Risks Relating to Insurance and Other Regulations

Any suspension or revocation of our reinsurance license would materially impact our ability to do business and implement our business strategy.

We are presently licensed as a reinsurer only in the Cayman Islands and the European Economic Area. The suspension or revocation of our licenses to do business as a reinsurance company in either of these jurisdictions for any reason would mean that we would not be able to enter into any new reinsurance contracts in that jurisdiction until the suspension ended or we became licensed in another jurisdiction. Any such suspension or revocation of our license would negatively impact our reputation in the reinsurance marketplace and could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

CIMA may take a number of actions, including suspending or revoking a reinsurance license whenever CIMA believes that a licensee is or may become unable to meet its obligations, is carrying on business in a manner likely to be detrimental to the public interest or to the interest of its creditors or policyholders, has contravened the terms of the Law or has otherwise behaved in such a manner so as to cause CIMA to call into question the licensee's fitness.

Further CIMA may suspend or revoke our license if:

- we cease to carry on reinsurance business;
- the direction and management of our reinsurance business has not been conducted in a fit and proper manner;
- a person holding a position as a director, manager or officer is not a fit and proper person to hold the respective position; or
- we become bankrupt or go into liquidation or we are wound up or otherwise dissolved.

Similarly, if CIMA suspended or revoked our license, we could lose our exemption under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the "Investment Company Act") (See "— We are subject to the risk of possibly becoming an investment company under U.S. federal securities law.")

Our reinsurance subsidiaries are subject to minimum capital and surplus requirements, and our failure to meet these requirements could subject us to regulatory action.

The Insurance (Capital and Solvency) (Classes B, C, and D Insurers) Regulations, 2012 (the "Capital and Solvency Regulations") impose on Greenlight Re a minimum capital requirement of US$50 million, a prescribed capital requirement of US$466.5 million and a requirement to maintain solvency equal to or in excess of the total prescribed capital requirement (the "Capital Requirements"). As of December 31, 2015, Greenlight Re was in compliance with the Capital Requirements.

Under the prudential regime applying prior to the introduction of Solvency II, GRIL, our Irish subsidiary, was required to maintain statutory reserves, particularly in respect of underwriting liabilities, and a solvency margin of US$18.1 million as of December 31, 2015 as provided for in the Irish Insurance Acts and Regulations. As of December 31, 2015, GRIL has been in compliance with the capital requirements required under the Irish Insurance Acts and Regulations. Solvency II has introduced risk-based solvency requirements which GRIL is required to comply with as of January 1, 2016, including calculating and maintaining a minimum capital requirement and solvency capital requirement.

Any failure to meet applicable requirements or minimum statutory capital requirements could subject us to further examination or action by regulators, including restrictions on dividend payments, limitations on our writing of additional business or engaging in financial or other activities, enhanced supervision, financial or other penalties or liquidation. Further, any changes in existing risk based capital requirements or minimum statutory capital requirements may require us to increase our statutory capital levels, which we might be unable to do.

We are a holding company that depends on the ability of our subsidiaries to pay dividends.

We are a holding company and do not have any significant operations or assets other than our ownership of the shares of our subsidiaries. Dividends and other permitted distributions from our subsidiaries are our primary source of funds to meet ongoing cash requirements, including future debt service payments, if any, and other expenses, and to pay dividends to our shareholders if we choose to do so. Some of our subsidiaries are subject to significant regulatory restrictions limiting their ability to declare and pay dividends. The inability of our subsidiaries to pay dividends in an amount sufficient to enable us to meet our cash requirements at the holding company level could have an adverse effect on our operations and our ability to pay dividends to our shareholders if we choose to do so and/or meet our debt service obligations, if any.

Link to Table of Contents

To the extent any of our subsidiaries located in jurisdictions other than the Cayman Islands consider declaring dividends, such subsidiaries are required to comply with restrictions set forth under applicable law and regulations in such other jurisdictions. These restrictions could adversely impact the Company.

We are subject to the risk of possibly becoming an investment company under U.S. federal securities law.

In the United States, the Investment Company Act regulates certain companies that invest in or trade securities. We rely on an exemption under the Investment Company Act for an entity organized and regulated as a foreign insurance company which is engaged primarily and predominantly in the reinsurance of risks on insurance agreements. The law in this area is subjective and there is a lack of guidance as to the meaning of "primarily and predominantly" under the relevant exemption to the Investment Company Act. For example, there is no standard for the amount of premiums that need to be written relative to the level of an entity’s capital in order to qualify for the exemption. If this exemption were deemed inapplicable, we would have to register under the Investment Company Act as an investment company. Registered investment companies are subject to extensive, restrictive and potentially adverse regulation relating to, among other things, operating methods, management, capital structure, leverage, dividends and transactions with affiliates. Registered investment companies are not permitted to operate their business in the manner in which we operate our business, nor are registered investment companies permitted to have many of the relationships that we have with our affiliated companies. Accordingly, we likely would not be permitted to engage DME Advisors as our investment advisor, unless we obtained board and shareholder approvals under the Investment Company Act. If DME Advisors were not our investment advisor, we would seek to identify and retain another investment advisor with a value-oriented investment philosophy. If we could not identify or retain such an advisor, we would be required to make substantial modifications to our investment strategy. Any such changes to our investment strategy could significantly and negatively impact our investment results, financial condition and our ability to implement our business strategy.

If at any time it were established that we had been operating as an investment company in violation of the registration requirements of the Investment Company Act, there would be a risk, among other material adverse consequences, that we could become subject to monetary penalties or injunctive relief, or both, or that we would be unable to enforce contracts with third parties or that third parties could seek to obtain rescission of transactions with us undertaken during the period in which it was established that we were an unregistered investment company.

To the extent that the laws and regulations change in the future so that contracts we write are deemed not to be reinsurance contracts, we will be at greater risk of not qualifying for the Investment Company Act exception. Additionally, it is possible that our classification as an investment company would result in the suspension or revocation of our reinsurance license.

Insurance regulations to which we are, or may become, subject, and potential changes thereto, could have a significant and negative effect on our business.

We currently are admitted to do business in the Cayman Islands and the European Economic Area. Our operations in each of these jurisdictions are subject to varying degrees of regulation and supervision. The laws and regulations of the jurisdictions in which our subsidiaries are domiciled require that, among other things, these subsidiaries maintain minimum levels of statutory or regulatory capital, surplus and liquidity, meet solvency standards, submit to periodic examinations of their financial condition and restrict payments of dividends and reductions of capital. Statutes, regulations and policies that our subsidiaries are subject to may also restrict the ability of these subsidiaries to write insurance and reinsurance policies, make certain investments and distribute funds.

More specifically with respect to our Irish subsidiary, European legislation known as "Solvency II", was introduced with effect from January 1, 2016 and governs the prudential regulation of insurers and reinsurers, and requires insurers and reinsurers in Europe to meet risk-based solvency requirements. It also imposes group solvency and governance requirements on groups with insurers and/or reinsurers operating in the European Economic Area. A number of European Commission delegated acts and technical standards have been adopted, which set out more detailed requirements based on the overarching provisions of the Solvency II Directive. However, further delegated acts, technical standards and guidance are likely to be published on an ongoing basis.

Although we do not presently expect that we will be admitted to do business in any other jurisdiction other than the Cayman Islands and the European Economic Area, we cannot assure you that insurance regulators in the United States or elsewhere will not review our activities and claim that we are subject to such jurisdiction's licensing requirements. In addition, we are subject to indirect regulatory requirements imposed by jurisdictions that may limit our ability to provide reinsurance. For example, our ability to write reinsurance may be subject, in certain cases, to arrangements satisfactory to applicable regulatory bodies, and proposed legislation and regulations may have the effect of imposing additional requirements upon, or restricting

Link to Table of Contents

the market for, non-U.S. reinsurers such as Greenlight Re and GRIL, with whom domestic companies may place business. We do not know of any such proposed legislation pending at this time.

We may not be able to comply fully with, or obtain desired exemptions from, revised statutes, regulations and policies that currently, or may in the future, govern the conduct of our business. Failure to comply with, or to obtain desired authorizations and/or exemptions under, any applicable laws could result in restrictions on our ability to do business or undertake activities that are regulated in one or more of the jurisdictions in which we operate and could subject us to fines and other sanctions.

In addition, governmental authorities worldwide have become increasingly interested in potential risks posed by the insurance industry as a whole, and to the commercial and financial systems in general. While we cannot predict the exact nature, timing or scope of possible governmental initiatives, there may be increased regulatory intervention in our industry in the future. Changes in the laws or regulations to which our subsidiaries are subject or may become subject, or in the interpretations thereof by enforcement or regulatory agencies, could have a material adverse effect on our business.

Risks Relating to Our Investment Strategy and Our Investment Advisor

We have limited control as to how our investment portfolio is allocated and its performance depends on the ability of DME Advisors to select and manage appropriate investments.

DME Advisors acts as our exclusive investment advisor for our investment portfolio and recommends appropriate investment opportunities. Although DME Advisors is contractually obligated to follow our investment guidelines, we cannot assure shareholders as to how assets will be allocated to different investment opportunities, including long and short positions and derivatives trading, which could increase the level of risk to which our investment portfolio will be exposed. In addition, DME Advisors can outsource to sub-advisors without our consent or approval.

The performance of our investment portfolio depends to a great extent on the ability of DME Advisors to select and manage appropriate investments. Our advisory agreement with DME Advisors terminates on December 31, 2016, unless extended, and we have limited ability to terminate the advisory agreement earlier. We cannot assure you that DME Advisors will be successful in meeting our investment objectives or that the advisory agreement with DME Advisors will be renewed. The failure of DME Advisors to perform adequately could significantly and negatively affect our business, results of operations and financial condition.

We depend upon DME Advisors to implement our investment strategy.

We depend upon DME Advisors to implement our investment strategy. Accordingly, the diminution or loss of the services of DME Advisors could significantly affect our business. DME Advisors, in turn, is dependent on the talents, efforts and leadership of DME Advisors’ principals. The diminution or loss of the services of DME Advisors’ principals, or diminution or loss of their reputation and integrity or any negative market or industry perception arising from that diminution or loss, could have a material adverse effect on our business. In addition, the loss of DME Advisors' key personnel, or DME Advisors' inability to hire and retain other key personnel, over which we have no control, could delay or prevent DME Advisors from fully implementing our investment strategy on our behalf, and consequently, could significantly and negatively affect our business.

Our advisory agreement with DME Advisors does not allow us to terminate the agreement in the event that DME Advisors loses any or all of its principals or key personnel. The advisory agreement expires on the date on which the venture agreement expires or terminates for any reason. The venture agreement requires that we utilize the advisory services of DME Advisors or its affiliates exclusively until December 31, 2016, subject to limited termination provisions. See "— The venture agreement has limited termination provisions."

Our investment performance may suffer as a result of adverse capital market developments or other factors that impact our liquidity, which could in turn adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

We may derive a significant portion of our income from our investment portfolio. As a result, our operating results depend in part on the performance of our investment portfolio. We strive to structure our investments in a manner that recognizes our liquidity needs for future liabilities. We cannot assure you that DME Advisors will successfully structure our investments in relation to our anticipated liabilities. Failure to do so could force us to liquidate investments at a significant loss or at prices that are not optimal, which could significantly and adversely affect our financial results.

Link to Table of Contents

The risks associated with DME Advisors’ value-oriented investment strategy may be substantially greater than the risks associated with traditional fixed-income investment strategies. In addition, making long equity investments in an up or rising market may increase the risk of not generating profits on these investments and we may incur losses if the market declines. Similarly, making short equity investments in a down or falling market may increase the risk of not generating profits on these investments and we may incur losses if the market rises. The success of our investment strategy may also be affected by general economic conditions. Unexpected market volatility and illiquidity associated with our investments could significantly and negatively affect our investment portfolio results.

Potential conflicts of interest with DME Advisors may exist that could adversely affect us.

None of DME Advisors or its principals, including David Einhorn, Chairman of our Board of Directors and the President of Greenlight Capital, Inc., are obligated to devote any specific amount of time to the affairs of our Company. Affiliates of DME Advisors, including Greenlight Capital, Inc., manage and expect to continue to manage other client accounts, some of which have objectives similar to ours, including collective investment vehicles managed by DME Advisors' affiliates and in which DME Advisors or its affiliates may have an equity interest. Pursuant to our advisory agreement with DME Advisors, DME Advisors has the exclusive right to manage our investment portfolio and is required to follow our investment guidelines and act in a manner that is fair and equitable in allocating investment opportunities to us, but the agreement does not otherwise impose any specific obligations or requirements concerning allocation of time, effort or investment opportunities to us or any restriction on the nature or timing of investments for our account or other accounts that DME Advisors or its affiliates may manage. If we compete for any investment opportunity with another entity that DME Advisors or its affiliates manage, DME Advisors is not required to afford us any exclusivity or priority. DME Advisors' interest and the interests of its affiliates, including Greenlight Capital, Inc., may at times conflict, possibly to DME Advisors' detriment, which may potentially adversely affect our investment opportunities and returns.

Although Mr. Einhorn, Chairman of our Board of Directors, recused himself from the vote by the Board of Directors of Greenlight Re approving and adopting Greenlight Re's investment guidelines, he is not, under Cayman Islands law, legally restricted from participating in making decisions with respect to Greenlight Re's investment guidelines. Accordingly, his involvement as a member of the Boards of Directors of Greenlight Capital Re, Ltd. and Greenlight Re may lead to a conflict of interest.

DME Advisors and its affiliates may also manage accounts whose advisory fee schedules, investment objectives and policies differ from ours, which may cause DME Advisors and its affiliates to effect trading in one account that may have an adverse effect on another account, including ours. We are not entitled to inspect the trading records of DME Advisors, or its principals, that are not related to our Company.

Our investment portfolio may be concentrated in a few large positions which could result in large losses.

Our investment guidelines provide that DME Advisors may commit up to 20% of Greenlight Re’s assets under management (10% for GRIL) to any one investment. In addition, GRIL's investment guidelines require that the 10 largest investments shall not constitute more than 50% of the total investment portfolio and GRIL's investment portfolio shall at all times be comprised of a minimum of 50 debt or equity securities of publicly traded companies. Accordingly, from time to time we may hold a few, relatively large security positions in relation to our capital. As of December 31, 2015, we were invested in approximately 101 equity and debt securities and the largest five long and short positions comprised an aggregate of 24% and 21%, respectively, of our investment portfolio. Since our investment portfolio may not be widely diversified, it may be subject to more rapid changes in value than would be the case if the investment portfolio were required to maintain a wide diversification among companies, securities and types of securities.

We are exposed to credit risk primarily from the possibility that counterparties may default on their obligations to us.

We are exposed to credit risk primarily from the possibility that counterparties may default on their obligations to us. The amount of the maximum exposure to credit risk is indicated by the carrying value of our financial assets. In addition, we hold the securities of our investment portfolio with several prime brokers and have credit risk from the possibility that one or more of them may default on their obligations to us. Other than our investment in derivative contracts and corporate debt, if any, and the fact that our investments are held by prime brokers and custodians on our behalf, we have no other significant concentrations of credit risk.

Issuers or borrowers whose securities or debt we hold, customers, reinsurers, clearing agents, exchanges, clearing houses and other financial intermediaries and guarantors may default on their obligations to us due to bankruptcy, insolvency, lack of liquidity, adverse economic conditions, operational failure, fraud or other reasons. Such defaults could have a significant and

Link to Table of Contents

negative effect on our results of operations, financial condition and cash flows. Additionally, the underlying assets supporting our financial contracts may deteriorate causing these securities to incur losses.

DME Advisors may trade on margin and use other forms of financial leverage, which could potentially adversely affect our revenues.

Our investment guidelines provide DME Advisors with the ability to trade on margin and use other forms of financial leverage. Fluctuations in the market value of our investment portfolio could have a disproportionately large effect in relation to our capital. Any event which may adversely affect the value of positions we hold could significantly and negatively affect the net asset value of our investment portfolio and thus our results of operations.

DME Advisors may effectuate short sales that subject us to unlimited loss potential.

DME Advisors may enter into transactions in which it sells a security it does not own, which we refer to as a short sale, in anticipation of a decline in the market value of the security. Short sales for our account theoretically will involve unlimited loss potential since the market price of securities sold short may continuously increase. DME Advisors might have difficulty purchasing securities to meet short sale delivery obligations and may have to cover short sales at suboptimal prices.

DME Advisors may transact in derivative instruments, which may increase the risk of our investment portfolio.

Derivative instruments, or derivatives, include futures, options, swaps, structured securities and other instruments and contracts that derive their value from one or more underlying securities, financial benchmarks, currencies, commodities or indices. There are a number of risks associated with derivatives trading. Because many derivatives are leveraged, and thus provide significantly more market exposure than the money paid or deposited when the transaction is entered into, a relatively small adverse market movement may result in a substantial loss, and may potentially expose us to a loss exceeding the original amount invested. Derivatives may also expose us to liquidity and counterparty risk. There may not be a liquid market within which to close or dispose of outstanding derivatives contracts. In the event of the counterparty’s default, we will generally only rank as an unsecured creditor and risk the loss of all or a portion of the amounts we are contractually entitled to receive.

The compensation arrangements of DME and DME Advisors may create an incentive to effect transactions that are risky or speculative.

Pursuant to the venture agreement and the advisory agreement, we are obligated to pay the following:

- a 1.5% annual management fee to DME Advisors, regardless of the performance of our investment account, payable monthly based on the capital account balance of each participant; and

- a performance allocation to DME based on the positive performance change in such participant's capital account equal to 20% of net profits calculated per annum, subject to a loss carry forward provision.

The loss carry forward provision allows DME to earn reduced performance allocation of 10% of profits in any year subsequent to the year in which our investment account managed by DME Advisors incurs a loss, until all losses are recouped and an additional amount equal to 150% of the loss is earned.

While the performance compensation arrangement provides that losses will be carried forward as an offset against net profits in subsequent periods, DME and DME Advisors generally will not otherwise be penalized for losses or decreases in the value of our portfolio. These performance compensation arrangements may create an incentive for DME Advisors to engage in transactions that focus on the potential for short-term gains rather than long-term growth or that are particularly risky or speculative.

DME Advisors' representatives' service on boards and committees may place trading restrictions on our investments and may subject us to indemnification liability.

DME Advisors may from time to time place its or its affiliates’ representatives on creditors’ committees and/or boards of certain companies in which we have invested. While such representation may enable DME Advisors to enhance the sale value of our investments, it may also place trading restrictions on our investments and may subject us to indemnification liability. The advisory agreement provides for the indemnification of DME Advisors or any other person designated by DME Advisors for claims arising from such board representation.

As of December 31, 2015, representatives of DME Advisors (including Mr. Einhorn) sat on the board of Green Brick Partners Inc., whose securities are publicly traded and were included in our portfolio as of December 31, 2015.

Link to Table of Contents

The ability to use "soft dollars" may provide DME Advisors with an incentive to select certain brokers that may take into account benefits to be received by DME Advisors.

DME Advisors is entitled to use so-called "soft dollars" generated by commissions paid in connection with transactions for our investment portfolio to pay for certain of DME Advisors' operating and overhead costs, including the payment of all or a portion of its costs and expenses of operation. "Soft dollars" are a means of paying brokerage firms for their services through commission revenue, rather than through direct payments. DME Advisors' right to use soft dollars may give DME Advisors an incentive to select brokers or dealers for our transactions, or to negotiate commission rates or other execution terms, in a manner that takes into account the soft dollar benefits received by DME Advisors rather than giving exclusive consideration to the interests of our investment portfolio and, accordingly, may create a conflict.

The venture agreement has limited termination provisions.

The venture agreement has limited termination provisions which restrict our ability to manage our investment portfolio outside of DME Advisors. Because the venture agreement contains exclusivity and limited termination provisions, we are unable to use investment managers other than DME Advisors for so long as the agreement is in effect. The current venture agreement term ends on December 31, 2016 and will automatically renew for successive three-year terms unless at least 90 days prior to the end of the then current term, DME notifies us of its desire to terminate the venture agreement, or Greenlight Re or GRIL notifies DME of their desire to withdraw from the venture agreement. Greenlight Re or GRIL may also withdraw as participants under the venture agreement prior to the expiration of the venture agreement's term at any time only "for cause", which is defined as:

- a material violation of applicable law relating to DME's or DME Advisors' advisory business;
- DME's or DME Advisors' gross negligence, willful misconduct or reckless disregard of DME's obligations under the venture agreement or DME Advisors' obligations under the advisory agreement;
- a material breach by DME or DME Advisors of Greenlight Re’s or GRIL’s investment guidelines that is not cured within a 15-day period; or
- a material breach by DME or DME Advisors of its obligations to return and deliver assets as we may request.

In addition, GRIL may withdraw as a participant under the venture agreement prior to the expiration of its term due to unsatisfactory long term performance of DME or DME Advisors, as determined solely by the Board of Directors of GRIL on each anniversary date of the venture agreement.

Greenlight Re may not withdraw or terminate the venture agreement on the basis of performance. If Greenlight Re becomes dissatisfied with the results of the investment performance of DME or DME Advisors, we will be unable to hire new investment managers until the venture agreement expires by its terms or is terminated for cause.

Certain of our investments may have limited liquidity and lack valuation data, which could create a conflict of interest.

Our investment guidelines provide DME Advisors with the flexibility to invest in certain securities with limited liquidity or no public market. This lack of liquidity may adversely affect the ability of DME Advisors to execute trade orders at desired prices and may impact our ability to fulfill our payment obligations. To the extent that DME Advisors invests in securities or instruments for which market quotations are not readily available, under the terms of the advisory agreement the valuation of such securities and instruments for purposes of compensation to DME Advisors will be determined by DME Advisors, whose determination, subject to audit verification, will be conclusive and binding in the absence of bad faith or manifest error. Because the advisory agreement gives DME Advisors the power to determine the value of securities with no readily discernible market value, and because the calculation of

DME Advisors' fee is based on the value of the investment account, a conflict may exist or arise.

Increased regulation or scrutiny of alternative investment advisors may affect DME Advisors’ ability to manage our investment portfolio or affect our business reputation.

The regulatory environment for investment managers is evolving, and changes in the regulation of managers may adversely affect the ability of DME Advisors to obtain the leverage it might otherwise obtain or to pursue its trading strategies. In addition, the securities and futures markets are subject to comprehensive statutes, regulations and margin requirements. The SEC, other regulators and self-regulatory organizations and exchanges are authorized to take extraordinary actions in the event of market emergencies. The regulation of derivatives transactions and funds that engage in such transactions is an evolving area of law and is subject to modification by government and judicial action. Any future regulatory change could have a significant negative impact on our financial condition and results of operations.

Link to Table of Contents

Short sale transactions have been subject to increased regulatory scrutiny, including the imposition of restrictions on short selling certain securities and reporting requirements. Our ability to execute a short selling strategy may be materially and adversely impacted by temporary and/or new permanent rules, interpretations, prohibitions, and restrictions adopted in response to these adverse market events. Temporary restrictions and/or prohibitions on short selling activity may be imposed by regulatory authorities with little or no advance notice and may impact prior and future trading activities of our investment portfolio. Additionally, the SEC, its non-U.S. counterparts, other governmental authorities and/or self-regulatory organizations may at any time promulgate permanent rules or interpretations consistent with such temporary restrictions or that impose additional or different permanent or temporary limitations or prohibitions. The SEC might impose different limitations and/or prohibitions on short selling from those imposed by various non-U.S. regulatory authorities. These different regulations, rules or interpretations might have different effective periods.

Regulatory authorities may, from time-to-time, impose restrictions that adversely affect our ability to borrow certain securities in connection with short sale transactions. In addition, traditional lenders of securities might be less likely to lend securities under certain market conditions. As a result, we may not be able to effectively pursue a short selling strategy due to a limited supply of securities available for borrowing. We may also incur additional costs in connection with short sale transactions, including, in the event that DME Advisors is required to enter into a borrowing arrangement in advance of any short sales. Moreover, the ability to continue to borrow a security is not guaranteed and we are subject to strict delivery requirements. The inability to deliver securities within the required time frame may subject us to mandatory close out by the executing broker-dealer. A mandatory close out may subject us to unintended costs and losses. Certain action or inaction by third parties, such as executing broker-dealers or clearing broker-dealers, may materially impact our ability to effect short sale transactions.

We may invest in securities based outside the United States which may be riskier than securities of United States issuers.

Under our investment guidelines, DME Advisors may invest in securities of issuers organized or based outside the United States. These investments may be subject to a variety of risks and other special considerations not affecting securities of U.S. issuers. Particularly within the Euro-zone, there is increasing market concern as to the potential default of government issuers. Should governments default on their obligations, there could be a negative impact on both the Company's direct holdings as well as non-government issues held within the country of default. Many foreign securities markets are not as developed or efficient as those in the United States. Securities of some foreign issuers are less liquid and more volatile than securities of comparable U.S. issuers. Similarly, volume and liquidity in many foreign securities markets are less than in the United States and, at times, price volatility can be greater than in the United States. Non-U.S. issuers may be subject to less stringent financial reporting and informational disclosure standards, regulatory oversight, practices and requirements than those applicable to U.S. issuers.

Risks Relating to our Class A Ordinary Shares

A shareholder may be required to sell its Class A ordinary shares.

Our Third Amended and Restated Memorandum and Articles of Association, or Articles, provide that we have the option, but not the obligation, to require a shareholder to sell its Class A ordinary shares for their fair market value to us, to other shareholders or to third parties if our Board of Directors determines that ownership of our Class A ordinary shares by such shareholder may result in adverse tax, regulatory or legal consequences to us, any of our subsidiaries or any of our shareholders and that such sale is necessary to avoid or cure such adverse consequences.

Provisions of our Articles, the Companies Law of the Cayman Islands and our corporate structure may each impede a takeover, which could adversely affect the value of our Class A ordinary shares.

Our Articles contain certain provisions that could make it more difficult for a third party to acquire us, even if doing so would be beneficial to our shareholders. Our Articles provide that a director may only be removed for "cause" as defined in the Articles, upon the affirmative vote of not less than 50% of the votes cast at a meeting at which more than 50% of our issued and outstanding Class A ordinary shares are represented. Further, under our Articles, a director may only be removed without cause upon the affirmative vote of not less than 80% of the votes cast at a meeting at which more than 50% of our issued and outstanding Class A ordinary shares are represented.

Our Articles permit our Board of Directors to issue preferred shares from time to time, with such rights and preferences as they consider appropriate. Our Board of Directors may authorize the issuance of preferred shares with terms and conditions and under circumstances that could have an effect of discouraging a takeover or other transaction, deny shareholders the receipt

Link to Table of Contents

of a premium on their Class A ordinary shares in the event of a tender or other offer for Class A ordinary shares and have a depressive effect on the market price of the Class A ordinary shares.

As compared to mergers under corporate law in the United States, it may be more difficult to consummate a merger of two or more companies in the Cayman Islands or the merger of one or more Cayman Islands companies with one or more overseas companies, even if such transaction would be beneficial to our shareholders. Cayman Islands law has statutory provisions that provide for the reconstruction and amalgamation of companies, which are commonly referred to, in the Cayman Islands, as "schemes of arrangement". The Companies Law (as amended) of the Cayman Islands (the "Companies Law") provides for the merger or consolidation of two or more companies that are Cayman Islands entities or the merger of one or more Cayman Islands companies with one or more overseas companies, where the surviving entity is either a Cayman Islands company or an overseas company. Prior to the adoption of certain amendments to the Companies Law, the "scheme of arrangement" was the only vehicle available to consolidate companies and Cayman Islands law did not provide for mergers as that term is understood under corporate law in the United States. Although the current merger provisions have made it faster and easier for companies to merge or consolidate than the "schemes of arrangement" statutory provision, these provisions do not replace the "schemes of arrangement" provision which continues to apply. The procedural and legal requirements necessary to consummate these transactions under the merger provisions of the Companies Law or the "schemes of arrangement" provision may be more rigorous and take longer to complete than the procedures typically required to consummate a merger in the United States.

Under Cayman Islands law and practice, a "scheme of arrangement" must be approved at a shareholders' meeting by each class of shareholders, in each case, by a majority of the number of holders of each class of an entity's shares that are present and voting, either in person or by proxy, at such a meeting, which holders must also represent 75% in value of such class issued that are present and voting, either in person or by proxy, at such meeting, excluding the shares owned by the parties to the scheme of arrangement. A merger requires approval by special resolution of the shareholders of each company (which normally requires, as a minimum, a two thirds majority of shareholders voting together as one class) and such other authorization, if any, as may be specified in such constituent company's articles of association.

Although a merger under the Companies Law does not require court approval, the convening of these meetings and the terms of an amalgamation under the "schemes of arrangement" provision must be sanctioned by the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands. Although there is no requirement to seek the consent of the creditors of the parties involved in the scheme of arrangement, the Grand Court typically seeks to ensure that the creditors have consented to the transfer of their liabilities to the surviving entity or that the scheme of arrangement does not otherwise materially adversely affect the creditors' interests. Furthermore, the Grand Court will only approve a scheme of arrangement if it is satisfied that:

- the statutory provisions as to majority vote have been complied with;
- the shareholders have been fairly represented at the meeting in question;
- the scheme of arrangement is such as a businessman would reasonably approve; and
- the scheme of arrangement is not one that would more properly be sanctioned under some other provision of the Companies Law.

In addition, David Einhorn, Chairman of our Board of Directors, owns all of the outstanding Class B ordinary shares. As a result, we will not be able to enter into a scheme of arrangement without the approval of Mr. Einhorn as the holder of our Class B ordinary shares.

Holders of Class A ordinary shares may have difficulty obtaining or enforcing a judgment against us, and they may face difficulties in protecting their interests because we are incorporated under Cayman Islands law.

Because we are a Cayman Islands company, there is uncertainty as to whether the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands would recognize or enforce judgments of United States courts obtained against us predicated upon the civil liability provisions of the securities laws of the United States or any state thereof, or be competent to hear original actions brought in the Cayman Islands against us predicated upon the securities laws of the United States or any state thereof.

We are incorporated as an exempted company limited by shares under the Companies Law. A significant amount of our assets are located outside of the United States. As a result, it may be difficult for persons purchasing Class A ordinary shares to effect service of process within the United States upon us or to enforce judgments against us or judgments obtained in U.S. courts predicated upon the civil liability provisions of the federal securities laws of the United States or any state of the United States.

Link to Table of Contents

Although there is no statutory enforcement in the Cayman Islands of judgments obtained in the United States, the courts of the Cayman Islands will, based on the principle that a judgment by a competent foreign court will impose upon the judgment debtor an obligation to pay the sum for which judgment has been given, recognize and enforce a foreign judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction if such judgment is final, for a liquidated sum, not in respect of taxes or a fine or penalty if not inconsistent with a Cayman Islands judgment in respect of the same matters, and was not obtained in a manner, and is not of a kind, the enforcement of which is contrary to the public policy of the Cayman Islands. There is doubt, however, as to whether the courts of the Cayman Islands will, in an original action in the Cayman Islands, recognize or enforce judgments of U.S. courts predicated upon the civil liability provisions of the securities laws of the United States or any state of the United States on the grounds that such provisions are penal in nature.

A Cayman Islands court may stay proceedings if concurrent proceedings are being brought elsewhere.

Unlike many jurisdictions in the United States, Cayman Islands law does not specifically provide for shareholder appraisal rights on a merger or consolidation of an entity. This may make it more difficult for shareholders to assess the value of any consideration they may receive in a merger or consolidation or to require that the offeror give a shareholder additional consideration if he believes the consideration offered is insufficient.

Shareholders of Cayman Islands exempted companies such as ours have no general rights under Cayman Islands law to inspect corporate records and accounts. Our directors have discretion under our Articles to determine whether or not, and under what conditions, the corporate records may be inspected by shareholders, but are not obligated to make them available to shareholders. This fact may make it more difficult for shareholders to obtain the information needed to establish any facts necessary for a shareholder motion or to solicit proxies from other shareholders in connection with a proxy contest.

Subject to limited exceptions, under Cayman Islands law, a minority shareholder may not bring a derivative action against our Board of Directors.

Provisions of our Articles may reallocate the voting power of our Class A ordinary shares and subject holders of Class A ordinary shares to SEC compliance.

In certain circumstances, the total voting power of our Class A ordinary shares held by any one person will be reduced to less than 9.9% of the total issued and outstanding ordinary shares, and the total voting power of the Class B ordinary shares will be reduced to 9.5% of the total voting power of the total issued and outstanding ordinary shares. In the event a holder of our Class A ordinary shares acquires shares representing 9.9% or more of the total voting power of our total ordinary shares or the Class B ordinary shares represent more than 9.5% of the total voting power of our total outstanding shares, there will be an effective reallocation of the voting power of the Class A ordinary shares or Class B ordinary shares which may cause a shareholder to acquire 5% or more of the voting power of the total ordinary shares.

Such a shareholder may become subject to the reporting and disclosure requirements of Sections 13(d) and (g) of the Exchange Act. Such a reallocation also may result in an obligation to amend previous filings made under Section 13(d) or (g) of the Exchange Act. Under our Articles, we have no obligation to notify shareholders of any adjustments to their voting power. Shareholders should consult their own legal counsel regarding the possible reporting requirements under Section 13 of the Exchange Act.

As of December 31, 2015, David Einhorn owned 16.9% of the issued and outstanding ordinary shares, which given that each Class B share is entitled to ten votes, causes him to exceed the 9.5% limitation imposed on the total voting power of the Class B ordinary shares. Thus, the voting power held by the Class B ordinary shares that is in excess of the 9.5% limitation will be reallocated pro-rata to holders of Class A ordinary shares according to their percentage interest in the Company. However, no shareholder will be allocated voting rights that would cause it to have 9.9% or more of the total voting power of our ordinary shares. The allocation of the voting power of the Class B ordinary shares to a holder of Class A ordinary shares will depend upon the total voting power of the Class B ordinary shares outstanding, as well as the percentage of Class A ordinary shares held by a shareholder and the other holders of Class A ordinary shares. Accordingly, we cannot estimate with precision what multiple of a vote per share a holder of Class A ordinary shares will be allocated as a result of the anticipated reallocation of voting power of the Class B ordinary shares.

Link to Table of Contents

Risks Relating to Taxation

We may become subject to taxation in the Cayman Islands, which would negatively affect our results.

Under current Cayman Islands law, we are not obligated to pay any taxes in the Cayman Islands on either income or capital gains. The Governor-in-Cabinet of Cayman Islands has granted us an exemption from the imposition of any such tax on us until February 1, 2025. We cannot be assured that after such date we would not be subject to any such tax. If we were to become subject to taxation in the Cayman Islands, our financial condition and results of operations could be significantly and negatively affected.

Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re and/or GRIL may be subject to United States federal income taxation.

Greenlight Capital Re and Greenlight Re are incorporated under the laws of the Cayman Islands, and GRIL is incorporated under the laws of Ireland. These entities intend to operate in a manner that will not cause us to be treated as engaging in a trade or business within the United States and will not cause us to be subject to current United States federal income taxation on Greenlight Capital Re's, Greenlight Re's and/or GRIL's net income. However, because there are no definitive standards provided by the Internal Revenue Code, regulations or court decisions as to the specific activities that constitute being engaged in the conduct of a trade or business within the United States, and as any such determination is essentially factual in nature, we cannot assure you that the United States Internal Revenue Service (the "IRS"), will not successfully assert that Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re and/or GRIL are engaged in a trade or business within the United States. If the IRS were to successfully assert that Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re, and/or GRIL have been engaged in a trade or business within the United States in any taxable year, various adverse tax consequences could result, including the following: Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re and/or GRIL may become subject to current United States federal income taxation on its net income from sources within the United States; Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re and/or GRIL may be subject to United States federal income tax on a portion of its net investment income, regardless of its source; Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re, and/or GRIL may not be entitled to deduct certain expenses that would otherwise be deductible from the income subject to United States taxation; and Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re and/or GRIL may be subject to United States branch profits tax on profits deemed to have been distributed out of the United States.

United States persons who own Class A ordinary shares may be subject to United States federal income taxation on our undistributed earnings and may recognize ordinary income upon disposition of Class A ordinary shares.

Passive Foreign Investment Company. Significant potential adverse United States federal income tax consequences, including certain reporting requirements, generally apply to any United States person who owns shares in a passive foreign investment company, or a PFIC. We believe that each of Greenlight Capital Re and Greenlight Re was a PFIC in 2006, 2005 and 2004. We do not believe, although we cannot assure you, that none of Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re or GRIL has been a PFIC from 2007 onwards. We cannot provide assurance that none of Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re or GRIL will be a PFIC in any future taxable year.

In general, any of Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re or GRIL would be a PFIC for a taxable year if either (i) 75% or more of its income constitutes "passive income" or (ii) 50% or more of its assets produce "passive income", or are held for the production of passive income. Passive income generally includes interest, dividends and other investment income but does not include income derived in the active conduct of an insurance business by a corporation predominantly engaged in an insurance business. This exception for insurance companies is intended to ensure that a bona fide insurance entity's income is not treated as passive income, except to the extent such income is attributable to financial reserves in excess of the reasonable needs of the insurance business. We believe that we are currently operating and intend to continue operating our business with financial reserves at a level that should not cause us to be deemed PFICs, although we cannot assure you the IRS will not successfully challenge this conclusion. If we are unable to underwrite sufficient amount of risks, any of Greenlight Capital Re, Greenlight Re or GRIL may become a PFIC.

In addition, sufficient risk must be transferred under an insurance entity's contracts with its insureds in order to qualify for the insurance exception. Whether our insurance contracts possess adequate risk transfer for purposes of determining whether income under our contracts is insurance income, and whether we are predominantly engaged in an insurance business, are subjective in nature and there is very little authority on these issues. We cannot assure you that the IRS will not successfully challenge our interpretation of the scope of the active insurance company exception and our qualification for the exception. Further, the IRS may issue regulatory or other guidance that causes us to fail to qualify for the active insurance company exception on a prospective or retroactive basis. Therefore, we cannot assure you that we will satisfy the exception for insurance companies and will not be treated as PFICs currently or in the future.

Link to Table of Contents

Controlled Foreign Corporation. United States persons who, directly or indirectly or through attribution rules, own 10% or more of the total combined voting power of our shares, which we refer to as United States 10% shareholders, may be subject to the controlled foreign corporation, or CFC, rules. Under the CFC rules, each United States 10% shareholder must annually include his pro-rata share of the CFC's "subpart F income", even if no distributions are made. In general, a foreign insurance company will be treated as a CFC only if United States 10% shareholders collectively own more than 25% of the total combined voting power or total value of the entity's shares for an uninterrupted period of 30 days or more during any year. We believe that the dispersion of our Class A ordinary shares among holders and the restrictions placed on transfer, issuance or repurchase of our Class A ordinary shares (including the ownership limitations described below), will generally prevent shareholders who acquire Class A ordinary shares from being United States 10% shareholders. In addition, because our Articles prevent any person from holding 9.9% or more of the total combined voting power of our shares (whether held directly, indirectly or constructively), unless such provision is waived by the unanimous consent of our Board of Directors, we believe no persons holding Class A ordinary shares should be viewed as United States 10% shareholders of a CFC for purposes of the CFC rules. We cannot assure you, however, that these rules will not apply to you. If you are a United States person, we strongly urge you to consult your own tax advisor concerning the CFC rules.

Related Person Insurance Income. If:

- our gross income attributable to insurance or reinsurance policies where the direct or indirect insureds are our direct or indirect United States shareholders or persons related to such United States shareholders equals or exceeds 20% of our gross insurance income in any taxable year; and
- direct or indirect insureds and persons related to such insureds owned directly or indirectly 20% or more of the voting power or value of our stock,

a United States person who owns Class A ordinary shares directly or indirectly on the last day of the taxable year would most likely be required to include their pro-rata share of our related person insurance income for the taxable year in their income. This amount would be determined as if such related person insurance income were distributed proportionally to United States persons at that date. We do not expect that we will knowingly enter into reinsurance agreements in which, in the aggregate, the direct or indirect insureds are, or are related to, owners of 20% or more of the Class A ordinary shares. We do not believe that the 20% gross insurance income threshold will be met. However, we cannot assure you that this is or will continue to be the case. Consequently, we cannot assure you that a person who is a direct or indirect United States shareholder will not be required to include amounts in its income in respect of related person insurance income in any taxable year.

If a United States shareholder is treated as disposing of shares in a foreign insurance corporation that has related person insurance income and in which United States persons own 25% or more of the voting power or value of the entity's shares, any gain from the disposition will generally be treated as a dividend to the extent of the United States shareholder's portion of the corporation's undistributed earnings and profits that were accumulated during the period that the United States shareholder owned the shares. In addition, the shareholder will be required to comply with certain reporting requirements, regardless of the amount of shares owned by the direct or indirect United States shareholder. Although not free from doubt, we believe these rules should not apply to dispositions of Class A ordinary shares because Greenlight Capital Re is not directly engaged in the insurance business and because proposed United States Treasury regulations applicable to this situation appear to apply only in the case of shares of corporations that are directly engaged in the insurance business. We cannot assure you, however, that the IRS will interpret the proposed regulations in this manner or that the proposed regulations will not be promulgated in final form in a manner that would cause these rules to apply to dispositions of Class A ordinary shares.

United States tax-exempt organizations who own Class A ordinary shares may recognize unrelated business taxable income.

If you are a United States tax-exempt organization you may recognize unrelated business taxable income if a portion of our subpart F insurance income is allocated to you. In general, subpart F insurance income will be allocated to you if we are a CFC as discussed above and you are a United States 10% shareholder or there is related person insurance income and certain exceptions do not apply. Although we do not believe that any United States persons will be allocated subpart F insurance income, we cannot assure you that this will be the case. If you are a United States tax-exempt organization, we advise you to consult your own tax advisor regarding the risk of recognizing unrelated business taxable income.

Proposed changes in United States tax regulations and laws could subject United States persons who own Class A ordinary shares to United States income taxation on our undistributed earnings and may cause us to undertake changes to the manner in which we conduct our business.

In April 2015, the IRS issued proposed regulations that would provide guidance regarding the exclusion of the investment income of a foreign insurance company from the definition of "passive income" for the purposes of the PFIC rules.

Link to Table of Contents

Furthermore, in June 2015, U.S. Senator Ron Wyden, a member of the U.S. Senate Finance Committee, introduced a bill that provides a "bright line" annual test that a foreign company must satisfy in order to qualify as an insurance company for purposes of the insurance company exception to the PFIC rules.

We are monitoring developments with respect to both the IRS proposed regulations and the Wyden bill. At this time, we cannot predict whether or what, if any, regulations will be adopted or legislation will be enacted. If regulations are adopted or legislation enacted that cause us to fail to meet the requirements of the insurance company exception, such failure could have a material adverse effect on the taxation of our shareholders who are U.S. persons. In that event we may undertake changes to the manner in which we conduct our business, which could have a material effect on our results of operations.

The tax laws and interpretations regarding whether an entity is engaged in a United States trade or business, is a CFC, has related party insurance income or is a PFIC are subject to change, possibly on a retroactive basis. New regulations or pronouncements interpreting or clarifying such rules may be forthcoming from the IRS. We are not able to predict if, when or in what form such guidance will be provided and whether such guidance will have a retroactive effect.

If investments held by GRIL are determined not to be integral to the insurance and reinsurance business carried on by GRIL, additional Irish tax could be imposed and our business and financial results could be materially adversely affected.

Based on administrative practice, taxable income derived from investments made by GRIL is generally taxed in Ireland at the rate of 12.5% on the grounds that such investments either form part of the permanent capital required by regulatory authorities, or are otherwise integral to the insurance and reinsurance business carried on by GRIL. GRIL intends to operate in such a manner so that the level of investments held by GRIL does not exceed the amount that is integral to the insurance and reinsurance businesses carried on by GRIL. If, however, investment income earned by GRIL exceeds these thresholds or if the administrative practice of the Irish Revenue Commissioners changes, Irish corporation tax could apply to such investment income at a higher rate (currently 25%) instead of the general 12.5% rate, and our results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

The impact of the initiative of the OECD to eliminate harmful tax practices is uncertain and could adversely affect our tax status in the Cayman Islands.

The OECD has published reports and launched a global dialogue among member and non-member countries on measures to limit harmful tax competition. These measures are largely directed at counteracting the effects of tax havens and preferential tax regimes in countries around the world. While the Cayman Islands is currently on the list of jurisdictions that have substantially implemented the internationally agreed tax standard, we are not able to predict if additional requirements will be imposed and if so whether changes arising from such additional requirements will subject us to additional taxes.

ITEM 1B. UNRESOLVED STAFF COMMENTS

None.

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

We currently occupy our office space in Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands under operating lease agreements which will expire on June 30, 2018, unless we renew the leases for an additional five year term. Additionally, we have an operating lease agreement for office space in Dublin, Ireland which expires in 2031 but provides us an option to terminate the lease in 2021 without any penalty. We believe that for the foreseeable future the office spaces in the

Cayman Islands and Ireland will be sufficient for conducting our operations.

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

From time to time, in the normal course of business, we may be involved in formal and informal dispute resolution procedures, which may include arbitration or litigation, the outcomes of which determine our rights and obligations under our reinsurance contracts and other contractual agreements. In some disputes, we may seek to enforce our rights under an agreement or to collect funds owing to us. In other matters, we may resist attempts by others to collect funds or enforce alleged rights. While the final outcome of legal disputes cannot be predicted with certainty, we do not believe that any of our existing contractual disputes, when finally resolved, will have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or operating results.

Link to Table of Contents

ITEM 4. MINE SAFETY DISCLOSURES

Not applicable.

PART II

ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT’S COMMON EQUITY, RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS AND ISSUER PURCHASES OF EQUITY SECURITIES

Market Information

Our Class A ordinary shares began publicly trading on the Nasdaq Global Select Market on May 24, 2007 under the symbol "GLRE". The following table sets forth, for the periods indicated, the high and low reported sale price per share of our Class A ordinary shares on the Nasdaq Global Select Market.

	2015		2014	
	High	Low	High	Low
First Quarter	$33.23	$30.42	$34.24	$29.97
Second Quarter	$31.91	$29.14	$34.70	$30.83
Third Quarter	$30.05	$22.13	$35.18	$31.55
Fourth Quarter	$25.20	$17.86	$33.87	$30.18

Holders

As of January 31, 2016, the number of holders of record of our Class A ordinary shares was approximately 45, not including beneficial owners of shares registered in nominee or street name who represent approximately 96.9% of the Class A ordinary shares issued and outstanding.

Dividends

Since inception, we have not paid any cash dividends on our Class A ordinary shares or Class B ordinary shares, or collectively, our ordinary shares.

Holders of ordinary shares are entitled to receive dividends when, as and if declared by the Board of Directors in accordance with the provisions of our Articles and the Companies Law. In the event of a liquidation, dissolution or winding-up of the Company, the holders of ordinary shares are entitled to share equally and ratably in our assets, if any remain after the payment of all of our debts and liabilities and the liquidation preference of any outstanding preferred shares.

We currently do not intend to declare and pay dividends on our ordinary shares in the foreseeable future. However, if we decide to pay dividends, we cannot assure you that sufficient cash will be available to pay such dividends. In addition, a letter of credit facility prohibits us from paying dividends during an event of default as defined in the letter of credit agreement. Our future dividend policy will also depend on the requirements of any future financing agreements to which we may be a party and other factors considered relevant by our Board of Directors, such as our results of operations and cash flows, our financial position and capital requirements, general business conditions, rating agency guidelines, legal, tax, regulatory and any contractual restrictions on the payment of dividends. Further, any future declaration and payment of dividends is discretionary and our Board of Directors may at any time modify or revoke our dividend policy on our ordinary shares. Finally, our ability to pay dividends also depends on the ability of our subsidiaries to pay dividends to us. Although Greenlight Capital Re is not subject to any significant legal prohibitions on the payment of dividends, Greenlight Re and GRIL are subject to regulatory constraints that affect their ability to pay dividends and include minimum net worth requirements. As of December 31, 2015, Greenlight Re and GRIL both exceeded the minimum statutory capital requirements. Any dividends we pay will be declared and paid in U.S. dollars.

Link to Table of Contents

Performance Graph

Presented below is a line graph comparing the yearly percentage change in the cumulative total shareholder return on our Class A ordinary shares from May 24, 2007 (the date on which our Class A ordinary shares were first listed on the Nasdaq Global Select Market) through December 31, 2015 against the total return index for the Russell 2000 Index, or RUT, and the S&P 500 Property & Casualty Insurance Index, or S&P Insurance Index, for the same period. The performance graph assumes $100 invested on May 24, 2007 in the ordinary shares of Greenlight Capital Re, the RUT and the S&P Insurance Index. The performance graph also assumes that all dividends are reinvested.

The performance reflected in the graph above is not necessarily indicative of future performance.

This graph is not "soliciting material," is not deemed filed with the SEC and is not to be incorporated by reference in any filing by us under the Securities Act or the Exchange Act, whether made before or after the date hereof and irrespective of any general incorporation language in any such filing.

Link to Table of Contents

Purchases of Equity Securities by the Issuer and Affiliated Purchasers

The table below details the repurchases that were made under our share repurchase plan during the year ended December 31, 2015.
Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

Period	Total Number of Shares Purchased [1]	Average Price Paid per Share	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs [1]	Maximum Number of Shares that May Yet Be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs [1]
January 1 - 31, 2015	—	$—	—	2,000,000
February 1 - 28, 2015	—	$—	—	2,000,000
March 1 - 31, 2015	—	$—	—	2,000,000
April 1 - 30, 2015	—	$—	—	2,000,000
May 1 - 31, 2015	—	$—	—	2,000,000
June 1 - 30, 2015	140,000	$30.28	140,000	1,860,000
July 1 - 31, 2015	360,000	$28.95	360,000	1,500,000
August 1 - 31, 2015	113,540	$26.68	113,540	1,386,460
September 1 - 30, 2015	—	$—	—	1,386,460
October 1 - 31, 2015	—	$—	—	1,386,460
November 1 - 30, 2015	—	$—	—	1,386,460
December 1 - 31, 2015	—	$—	—	1,386,460
Total	613,540		613,540	1,386,460

[1] Class A ordinary shares.

On August 5, 2008, our board of directors adopted a share repurchase plan authorizing the Company to repurchase Class A ordinary shares in the open market, through privately negotiated transactions or Rule 10b5-1 stock trading plans. From time to time, the repurchase plan has been re-approved or modified at the election of our Board of Directors. On April 29, 2015, our Board of Directors amended the share repurchase plan to extend the duration of the repurchase plan to June 30, 2016 and reinstated the authorization for the Company to purchase up to 2.0 million Class A ordinary shares or securities convertible into Class A ordinary shares. As of December 31, 2015, 1,386,460 Class A ordinary shares remained authorized for repurchase under the share repurchase plan. The Company is not required to repurchase any Class A ordinary shares and the repurchase plan may be modified, suspended or terminated at any time without prior notice.

ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA

The following table sets forth our selected historical consolidated statement of income data for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2015, 2014, 2013, 2012 and 2011, as well as our selected historical consolidated balance sheet data as of December 31, 2015, 2014, 2013, 2012 and 2011, which are derived from our audited consolidated financial statements. The audited consolidated financial statements are prepared in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America ("U.S. GAAP") and have been audited by BDO USA, LLP, an independent registered public accounting firm.

These historic results are not necessarily indicative of results for any future period. You should read the following selected financial data in conjunction with our consolidated financial statements and related notes thereto contained in "Item 8. Financial Statements and Supplementary Data" and "Item 7. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" included in this filing and all other information appearing elsewhere or incorporated into this filing by reference.

41

Link to Table of Contents

	Year ended December 31				
	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
	($ in thousands, except per share and share amounts)				
Selected Consolidated Statement of Income Data					
Gross premiums written	$502,124	$324,023	$535,702	$427,844	$397,659
Net premiums earned	408,387	354,240	547,899	466,714	379,775
Net investment income (loss)	(281,924)	122,575	218,140	78,941	23,118
Loss and loss adjustment expenses incurred, net	317,097	234,986	338,493	366,601	241,690
Acquisition costs, net	116,207	107,665	171,872	142,721	138,751
General and administrative expenses	23,434	24,500	20,958	16,755	13,892
Net income (loss)	$(326,425)	$109,592	$225,699	$14,598	$6,769
Earnings (Loss) Per Share Data (1)					
Basic	$(8.90)	$2.94	$6.13	$0.40	$0.19
Diluted	(8.90)	2.89	6.01	0.39	0.18
Weighted average number of ordinary shares used in the determination of earnings and loss per share					
Basic	36,670,466	37,242,687	36,838,128	36,702,128	36,548,466
Diluted	36,670,466	37,874,387	37,585,167	37,361,338	37,286,454
Selected Ratios (based on U.S. GAAP Consolidated Statement of Income data)					
Loss ratio (2)	77.6%	66.3%	61.8%	78.5%	63.6%
Acquisition cost ratio (3)	28.5%	30.4%	31.4%	30.6%	36.5%
Internal expense ratio (4)	4.5%	6.0%	3.2%	2.8%	2.8%
Corporate expense ratio (5)	1.2%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%	0.9%
Combined ratio (6)	111.8%	103.6%	97.0%	112.7%	103.8%

Prior to January 1, 2015, non-investment related foreign exchange gains and losses were recorded under general and administrative expenses. Effective January 1, 2015, the presentation has been modified and any non-investment related foreign exchange gains or losses are now recorded under "other income (expense), net" in the consolidated statements of income. Therefore, the general and administrative expenses, corporate expense ratios and combined ratios for prior periods have been reclassified in the above table to conform to the current year presentation.

Link to Table of Contents

	December 31				
	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
	($ in thousands, except per share and share amounts)				
Selected Consolidated Balance Sheet Data					
Total investments	$1,064,164	$1,430,978	$1,393,679	$1,177,928	$1,030,146
Cash and cash equivalents	112,162	12,030	3,722	21,890	42,284
Restricted cash and cash equivalents	1,236,589	1,296,914	1,334,074	1,206,837	957,462
Total assets	2,712,522	2,995,292	3,095,276	2,722,753	2,343,488
Securities sold, not yet purchased, at fair value	882,906	1,090,731	1,111,690	908,368	683,816
Due to prime brokers	396,453	211,070	314,702	326,488	260,359
Loss and loss adjustment expense reserves ^	305,997	264,243	329,894	356,470	241,279
Unearned premium reserves	211,954	128,736	173,057	188,185	225,735
Total liabilities	1,863,749	1,801,251	2,008,972	1,862,343	1,497,790
Total equity	848,773	1,194,041	1,086,304	860,410	845,698
Adjusted book value* (7)	825,391	1,165,151	1,051,595	821,708	803,103
Diluted adjusted book value* (8)	836,944	1,184,779	1,067,623	840,683	821,318
Ordinary shares outstanding					
Basic	37,027,467	37,384,543	37,046,814	36,702,128	36,538,149
Diluted (9)	37,744,807	38,516,460	38,257,545	38,193,418	38,007,149
Per Share Data					
Basic adjusted book value per share* (10)	$22.29	$31.17	$28.39	$22.39	$21.98
Fully diluted adjusted book value per share* (11)	22.17	30.76	27.91	22.01	21.61

(1) Basic earnings per share is calculated by dividing net income by the weighted average number of common shares and participating securities outstanding for the period. Diluted earnings per share is calculated by taking into account the effects of exercising all dilutive stock options. In the event of a net loss, any stock options outstanding are excluded from the calculation of diluted loss per share. Unvested stock awards which contain non-forfeitable rights to dividends or dividend equivalents, whether paid or unpaid (referred to as "participating securities") are included in the number of shares outstanding for both basic and diluted earnings per share calculations. In the event of a net loss, the participating securities are excluded from both basic and diluted loss per share.

(2) The loss ratio is calculated by dividing net loss and loss adjustment expenses incurred by net premiums earned.

(3) The acquisition cost ratio is calculated by dividing net acquisition costs by net premiums earned.

(4) The internal expense ratio is the ratio of general and administrative expenses, excluding any corporate expenses, to net premiums earned.

(5) The corporate expense ratio is the ratio of corporate expenses to net premiums earned. Corporate expenses include expenses relating to Greenlight Capital Re being a publicly listed entity and certain non-core operating expenses.

(6) The combined ratio is the sum of the loss ratio, acquisition cost ratio, the internal expense ratio and corporate expense ratio.

(7) Adjusted book value equals total equity minus non-controlling interest in joint venture.

(8) Diluted adjusted book value is the adjusted book value plus the proceeds from the exercise of in-the-money options issued and outstanding at year end.

(9) Diluted number of shares outstanding is the sum of basic shares outstanding and the in-the-money options and restricted stock units issued and outstanding at year end.

(10) Basic adjusted book value per share is calculated by dividing adjusted book value by the number of shares and share equivalents issued and outstanding at year end.

(11) Fully diluted adjusted book value per share is calculated by dividing the diluted adjusted book value by the diluted number of shares outstanding at year end.

* Adjusted book value, diluted adjusted book value, basic adjusted book value per share, and fully diluted adjusted book value per share are non-GAAP measures. For a reconciliation of the non-GAAP measures to the most comparable GAAP measures, refer to "Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations — Results of Operations".

^ For detailed discussion of change in loss and loss adjustment expenses, refer to "Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations — Financial Condition" and Note 7 to the consolidated financial statements.

Link to Table of Contents

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

References to "we," "us," "our," "our company," or "the Company" refer to Greenlight Capital Re, Ltd. ("GLRE") and its wholly-owned subsidiaries, Greenlight Reinsurance, Ltd, ("Greenlight Re"), Greenlight Reinsurance Ireland, Ltd. ("GRIL") and Verdant Holding Company, Ltd. ("Verdant"), unless the context dictates otherwise. References to our "Ordinary Shares" refers collectively to our Class A Ordinary Shares and Class B Ordinary Shares.

The following is a discussion and analysis of our results of operations for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013 and financial condition as of December 31, 2015 and 2014. The following discussion should be read in conjunction with the audited consolidated financial statements and accompanying notes, which appear elsewhere in this filing.

General

We are a Cayman Islands headquartered global specialty property and casualty reinsurer with a reinsurance and investment strategy that we believe differentiates us from most of our competitors. Our goal is to build long-term shareholder value by selectively offering customized reinsurance solutions, in markets where capacity and alternatives are limited, which we believe will yield favorable long-term returns on equity.

We aim to complement our underwriting results with a non-traditional investment approach in order to achieve higher rates of return over the long term than reinsurance companies that employ more traditional, fixed-income investment strategies. We manage our investment portfolio according to a value-oriented philosophy, in which we take long positions in perceived undervalued securities and short positions in perceived overvalued securities.

Because we employ an opportunistic underwriting philosophy, period-to-period comparisons of our underwriting results may not be meaningful. In addition, our historical investment results may not necessarily be indicative of future performance. Due to the nature of our reinsurance and investment strategies, our operating results will likely fluctuate from period to period.

Outlook and Trends

The reinsurance industry has experienced significant consolidation in the last several years, fueled by many traditional participants with excess capital looking to strengthen their positions in their core markets and boost their investment returns in a low interest rate environment. We believe further consolidation will likely continue but do not believe that consolidation will result in a significant reduction in total capital within the industry. Rather, we expect the industry consolidation to create concentrations of capital in fewer, larger participants, and that with a reduction in the number of competitors in the industry, pricing may partially stabilize. Further, while some opportunities may become available on an attractive basis to only the largest reinsurance companies in the industry, we believe that the consolidation trend may create new opportunities for us if more capacity becomes available as a result of the industry consolidating.

We do not believe that the over-capitalization of the market is uniform across all industry participants and there are many insurers and reinsurers with lower financial security profiles than ours that have and will continue to suffer disproportionately. We believe the value proposition of our reinsurance offering and our differentiated underwriting strategy positions us well to compete for new, targeted business in niche areas that we know and service well.

A key part of our underwriting strategy is to identify and partner with companies that have suffered dislocation. Accordingly, given declining or flat investment earnings for fixed income investors, resulting from a prolonged low interest rate environment, we believe underwriting opportunities may increase, which we intend to pursue where we believe pricing is economically rational. Conversely, if attractive opportunities are not available on economically rational terms, we anticipate that we will seek to maintain or even reduce premium writings rather than accept mispriced risk in order to conserve our capital for a more opportune environment. We believe that significant price increases could occur if financial and credit markets experience adverse shocks that result in the loss of capital of insurers and reinsurers, or if there are major catastrophic events, especially in North America.

During 2015, we experienced more success in closing targeted new business opportunities, especially new transactions with existing partners, than we have experienced in the prior two fiscal years. For specific information regarding our gross written premium by area of business as at December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, please refer to the table in Note 15 of the consolidated financial statements. Additionally, several of our renewal clients experienced growth in their portfolios, which, in turn, resulted in growth of the premium ceded under our transactions with these clients in 2015. In particular:

Link to Table of Contents

- We observed stability and favorable trends in our underlying rates and profitability for our non-standard automobile business. We continue to believe we are achieving acceptable risk adjusted returns on this business and expect to have a high concentration of premium in this line for the foreseeable future.
- We observed an increase in the size of the U.S. health stop loss market as employers seek to control their health care costs by moving from first dollar health care plans subject to the Affordable Care Act. We believe that the majority of this growth has been absorbed by large carriers that elect to not purchase reinsurance. However, we have seen growth in the portion of the market controlled by managing general underwriters that rely heavily on quota share reinsurance and we expect to modestly increase our market share in this line for the foreseeable future.
- We note that pricing for property catastrophe retro and other property catastrophe business is under severe competitive pressure and we believe much of the business in the market is being priced below the expected losses. As such, in 2015 we have decreased, and expect to continue to decrease, our focus in this line of business unless there is a market changing event that improves expected profitability.
- Our specialty casualty business is comprised of larger, syndicated reinsurance placements for general casualty and professional liability. For most of this business, we are not a lead underwriter and, instead are following the market on these transactions. This business has a longer duration of claim payments than business we have historically written, which leads to a build-up of reserves and exposure over a longer period of time. We expect this portion of our business to grow modestly in 2016.
- We also observed a decrease in the underlying rates and profitability for Florida Homeowners business. If rates and expected profitability continue to decline, we would expect to further decrease the premiums written in this line.

On October 23, 2015 A.M. Best affirmed Greenlight Re's rating of "A (Excellent)" but revised the outlook from stable to negative. We do not expect any of our current business to be affected due to strong client relationships and our capital position; however, there is the potential for new business generation in the rating sensitive areas of the market to be adversely impacted.

While competitive market conditions have made finding and successfully underwriting new business that meets our targeted return hurdles challenging, we believe that we have a strong pipeline of attractive opportunities with counterparties that seek highly customized structures, terms and conditions, which aligns well with our underwriting strategy. We intend to continue to monitor market conditions and pursue opportunities to best position ourselves to participate in future under-served or capacity-constrained markets as they arise, and intend to offer products that we believe will generate favorable returns on equity over the long term. Accordingly, our underlying results and product line concentrations in any given period may vary, perhaps significantly, and are not necessarily indicative of our future results of operations.

Our investment portfolio had a net long exposure of 15.5% as of December 31, 2015. Our goal for 2016 is to protect capital in an uncertain environment and to find investment opportunities on both our long and short portfolios that we believe will generate positive returns. Despite a Federal Reserve interest rate increase in December, monetary policy remains very accommodative globally. Additionally, there are many global economic and political risks that are coming to the forefront. Global equity markets have had a difficult start in 2016 with many global market indices falling, and volatility rising. Given the current investment environment, we judge it appropriate to maintain comparatively lower gross and net equity exposures and to hold a significant position in gold and other macro positions.

Segments

We manage our business on the basis of one operating segment, property and casualty reinsurance, in accordance with the qualitative and quantitative criteria established by U.S. GAAP. Within the property and casualty reinsurance segment, we analyze our underwriting operations using two categories:

- frequency business; and
- severity business.

Frequency business is generally characterized as contracts containing a potentially large number of small losses emanating from multiple events. Clients generally buy this protection to increase their own underwriting capacity and typically select a reinsurer based upon the reinsurer’s financial strength, service and expertise. We expect the results of frequency business to be less volatile than those of severity business from period to period due to greater predictability. We also expect that over time the profit margins and return on equity of our frequency business will be lower than those of our severity business.

Link to Table of Contents

Severity business is generally characterized as contracts with the potential for significant losses emanating from one event or multiple events. Clients generally buy this protection to remove volatility from their balance sheets, and accordingly, we expect the results of severity business to be volatile from period to period. However, over the long term, we also expect that our severity business will generate higher profit margins and return on equity than those of our frequency business.

Revenues

We derive our revenues from two principal sources:

- premiums from reinsurance on property and casualty business assumed; and
- income from investments.

Premiums from reinsurance on property and casualty business assumed are directly related to the number, type and pricing of contracts we write. For financial reporting purposes, we earn premiums over the contract period in proportion to the period of risk covered.

Income from our investments is primarily comprised of interest income, dividends, net realized gains and losses, and changes in unrealized gains and losses on investment securities. We also derive interest income from money market funds and notes receivable.

In addition, we may from time to time derive other income from gains on deposit accounted contracts, fees generated from advisory services provided by Verdant and fees relating to overrides, profit commissions and early termination of contracts.

Expenses

Our expenses consist primarily of the following:

- underwriting losses and loss adjustment expenses;
- acquisition costs;
- investment-related expenses; and
- general and administrative expenses.

Loss and loss adjustment expenses are a function of the amount and type of reinsurance contracts we write and of the loss experience of the underlying coverage. As described below, loss and loss adjustment expenses include an actuarial analysis of the estimated losses, including losses incurred during the period and changes in estimates from prior periods. Depending on the nature of the contract, loss and loss adjustment expenses may be paid over a period of years.

Acquisition costs primarily consist of brokerage fees, ceding commissions, premium taxes, profit commissions, letters of credit fees, federal excise tax, and other direct expenses we incur that are directly related to underwriting reinsurance contracts. We amortize deferred acquisition costs over the related contract term.

Investment-related expenses primarily consist of interest expense on borrowings, dividend expense on short sales, management fees and performance compensation that we pay to our investment advisor. We net these expenses against investment income in our consolidated financial statements.

General and administrative expenses consist primarily of salaries and benefits and related costs, including costs associated with our incentive compensation plan, bonuses and stock compensation expenses. General and administrative expenses also include professional fees, travel and entertainment, information technology, rent and other general operating expenses.

For stock option expenses, we calculate compensation cost using the Black-Scholes option pricing model and expense stock options over their vesting period, which is typically three years. For restricted stock awards and restricted stock units, we calculate compensation cost using the grant date fair value of each award and expense the stock awards over their vesting period, which is typically three years for employees and one year for directors.

Link to Table of Contents

Critical Accounting Policies

Our consolidated financial statements contain certain amounts that are inherently subjective in nature and have required management to make assumptions and best estimates to determine reported values. If certain factors, including those described in "Part I. Item IA. — Risk Factors", cause actual events or results to differ materially from our underlying assumptions or estimates, there could be a material adverse effect on our results of operations, financial condition or liquidity. We believe that the following accounting policies affect the more significant estimates used in the preparation of our consolidated financial statements. The descriptions below are summarized and have been simplified for clarity. A more detailed description of our significant accounting policies as well as recently issued accounting standards is included in Note 2 to the consolidated financial statements.

Premium Revenues and Risk Transfer. Our property and casualty reinsurance premiums are recorded as premiums written based upon contract terms and information received from ceding companies and their brokers. For excess of loss reinsurance contracts, premiums are typically stated as a percentage of the subject premiums written by the client, subject to a minimum and deposit premium. The minimum and deposit premium is typically based on an estimate of subject premiums expected to be written by the client during the contract term. The minimum and deposit premium is reported initially as premiums written and adjusted, if necessary, in subsequent periods once the actual subject premium is known. For catastrophe contracts that contractually require the payment of a reinstatement premium equal to or greater than the original premium upon the occurrence of a full limit loss, the reinstatement premiums are earned over the original contract period. Reinstatement premiums that are contractually calculated on a pro-rata basis of the original premiums are earned over the remaining coverage period.

For each quota share or proportional property and casualty reinsurance contract we underwrite, our client estimates gross premiums written at inception of the contract. We generally account for such premiums using our best estimates and then adjust our estimates based on actual reports provided by our client and based on our expectations of industry developments. As the contract progresses, we monitor actual premiums received in conjunction with correspondence from the client in order to refine our estimate. Variances from initial gross premiums written estimates can be greater for quota share contracts than for excess of loss contracts. All premiums on quota share contracts are earned over the risk coverage period. Unearned premiums consist of the unexpired portion of reinsurance provided.

At the inception of each of our reinsurance contracts, we receive premium estimates from the client, which, together with historical and industry data, are used to estimate what we believe will be the ultimate premium payable pursuant to each contract. We receive actual premiums written by each client as the client reports the actual results of the underlying insurance writings to us on a monthly or quarterly basis (depending on the terms of the contract). We book the actual premiums written when we receive them from our client. Each reporting period we estimate the amount of premiums that are written for stub periods that have not yet been reported to us by the client. For example, for December year-end we may have to estimate December premiums ceded under certain contracts since the client may not be required to report the actual results to us until after we have finalized our audited financial statements. Typically, premium estimates are only used for unreported stub periods, which accounts for a small percentage of our reported premiums written. We believe that estimating premiums written for these stub periods is standard reinsurance industry practice.

We are able to confirm the accuracy and completeness of premiums reported by our clients by either reviewing the client's statutory filings and/or performing an audit of the client, as per the terms of the contract. Discrepancies between premiums being ceded and reported under a contract are, in our experience, rare. To date, we have not had any material discrepancy in premiums being reported by a client that required a dispute resolution process.

We account for reinsurance contracts in accordance with U.S. GAAP. Assessing whether or not a reinsurance contract meets the conditions for risk transfer requires judgment. The determination of risk transfer is critical to reporting premiums written and is based, in part, on the use of actuarial and pricing models and assumptions. If we determine that a reinsurance contract does not transfer sufficient risk, or if a contract provides retroactive reinsurance coverage, we use deposit accounting. Any losses on such contracts are charged to earnings immediately and recorded in the consolidated statements of income as other expense. Any gains relating to such contracts are deferred and amortized over the estimated remaining settlement period. All such deferred gains are included in reinsurance balances payable in the consolidated balance sheets. Amortized gains are recorded in the consolidated statements of income as other income.

Investments. Our investments in debt and equity securities that are classified as "trading securities" are carried at fair value in accordance with U.S. GAAP. The fair values of the listed equities are derived based on the last reported price on the balance sheet date as reported by a recognized exchange. The fair values of listed equities that have restrictions on sale or transfer which expire within one year, are determined by adjusting the observed market price of the equity using a liquidity discount based on observable market inputs. The fair values of debt instruments are generally derived based on the average of

Link to Table of Contents

multiple market maker or broker quotes which are considered to be binding. Where quotes are not available, debt instruments are valued using cash flow models using assumptions and estimates that may be subjective and non-observable.

The fair values of our investments in commodities are based on the commodity’s last reported price on the balance sheet date as reported by a recognized commodities exchange. Our investments in private and unlisted equity securities and limited partnerships are all carried at fair value, based on broker or market maker quotes, or based on management’s assumptions developed from available information, using the services of our investment advisor including the most recent net asset values obtained from the managers of those underlying investments. Investments in private equity funds are valued based on unadjusted net asset values reported by the funds’ managers.

For securities classified as "trading securities" and "other investments", any realized and unrealized gains or losses are determined on the basis of specific identification method (by reference to cost or amortized cost, as appropriate) and included in net investment income in the consolidated statements of income.

Financial contracts which include total return swaps, credit default swaps, options, futures and other derivative instruments are recorded at their fair value with any unrealized gains and losses included in net investment income in the consolidated statements of income. Fair values on total return swaps are based on the underlying security’s fair value which is obtained from closing prices on a recognized exchange (for equity or commodity swaps), or from market makers or broker quotes. Fair values for credit default swaps trading in an active market are based on market maker or broker quotes taking into account credit spreads on identical contracts. Our exchange traded option contracts are recorded at fair value based on quoted prices in active markets. For over the counter ("OTC") options and exchange traded options where a quoted price in an active market is not available, we obtain multiple market maker quotes to determine the fair values. Fair values for other derivative instruments are determined based on multiple broker or market maker quotes taking into account the liquidity and the availability of an active market for the derivative.

Loss and Loss Adjustment Expense Reserves. Our loss and loss adjustment expense reserves are comprised of:

- case reserves resulting from claims notified to us by our clients;
- incurred but not reported ("IBNR") losses; and
- estimated loss adjustment expenses.

Case reserves are provided by our clients, and IBNR losses are estimated each reporting period based on a contract by contract review of all data available to us for each individual contract. Each of our reinsurance contracts is unique and the methods and estimates we use vary depending on the facts and circumstances of each contract. The resulting total loss reserves, including IBNR loss reserves, are the sum of each loss reserve estimated on a contract by contract basis.

We establish reserves for contracts based on estimates of the ultimate cost of all losses including IBNR. These estimated ultimate reserves are based on our own actuarial estimates derived from reports received from ceding companies, industry data and historical experience. These estimates are periodically reviewed by the Company on a contract by contract basis and adjusted when necessary. Since reserves are estimates, the setting of appropriate reserves is an inherently uncertain process. Our estimates are based upon actuarial and statistical projections and on our assessment of currently available data, predictions of future developments and estimates of future trends and other factors. The final settlement of losses may vary, perhaps materially, from the reserves initially established and periodically adjusted. All adjustments to the estimates are recorded in the period in which they are determined. Under U.S. GAAP, we are not permitted to establish loss reserves, which include case reserves and IBNR loss reserves, until the occurrence of an event which may give rise to a claim. As a result, only loss reserves applicable to losses incurred up to the reporting date are established, with no allowance for the establishment of loss reserves to account for expected future loss events.

For natural peril exposed business, we generally establish loss reserves based on loss payments and case reserves reported by our clients when, and if, received. We then add our estimates for IBNR losses to the case reserves. To establish our IBNR loss estimates, in addition to the loss information and estimates communicated by ceding companies, we use industry information, knowledge of the business written and management's judgment.

For most of the contracts we write, our risk exposure is limited by defined limits of liability. Once the loss limit for a contract has been reached, we have no further exposure to additional losses from that contract. However, certain contracts, particularly quota share contracts that relate to first dollar exposure, may not contain aggregate limits.

For all non-natural peril business, we initially reserve every individual contract to the expected loss and loss expense ratio that we calculated when we originally priced the business. In our pricing analysis, we typically utilize a significant amount of information both from the individual client and from industry data. Where practical, we compare historic reserving data that

Link to Table of Contents

we receive from our client, if any, to publicly available financial statements of the client in an effort to identify, confirm and monitor the accuracy and completeness of the data. We require each of our clients to provide loss information for each reporting period, which, depending on the contract, could be monthly or quarterly. The loss information required depends on the terms and conditions of each contract and may include many years of history. Depending on the type of business underwritten, we are entitled to receive client and industry information on historical paid losses, incurred losses, number of open claims, number of closed claims, number of total claims, listings of individual large losses, earned premiums, policy count, policy limits underwritten, exposure information and rate change information. We may also receive information by class or subclass of business. If the reserving data is not available from a client, we rely on industry data, as well as the judgment and experience of our underwriters and actuaries.

We rely more on client and industry data than our own data to identify unusual trends requiring changes in reserve estimates. Each reinsurance contract is different and the degree to which we rely on client data versus our own data varies greatly from contract to contract. The extent to which we rely on client data for reserve setting purposes depends upon the availability of historical loss data from the client and our judgment as to how reliable we believe the client’s historic loss performance is compared to its current book of business. We may from time to time supplement client data with industry and competitor information where we deem appropriate. Where available, we also receive relevant actuarial reports from the client. We supplement this information with subjective information on each client, which may include management experience, competitor information, meetings with the client and supplementary industry research and data.

Generally, we obtain regular updates of premium and loss related information for the current period and historical periods, which we utilize to update our initial expected loss and loss expense ratio. There may be a time lag from when claims are reported to our client and when our client reports the claims to us. This time lag may impact our loss reserve estimates from period to period. Client reports, whether due monthly or quarterly, have set reporting dates of when they are due to us (for example, fifteen days after month end). As such, the time lag in the client’s reporting depends upon the terms of the specific contract. The timing of the reporting requirements is designed so that we receive premium and loss information as soon as practicable once the client has closed its books. Accordingly, there should be a short lag in such reporting. Additionally, most of our contracts that have the potential for large single event losses have provisions that such loss notification needs to be received immediately upon the occurrence of an event. Once we receive this updated information, we use a variety of standard actuarial methods in our analysis each quarter. Such methods may include:

- Paid Loss Development Method. We estimate ultimate losses by calculating past paid loss development factors and applying them to exposure periods with further expected paid loss development. The paid loss development method assumes that losses are paid in a consistent pattern. It provides an objective test of reported loss projections because paid losses contain no reserve estimates. For many coverages, claim payments are made very slowly and it may take years for claims to be fully reported and settled.
- Reported Loss Development Method. We estimate ultimate losses by calculating past reported loss development factors and applying them to exposure periods with further expected reported loss development. Since reported losses include payments and case reserves, changes in both of these amounts are incorporated in this method. This approach provides a larger volume of data to estimate ultimate losses than paid loss methods. Thus, reported loss patterns may be less varied than paid loss patterns, especially for coverage that have historically been paid out over a long period of time but for which claims are reported relatively early and case loss reserve estimates have been established.
- Expected Loss Ratio Method. We estimate ultimate losses under the expected loss ratio method, by multiplying earned premiums by an expected loss ratio. We select the expected loss ratio using industry data, historical company data and our professional judgment. We use this method for lines of business and contracts where there are no historical losses or where past loss experience is not credible.

Bornhuetter-Ferguson Paid Loss Method. We estimate ultimate losses by modifying expected loss ratios to the extent paid losses experienced to date differ from what would have been expected to have been paid based upon the selected paid loss development pattern. This method avoids some of the distortions that could result from a large development factor being applied to a small base of paid losses to calculate ultimate losses. We generally use this method for lines of business and contracts where there are limited historical paid losses.

Bornhuetter-Ferguson Reported Loss Method. We estimate ultimate losses by modifying expected loss ratios to the extent reported losses experienced to date differ from what would have been expected to have been reported based upon the selected reported loss development pattern. This method avoids some of the distortions that could result from a large development factor being applied to a small base of reported losses to calculate ultimate losses. We generally use this method for lines of business and contracts where there are limited historical reported losses.

Frequency / Severity Method. We estimate ultimate losses under this method by multiplying the ultimate number of claims (i.e. the frequency), by the estimated ultimate average cost per claim (i.e. the severity). By analyzing claims experience by its frequency and severity components, we are able to examine trends and patterns in the rates of claims emergence (i.e. reporting) and settlement (i.e. closure) as well as in the average cost of claims. The approach is valuable because sometimes there is more inherent stability in the frequency and severity data when viewed separately rather than in the total losses.

Link to Table of Contents

In addition, we supplement our analysis with other reserving methodologies that we deem to be relevant to specific contracts.

For each contract, we utilize such reserving methodology that our actuaries deem appropriate in order to calculate a best estimate, or point estimate, of reserves. We use various actuarial methods to provide data point estimates to aid us in our estimation of reasonable and adequate loss reserves. In setting our reserves, we do not select a range of estimates that may be subject to adjustment. We analyze reserves on a contract by contract basis and do not reserve based on aggregated product lines. Whether we use one methodology, a combination of methodologies or all methodologies depends upon the contract and the judgment of the actuaries responsible for the contract. We do not have a set weighting of the various methods we use. Certain of the methods we consider are more appropriate depending on the type and structure of the contract, how mature is the contract, and the duration of the expected paid losses on the contract. For example, the data estimation for contracts that are relatively new and therefore have little paid loss development is more appropriately considered using the Bornhuetter-Ferguson Reported Loss Method than a paid loss development method.

Our aggregate reserves are the sum of the point estimate of all contracts. We perform a quarterly loss reserve analysis on each contract regardless of the line of business. This analysis may incorporate some or all of the information described above, using some or all of the methodologies described above. We generally calculate IBNR loss reserves for each contract by estimating the ultimate incurred losses at any point in time and subtracting cumulative paid claims and case reserves, which incorporate specific exposures, loss payment and reporting patterns and other relevant factors. Each quarter, our reserving committee, which is comprised of our Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Actuarial Officer, Assistant Controller and Reserving Actuary, meets to assess the adequacy of our loss reserves based on the reserve analysis and recommendations prepared by the Company’s actuaries. The reserving committee discusses each contract individually and approves or revises the stated reserves.

Additionally, we contract with a third-party actuarial firm to perform a quarterly reserve review and to annually opine on the reasonableness and adequacy of our aggregate loss reserves. We provide our external actuary with our pricing models, reserving analysis and any other data they may request. Additionally, the actuarial firm may inquire as to the various assumptions and estimates that we may use in our reserving analysis. The external actuarial firm independently creates its own reserving models based on industry loss information, augmented by specific client loss information that we may be asked to provide as well as its own independent assumptions and estimates. Based on various reserving methodologies that the actuarial firm considers appropriate, it creates a reserve estimate for each contract in our portfolio and provides us with an aggregate recommended loss reserve, including IBNR. If there are material differences between our aggregate booked reserves and the actuarial firm’s recommended reserves, we review the differences and make any necessary adjustments to the booked reserves. To date there have been no material differences resulting from the external actuary's reviews requiring adjustments to our booked reserves.

Because of the uncertainties that surround our estimates of loss and loss adjustment expense reserves, we cannot be certain that ultimate loss and loss adjustment expense payments will not exceed our estimates, or be less than our estimates. If our estimated reserves are deficient, we would be required to increase loss reserves in the period in which such deficiencies are identified, which would cause a charge to our earnings and a reduction of our capital. Similarly, if our estimated reserves are excessive, we would decrease loss reserves in such period in which the excess is identified. By way of illustration, since we started underwriting operations in 2006, the reserve re-estimation process has resulted in the following effect on the prior year reserves and the corresponding inverse effect on net income (excluding any adjustments for additional premiums, reinstatement premiums, profit commissions or ceding commissions) during each of the years ended December 31:

Calendar Year	Effect on prior year reserves	Effect on net income
	($ in thousands)	

2015	$ 50,301 increase	$ 50,301 decrease
2014	18,229 increase	18,229 decrease
2013	6,120 decrease	6,120 increase
2012	56,898 increase	56,898 decrease
2011	26,015 increase	26,015 decrease
2010	8,678 increase	8,678 decrease
2009	7,597 decrease	7,597 increase
2008	11,988 decrease	11,988 increase
2007	1,077 decrease	1,077 increase

Link to Table of Contents

Given the uncertainties involved in estimating ultimate reserves and since we reserve to a point estimate on an individual contract basis, our estimated reserves may be deficient or excessive. Historical development of estimated reserves is not an accurate reflection of future loss development. Additionally, external factors can influence prior year loss development. For example, changes in specific tort law which may cause ultimate loss awards to increase or decrease could have a material effect on our loss reserve development. We are unable to predict with accuracy the magnitude or direction that such external factors may have on our estimated loss reserves.

Acquisition Costs. We capitalize brokerage fees, ceding commissions, premium taxes and other direct expenses that relate directly to and vary with the writing of reinsurance contracts. Acquisition costs are deferred subject to ultimate recoverability and amortized over the related period of risk covered. Acquisition costs also include profit commissions. Certain contracts include provisions for profit commissions to be paid to the ceding insurer based upon the ultimate experience of the contracts. The methodology for calculating profit commissions is specific to the individual contracts and varies from contract to contract. Typically profit commissions are calculated and accrued based on the expected ultimate loss experience for such contracts and recorded when the expected loss experience indicates that a profit commission is probable under the contract terms. Profit commission reserves, if any, are included in reinsurance balances payable on the consolidated balance sheets.

Bonus Accruals. Under the Company's bonus program, each employee’s target bonus consists of two components: a discretionary component based on a qualitative assessment of each employee’s performance and a quantitative component based on the return on deployed equity ("RODE") for each underwriting year relating to reinsurance operations. The qualitative portion of an employee’s annual bonus is accrued at each employee's target amount, which may differ significantly from the actual amount awarded. The quantitative portion of each employee’s annual bonus is accrued based on the expected RODE for each underwriting year and adjusted for changes in the expected RODE and actual investment return each quarter until all losses are settled and the underwriting year is declared closed. The quantitative bonus is calculated and paid in annual installments between two to five years from the end of the fiscal year in which the business was underwritten. Any subsequent changes to the quantitative bonus are incorporated into the following open underwriting year. The Compensation Committee of our Board of Directors approves all quantitative bonuses prior to being paid. The expected RODE calculation utilizes proprietary models which require significant estimation and judgment. Actual RODE may vary significantly from the expected RODE and any adjustments to the quantitative bonus estimates, which may be material, are recorded in the period in which they are determined.

Share-Based Payments. We have established a stock incentive plan for directors, employees and consultants. U.S. GAAP requires us to recognize share-based compensation transactions using the fair value at the grant date of the award. We calculate the compensation for restricted stock awards and restricted stock units based on the price of the Company’s common shares at the grant date and recognize the expense over the vesting period. Share purchase options are expensed over the vesting period on a graded vesting basis. Determining the fair value of share option awards at the grant date requires significant estimation and judgment. We use an option-pricing model (Black-Scholes pricing model) to assist in the calculation of fair value. Effective from August 2014, the estimate of expected volatility was based on the daily historical trading data of our Class A ordinary shares from the date that these shares commenced trading (May 24, 2007) to the grant date.

Prior to 2014, our shares had not been publicly traded for a sufficient length of time to reasonably estimate the expected volatility. Therefore, for share purchase options granted prior to 2014, we determined the expected volatility based primarily on the historical volatility of a peer group of companies in the reinsurance industry while also considering our own historical volatility in determining the expected volatility. We typically considered factors such as an entity's industry, stage of life cycle, size and financial leverage when selecting the peer group. Additionally, we used the full life of the option, ten years, as the estimated term of the option, and we have assumed that dividends will not be paid.

If actual results differ significantly from these estimates and assumptions, particularly in relation to our estimation of volatility which requires significant judgment, share-based compensation expense, primarily with respect to future share-based awards, could be materially impacted.

Results of Operations

Years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013

For the year ended December 31, 2015, we reported net loss of $326.4 million, compared to net income of $109.6 million reported for the year ended December 31, 2014. Our investment portfolio reported net loss of $281.9 million, or a return of (20.2)%, for the year ended December 31, 2015, compared to net investment income of $122.6 million, or a return of 8.7%, for the same period in 2014. The underwriting loss before general and administrative expenses for the year ended December 31, 2015 was $24.9 million, compared to underwriting income of $11.6 million reported for the year ended December 31, 2014. The underwriting loss for the 2015 fiscal year was driven by adverse loss development relating to construction defect losses on legacy

Link to Table of Contents

general liability contracts written during the 2008 to 2011 underwriting years. For the year ended December 31, 2015, our overall composite ratio was 106.1% compared to 96.7% for the year ended December 31, 2014. General and administrative expenses decreased for the year ended December 31, 2015 to $23.4 million from $24.5 million for the year ended December 31, 2014, primarily as a result of lower quantitative bonuses accrued relating to prior underwriting years, partially offset by non-recurring professional fees incurred during the year.

The poor investment performance during 2015 was primarily the result of losses experienced on three equity securities (CONSOL Energy, Micron Technology, and SunEdison) which were among our largest long positions. This coupled with very few securities that reported gains during the year, combined to result in the large investment loss reported during 2015.

The poor underwriting performance of certain contracts that were written between 2008 and 2011, and are currently in run-off, have had a negative impact on our recent reported financial results. The below graph presents our underwriting results reported during each of the fiscal accounting years from 2007 to 2015 compared to the underwriting results for each of those underwriting years. This graph shows that while accounting results have been negatively impacted in recent periods, particularly from adverse loss development on contracts written during the 2009 and 2010 underwriting years, the underlying business written in the more recent years has been profitable and the contracts written since 2012 are performing well.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, we reported net income of $109.6 million, compared to net income of $225.7 million reported for the year ended December 31, 2013. Our investment portfolio reported net income of $122.6 million, or a return of 8.7%, for the year ended December 31, 2014, compared to net investment income of $218.1 million, or a return of 19.6%, for the same period in 2013. The underwriting income before general and administrative expenses for the year ended December 31, 2014 was $11.6 million, compared to underwriting income of $37.5 million reported for the year ended December 31, 2013. The decrease in underwriting income was driven by adverse loss development on prior year contracts and to a lesser extent by lower volume of premiums earned during 2014 compared to 2013. By comparison, the 2013 underwriting income included a reversal of $12.4 million of loss reserves (net of reinstatement premiums) relating to super-storm Sandy due to revised loss estimates recorded during 2013. For the year ended December 31, 2014, our overall composite ratio was 96.7% compared to 93.2% for the year ended December 31, 2013. General and administrative expenses increased for the year ended December 31, 2014 to $24.5 million from $21.0 million for the year ended December 31, 2013, primarily as a result of higher quantitative bonuses accrued relating to the 2012, 2013 and 2014 underwriting years.

Our primary financial goal is to increase the long-term value in fully diluted adjusted book value per share. For the year ended December 31, 2015, the fully diluted adjusted book value per share decreased by $8.59 per share, or 27.9%, to $22.17 per share from $30.76 per share at December 31, 2014. For the year ended December 31, 2015, the basic adjusted book value per share decreased by $8.88 per share, or 28.5%, to $22.29 per share from $31.17 per share at December 31, 2014.

Link to Table of Contents

For the year ended December 31, 2014, the fully diluted adjusted book value per share increased by $2.85 per share, or 10.2%, to $30.76 per share from $27.91 per share at December 31, 2013. For the year ended December 31, 2014, the basic adjusted book value per share increased by $2.78 per share, or 9.8%, to $31.17 per share from $28.39 per share at December 31, 2013.

Basic adjusted book value per share is a non-GAAP measure as it excludes the non-controlling interest in a joint venture from total equity. In addition, fully diluted adjusted book value per share is also a non-GAAP measure and represents basic adjusted book value per share combined with the impact from dilution of all in-the-money stock options and RSUs issued and outstanding as of any period end. We believe that long-term growth in fully diluted adjusted book value per share is the most relevant measure of our financial performance. In addition, fully diluted adjusted book value per share may be of benefit to our investors, shareholders and other interested parties to form a basis of comparison with other companies within the property and casualty reinsurance industry.

The following table presents a reconciliation of the non-GAAP basic adjusted and fully diluted adjusted book value per share to the most comparable GAAP measure.

	December 31, 2015	December 31, 2014	December 31, 2013
	($ in thousands, except per share and share amounts)		
Basic adjusted and fully diluted adjusted book value per share numerator:			
Total equity (U.S. GAAP)	$848,773	$1,194,041	$1,086,304
Less: Non-controlling interest in joint venture	(23,382)	(28,890)	(34,709)
Basic adjusted book value per share numerator	825,391	1,165,151	1,051,595
Add: Proceeds from in-the-money stock options issued and outstanding	11,553	19,628	16,028
Fully diluted adjusted book value per share numerator	$836,944	$1,184,779	$1,067,623
Basic adjusted and fully diluted adjusted book value per share denominator:			
Ordinary shares issued and outstanding for basic adjusted book value per share denominator	37,027,467	37,384,543	37,046,814
Add: In-the-money stock options and RSUs issued and outstanding	717,340	1,131,917	1,210,731
Fully diluted adjusted book value per share denominator	37,744,807	38,516,460	38,257,545
Basic adjusted book value per share	$22.29	$31.17	$28.39
Fully diluted adjusted book value per share	$22.17	$30.76	$27.91

Gross Premiums Written

Details of gross premiums written are provided in the following table:

	Year ended December 31					
	2015		2014		2013	
	($ in thousands)					
Frequency	$464,376	92.5 %	$295,861	91.3 %	$512,096	95.6 %
Severity	37,748	7.5	28,162	8.7	23,606	4.4
Total	$502,124	100.0 %	$324,023	100.0 %	$535,702	100.0 %

As a result of our opportunistic underwriting philosophy, our reported quarterly premiums written may be volatile. Additionally, the composition of premiums written between frequency and severity business may vary from period to period depending on the specific market opportunities that we pursue.

Year ended December 31, 2015

53

Link to Table of Contents

During 2015, our gross premiums written increased by $178.1 million, or 55.0%, compared to the year ended December 31, 2014. For the year ended December 31, 2015, our frequency gross premiums written increased by $168.5 million, or 57.0%, compared to the same period in 2014. The increase was primarily driven by new contracts bound during 2015 and premium growth on existing contracts renewed during 2015.

The gross premiums written for motor liability (including motor physical damage) increased by $86.3 million during the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the same period in 2014. The increase was partially a result of higher premiums on an existing private passenger motor contract which was renewed during 2015. New motor contracts written during 2015 also contributed partially to the increase in motor liability gross premiums written. The frequency gross premiums written for professional liability increased by $41.3 million during the year ended December 31, 2015, compared to the same period in 2014, as a result of new quota share casualty contracts bound during 2015 and during the second half of 2014. The frequency gross premiums written for specialty health, general liability, workers' compensation, and commercial property lines increased by $12.9 million, $13.5 million, $11.9 million, and $7.5 million, respectively, as a result of new quota share contracts written during 2015 and the latter half of 2014. Other lines of business also reported increases in gross written premiums with financial, marine, aviation and energy, in the aggregate, accounting for $5.5 million of the increase in gross written premiums during the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the same period in 2014. The increase in gross premiums written were partially offset by a $11.6 million decrease in the personal property line for the year ended December 31, 2015. The decrease was primarily a result of a Florida homeowners' contract which expired during 2015 and was not renewed.

For the year ended December 31, 2015, severity premiums written increased by $9.6 million, or 34.0%, compared to the same period in 2014, primarily due to new severity contracts written during 2015 which accounted for a $14.7 million increase in severity gross premiums written. Additionally, a multi-year severity quota share contract written during the second half of 2014 contributed $7.6 million of the increase in severity premiums written for the year ended December 31, 2015. The increases were partially offset by a net decrease of $10.1 million relating to property catastrophe contracts that expired and were not renewed or were renewed at a lower premium volume during 2015. For the year ended December 31, 2015, the severity premiums reported were net of return premiums of $2.5 million relating to an excess of loss catastrophe contract. This contract was previously expected to incur a loss and we had recorded a loss reserve which had triggered an additional premium. During the year ended December 31, 2015, we were informed that losses incurred by the cedent on this contract would not breach into our layer and as a result the additional premium was reversed along with the loss reserve, and a corresponding profit commission expense was recorded during 2015.

Year ended December 31, 2014

During 2014, our gross premiums written decreased by $211.7 million, or 39.5%, primarily due to a private passenger motor contract that we terminated at the end of 2013 and due to some of our personal property contracts renewed during 2014 at a smaller share ceded to us. However, during the second half of 2014, we entered into several new relationships which offset some of the decrease in gross premiums written during 2014.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, the frequency gross premiums written decreased by $216.2 million, or 42.2%, primarily relating to the motor line (physical damage and liability) and personal property line. The motor line gross premiums written decreased by $137.0 million relating to a private passenger motor contract that we terminated at the end of 2013 on a run-off basis. Additionally, our remaining private passenger motor contracts reported a decrease of $24.3 million in gross premiums written during 2014, compared to the same period in 2013, due to competitive pricing pressure on the underlying premiums written by the insurers. The personal property line frequency gross premiums written decreased by $78.3 million, primarily relating to a decrease in our share of the Florida homeowners' contracts which renewed during 2014, with the cedents choosing to retain a larger share on the renewed contracts compared to the expiring contracts. The decrease in frequency gross premiums written was partially offset by a number of new contracts entered into relating to the general liability, specialty health and workers' compensation lines of business.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, the increase in severity gross premiums written of $4.6 million, or 19.3%, compared to the same period in 2013 was primarily due to new and renewed severity contracts written during 2014, including excess of loss and multi-line property and casualty retrocession contracts.

Premiums Ceded

For the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, retrocessional premiums ceded were $9.0 million, $13.5 million and $2.8 million, respectively. For the year ended December 31, 2015, the decrease in ceded premiums compared to the same period in 2014 was partially due to a retroceded contract for catastrophic risk protection that expired at the end of 2014 and was not renewed. However, in the first quarter of 2015, we purchased an industry loss warranty derivative contract ("ILW") to reduce our net exposure to natural peril catastrophe events. In accordance with U.S. GAAP, the ILW is recorded as a weather derivative

Link to Table of Contents

swap and the cost of the ILW is amortized over the risk period and recorded in the consolidated statements of income as "other income (expense), net" and not as part of premiums ceded. For the year ended December 31, 2015, the ILW amortization expense was $2.3 million.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, our ceded premiums increased by $10.7 million partially relating to a retrocession contract purchased during 2014 in order to reduce our net exposure to natural peril catastrophe events, and partially relating to higher premiums on the inward contracts which were proportionally retroceded to entities affiliated with the ceding insurers.

Net Premiums Written

Details of net premiums written are provided in the following table:

	Year ended December 31								
	2015			2014			2013		
	($ in thousands)								
Frequency	$455,375	92.3	%	$286,121	92.1	%	$509,316	95.6	%
Severity	37,748	7.7		24,409	7.9		23,606	4.4	
Total	$493,123	100.0	%	$310,530	100.0	%	$532,922	100.0	%

The movement in net premiums written is the net result of the increases or decreases in gross premiums written and premiums ceded as explained in the preceding paragraphs.

Net Premiums Earned

Net premiums earned reflect the pro-rata inclusion into income of net premiums written over the risk period of the reinsurance contracts. Details of net premiums earned are provided in the following table:

	Year ended December 31								
	2015			2014			2013		
	($ in thousands)								
Frequency	$380,565	93.2	%	$330,617	93.3	%	$529,779	96.7	%
Severity	27,822	6.8		23,623	6.7		18,120	3.3	
Total	$408,387	100.0	%	$354,240	100.0	%	$547,899	100.0	%

Premiums relating to quota share contracts and excess of loss contracts are earned over the contract period in proportion to the period of protection. Similarly, incoming unearned premiums are earned in proportion to the remaining period of protection.

Year ended December 31, 2015
For the year ended December 31, 2015, the frequency net premiums earned increased by $49.9 million, or 15.1%, compared to the same period in 2014. The increase was primarily as a result of the motor liability and physical damage business which increased by $41.0 million during the year ended December 31, 2015, compared to the same period in 2014, primarily due to an increase in volume of underlying premiums earned on private passenger motor contracts in effect during the current period. Our professional lines premiums earned increased primarily due to new contracts entered into during 2015 and the second half of 2014 which contributed $29.7 million of the increase. The increase in professional liability premiums earned was partially offset by a decrease of $11.3 million relating to solicitors' professional indemnity business due to a lower volume of underlying business written by the cedents. Additionally, the general liability, specialty health and workers' compensation premiums earned increased by $11.1 million, $7.9 million and $4.5 million respectively, during the year ended December 31, 2015 as a result of new contracts entered into during 2015 and the second half of 2014. New contracts entered in other lines of business also

contributed to increases in premiums earned with marine, financial and commercial property, in the aggregate, accounting for $6.6 million of the increase in net premiums earned during the year ended December 31, 2015. The increases in premiums earned were partially offset by a $40.7 million decrease in personal property premiums partly due to a Florida homeowners' contract not renewed upon

Link to Table of Contents

expiration during 2015, and partly due to a lower share on other Florida homeowners' contracts in effect during the current period compared to the same period in 2014.

For the year ended December 31, 2015, the severity net premiums earned increased by $4.2 million, or 17.8%, compared to the same period in 2014. The increase was a net impact of new and renewed severity quota share contracts entered into during 2015 and the latter half of 2014, partially offset by severity contracts that expired and were not renewed or renewed with a smaller share during 2015. For the year ended December 31, 2015, the reported severity premiums earned were net of $2.5 million of return premiums relating to an excess of loss catastrophe contract. This contract was previously expected to incur a loss into our layer, resulting in an additional premium being recorded. During the year ended December 31, 2015, we were informed by the client that the loss will not breach into our layer. As a result, we reversed the additional premium along with the loss reserve and recorded a profit commission expense. Additionally, the severity premiums earned for the year ended December 31, 2015 appear higher than the comparable period in 2014 because the 2014 earned premiums were net of $3.8 million expense relating to a retroceded contract for catastrophic risk protection which was not renewed in 2015. Instead during 2015, we purchased an ILW contract which, in accordance with U.S. GAAP, was recorded as a weather derivative swap and the cost of the ILW was recorded in the consolidated statements of income as "other income (expense), net". For the year ended December 31, 2015, the ILW amortization expense was $2.3 million.

Year ended December 31, 2014
For the year ended December 31, 2014, the frequency net premiums earned decreased by $199.2 million, or 37.6%, compared to the same period in 2013. The decrease was primarily attributed to a private passenger motor contract terminated at the end of 2013 which accounted for $159.5 million of the decrease. Additionally, the volume of premiums earned on other private passenger motor contracts decreased by $13.9 million, compared to the same period in 2013. This decrease was due to a reduction in earned premiums reported during 2014 resulting from competitive pricing pressure on the underlying premiums written by the insurers. The personal line premiums earned decreased by $40.1 million during 2014, compared to the same period in 2013 primarily due to the explanation provided above for gross premiums written. Other decreases in net premiums earned related to the workers' compensation line and the general liability line which decreased by $11.1 million and $2.4 million, respectively, primarily as a result of certain multi-line contracts terminated during 2013. The decreases in frequency net premiums earned were partially offset by net premiums earned on new contracts and increases in the volume of underlying business in other lines including $10.3 million relating to professional liability contracts and $3.0 million relating to specialty health contracts.
Premiums written relating to severity contracts are earned over the contract period in proportion to the period of protection. For the year ended December 31, 2014, severity net premiums earned increased $5.5 million, or 30.4%, compared to the same period in 2013. The increase is partially a function of the reversal of reinstatement premiums reflected in the comparative period and partially due to the new and renewed severity contracts entered into during 2014. The increases were partially offset by decreases due to catastrophe contracts expired but not renewed during 2014 due to inadequate pricing.

Loss and Loss Adjustment Expenses Incurred, Net

Net losses incurred include losses paid and changes in loss reserves, including reserves for IBNR, net of actual and estimated loss recoverables. Details of net losses incurred are provided in the following table:

	Year ended December 31								
	2015			2014			2013		
	($ in thousands)								
Frequency	$314,459	99.2	%	$231,185	98.4	%	$347,217	102.6	%
Severity	2,638	0.8		3,801	1.6		(8,724)	(2.6	)
Total	$317,097	100.0	%	$234,986	100.0	%	$338,493	100.0	%

We establish reserves for each contract based on estimates of the ultimate cost of all losses, including losses incurred but not reported. These estimated ultimate reserves are based on reports received from ceding companies, industry data and historical experience as well as our own actuarial estimates. Quarterly, we review these estimates on a contract by contract basis and adjust them as we deem appropriate to reflect our best estimates based on updated information and our internal actuarial estimates. We expect losses incurred on our severity business to be volatile depending on the frequency and magnitude of catastrophic events from year to year.

Link to Table of Contents

Year ended December 31 2015
For the year ended December 31, 2015, the total net losses incurred on frequency contracts increased by $83.3 million, or 36.0%, compared to the same period in 2014. The increase was driven primarily by $51.6 million of additional loss reserves recorded during the year ended December 31, 2015 on two legacy general liability contracts that are currently in run-off. One of the general liability contracts, which was in effect from 2008 to 2011, included general contractors' liability with the majority of exposure relating to single-family homes. During 2015, we completed an in-depth analysis, with the assistance of a third party expert, of the construction defect claims reported and the potential for claims not yet reported on this contract. Based on this assessment, we revised the actuarial methodology used for reserving these claims, which resulted in an increase in IBNR reserves of $36.9 million recorded in the third quarter of 2015. The other general liability contract, which was written in 2010, included general contractors' liability with the majority of exposure relating to construction defect claims in the western United States. During the second quarter of 2015, we experienced adverse development on known claims, which caused us to re-evaluate the expected value of known claims as well as the value of claims still to be filed. Additionally, we re-evaluated the claims handling costs associated with this contract and increased our provision for case reserves, IBNR reserves and the cost of claims handling by $14.7 million during the second quarter of 2015. We have reviewed all other contracts and do not believe that any other contract has similar exposure. Some of our prior years' Florida homeowners' contracts also contributed to the increase in losses incurred due to unfavorable loss development of $9.3 million (see Note 7 of the consolidated financial statements for details). The remainder of the increase in incurred losses related primarily to the higher earned premiums recorded for the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the same period in 2014.

For the year ended December 31, 2015, the losses incurred on severity contracts decreased by $1.2 million, primarily due to the elimination of $5.1 million of loss reserves resulting from favorable loss development on an excess of loss contract. The decrease in severity losses incurred was partially offset by an increase related to the mix of severity business.

Losses incurred as a percentage of premiums earned (referred to as the loss ratio) fluctuates based on the mix of business, and any favorable or adverse loss development on our larger contracts. The loss ratios for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, were as follows:

	Year ended December 31		
	2015	2014	2013
Frequency	82.6 %	69.9 %	65.5 %
Severity	9.5 %	16.1 %	(48.1)%
Total	77.6 %	66.3 %	61.8 %

The higher frequency loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015 primarily related to the adverse loss development on the general liability contracts discussed above. Excluding the affected general liability contracts, the loss ratio for frequency business for the year ended December 31, 2015 was 69.1%. The loss ratio for the Florida homeowners' insurance contracts also increased during the year ended December 31, 2015 due to unfavorable loss development primarily as a result of sinkhole claims, higher than anticipated water damage claims from rainstorms and an increase in the practice of "assignment of benefits" whereby homeowners assign their rights for filing and settling claims to attorneys and public adjusters which led to increases in the frequency of claims reported as well as the severity of loss adjustment expenses. The increase in the loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015 was partially offset by a lower loss ratio on specialty health contracts due to no adverse losses developing on the employers' medical stop-loss contracts in the current period compared to adverse losses recorded during the comparable period in 2014. The loss ratio for professional liability line was also lower for the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the same period in 2014 due to a shift in the mix of business from predominantly solicitors' indemnity contracts to a more diversified professional liability book of business.

The severity loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015 reflects the elimination of $5.1 million of loss reserves on an excess of loss contract entered into in 2008. Excluding this contract, the severity loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015 was 25.4% compared to 16.1% for the same period in 2014. This increase in severity loss ratio was due to the change in mix of severity business with a higher proportion of quota share severity contracts in effect during the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the same period in 2014.

We expect our severity loss ratio to vary, sometimes significantly, based on the change in mix of business between catastrophe and non-catastrophe business and quota share and excess of loss contracts.

Link to Table of Contents

Year ended December 31 2014
For the year ended December 31, 2014, the net losses incurred on frequency contracts decreased by $116.0 million, or 33.4%. This decrease was primarily the net result of the 37.6% decrease in net premiums earned relating to a private passenger motor contract terminated at the end of 2013 and Florida homeowners' personal property contracts renewed at a lower assigned share. Additionally, the multi-line contracts terminated and commuted during 2013 also contributed to the decrease in incurred losses for the year ended December 31, 2014. The decreases were partially offset by an increase in losses incurred relating to adverse loss development on general liability, commercial motor, solicitors' professional liability and employers' medical stop-loss contracts (see Note 7 of the consolidated financial statements for details).

For the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, the loss ratios for our frequency business were 69.9% and 65.5%, respectively. The higher loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2014 was due to adverse loss development relating to prior period general liability, commercial motor, solicitors' professional liability and employers' medical stop-loss contracts. Additionally, the loss ratio on the motor line was also higher primarily due to current year private passenger motor contracts reporting higher expected loss ratios compared to the prior year contracts. The increase in the loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2014 was partially offset by a lower loss ratio for the general liability line due to a decrease in the amount of adverse loss development during 2014, compared to the adverse loss development during 2013.

For the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, the loss ratios for our severity business were 16.1% and (48.1)%, respectively. During the year ended December 31, 2014 our severity business was not impacted by any major catastrophe events. The net losses incurred on severity contracts was $3.8 million for the year ended December 31, 2014, and primarily related to attritional loss reserves on certain excess of loss contracts. The negative loss ratio of (48.1)% for the comparable year ended December 31, 2013 was due to the reversal of loss reserves relating to super-storm Sandy. Excluding the effect of that loss reserve reversal (and the corresponding reversal of reinstatement premiums), the severity loss ratio for the year ended December 31, 2013 was 29.9%, which included a $4.0 million increase in loss reserves on a casualty clash contract.

Losses incurred can be further broken down into losses paid and changes in loss and loss adjustment expense reserves as follows:

	Year ended December 31								
		2015			2014			2013	
	Gross	Ceded	Net	Gross	Ceded	Net	Gross	Ceded	Net
	($ in thousands)								
Losses paid (recovered)	$274,713	$(9,851)	$264,862	$303,272	$(9,695)	$293,577	$355,275	$(7,386)	$347,889
Change in loss and loss adjustment expense reserves	44,080	8,155	52,235	(63,897)	5,306	(58,591)	(27,019)	17,623	(9,396)
Total	$318,793	$(1,696)	$317,097	$239,375	$(4,389)	$234,986	$328,256	$10,237	$338,493

For the year ended December 31, 2015, our net loss reserves on prior period contracts increased by $50.3 million primarily related to adverse loss development on general liability contracts relating to construction defect claims. For the year ended December 31, 2014, our net loss reserves on prior period contracts increased by $18.2 million, which primarily related to adverse loss development on general liability, commercial motor, solicitors' professional liability and employers' medical stop-loss businesses, partially offset by favorable loss development on private passenger automobile business. For the year ended December 31, 2013, our net loss reserves relating to prior period contracts decreased by $6.1 million, which was partially due to the elimination of reserves relating to super-storm Sandy, and partially due to the favorable loss development on the private passenger automobile, commercial motor and personal property businesses. The decrease was partially offset by adverse loss development on the general liability and casualty clash businesses.

For further details on prior period loss developments, please refer to Note 7 "Loss and loss adjustment expense reserves" of the consolidated financial statements.

Link to Table of Contents

Acquisition Costs, Net

Acquisition costs represent the amortization of commission and brokerage expenses incurred on contracts written as well as profit commissions and other underwriting expenses which are expensed when incurred. Deferred acquisition costs are limited to the amount of commission and brokerage expenses that are expected to be recovered from future earned premiums and anticipated investment income. Details of acquisition costs are provided in the following table:

	Year ended December 31								
	2015			2014			2013		
	($ in thousands)								
Frequency	$106,411	91.6	%	$103,008	95.7	%	$168,109	97.8	%
Severity	9,796	8.4		4,657	4.3		3,763	2.2	
Total	$116,207	100.0	%	$107,665	100.0	%	$171,872	100.0	%

We expect acquisition costs to be higher for frequency business than for severity business. Acquisition cost as a percentage of net premiums earned (referred to as acquisition cost ratio) are generally higher for our frequency business than for our severity business, but fluctuate based on the mix of business. The acquisition cost ratios for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, were as follows:

	Year ended December 31					
	2015		2014		2013	
Frequency	28.0	%	31.2	%	31.7	%
Severity	35.2	%	19.7	%	20.8	%
Total	28.5	%	30.4	%	31.4	%

Year ended December 31 2015

The decrease in the frequency acquisition cost ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015, compared to the same period in 2014, was primarily due to Florida homeowners' insurance contracts that contain sliding scale ceding commissions which decreased during the year ended December 31, 2015 as a result of adverse loss development on those contracts. Additionally, the private passenger motor contracts in force during 2015 reported lower ceding commissions than the prior year which also contributed to a lower frequency acquisition cost ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015. The decrease in acquisition cost ratio was partially offset by the change in mix of professional liability contracts which carry higher ceding commission rates than the predominantly solicitors' professional indemnity contracts in force during the year ended 2014.

The higher severity acquisition cost ratio for the year ended December 31, 2015, compared to the same period in 2014, was primarily due to profit commissions of $3.4 million recorded on an excess of loss contract during 2015. These profit commissions were triggered by the elimination of loss reserves on this contract based on updated information received from the insurer. There were no other significant changes in acquisition costs during the year ended December 31, 2015.

Year ended December 31 2014

For the year ended December 31, 2014, the slightly lower frequency acquisition cost ratio compared to the same period in 2013 was related to a combination of decreases in specialty health, professional liability and workers' compensation lines, partially offset by increases in general liability and personal property lines. Acquisition cost ratio for the motor line remained unchanged due to the lower ceding commissions on the in-force private passenger contracts being entirely offset by an increase in sliding scale commission adjustments from the favorable loss development on prior period private passenger contracts.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, the acquisition cost ratios for severity business was slightly lower than the same period in 2013 due to the impact of reinstatement premiums reversed during 2013 relating to super-storm Sandy with no corresponding reversal of commissions. Excluding the impact of this reversal, the 2013 severity acquisition cost ratio was 18.0%. The acquisition cost ratio on the new severity contracts written during 2014 was higher due to a change in mix of business. During the year ended 2014, we wrote several new severity quota share contracts which had higher ceding commissions than the catastrophe excess of loss contracts written during 2013.

Link to Table of Contents

General and Administrative Expenses

Our total general and administrative expenses for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, were $23.4 million, $24.5 million, and $21.0 million, respectively. General and administrative expenses for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013 included $4.3 million, $4.0 million and $3.8 million, respectively, for the expensing of the fair value of stock options, RSUs and restricted stock granted to employees and directors.

Details of general and administrative expenses are provided in the following table:

	Year ended December 31		
	2015	2014	2013
	($ in thousands)		
Internal expenses	$18,476	$21,341	$17,683
Corporate expenses	4,958	3,159	3,275
General and administrative expenses	$23,434	$24,500	$20,958

Internal expenses include all general and administrative expenses except for corporate expenses. Corporate expenses included those expenses directly related to being a publicly listed entity and certain non-core operating expenses. Prior to 2015, corporate expenses also included non-investment related foreign exchange gains and losses. Effective from January 1, 2015, the presentation was modified and any non-investment related foreign exchange gains and losses are now presented on the consolidated statements of income under the caption "other income (expenses), net". As a result, foreign exchange gain of $2.6 million and loss of $0.8 million that were previously included in corporate expenses for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively, have been reclassified to "other income (expense), net", to conform to the current period presentation. For the year ended December 31, 2015, a foreign exchange gain of $0.03 million was included in "other income (expense), net".

For the year ended December 31, 2015, internal expenses decreased primarily due to a decrease in bonuses relating to prior underwriting years. The increase in corporate expenses for the year ended December 31, 2015, compared to the same period in 2014, was mainly due to non-recurring professional fees incurred during 2015.

For the year ended December 31, 2014, the increase in internal expenses was primarily related to higher underwriting quantitative bonuses estimated relating to the 2012, 2013 and 2014 underwriting years, and to a lesser extent, related to information technology system upgrades and an increase in head-count from the comparative period in 2013.

Net Investment Income (Loss)

A summary of our net investment income (loss) is as follows:

	Year ended December 31		
	2015	2014	2013
	($ in thousands)		
Realized gains (losses)	$22,227	$352,133	$122,568
Change in unrealized gains and losses	(265,401)	(187,753)	149,012
Investment related foreign exchange gains (losses)	(3,725)	14,797	44,492
Interest and dividend income, net of withholding taxes	15,313	31,423	22,265
Interest, dividend and other expenses	(31,092)	(38,892)	(47,665)
Investment advisor compensation	(19,246)	(49,133)	(72,532)
Net investment income (loss)	$(281,924)	$122,575	$218,140

Investment returns relating to our investment portfolio managed by DME Advisors are calculated monthly and compounded to calculate the quarterly and annual returns. The resulting actual investment income (loss) may vary depending on cash flows into and out of the investment account.

Link to Table of Contents

For the year ended December 31, 2015, investment loss, net of fees and expenses, resulted in a loss of 20.2% on our investments managed by DME Advisors, compared to gains of 8.7% and 19.6% for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, respectively. The investment loss for the year ended December 31, 2015 was primarily driven by our long portfolio, which reported an investment loss of 17.2%. Our three large long investments (CONSOL Energy, Micron Technology and SunEdison) combined, resulted in a 14.9% investment loss. Additionally, the macro positions and other expenses accounted for 1.9% and 1.5%, respectively, of the investment loss. The short portfolio reported a gain of 0.4% for the year ended December 31, 2015.

We expect our investment income, including realized and unrealized gains (or losses), to fluctuate from period to period. Fluctuations in realized and unrealized gains (or losses) are a function of both the market performance of the securities held in our investment portfolio, and the timing of additions to and dispositions of securities in our investment portfolio. Our investment advisor uses its discretion over when to realize a gain (or loss) on a particular investment. We believe that net investment income, which includes both realized and unrealized gains (or losses), is the best way to assess our investment performance, rather than analyzing the realized gains (or losses) and unrealized gains (or losses) separately.

For the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, the gross investment returns on our investment portfolio managed by DME Advisors (excluding investment performance compensation) were (20.2)%, 10.8% and 24.6%, respectively, and were comprised of the following:

	Year ended December 31					
	2015		2014		2013	
Long portfolio gains (losses)	(17.2	)%	17.8	%	41.2	%
Short portfolio gains (losses)	0.4	%	(4.2	)%	(17.0	)%
Macro gains (losses)	(1.9	)%	(1.1	)%	2.2	%
Other income and expenses	(1.5	)%	(1.7	)%	(1.8	)%
Gross investment return	(20.2	)%	10.8	%	24.6	%

For the year ended December 31, 2015, included in "other income and expenses" was $19.2 million (2014: $20.6 million, 2013: $18.3 million) relating to management fees paid to DME Advisors. For the year ended December 31, 2015, no performance compensation was recorded due to the negative investment returns for this period (2014: $28.5 million, 2013: $54.2 million). Due to the investment loss for the year ended December 31, 2015, based on the advisory agreement, the performance compensation for the subsequent years will be reduced to 10% of investment income until all the investment losses have been recouped and an additional amount equal to 150% of the investment loss is earned.

DME Advisors and its affiliates manage and expect to manage other client accounts besides ours, some of which have investment objectives similar to ours. To comply with Regulation FD, our investment returns are posted on our website on a monthly basis. Additionally, our website (www.greenlightre.ky) provides the names of the largest disclosed long positions in our investment portfolio as of the last business day of the month of the relevant posting, as well as information on our long and short exposures. Although DME Advisors discloses all investment positions to us, it may choose not to disclose certain positions to its other clients in order to protect its investment strategy. Therefore, we present on our website the relevant largest long positions and exposure information as disclosed by DME Advisors or its affiliates to their other clients.

Income Taxes

We are not obligated to pay taxes in the Cayman Islands on either income or capital gains. We have been granted an exemption by the Governor-In-Cabinet from any income taxes that may be imposed in the Cayman Islands for a period of 20 years, expiring on February 1, 2025.

GRIL is incorporated in Ireland and, therefore, is subject to the Irish corporation tax. GRIL is expected to be taxed at a rate of 12.5% on its taxable trading income, and 25% on its non-trading income, if any.

Verdant is incorporated in Delaware and, therefore, is subject to taxes in accordance with the U.S. federal rates and regulations prescribed by the Internal Revenue Service. Verdant’s taxable income is expected to be taxed at a rate of 35%.

As of December 31, 2015, a deferred tax asset of $1.8 million (2014: $33.4 thousand) was included in other assets on the consolidated balance sheets. The increase in deferred tax asset during the year ended December 31, 2015, primarily resulted from the operating losses carried forward relating to GRIL and to a lesser extent from the temporary differences in recognition of expenses for tax purposes. As of December 31, 2015, an accrual for current taxes recoverable of $0.5 million (2014: $0.8 million)

Link to Table of Contents

was recorded on the consolidated balance sheets relating to a refund for taxes paid by GRIL in prior years. Based on the timing of the reversal of the temporary differences and likelihood of generating sufficient taxable income to realize the future tax benefit, management believes it is more likely than not that the deferred tax asset will be fully realized in the future and therefore no valuation allowance has been recorded. The Company has not taken any other tax positions that management believes are subject to uncertainty or that are reasonably likely to have a material impact to the Company, GRIL or Verdant.

Ratio Analysis

Due to the opportunistic and customized nature of our underwriting operations, we expect to report different loss and expense ratios in both our frequency and severity businesses from period to period.

The following table provides the ratios:

	Year ended December 31								
		2015			2014			2013	
	Frequency	Severity	Total	Frequency	Severity	Total	Frequency	Severity	Total
Loss ratio	82.6 %	9.5 %	77.6 %	69.9 %	16.1 %	66.3 %	65.5 %	(48.1)%	61.8 %
Acquisition cost ratio	28.0	35.2	28.5	31.2	19.7	30.4	31.7	20.8	31.4
Composite ratio	110.6 %	44.7 %	106.1 %	101.1 %	35.8 %	96.7 %	97.2 %	(27.3)%	93.2 %
Internal expense ratio			4.5			6.0			3.2
Corporate expense ratio			1.2			0.9			0.6
Combined ratio			111.8 %			103.6 %			97.0 %

The loss ratio is calculated by dividing loss and loss adjustment expenses incurred by net premiums earned. We expect that the loss ratio will be volatile for our severity business and may exceed that of our frequency business in certain periods. Given that we opportunistically underwrite a concentrated portfolio across several lines of business that have varying expected loss ratios, we can expect there to be significant annual variations in the loss ratios reported from our frequency business. In addition, the loss ratios for both frequency and severity business can vary depending on the mix of the lines of business written.

The acquisition cost ratio is calculated by dividing acquisition costs by net premiums earned. We expect that this ratio will generally be higher for our frequency business than for our severity business.

The composite ratio is the ratio of underwriting losses incurred, loss adjustment expenses and acquisition costs, excluding general and administrative expenses, to net premiums earned. Similar to the loss ratio, we expect that this ratio will be more volatile for our severity business depending on loss activity in any particular period.

The internal expense ratio is the ratio of general and administrative expenses, excluding any corporate expenses, to net premiums earned.

The corporate expense ratio is the ratio of corporate expenses to net premiums earned. Corporate expenses include expenses relating to GLRE being a publicly listed entity and certain non-core operating expenses.

Prior to January 1, 2015, non-investment related foreign exchange gains and losses were recorded under corporate expenses. Effective from January 1, 2015, the presentation has been modified and any non-investment related foreign exchange gains or losses are now recorded under "other income (expense), net" in the consolidated statements of income. Therefore, the corporate expense ratios and combined ratios for prior periods have been reclassified in the above table to conform to the current year presentation.

The combined ratio is the sum of the composite ratio, the internal expense ratio and the corporate expense ratio. The combined ratio measures the total profitability of our underwriting operations and does not take net investment income or loss into account. Given the nature of our opportunistic underwriting strategy, we expect that our combined ratio may also be volatile from period to period.

Link to Table of Contents

Financial Condition

Investments, Financial Contracts Receivable, Financial Contracts Payable and Due to Prime Brokers

Our long investments and financial contracts receivable reported in the consolidated balance sheets as of December 31, 2015 were $1,077.4 million, compared to $1,478.1 million as of December 31, 2014, a decrease of $400.7 million, or 27.1%, primarily due to the loss on long investments. As of December 31, 2015, our exposure to long investments decreased to 89.5%, compared to 105.8% as of December 31, 2014. This exposure analysis is conducted on a delta-adjusted basis and excludes macro positions which consist of CDS, interest rate swaps, sovereign debt, currencies, commodities, volatility indexes and derivatives on any of these instruments.

Financial contracts receivable as of December 31, 2015 decreased by $34.0 million, or 72.0%, compared to December 31, 2014, partially due to a decrease in the fair value of equity based total return swaps and partially due to put options exited during 2015. As of December 31, 2015, financial contracts payable decreased by $16.3 million, or 36.7%, compared to December 31, 2014, primarily due to a decrease in total return swaps that were in payable position and to a lesser extent due to the expiration of certain credit default swaps during the period.

From time to time, we incur indebtedness to our prime brokers to implement our investment strategy in accordance with our investment guidelines. As of December 31, 2015, we had borrowed $95.0 million (2014: $76.1 million) from our prime brokers for investing activities and to provide collateral for unrealized losses on short positions. In accordance with Greenlight Re's investment guidelines, DME Advisors is allowed to use up to 15% (GRIL: 5%) net margin leverage for extended periods of time and up to 30% (GRIL: 20%) net margin leverage for periods of less than 30 days.

Additionally, as of December 31, 2015, we had borrowed $301.4 million (2014: $135.0 million) under term margin agreements from prime brokers to provide collateral for trust accounts and for some of our letters of credit outstanding, whereby we pledge certain investment securities to borrow cash from the prime brokers.

Our investment portfolio, including any derivatives, is valued at fair value and any unrealized gains or losses are reflected in net investment income (loss) in the consolidated statements of income. As of December 31, 2015, 90.9% (2014: 83.9%) of our investment portfolio (excluding restricted and unrestricted cash and cash equivalents) was comprised of investments valued based on quoted prices in actively traded markets (Level 1), 8.0% (2014: 14.5%) was comprised of securities valued based on observable inputs other than quoted prices (Level 2) and 1.1% (2014: 1.6%) was comprised of securities valued based on non-observable inputs (Level 3). (Refer to Note 3 "Financial Instruments" in the consolidated financial statements for details of transfers into and out of Level 3 during the year ended December 31, 2015).

In determining whether a market for a financial instrument is active or inactive, we obtain information from DME Advisors, based on feedback it receives from executing brokers, market makers, analysts and traders, to assess the level of market activity and available liquidity for any given financial instrument. Where a financial instrument is valued based on broker quotes, DME Advisors requests multiple quotes. The ultimate value is based on an average of the quotes obtained. Broker quoted prices are generally not adjusted in determining the ultimate values and are obtained with the expectation of the quotes being binding. As of December 31, 2015, $129.8 million (2014: $316.4 million) of our investments (longs, shorts and derivatives) were valued based on broker quotes, of which $128.0 million (2014: $315.7 million) were based on broker quotes that utilized observable market information and classified as Level 2 fair value measurements, and $1.8 million (2014: $0.7 million) were based on broker quotes that utilized non-observable inputs and classified as Level 3 fair value measurements.

Non-observable inputs used by our investment advisor include the use of investment manager statements and management estimates based on third party appraisals of underlying assets for valuing private equity investments.

Restricted Cash and Cash Equivalents; Securities Sold, Not Yet Purchased

As of December 31, 2015, our securities sold, not yet purchased were $882.9 million compared to $1,090.7 million at December 31, 2014, a decrease of 19.1%, primarily due to disposal of certain non-U.S. sovereign debt short positions and, to a lesser extent, due to an increase in unrealized gains on the short equity securities. However, since macro positions such as sovereign debt are not included in the exposure analysis, our short exposure was 74.0% as of December 31, 2015, compared to 66.9% at December 31, 2014.

Unlike long investments, short sales theoretically involve unlimited loss potential since there is no limit as to how high the market price of a security may rise. While it is not possible to list all of the reasons why a loss on a short sale may occur, a loss on a short sale may be caused by one or more of the following factors:

Link to Table of Contents

- Fluctuations in the share price due to an overall positive investment market;
- Sudden unexpected changes in the underlying business model of the issuer;
- Changes in laws and regulations relating to short sales;
- Press releases and earnings guidance issued by the issuer;
- A merger or acquisition of the issuer at a price in excess of the current share price;
- The shares of the issuer becoming difficult to borrow; or
- A short squeeze.

Given the various scenarios under which a loss may occur on a short sale, it is not possible to quantify the risk and uncertainty of loss relating to short sales. However, DME Advisors typically performs a detailed analysis prior to entering into a short sale. Thereafter, the investment is routinely monitored by DME Advisors. As of December 31, 2015, Greenlight Re's investment guidelines limit any single investment from constituting more than 20% of the portfolio (10% for GRIL's portfolio) at any given time, which limits the potential adverse impact on our results of operations and financial position from any one position.

As of December 31, 2015, the restricted cash included $882.9 million relating to collateral for securities sold, not yet purchased, compared to $1,090.7 million as of December 31, 2014.

Overall, our restricted cash decreased by $60.3 million, or 4.7%, from $1,296.9 million to $1,236.6 million, primarily due to the decrease in securities sold, not yet purchased. The cash collateral held by derivative counterparties decreased by $19.0 million to $52.2 million during the year ended December 31, 2015 due to a decrease in derivatives. Additionally, as of December 31, 2015, included in restricted cash and cash equivalents was $301.4 million (2014: $135.0 million) of cash and cash equivalents pledged as collateral (for letters of credit and trust accounts) to our cedents to satisfy our reinsurance collateral obligations.

Reinsurance Balances Receivable; Deferred Acquisition Costs, Net; Unearned Premium Reserves

At December 31, 2015, reinsurance balances receivable were $187.9 million compared to $151.2 million as of December 31, 2014, an increase of $36.7 million, or 24.3%. The increase in reinsurance balances receivable was primarily attributable to the increase in premiums written during the year ended December 31, 2015 compared to the same period in 2014.

At December 31, 2015, deferred acquisition costs (net of retrocession) increased by $25.4 million, or 73.8%, compared to December 31, 2014. The increase was closely related to the corresponding increase in unearned premium reserves which increased by $83.2 million, or 64.6%, during the same period. We evaluate the recoverability of deferred acquisition costs by determining if the sum of future earned premiums and anticipated investment income is greater than the expected future claims and expenses. If a loss is probable on the unexpired portion of policies in force, a premium deficiency loss is recognized. As of December 31, 2015, we believe that the deferred acquisition costs were fully recoverable and no premium deficiency loss was recorded.

Notes Receivable

As of December 31, 2015, notes receivable increased by $23.6 million to $25.1 million from $1.6 million as of December 31, 2014. The increase was primarily related to a settlement agreement entered into with a ceding insurer during 2015 whereby certain amounts, previously classified under reinsurance balances receivable, were converted into a ten-year note receivable. For further details on notes receivable, refer to Note 2 "Significant Accounting Policies" in the consolidated financial statements.

Loss and Loss Adjustment Expense Reserves; Loss and Loss Adjustment Expenses Recoverable

Reserves for loss and loss adjustment expenses were comprised of the following table:

	December 31, 2015			December 31, 2014		
	Case Reserves	IBNR	Total	Case Reserves	IBNR	Total
	($ in thousands)					
Frequency	$103,347	$165,740	$269,087	$103,357	$124,173	$227,530
Severity	8,188	28,722	36,910	13,692	23,021	36,713
Total	$111,535	$194,462	$305,997	$117,049	$147,194	$264,243

Link to Table of Contents

During the year ended December 31, 2015, the frequency loss reserves increased by $41.6 million, or 18.3%, to $269.1 million from $227.5 million as of December 31, 2014. The increase in the frequency IBNR was driven primarily by an increase in booked reserves on prior period contracts as a result of unfavorable loss development, partially offset by a net decrease in claims reported on active contracts during the period.

The severity loss reserves decreased by $0.2 million, or 0.5%. The increase in the severity IBNR was due to new severity quota share contracts written during 2015 and in the latter half of 2014. The decrease in the severity case reserves related to the elimination of $5.1 million case reserves on an excess of loss contract based on updated loss information received from the insurer indicating that the losses would not breach into our layer of coverage.

For most of our contracts written as of December 31, 2015, our risk exposure is limited by defined limits of liability. Once the loss limit for a contract has been reached, we have no further exposure to additional losses from that contract. However, certain contracts, particularly quota share contracts that relate to first dollar exposure, may not contain aggregate limits. Our severity and frequency business both have certain contracts that contain natural peril loss exposure. As of January 1, 2016, our maximum aggregate loss exposure to any series of natural peril events was $236.3 million. For purposes of the preceding sentence, aggregate loss exposure is net of any retrocession (including any ILWs) and is equal to the difference between the aggregate limits available in the contracts that contain natural peril exposure minus reinstatement premiums, if any, for the same contracts.

We categorize peak zones as: United States, Canada and the Caribbean; Europe; Japan; and the rest of the world. The following table provides the theoretical maximum single event loss exposure and aggregate loss exposure to natural peril losses for each of the peak zones as of January 1, 2016:

Zone	January 1, 2016 Maximum Single Event Loss ($ in thousands)	Maximum Aggregate Loss
United States, Canada and the Caribbean	$165,357	$236,263
Europe	114,440	144,383
Japan	114,440	144,383
Rest of the world	114,440	144,383
Maximum Aggregate	165,357	236,263

Since our maximum loss exposures are theoretical maximums based on contract limits, these limits may be significantly higher than modeled loss estimates which are commonly used in the insurance industry. Therefore as of January 1, 2016, we also estimate catastrophe losses in terms of the probable maximum loss ("PML"). We define PML as the anticipated loss, taking into account contract terms and limits, caused by a catastrophe affecting a broad geographic area, such as that caused by an earthquake or hurricane. We anticipate that the PML will vary depending upon the modeled simulated losses and the composition of the in-force book of business. The projected severity levels are described in terms of a 1-in-250 year return period. The 1-in-250 year return period PML means that there is a 0.4% chance in any given year that an occurrence of a natural catastrophe will lead to losses exceeding the stated estimate. In other words, it corresponds to a 99.6% probability that the loss from an event will fall below the indicated PML.

It is important to note that PMLs are estimates. As a result, we cannot provide any assurance that any actual event will align with the modeled event or that actual losses from events similar to the modeled events will not vary materially from the modeled event PML.

The PML estimate includes all significant exposure from our reinsurance operations. This includes coverage for property, motor, marine, energy, aviation and workers’ compensation.

Link to Table of Contents

As of January 1, 2016, our estimated net PML exposure (net of retrocession and reinstatement premiums) at a 1-in-250 year return period for a single event and in aggregate, was $113.0 million and $143.9 million, respectively. The following table provides the PML for single event loss exposure and aggregate loss exposure to natural peril losses for each of the peak zones as of January 1, 2016:

Zone	January 1, 2016 1-in-250 year return Single Event Loss ($ in thousands)	Aggregate Loss
United States, Canada and the Caribbean	113,004	142,196
Europe	50,602	64,809
Japan	33,010	41,555
Rest of the world	34,600	49,087
Maximum	113,004	143,851

Shareholders' Equity

Total equity reported on the consolidated balance sheet, which includes non-controlling interest, decreased by $345.3 million to $848.8 million as of December 31, 2015, compared to $1,194.0 million as of December 31, 2014. Retained earnings decreased primarily due to net loss of $326.4 million reported for the year ended December 31, 2015 and $9.2 million related to repurchase of Class A ordinary shares. The non-controlling interest decreased by $5.5 million due to investment losses attributable to DME's interest in the joint venture during the year ended December 31, 2015. The decrease in additional paid-in capital for the year ended December 31, 2015 of $4.2 million primarily related to common shares repurchased during the period, partially offset by stock based compensation for the year ended December 31, 2015.

Liquidity and Capital Resources

General

Greenlight Capital Re is organized as a holding company with no operations of its own. As a holding company, Greenlight Capital Re has minimal continuing cash needs, most of which are related to the payment of administrative expenses. All of our underwriting operations are conducted through our wholly-owned reinsurance subsidiaries, Greenlight Re and GRIL, which underwrite risks associated with our property and casualty reinsurance programs. There are restrictions on Greenlight Re's and GRIL's ability to pay dividends which are described in more detail below. It is our current policy to retain earnings to support the growth of our business. We currently do not expect to pay dividends on our ordinary shares.

As of December 31, 2015, Greenlight Re and GRIL were each rated "A (Excellent)" by A.M. Best. On October 23, 2015, A.M. Best affirmed the "A (Excellent)" ratings but revised the ratings' outlook from stable to negative. The ratings reflect A.M. Best's opinion of our reinsurance subsidiaries' financial strength, operating performance and ability to meet obligations and it is not an evaluation directed toward the protection of investors or a recommendation to buy, sell or hold our Class A ordinary shares. If A.M. Best downgrades our ratings below "A- (Excellent)" or withdraws our rating, we could be severely limited or prevented from writing any new reinsurance contracts, which would significantly and negatively affect our business. Insurer financial strength ratings are based upon factors relevant to policyholders and are not directed toward the protection of investors. Our A.M. Best ratings may be revised or revoked at the sole discretion of the rating agency.

Link to Table of Contents

Sources and Uses of Funds

Our sources of funds consist primarily of premium receipts (net of brokerage and ceding commissions), investment income (net of advisory compensation and investment expenses), including realized gains, and other income. We use cash from our operations to pay losses and loss adjustment expenses, profit commissions and general and administrative expenses. Substantially all of our funds, including shareholders' capital, net of funds required for business operations, are invested by DME Advisors in accordance with our investment guidelines. As of December 31, 2015, approximately 96% (December 31, 2014: 96%) of our long investments were comprised of publicly-traded equity securities and other holdings which can be readily liquidated to meet current and future liabilities. Given our value-oriented long and short investment strategy, if markets are distressed we would expect the liability of the short portfolio to decline. Any reduction in the liability would cause our need for restricted cash to decrease and thereby free up cash to be used for any purpose. Additionally, since the majority of our invested assets can be readily liquidated, even in distressed markets, we believe sufficient securities can be readily sold or covered in a timely manner to generate cash to pay claims. Since we classify our investments as "trading," we book all gains and losses (including unrealized gains and losses) on all our investments (including derivatives) as net investment income or loss in our consolidated statements of income for each reporting period.

For the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, the net cash used in operating activities was $59.9 million, $133.7 million and $92.7 million, respectively. Included in the net cash used in operating activities were investment related expenses, such as investment advisor compensation, and net interest and dividend expenses of $35.0 million, $56.6 million and $97.9 million for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, respectively. Excluding the investment related expenses from the net cash used in operating activities results in net cash primarily provided by (used in) our underwriting activities, which was $(24.9) million, $(77.1) million and $5.2 million for the years ended December 31, 2015, 2014 and 2013, respectively. During the year ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 , the use of cash for underwriting activities was primarily a result of losses paid in excess of the premiums collected (net of acquisition costs). Generally, in a given period if the premiums collected are sufficient to cover claim payments, we would generate cash from our underwriting activities. Due to the inherent nature of our underwriting portfolio, claims are often paid several months or even years after the premiums are collected. The cash generated from underwriting activities, however, may be volatile from period to period depending on the underwriting opportunities available.

For the year ended December 31, 2015, our investing activities provided cash of $177.7 million (2014: $142.0 million, 2013: $74.0 million), primarily as a result of borrowings from prime brokers under term margin agreements to provide collateral for trust accounts and letters of credit issued. The cash provided from investing activities for the years ended December 31, 2014 and 2013 was driven primarily by the trading of long and short securities in the investment portfolio. Cash provided by investing activities is net of withdrawals from the joint venture by DME during the year ended December 31, 2015 of nil (2014: $9.5 million, 2013: $10.8 million). We used $17.7 million in financing activities relating to the repurchase of Class A ordinary shares during the year ended December 31, 2015 (2014: nil, 2013: nil).

As of December 31, 2015, we believe we have sufficient cash flow from operating and investing activities to meet our foreseeable liquidity requirements. We expect that our operational needs for liquidity will be met by cash, funds generated from underwriting activities and investment income, including realized gains and the disposition of investment securities. As of December 31, 2015, we had no plans to issue debt and expect to fund our operations for the next twelve months from operating cash flow. However, we cannot provide assurances that in the future we will not incur indebtedness to implement our business strategy, pay claims or make acquisitions.

Although GLRE is not subject to any significant legal prohibitions on the payment of dividends, Greenlight Re and GRIL are each subject to regulatory minimum capital requirements and regulatory constraints that affect their ability to pay dividends to us. In addition, any dividend payment would have to be approved by the relevant regulatory authorities prior to payment. As of December 31, 2015, Greenlight Re and GRIL both exceeded the regulatory minimum capital requirements. See Note 9 of the consolidated financial statements for details of statutory surplus and regulatory capital of Greenlight Re and GRIL.

Letters of Credit and Trust Arrangements

As of December 31, 2015, neither Greenlight Re nor GRIL was licensed or admitted as a reinsurer in any jurisdiction other than the Cayman Islands and the European Economic Area, respectively. Because many jurisdictions do not permit domestic insurance companies to take credit on their statutory financial statements for loss recoveries or ceded unearned premiums unless appropriate measures are in place for reinsurance obtained from unlicensed or non-admitted insurers, we anticipate that all of our U.S. clients and some of our non-U.S. clients will require us to provide collateral through funds withheld, trust arrangements, letters of credit or a combination thereof.

Link to Table of Contents

As of December 31, 2015, we had four letter of credit facilities with an aggregate capacity of $720.0 million (2014: $760.0 million) with various financial institutions. See Note 14 of the accompanying consolidated financial statements for details on each of these facilities. As of December 31, 2015, an aggregate amount of $245.6 million (2014: $273.7 million) in letters of credit was issued under these facilities. Under these facilities, we provide collateral that may consist of equity securities or cash and cash equivalents. At December 31, 2015, total equity securities and cash and cash equivalents with a fair value in the aggregate of $324.3 million (2014: $302.6 million) were pledged as security against the letters of credit issued. The decrease in letters of credit issued as of December 31, 2015 compared to 2014 was a result of canceling some of the issued letters of credit for certain cedents and establishing regulatory trust arrangements in the amount of $78.6 million as of December 31, 2015.

Each of the facilities contain customary events of default and restrictive covenants, including but not limited to, limitations on liens on collateral, transactions with affiliates, mergers and sales of assets, as well as solvency and maintenance of certain minimum pledged equity requirements, and restricts issuance of any debt without the consent of the letter of credit provider. Additionally, if an event of default exists, as defined in the letter of credit facilities, Greenlight Re would be prohibited from paying dividends to its parent company. The Company was in compliance with all the covenants of each of these facilities as of December 31, 2015.

Capital

Our capital structure currently consists entirely of equity issued in two separate classes of ordinary shares. We expect that the existing capital base and internally generated funds will be sufficient to implement our business strategy for the foreseeable future. Consequently, we do not presently anticipate that we will incur any material indebtedness in the ordinary course of our business other than temporary borrowing directly related to the management of our investment portfolio. However, in order to provide us with flexibility and timely access to public capital markets should we require additional capital for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions or other general corporate purposes, we have filed a Form S-3 registration statement, which expires in June 2018 unless renewed. We did not make any significant commitments for capital expenditures during the year ended December 31, 2015.

Our Board of Directors has adopted a share repurchase plan authorizing the Company to repurchase up to 2.0 million Class A ordinary shares or securities convertible into Class A ordinary shares in the open market, through privately negotiated transactions or Rule 10b5-1 stock trading plans. The current share repurchase plan was renewed on April 29, 2015 by the Board of Directors and expires on June 30, 2016. The Company is not required to repurchase any of the Class A ordinary shares and the repurchase plan may be modified, suspended or terminated at the election of our Board of Directors at any time without prior notice. During the year ended December 31, 2015, 613,540 Class A ordinary shares were repurchased by the Company.

On April 28, 2010, our shareholders approved an amendment to our stock incentive plan to increase the number of Class A ordinary shares available for issuance from 2.0 million to 3.5 million. As of December 31, 2015, there were 658,775 Class A ordinary shares available for future issuance.

Contractual Obligations and Commitments

The following table shows our aggregate contractual obligations as of December 31, 2015 by time period remaining:

	Less than 1 year	1-3 years	3-5 years	More than 5 years	Total
	($ in thousands)				
Operating lease obligations [1]	$548	$863	$164	$31	$1,606
Private equity and limited partnerships [2]	6,107	—	—	—	6,107
Loss and loss adjustment expense reserves [3]	132,742	86,421	44,036		