

CHUBB CORP
Form 10-K
February 28, 2008

Table of Contents

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

x ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES
EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007
OR
o TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES
EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 FOR THE TRANSITION PERIOD FROM TO
Commission File No. 1-8661

The Chubb Corporation

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

New Jersey

(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

13-2595722

(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

15 Mountain View Road

Warren, New Jersey

(Address of principal executive offices)

07059

(Zip Code)

(908) 903-2000

(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)

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

(Title of each class)

(Name of each exchange on which registered)

Common Stock, par value \$1 per share
Series B Participating Cumulative
Preferred Stock Purchase Rights

New York Stock Exchange
New York Stock Exchange

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

None

(Title of class)

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

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

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

Indicate by check mark 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 the registrant's knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K.

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

Large accelerated filer

Accelerated filer

Non-accelerated filer
(Do not check if a smaller reporting company)

Smaller reporting company

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

The aggregate market value of common stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant was \$21,242,705,472 as of June 30, 2007, computed on the basis of the closing sale price of the common stock on that date.

370,249,648

Number of shares of common stock outstanding as of February 15, 2008

Documents Incorporated by Reference

Portions of the definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders are incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K.

CONTENTS

| | ITEM | DESCRIPTION | PAGE |
|----------|------|---|------|
| PART I | 1 | <u>Business</u> | 3 |
| | 1A | <u>Risk Factors</u> | 12 |
| | 1B | <u>Unresolved Staff Comments</u> | 17 |
| | 2 | <u>Properties</u> | 17 |
| | 3 | <u>Legal Proceedings</u> | 17 |
| | 4 | <u>Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders</u> | 19 |
| PART II | 5 | <u>Market for the Registrant's Common Stock and Related Stockholder Matters</u> | 20 |
| | 6 | <u>Selected Financial Data</u> | 22 |
| | 7 | <u>Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations</u> | 23 |
| | 7A | <u>Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk</u> | 61 |
| | 8 | <u>Consolidated Financial Statements and Supplementary Data</u> | 64 |
| | 9 | <u>Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure</u> | 64 |
| | 9A | <u>Controls and Procedures</u> | 64 |
| | 9B | <u>Other Information</u> | 65 |
| PART III | 10 | <u>Directors and Executive Officers of the Registrant</u> | 67 |
| | 11 | <u>Executive Compensation</u> | 67 |
| | 12 | <u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters</u> | 67 |
| | 13 | <u>Certain Relationships and Related Transactions</u> | 67 |
| | 14 | <u>Principal Accountant Fees and Services</u> | 67 |
| PART IV | 15 | <u>Exhibits, Financial Statements and Schedules</u> | 67 |
| | | <u>Signatures</u> | 68 |
| | | <u>Index to Financial Statements and Financial Statement Schedules</u> | F-1 |
| | | <u>Exhibits Index</u> | E-1 |
| | | <u>EX-12.1: COMPUTATION OF RATIO OF CONSOLIDATED EARNINGS TO FIXED CHARGES</u> | |
| | | <u>EX-21.1: SUBSIDIARIES</u> | |
| | | <u>EX-23.1: CONSENT OF ERNST & YOUNG LLP</u> | |
| | | <u>EX-31.1: CERTIFICATION</u> | |
| | | <u>EX-31.2: CERTIFICATION</u> | |
| | | <u>EX-32.1: CERTIFICATION</u> | |
| | | <u>EX-32.2: CERTIFICATION</u> | |

Table of Contents

PART I.

Item 1. *Business*
General

The Chubb Corporation (Chubb) was incorporated as a business corporation under the laws of the State of New Jersey in June 1967. Chubb and its subsidiaries are referred to collectively as the Corporation. Chubb is a holding company for a family of property and casualty insurance companies known informally as the Chubb Group of Insurance Companies (the P&C Group). Since 1882, the P&C Group has provided property and casualty insurance to businesses and individuals around the world. According to A.M. Best, the P&C Group is the 11th largest U.S. property and casualty insurance group based on 2006 net written premiums.

At December 31, 2007, the Corporation had total assets of \$51 billion and shareholders' equity of \$14 billion. Revenues, income before income tax and assets for each operating segment for the three years ended December 31, 2007 are included in Note (12) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements. The Corporation employed approximately 10,600 persons worldwide on December 31, 2007.

The Corporation's principal executive offices are located at 15 Mountain View Road, Warren, New Jersey 07059, and our telephone number is (908) 903-2000.

The Corporation's internet address is www.chubb.com. The Corporation's annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K and amendments to those reports filed or furnished pursuant to Section 13(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 are available free of charge on this website as soon as reasonably practicable after they have been electronically filed with or furnished to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Chubb's Corporate Governance Guidelines, charters of certain key committees of its Board of Directors, Restated Certificate of Incorporation, By-Laws, Code of Business Conduct and Code of Ethics for CEO and Senior Financial Officers are also available on the Corporation's website or by writing to the Corporation's Corporate Secretary.

Property and Casualty Insurance

The P&C Group is divided into three strategic business units. Chubb Commercial Insurance offers a full range of commercial insurance products, including coverage for multiple peril, casualty, workers' compensation and property and marine. Chubb Commercial Insurance is known for writing niche business, where our expertise can add value for our agents, brokers and policyholders. Chubb Specialty Insurance offers a wide variety of specialized professional liability products for privately and publicly owned companies, financial institutions, professional firms and healthcare organizations. Chubb Specialty Insurance also includes our surety business. Chubb Personal Insurance offers products for individuals with fine homes and possessions who require more coverage choices and higher limits than standard insurance policies.

In December 2005, the Corporation transferred its ongoing reinsurance assumed business to Harbor Point Limited. For a transition period of about two years, Harbor Point underwrote specific reinsurance business on the P&C Group's behalf. The P&C Group retained a portion of this business and ceded the balance to Harbor Point.

The P&C Group provides insurance coverages principally in the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia, and parts of Latin America and Asia. Revenues of the P&C Group by geographic area for the three years ended December 31, 2007 are included in Note (12) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

The principal members of the P&C Group are Federal Insurance Company (Federal), Pacific Indemnity Company (Pacific Indemnity), Vigilant Insurance Company (Vigilant), Great Northern Insurance Company (Great Northern), Chubb Custom Insurance Company (Chubb Custom), Chubb National Insurance Company (Chubb National), Chubb Indemnity Insurance Company (Chubb Indemnity), Chubb Insurance Company of New Jersey (Chubb New Jersey), Texas Pacific Indemnity

Table of Contents

Company, Northwestern Pacific Indemnity Company, Executive Risk Indemnity Inc. (Executive Risk Indemnity) and Executive Risk Specialty Insurance Company (Executive Risk Specialty) in the United States, as well as Chubb Atlantic Indemnity Ltd. (a Bermuda company), Chubb Insurance Company of Canada, Chubb Insurance Company of Europe, S.A., Chubb Insurance Company of Australia Limited, Chubb Argentina de Seguros, S.A. and Chubb do Brasil Companhia de Seguros.

Federal is the manager of Vigilant, Pacific Indemnity, Great Northern, Chubb National, Chubb Indemnity, Chubb New Jersey, Executive Risk Indemnity and Executive Risk Specialty. Federal also provides certain services to other members of the P&C Group. Acting subject to the supervision and control of the boards of directors of the members of the P&C Group, Federal provides day to day executive management and operating personnel and makes available the economy and flexibility inherent in the common operation of a group of insurance companies.

Premiums Written

A summary of the P&C Group's premiums written during the past three years is shown in the following table:

| Year | Direct Premiums Written | Reinsurance Premiums Assumed(a) | Reinsurance Premiums Ceded(a) | Net Premiums Written |
|----------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| (in millions) | | | | |
| 2005 | \$ 12,180 | \$ 1,120 | \$ 1,017 | \$ 12,283 |
| 2006 | 12,224 | 954 | 1,204 | 11,974 |
| 2007 | 12,432 | 775 | 1,335 | 11,872 |

(a) Intercompany items eliminated.

The net premiums written during the last three years for major classes of the P&C Group's business are included in the Property and Casualty Insurance Underwriting Results section of Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations (MD&A).

One or more members of the P&C Group are licensed and transact business in each of the 50 states of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Canada, Europe, Australia, and parts of Latin America and Asia. In 2007, approximately 78% of the P&C Group's direct business was produced in the United States, where the P&C Group's businesses enjoy broad geographic distribution with a particularly strong market presence in the Northeast. The five states accounting for the largest amounts of direct premiums written were New York with 12%, California with 9%, Texas with 5%, New Jersey with 5% and Florida with 5%. No other state accounted for 5% of such premiums. Approximately 11% of the P&C Group's direct premiums written was produced in Europe and 5% was produced in Canada.

Underwriting Results

A frequently used industry measurement of property and casualty insurance underwriting results is the combined loss and expense ratio. The P&C Group uses the combined loss and expense ratio calculated in accordance with statutory accounting principles applicable to property and casualty insurance companies. This ratio is the sum of the ratio of losses and loss expenses to premiums earned (loss ratio) plus the ratio of statutory underwriting expenses to premiums written (expense ratio) after reducing both premium amounts by dividends to policyholders. When the combined ratio is under 100%, underwriting results are generally considered profitable; when the combined ratio is over 100%, underwriting results are generally considered unprofitable. Investment income is not reflected in the combined ratio. The profitability of property and casualty insurance companies depends on the results of both underwriting and investments operations.

Table of Contents

The combined loss and expense ratios during the last three years in total and for the major classes of the P&C Group's business are included in the Property and Casualty Insurance Underwriting Operations section of MD&A.

Another frequently used measurement in the property and casualty insurance industry is the ratio of statutory net premiums written to policyholders' surplus. At December 31, 2007 and 2006, the ratio for the P&C Group was .91 and 1.05, respectively.

Producing and Servicing of Business

The P&C Group does not utilize a significant in-house distribution model for its products. Instead, in the United States, the P&C Group offers products through approximately 5,000 independent insurance agencies and accepts business on a regular basis from approximately 500 insurance brokers. In most instances, these agencies and brokers also offer products of other companies that compete with the P&C Group. The P&C Group's branch and service offices assist these agencies and brokers in producing and servicing the P&C Group's business. In addition to the administrative offices in Warren and Whitehouse Station, New Jersey, the P&C Group has zone, branch and service offices throughout the United States.

The P&C Group offers products through approximately 3,000 insurance brokers outside the United States. Local branch offices of the P&C Group assist the brokers in producing and servicing the business. In conducting its foreign business, the P&C Group mitigates the risks relating to currency fluctuations by generally maintaining investments in those foreign currencies in which the P&C Group has loss reserves and other liabilities. The net asset or liability exposure to the various foreign currencies is regularly reviewed.

Business for the P&C Group is also produced through participation in certain underwriting pools and syndicates. Such pools and syndicates provide underwriting capacity for risks which an individual insurer cannot prudently underwrite because of the magnitude of the risk assumed or which can be more effectively handled by one organization due to the need for specialized loss control and other services.

Reinsurance Ceded

In accordance with the normal practice of the insurance industry, the P&C Group cedes reinsurance to other insurance companies. Reinsurance is ceded to provide greater diversification of risk and to limit the P&C Group's maximum net loss arising from large risks or from catastrophic events.

A large portion of the P&C Group's ceded reinsurance is effected under contracts known as treaties under which all risks meeting prescribed criteria are automatically covered. Most of the P&C Group's treaty reinsurance arrangements consist of excess of loss and catastrophe contracts that protect against a specified part or all of certain types of losses over stipulated amounts arising from any one occurrence or event. In certain circumstances, reinsurance is also effected by negotiation on individual risks. The amount of each risk retained by the P&C Group is subject to maximum limits that vary by line of business and type of coverage. Retention limits are regularly reviewed and are revised periodically as the P&C Group's capacity to underwrite risks changes. For a discussion of the P&C Group's reinsurance program and the cost and availability of reinsurance, see the Property and Casualty Insurance Underwriting Results section of MD&A.

Ceded reinsurance contracts do not relieve the P&C Group of the primary obligation to its policyholders. Thus, an exposure exists with respect to reinsurance recoverable to the extent that any reinsurer is unable to meet its obligations or disputes the liabilities assumed under the reinsurance contracts. The collectibility of reinsurance is subject to the solvency of the reinsurers, coverage interpretations and other factors. The P&C Group is selective in regard to its reinsurers, placing reinsurance with only those reinsurers that the P&C Group believes have strong balance sheets and superior underwriting ability. The P&C Group monitors the financial strength of its reinsurers on an ongoing basis.

Table of Contents*Unpaid Losses and Loss Adjustment Expenses and Related Amounts Recoverable from Reinsurers*

Insurance companies are required to establish a liability in their accounts for the ultimate costs (including loss adjustment expenses) of claims that have been reported but not settled and of claims that have been incurred but not reported. Insurance companies are also required to report as assets the portion of such liability that will be recovered from reinsurers.

The process of establishing the liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses is complex and imprecise as it must take into consideration many variables that are subject to the outcome of future events. As a result, informed subjective estimates and judgments as to our ultimate exposure to losses are an integral component of our loss reserving process.

The anticipated effect of inflation is implicitly considered when estimating liabilities for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses. Estimates of the ultimate value of all unpaid losses are based in part on the development of paid losses, which reflect actual inflation. Inflation is also reflected in the case estimates established on reported open claims which, when combined with paid losses, form another basis to derive estimates of reserves for all unpaid losses. There is no precise method for subsequently evaluating the adequacy of the consideration given to inflation, since claim settlements are affected by many factors.

The P&C Group continues to emphasize early and accurate reserving, inventory management of claims and suits, and control of the dollar value of settlements. The number of outstanding claims at year-end 2007 was approximately 9% lower than the number at year-end 2006. The number of new arising claims during 2007 was 4% lower than in the prior year.

Additional information related to the P&C Group's estimates related to unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses and the uncertainties in the estimation process is presented in the Property and Casualty Insurance Loss Reserves section of MD&A.

The table on page 7 presents the subsequent development of the estimated year-end liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses, net of reinsurance recoverable, for the ten years prior to 2007. The Corporation acquired Executive Risk Inc. in 1999. The amounts in the table for the years 1997 and 1998 do not include Executive Risk's unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses.

The top line of the table shows the estimated net liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses recorded at the balance sheet date for each of the indicated years. This liability represents the estimated amount of losses and loss adjustment expenses for claims arising in all years prior to the balance sheet date that were unpaid at the balance sheet date, including losses that had been incurred but not yet reported to the P&C Group.

The upper section of the table shows the reestimated amount of the previously recorded net liability based on experience as of the end of each succeeding year. The estimate is increased or decreased as more information becomes known about the frequency and severity of losses for each individual year. The increase or decrease is reflected in operating results of the period in which the estimate is changed. The cumulative deficiency (redundancy) as shown in the table represents the aggregate change in the reserve estimates from the original balance sheet dates through December 31, 2007. The amounts noted are cumulative in nature; that is, an increase in a loss estimate that is related to a prior period occurrence generates a deficiency in each intermediate year. For example, a deficiency recognized in 2007 relating to losses incurred prior to December 31, 1997 would be included in the cumulative deficiency amount for each year in the period 1997 through 2006. Yet, the deficiency would be reflected in operating results only in 2007. The effect of changes in estimates of the liabilities for losses occurring in prior years on income before income taxes in each of the past three years is shown in the reconciliation of the beginning and ending liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses in the Property and Casualty Insurance Loss Reserves section of MD&A.

Table of Contents**ANALYSIS OF LOSS AND LOSS ADJUSTMENT EXPENSE DEVELOPMENT****December 31**

| Year Ended | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

(in millions)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Net Liability for Unpaid Losses and Loss Adjustment Expenses | \$8,564 | \$ 9,050 | \$ 9,749 | \$10,051 | \$11,010 | \$12,642 | \$14,521 | \$16,809 | \$18,713 | \$19,699 | \$20,316 |
|--|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Net Liability Reestimated as of:

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| One year later | 8,346 | 8,855 | 9,519 | 9,856 | 11,799 | 13,039 | 14,848 | 16,972 | 18,417 | 19,002 |
| Two years later | 7,900 | 8,517 | 9,095 | 10,551 | 12,143 | 13,634 | 15,315 | 17,048 | 17,861 | |
| Three years later | 7,565 | 8,058 | 9,653 | 10,762 | 12,642 | 14,407 | 15,667 | 16,725 | | |
| Four years later | 7,145 | 8,527 | 9,740 | 11,150 | 13,246 | 14,842 | 15,584 | | | |
| Five years later | 7,571 | 8,656 | 9,999 | 11,605 | 13,676 | 14,907 | | | | |
| Six years later | 7,694 | 8,844 | 10,373 | 11,936 | 13,812 | | | | | |
| Seven years later | 7,822 | 9,119 | 10,602 | 12,019 | | | | | | |
| Eight years later | 8,061 | 9,324 | 10,702 | | | | | | | |
| Nine years later | 8,247 | 9,434 | | | | | | | | |

Ten
years
later 8,383

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| Total Cumulative Net Deficiency (Redundant) | (181) | 384 | 953 | 1,968 | 2,802 | 2,265 | 1,063 | (84) | (852) | (697) |
|---|-------|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Cumulative Net Deficiency Related to Asbestos and Toxic Waste Claims (Included in Above Total) | 1,420 | 1,352 | 1,305 | 1,274 | 1,213 | 472 | 222 | 147 | 112 | 88 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Cumulative Amount of Net Liability Paid as of: | | | | | | | | | | |
| One year later | 1,798 | 2,520 | 2,483 | 2,794 | 3,085 | 3,399 | 3,342 | 4,031 | 3,948 | 3,873 |
| Two years later | 3,444 | 3,708 | 4,079 | 4,669 | 5,354 | 5,671 | 6,095 | 6,594 | 6,586 | |
| Three years later | 4,161 | 4,653 | 5,286 | 5,981 | 6,932 | 7,753 | 8,039 | 8,487 | | |
| Four years later | 4,711 | 5,351 | 6,139 | 7,012 | 8,390 | 9,147 | 9,466 | | | |
| Five years later | 5,133 | 5,894 | 6,829 | 7,894 | 9,378 | 10,250 | | | | |
| Six years later | 5,481 | 6,326 | 7,382 | 8,635 | 10,126 | | | | | |
| | 5,807 | 6,680 | 7,926 | 9,159 | | | | | | |

Seven
years
later

Eight
years
later

| | | |
|-------|-------|-------|
| 6,060 | 7,040 | 8,310 |
|-------|-------|-------|

Nine
years
later

| | |
|-------|-------|
| 6,335 | 7,330 |
|-------|-------|

Ten
years
later

| |
|-------|
| 6,599 |
|-------|

Gross
Liability,
End of

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Year | \$9,772 | \$10,357 | \$11,435 | \$11,904 | \$15,515 | \$16,713 | \$17,948 | \$20,292 | \$22,482 | \$22,293 | \$22,623 |
|------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Reinsurance
Recoverable,
End of

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Year | 1,208 | 1,307 | 1,686 | 1,853 | 4,505 | 4,071 | 3,427 | 3,483 | 3,769 | 2,594 | 2,307 |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

Net
Liability,
End of

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Year | \$8,564 | \$9,050 | \$9,749 | \$10,051 | \$11,010 | \$12,642 | \$14,521 | \$16,809 | \$18,713 | \$19,699 | \$20,316 |
|------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Reestimated
Gross

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Liability | \$9,807 | \$11,050 | \$13,117 | \$14,828 | \$19,243 | \$19,688 | \$19,318 | \$20,119 | \$21,410 | \$21,565 |
|-----------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Reestimated
Reinsurance

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Recoverable | 424 | 1,616 | 2,415 | 2,809 | 5,431 | 4,781 | 3,734 | 3,394 | 3,549 | 2,563 |
|-------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

Reestimated
Net

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Liability | \$8,383 | \$9,434 | \$10,702 | \$12,019 | \$13,812 | \$14,907 | \$15,584 | \$16,725 | \$17,861 | \$19,002 |
|-----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

Cumulative
Gross
Deficiency

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|------------|----------|
| (Redundancy) | \$5 | \$693 | \$1,682 | \$2,924 | \$3,728 | \$2,975 | \$1,370 | \$ (173) | \$ (1,072) | \$ (728) |
|--------------|-----|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|------------|----------|

The amounts for the years 1997 and 1998 do not include the unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses of Executive Risk, which was acquired in 1999.

Table of Contents

The subsequent development of the net liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses as of year-ends 1997 through 2003 was adversely affected by substantial unfavorable development related to asbestos and toxic waste claims. The cumulative net deficiencies experienced related to asbestos and toxic waste claims were the result of: (1) an increase in the actual number of claims filed; (2) an increase in the estimated number of potential claims; (3) an increase in the severity of actual and potential claims; (4) an increasingly adverse litigation environment; and (5) an increase in litigation costs associated with such claims. For the years 1997 through 1999, the unfavorable development related to asbestos and toxic waste claims was offset in varying degrees by favorable loss experience in the professional liability classes, particularly directors and officers liability and fiduciary liability. For 2000, in addition to the unfavorable development related to asbestos and toxic waste claims, there was significant unfavorable development in the commercial casualty and workers' compensation classes. For the years 2001 through 2003, in addition to the unfavorable development related to asbestos and toxic waste claims, there was significant unfavorable development in the professional liability classes—principally directors and officers liability and errors and omissions liability, due in large part to adverse loss trends related to corporate failures and allegations of management misconduct and accounting irregularities—and the commercial casualty classes and, to a lesser extent, workers' compensation. For the years 2005 and 2006, there was significant favorable development, primarily in the professional liability classes due to favorable loss trends in recent years and in the homeowners and commercial property classes due to lower than expected emergence of losses.

Conditions and trends that have affected development of the liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses in the past will not necessarily recur in the future. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to extrapolate future redundancies or deficiencies based on the data in this table.

The middle section of the table on page 7 shows the cumulative amount paid with respect to the reestimated net liability as of the end of each succeeding year. For example, in the 1997 column, as of December 31, 2007 the P&C Group had paid \$6,599 million of the currently estimated \$8,383 million of net losses and loss adjustment expenses that were unpaid at the end of 1997; thus, an estimated \$1,784 million of net losses incurred on or before December 31, 1997 remain unpaid as of December 31, 2007, approximately 53% of which relates to asbestos and toxic waste claims.

The lower section of the table on page 7 shows the gross liability, reinsurance recoverable and net liability recorded at the balance sheet date for each of the indicated years and the reestimation of these amounts as of December 31, 2007.

The liability for unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses, net of reinsurance recoverable, reported in the accompanying consolidated financial statements prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) comprises the liabilities of U.S. and foreign members of the P&C Group as follows:

| | December 31 | |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions) | |
| U.S. subsidiaries | \$ 16,597 | \$ 16,492 |
| Foreign subsidiaries | 3,719 | 3,207 |
| | \$ 20,316 | \$ 19,699 |

Members of the P&C Group are required to file annual statements with insurance regulatory authorities prepared on an accounting basis prescribed or permitted by such authorities (statutory basis). The difference between the liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses reported in the statutory basis financial statements of the U.S. members of the P&C Group and such liability reported on a GAAP basis in the consolidated financial statements is not significant.

Table of Contents*Investments*

Investment decisions are centrally managed by investment professionals based on guidelines established by management and approved by the respective boards of directors for each company in the P&C Group.

Additional information about the Corporation's investment portfolio as well as its approach to managing risks is presented in the Invested Assets section of MD&A, the Investment Portfolio section of Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk and Note (4) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

The investment results of the P&C Group for each of the past three years are shown in the following table.

| Year | Average Invested Assets(a) | Investment Income(b) | Percent Earned | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| | | | Before Tax | After Tax |
| (in millions) | | | | |
| 2005 | \$30,570 | \$1,315 | 4.30% | 3.45% |
| 2006 | 33,492 | 1,454 | 4.34 | 3.48 |
| 2007 | 36,406 | 1,590 | 4.37 | 3.50 |

- (a) Average of amounts with fixed maturity securities at amortized cost, equity securities at market value and other invested assets, which include private equity limited partnerships, at the P&C Group's equity in the net assets of the partnerships.
- (b) Investment income after deduction of investment expenses, but before applicable income tax.

Competition

The property and casualty insurance industry is highly competitive both as to price and service. Members of the P&C Group compete not only with other stock companies but also with mutual companies, other underwriting organizations and alternative risk sharing mechanisms. Some competitors produce their business at a lower cost through the use of salaried personnel rather than independent agents and brokers. Rates are not uniform among insurers and vary according to the types of insurers, product coverage and methods of operation. The P&C Group competes for business not only on the basis of price, but also on the basis of financial strength, availability of coverage desired by customers and quality of service, including claim adjustment service. The P&C Group's products and services are generally designed to serve specific customer groups or needs and to offer a degree of customization that is of value to the insured. The P&C Group continues to work closely with its customers and to reinforce with them the stability, expertise and added value the P&C Group's products provide.

There are approximately 3,100 property and casualty insurance companies in the United States operating independently or in groups and no single company or group is dominant. However, the relatively large size and underwriting capacity of the P&C Group provide it opportunities not available to smaller companies.

Regulation and Premium Rates

Chubb is a holding company with subsidiaries primarily engaged in the property and casualty insurance business and is therefore subject to regulation by certain states as an insurance holding company. All states have enacted legislation that regulates insurance holding company systems such as the Corporation. This legislation generally provides that each insurance company in the system is required to register with the department of insurance of its state of domicile and furnish information concerning the operations of companies within the holding company system that may materially affect the operations, management or financial condition of the insurers within the system. All transactions within a holding company system affecting insurers must be fair and equitable. Notice to the insurance commissioners is required prior to the consummation of transactions affecting the ownership or control of an insurer and of certain material transactions between an insurer and any person in its

Table of Contents

holding company system and, in addition, certain of such transactions cannot be consummated without the commissioners' prior approval.

Companies within the P&C Group are subject to regulation and supervision in the respective states in which they do business. In general, such regulation is designed to protect the interests of policyholders, and not necessarily the interests of insurers, their shareholders and other investors. The extent of such regulation varies but generally has its source in statutes that delegate regulatory, supervisory and administrative powers to a department of insurance. The regulation, supervision and administration relate, among other things, to: the standards of solvency that must be met and maintained; the licensing of insurers and their agents; restrictions on insurance policy terminations; unfair trade practices; the nature of and limitations on investments; premium rates; restrictions on the size of risks that may be insured under a single policy; deposits of securities for the benefit of policyholders; approval of policy forms; periodic examinations of the affairs of insurance companies; annual and other reports required to be filed on the financial condition of companies or for other purposes; limitations on dividends to policyholders and shareholders; and the adequacy of provisions for unearned premiums, unpaid losses and loss adjustment expenses, both reported and unreported, and other liabilities.

The extent of insurance regulation on business outside the United States varies significantly among the countries in which the P&C Group operates. Some countries have minimal regulatory requirements, while others regulate insurers extensively. Foreign insurers in many countries are subject to greater restrictions than domestic competitors. In certain countries, the P&C Group has incorporated insurance subsidiaries locally to improve its competitive position.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) has a risk-based capital requirement for property and casualty insurance companies. The risk-based capital formula is used by state regulatory authorities to identify insurance companies that may be undercapitalized and that merit further regulatory attention. The formula prescribes a series of risk measurements to determine a minimum capital amount for an insurance company, based on the profile of the individual company. The ratio of a company's actual policyholders' surplus to its minimum capital requirement will determine whether any state regulatory action is required. At December 31, 2007, each member of the P&C Group had more than sufficient capital to meet the risk-based capital requirement. The NAIC periodically reviews the risk-based capital formula and changes to the formula could be considered in the future.

Regulatory requirements applying to premium rates vary from state to state, but generally provide that rates cannot be excessive, inadequate or unfairly discriminatory. In many states, these regulatory requirements can impact the P&C Group's ability to change rates, particularly with respect to personal lines products such as automobile and homeowners insurance, without prior regulatory approval. For example, in certain states there are measures that limit the use of catastrophe models or credit scoring as well as premium rate freezes or limitations on the ability to cancel or nonrenew certain policies, which can affect the P&C Group's ability to charge adequate rates.

Subject to legislative and regulatory requirements, the P&C Group's management determines the prices charged for its policies based on a variety of factors including loss and loss adjustment expense experience, inflation, anticipated changes in the legal environment, both judicial and legislative, and tax law and rate changes. Methods for arriving at prices vary by type of business, exposure assumed and size of risk. Underwriting profitability is affected by the accuracy of these assumptions, by the willingness of insurance regulators to approve changes in those rates that they control and by certain other matters, such as underwriting selectivity and expense control.

In all states, insurers authorized to transact certain classes of property and casualty insurance are required to become members of an insolvency fund. In the event of the insolvency of a licensed insurer writing a class of insurance covered by the fund in the state, companies in the P&C Group, together with the other fund members, are assessed in order to provide the funds necessary to pay certain claims against the insolvent insurer. Generally, fund assessments are proportionately based on the members' written premiums for the classes of insurance written by the insolvent insurer. In certain states, the P&C Group can recover a portion of these assessments through premium tax offsets and

Table of Contents

policyholder surcharges. In 2007, assessments of the members of the P&C Group amounted to \$9 million. The amount of future assessments cannot be reasonably estimated.

Insurance regulation in certain states requires the companies in the P&C Group, together with other insurers operating in the state, to participate in assigned risk plans, reinsurance facilities and joint underwriting associations, which are mechanisms that generally provide applicants with various basic insurance coverages when they are not available in voluntary markets. Such mechanisms are most prevalent for automobile and workers' compensation insurance, but a majority of states also mandate that insurers, such as the P&C Group, participate in Fair Plans or Windstorm Plans, which offer basic property coverages to insureds where not otherwise available. Some states also require insurers to participate in facilities that provide homeowners, crime and other classes of insurance where periodic market constrictions may occur. Participation is based upon the amount of a company's voluntary written premiums in a particular state for the classes of insurance involved. These involuntary market plans generally are underpriced and produce unprofitable underwriting results.

In several states, insurers, including members of the P&C Group, participate in market assistance plans. Typically, a market assistance plan is voluntary, of limited duration and operates under the supervision of the insurance commissioner to provide assistance to applicants unable to obtain commercial and personal liability and property insurance. The assistance may range from identifying sources where coverage may be obtained to pooling of risks among the participating insurers. A few states require insurers, including members of the P&C Group, to purchase reinsurance from a mandatory reinsurance fund.

Although the federal government and its regulatory agencies generally do not directly regulate the business of insurance, federal initiatives often have an impact on the business in a variety of ways. Current and proposed federal measures that may significantly affect the P&C Group's business and the market as a whole include federal terrorism insurance, asbestos liability reform measures, tort reform, natural catastrophes, corporate governance, ergonomics, health care reform including the containment of medical costs, medical malpractice reform and patients' rights, privacy, e-commerce, international trade, federal regulation of insurance companies and the taxation of insurance companies.

Companies in the P&C Group are also affected by a variety of state and federal legislative and regulatory measures as well as by decisions of their courts that define and extend the risks and benefits for which insurance is provided. These include: redefinitions of risk exposure in areas such as water damage, including mold, flood and storm surge; products liability and commercial general liability; credit scoring; and extension and protection of employee benefits, including workers' compensation and disability benefits.

Pursuant to a December 2006 settlement agreement with the Attorneys General of New York, Connecticut and Illinois, the Corporation, among other things, agreed to no longer pay compensation to agents and brokers in the form of contingent commissions on all lines of its business. A number of other property and casualty insurance carriers and a number of insurance producers also have agreed with various regulatory agencies to no longer pay or accept, as applicable, contingent commissions in some or all lines of business. A small number of states have enacted compensation disclosure rules and it is possible that additional states may adopt such rules in the future.

Legislative and judicial developments pertaining to asbestos and toxic waste exposures are discussed in the Property and Casualty Insurance - Loss Reserves section of MD&A.

Real Estate

The Corporation's wholly owned subsidiary, Bellemead Development Corporation (Bellemead), and its subsidiaries were involved in commercial development activities primarily in New Jersey and

Table of Contents

residential development activities primarily in central Florida. The real estate operations are in run-off. Additional information related to the Corporation's real estate operations is included in the Corporate and Other Real Estate section of MD&A.

Chubb Financial Solutions

Chubb Financial Solutions (CFS) provided customized financial products to corporate clients. CFS's business was primarily structured credit derivatives, principally as a counterparty in portfolio credit default swaps. CFS has been in run-off since April 2003. Since that date, CFS has terminated early or run-off nearly all of its contractual obligations within its financial products portfolio. Additional information related to CFS's operations is included in the Corporate and Other Chubb Financial Solutions section of MD&A.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

The Corporation's business is subject to a number of risks, including those described below, that could have a material effect on the Corporation's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity and that could cause our operating results to vary significantly from period to period. References to we, us and our appearing in this Form 10-K should be read to refer to the Corporation.

If our property and casualty loss reserves are insufficient, our results could be adversely affected.

The process of establishing loss reserves is complex and imprecise as it must take into consideration many variables that are subject to the outcome of future events. As a result, informed subjective estimates and judgments as to our ultimate exposure to losses are an integral component of our loss reserving process. Variations between our loss reserve estimates and the actual emergence of losses could be material and could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

A further discussion of the risk factors related to our property and casualty loss reserves is presented in the Property and Casualty Insurance Loss Reserves section of MD&A.

The effects of emerging claim and coverage issues on our business are uncertain.

As industry practices and legal, judicial, social, environmental and other conditions change, unexpected or unintended issues related to claims and coverage may emerge. These issues may adversely affect our business by either extending coverage beyond our underwriting intent or by increasing the number or size of claims. In some instances, these issues may not become apparent for some time after we have written the insurance policies that are affected by such issues. As a result, the full extent of liability under our insurance policies may not be known for many years after the policies are issued. Emerging claim and coverage issues could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

Catastrophe losses could materially and adversely affect our business.

As a property and casualty insurance holding company, our insurance operations expose us to claims arising out of catastrophes. Catastrophes can be caused by various natural perils, including hurricanes and other windstorms, earthquakes, severe winter weather and brush fires. Catastrophes can also be man-made, such as a terrorist attack. The frequency and severity of catastrophes are inherently unpredictable. It is possible that both the frequency and severity of natural and man-made catastrophic events will increase.

The extent of losses from a catastrophe is a function of both the total amount of exposure under our insurance policies in the area affected by the event and the severity of the event. Most catastrophes are restricted to relatively small geographic areas; however, hurricanes and earthquakes may produce significant damage over larger areas, especially those that are heavily populated. Natural or man-made catastrophic events could cause claims under our insurance policies to be higher than we

Table of Contents

anticipated and could cause substantial volatility in our financial results for any fiscal quarter or year. Our ability to write new business could also be affected. We believe that increases in the value and geographic concentration of insured property and the effects of inflation could increase the severity of claims from catastrophic events in the future. In addition, states have from time to time passed legislation that has the effect of limiting the ability of insurers to manage catastrophe risk, such as legislation prohibiting insurers from withdrawing from catastrophe-exposed areas.

As a result of the foregoing, it is possible that the occurrence of any natural or man-made catastrophic event could have a material adverse effect on our business, results of operations, financial condition and liquidity. A further discussion of the risk factors related to catastrophes is presented in the Property and Casualty Insurance Catastrophe Risk Management section of MD&A.

The occurrence of certain catastrophic events could have a materially adverse effect on our systems and could impact our ability to conduct business effectively.

Our computer, information technology and telecommunications systems, which we use to conduct our business, interface with and rely upon third-party systems. Systems failures or outages could compromise our ability to perform business functions in a timely manner, which could harm our ability to conduct business and hurt our relationships with our business partners and customers. In the event of a disaster such as a natural catastrophe, an industrial accident, a blackout, a computer virus, a terrorist attack or war, our systems may be inaccessible to our employees, customers or business partners for an extended period of time. Even if our employees or third party providers are able to report to work, they may be unable to perform their duties for an extended period of time if our computer, information technology or telecommunication systems are disabled or destroyed. Our systems could also be subject to physical and electronic break-ins, and subject to similar disruptions from unauthorized tampering. This may impede or interrupt our business operations, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

If we experience difficulties with outsourcing relationships, our ability to conduct our business might be negatively impacted.

We outsource certain business and administrative functions to third parties. If we fail to develop and implement our outsourcing strategies or our third party providers fail to perform as anticipated, we may experience operational difficulties, increased costs and a loss of business that may have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

The failure of the risk mitigation strategies we utilize could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition or results of operations.

We utilize a number of strategies to mitigate our risk exposure, such as:

engaging in vigorous underwriting;

carefully evaluating terms and conditions of our policies;

focusing on our risk aggregations by geographic zones, industry type, credit exposure and other bases; and

ceding reinsurance.

However, there are inherent limitations in all of these tactics and no assurance can be given that an event or series of unanticipated events will not result in loss levels in excess of our probable maximum loss models, which could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition or results of operations.

Table of Contents

Reinsurance coverage may not be available to us in the future at commercially reasonable rates or at all and we may not be able to collect all amounts due to us from reinsurers from whom we have purchased coverage.

The availability and cost of reinsurance are subject to prevailing market conditions that are beyond our control. No assurances can be made that reinsurance will remain continuously available to us in amounts that we consider sufficient and at prices that we consider acceptable, which would cause us to increase the amount of risk we retain, reduce the amount of business we underwrite or look for alternatives to reinsurance. This, in turn, could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition or results of operations.

With respect to reinsurance coverages we have purchased, our ability to recover amounts due from reinsurers may be affected by the creditworthiness and willingness to pay of the reinsurers from whom we have purchased coverage. The inability or unwillingness of any of our reinsurers to meet their obligations to us could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Cyclical nature of the property and casualty insurance industry may cause fluctuations in our results.

The property and casualty insurance business historically has been cyclical, experiencing periods characterized by intense price competition, relatively low premium rates and less restrictive underwriting standards followed by periods of relatively low levels of competition, high premium rates and more selective underwriting standards. We expect this cyclical nature to continue. The periods of intense price competition in the cycle could adversely affect our financial condition, profitability or cash flows.

A number of factors, including many that are volatile and unpredictable, can have a significant impact on cyclical trends in the property and casualty insurance industry and the industry's profitability. These factors include:

an apparent trend of courts to grant increasingly larger awards for certain damages;

catastrophic hurricanes, windstorms, earthquakes and other natural disasters, as well as the occurrence of man-made disasters (e.g., a terrorist attack);

availability, price and terms of reinsurance;

fluctuations in interest rates;

changes in the investment environment that affect market prices of and income and returns on investments; and

inflationary pressures that may tend to affect the size of losses experienced by insurance companies.

We cannot predict whether or when market conditions will improve, remain constant or deteriorate. Negative market conditions may impair our ability to write insurance at rates that we consider appropriate relative to the risk assumed. If we cannot write insurance at appropriate rates, our ability to transact business would be materially and adversely affected.

Payment of obligations under surety bonds could adversely affect our future operating results.

The surety business tends to be characterized by infrequent but potentially high severity losses. The majority of our surety obligations are intended to be performance-based guarantees. When losses occur, they may be mitigated, at times, by recovery rights to the customer's assets, contract payments, collateral and bankruptcy recoveries. We have substantial commercial and construction surety exposure for current and prior customers. In that regard, we have exposures related to surety bonds issued on behalf of companies that have experienced or may experience deterioration in creditworthiness. If the financial condition of these companies were adversely affected by the economy or otherwise, we may experience an increase in filed claims and may incur high severity losses, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations.

Table of Contents

A downgrade in our credit ratings and financial strength ratings could adversely impact the competitive positions of our operating businesses.

Credit ratings and financial strength ratings can be important factors in establishing our competitive position in the insurance markets. There can be no assurance that our ratings will continue for any given period of time or that they will not be changed. If our credit ratings were downgraded in the future, we could incur higher borrowing costs and may have more limited means to access capital. In addition, a downgrade in our financial strength ratings could adversely affect the competitive position of our insurance operations, including a possible reduction in demand for our products in certain markets.

Our businesses are heavily regulated, and changes in regulation may reduce our profitability and limit our growth.

Our insurance subsidiaries are subject to extensive regulation and supervision in the jurisdictions in which they conduct business. This regulation is generally designed to protect the interests of policyholders, and not necessarily the interests of insurers, their shareholders or other investors. The regulation relates to authorization for lines of business, capital and surplus requirements, investment limitations, underwriting limitations, transactions with affiliates, dividend limitations, changes in control, premium rates and a variety of other financial and nonfinancial components of an insurance company's business.

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

In recent years, the state insurance regulatory framework has come under increased scrutiny, including scrutiny by federal officials, and some state legislatures have considered or enacted laws that may alter or increase state authority to regulate insurance companies and insurance holding companies. Further, the NAIC and state insurance regulators are continually reexamining existing laws and regulations, specifically focusing on modifications to statutory accounting principles, interpretations of existing laws and the development of new laws and regulations. Any proposed or future legislation or NAIC initiatives, if adopted, may be more restrictive on our ability to conduct business than current regulatory requirements or may result in higher costs.

We cannot predict the outcome of the investigations into business practices in the property and casualty insurance industry or related legal proceedings, including any potential amounts that we may be required to pay.

In recent years, Attorneys General and regulatory authorities of several states, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and certain non-U.S. regulatory authorities commenced investigations into certain business practices in the property and casualty insurance industry involving, among other things, (1) the payment of contingent commissions to brokers and agents and (2) loss mitigation and finite reinsurance arrangements. We have received, and may continue to receive, subpoenas and other information requests from Attorneys General or other regulatory agencies regarding similar issues.

Table of Contents

In August 2007, the Attorney General of Ohio filed an action against us, as well as several other insurers and one broker, as a result of the Ohio Attorney General's business practices investigation. Although no other Attorney General or regulator has initiated an action against us and we have settled matters arising out of the investigations into business practices in the property and casualty insurance market by the Attorneys General of Connecticut, Illinois and New York, it is possible that such an action may be brought against us with respect to some or all of the issues that are the focus of the ongoing investigations. In addition, we have been named in legal proceedings brought by private plaintiffs arising out of these investigations. We cannot predict the ultimate outcome of these or any future investigations or legal proceedings, including any potential amounts that we may be required to pay in connection with them.

In addition, it is possible that one or more jurisdictions may adopt regulatory reforms as a result of these investigations. We cannot predict the impact of any such regulatory reforms on our ability to renew business or write new business.

Intense competition for our products could harm our ability to maintain or increase our profitability and premium volume.

The property and casualty insurance industry is highly competitive. We compete not only with other stock companies but also with mutual companies, other underwriting organizations and alternative risk sharing mechanisms. We compete for business not only on the basis of price, but also on the basis of financial strength, availability of coverage desired by customers and quality of service, including claim adjustment service. We may have difficulty in continuing to compete successfully on any of these bases in the future.

If competition limits our ability to write new business at adequate rates, our results of operations could be adversely affected.

We are dependent on a distribution network comprised of independent insurance brokers and agents to distribute our products.

We generally do not use salaried employees to promote or distribute our insurance products. Instead, we rely on a large number of independent insurance brokers and agents. Accordingly, our business is dependent on the willingness of these brokers and agents to recommend our products to their customers. Deterioration in relationships with our broker and agent distribution network could materially and adversely affect our ability to sell our products, which, in turn, could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

The inability of our insurance subsidiaries to pay dividends in sufficient amounts would harm our ability to meet our obligations and to pay future dividends.

As a holding company, Chubb relies primarily on dividends from its insurance subsidiaries to meet its obligations for payment of interest and principal on outstanding debt obligations and to pay dividends to shareholders. The ability of our insurance subsidiaries to pay dividends in the future will depend on their statutory surplus, on earnings and on regulatory restrictions. We are subject to regulation by some states as an insurance holding company system. Such regulation generally provides that transactions between companies within the holding company system must be fair and equitable. Transfers of assets among affiliated companies, certain dividend payments from insurance subsidiaries and certain material transactions between companies within the system may be subject to prior notice to, or prior approval by, state regulatory authorities. The ability of our insurance subsidiaries to pay dividends is also restricted by regulations that set standards of solvency that must be met and maintained, that limit investments and that limit dividends to shareholders. These regulations may affect Chubb's insurance subsidiaries' ability to provide Chubb with dividends.

Table of Contents**Our investments may suffer reduced returns or losses.**

The returns on our investment portfolio may be reduced or we may incur losses as a result of changes in general economic conditions, exchange rates, global capital market conditions and numerous other factors that are beyond our control. These factors may cause us to realize less than expected returns on invested assets, sell investments for a loss or write off or write down investments, any of which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial condition.

Item 1B. *Unresolved Staff Comments*

None.

Item 2. *Properties*

The executive offices of the Corporation are in Warren, New Jersey. The administrative offices of the P&C Group are located in Warren and Whitehouse Station, New Jersey. The P&C Group maintains zone, branch and service offices in major cities throughout the United States and also has offices in Canada, Europe, Australia, Latin America and Asia. Office facilities are leased with the exception of buildings in Whitehouse Station, New Jersey and Simsbury, Connecticut. Management considers its office facilities suitable and adequate for the current level of operations.

Item 3. *Legal Proceedings*

As previously disclosed, beginning in December 2002, Chubb Indemnity was named in a series of actions commenced by various plaintiffs against Chubb Indemnity and other non-affiliated insurers in the District Courts in Nueces, Travis and Bexar Counties in Texas. The plaintiffs generally allege that Chubb Indemnity and the other defendants breached duties to asbestos product end-users and conspired to conceal risks associated with asbestos exposure. The plaintiffs seek to impose liability on insurers directly. The plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary damages and punitive damages. Pursuant to the asbestos reform bill passed by the Texas legislature in May 2005, these actions were transferred to the Texas state asbestos Multidistrict Litigation on December 1, 2005. Chubb Indemnity is vigorously defending all of these actions and has been successful in getting a number of them dismissed through summary judgment, special exceptions, or voluntary withdrawal by the plaintiff.

Beginning in June 2003, Chubb Indemnity was also named in a number of similar cases in Cuyahoga, Mahoning, and Trumbull Counties in Ohio. The allegations and the damages sought in the Ohio actions are substantially similar to those in the Texas actions. In May 2005, the Ohio Court of Appeals sustained the trial court's dismissal of a group of nine cases for failure to state a claim. Following the appellate court's decision, Chubb Indemnity and other non-affiliated insurers were dismissed from the remaining cases filed in Ohio, except for a single case which had been removed to federal court and transferred to the federal asbestos Multidistrict Litigation. There has been no activity in that case since its removal.

In December 2007, certain of Chubb's subsidiaries were named in an action filed in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, California that contains allegations similar to those made in the Texas and Ohio actions. The subsidiaries are vigorously defending this action.

As previously disclosed, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries have been involved in the investigations of certain business practices in the property and casualty insurance industry by various Attorneys General and other regulatory authorities of several states, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and certain non-U.S. regulatory authorities with respect to, among other things, (1) potential conflicts of interest and anti-competitive behavior arising from the payment of contingent commissions to brokers and agents and (2) loss mitigation and finite reinsurance arrangements. In connection with these investigations, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries received subpoenas and other requests for information from various regulators. The Corporation has been cooperating fully with these investigations. In December 2006, the Corporation settled with the Attorneys General of New York, Connecticut and Illinois all issues arising out of their investigations. As described in more detail below, the Attorney General of Ohio in

Table of Contents

August 2007 filed an action against Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries, as well as several other insurers and one broker, as a result of the Ohio Attorney General's business practices investigation. Although no other Attorney General or regulator has initiated an action against the Corporation, it is possible that such an action may be brought against the Corporation with respect to some or all of the issues that are the focus of these ongoing investigations.

As previously disclosed, individual actions and purported class actions arising out of the investigations into the payment of contingent commissions to brokers and agents have been filed in a number of federal and state courts. On August 1, 2005, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries were named in a putative class action entitled *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation* in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. This action, brought against several brokers and insurers on behalf of a class of persons who purchased insurance through the broker defendants, asserts claims under the Sherman Act and state law and the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) arising from the alleged unlawful use of contingent commission agreements.

Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries have also been named as defendants in two purported class actions relating to allegations of unlawful use of contingent commission arrangements that were originally filed in state court. The first was filed on February 16, 2005 in Seminole County, Florida. The second was filed on May 17, 2005 in Essex County, Massachusetts. Both cases were removed to federal court and then transferred by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey for consolidation with the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. Since being transferred to the District of New Jersey, the plaintiff in the former action has been inactive, and that action currently is stayed. The latter action has been voluntarily dismissed. On September 28, 2007, the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey dismissed the second amended complaint filed by the plaintiffs in *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation* in its entirety. In so doing, the court dismissed the plaintiffs' Sherman Act and RICO claims with prejudice for failure to state a claim, and it dismissed the plaintiffs' state law claims without prejudice because it declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them. The plaintiffs have appealed the dismissal of their second amended complaint to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and that appeal is currently pending.

In December 2005, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries were named in a putative class action similar to the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. The action is pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey and has been assigned to the judge who is presiding over the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. The complaint has never been served in this matter. Separately, in April 2006, Chubb and one of its subsidiaries were named in an action similar to the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia and subsequently was transferred by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the U.S. District for the District of New Jersey for consolidation with the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action currently is stayed. On May 21, 2007, Chubb and one of its subsidiaries were named as defendants in another action similar to *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey and consolidated with *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action currently is stayed.

On October 12, 2007, certain of Chubb's subsidiaries were named as defendants in an action similar to *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. This action has been identified to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation as a potential tag-along action to *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. The Corporation currently anticipates that this action will be transferred by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey and consolidated with *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*.

On August 24, 2007, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries were named as defendants in an action filed by the Ohio Attorney General against several insurers and one broker. This action alleges

Table of Contents

violations of Ohio's antitrust laws. On November 18, 2007, the Corporation filed a motion to dismiss the Attorney General's complaint which is still pending.

In these actions, the plaintiffs generally allege that the defendants unlawfully used contingent commission agreements and conspired to reduce competition in the insurance markets. The actions seek treble damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, and attorneys' fees. The Corporation believes it has substantial defenses to all of the aforementioned legal proceedings and intends to defend the actions vigorously. It is possible that the Corporation may become involved in additional litigation of this sort.

Information regarding certain litigation to which the P&C Group is a party is included in the Property and Casualty Insurance - Loss Reserves section of MD&A.

Chubb and its subsidiaries are also defendants in various lawsuits arising out of their businesses. It is the opinion of management that the final outcome of these matters will not materially affect the Corporation's results of operations or financial condition.

Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders

No matters were submitted to a vote of the shareholders during the quarter ended December 31, 2007.

Executive Officers of the Registrant

| | Age(a) | Year of Election(b) |
|--|--------|---------------------|
| John D. Finnegan, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer | 59 | 2002 |
| Maureen A. Brundage, Executive Vice President and General Counsel | 51 | 2005 |
| Robert C. Cox, Executive Vice President of Chubb & Son, a division of Federal | 50 | 2003 |
| John J. Degnan, Vice Chairman and Chief Administrative Officer | 63 | 1994 |
| Paul J. Krump, Executive Vice President of Chubb & Son, a division of Federal | 48 | 2001 |
| Andrew A. McElwee, Jr., Executive Vice President of Chubb & Son, a division of Federal | 53 | 1997 |
| Thomas F. Motamed, Vice Chairman and Chief Operating Officer | 59 | 1997 |
| Dino E. Robusto, Executive Vice President of Chubb & Son, a division of Federal | 49 | 2006 |
| Michael O. Reilly, Vice Chairman and Chief Financial Officer | 64 | 1976 |
| Henry B. Schram, Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer | 61 | 1985 |

(a) Ages listed above are as of April 29, 2008.

(b) Date indicates year first elected or designated as an executive officer.

All of the foregoing officers serve at the pleasure of the Board of Directors of the Corporation and have been employees of the Corporation for more than five years except for Ms. Brundage.

Before joining the Corporation in 2005, Ms. Brundage was a partner in the law firm of White & Case LLP, where she headed the securities practice in New York and co-chaired its global securities practice.

Table of Contents**PART II.****Item 5. Market for the Registrant's Common Stock and Related Stockholder Matters**

The common stock of Chubb is listed and principally traded on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) under the trading symbol **CB**. The following are the high and low closing sale prices as reported on the NYSE Composite Tape and the quarterly dividends declared per share for each quarter of 2007 and 2006.

| | 2007 | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| | First Quarter | Second Quarter | Third Quarter | Fourth Quarter |
| Common stock prices | | | | |
| High | \$53.34 | \$55.91 | \$54.63 | \$55.52 |
| Low | 48.82 | 51.68 | 47.36 | 49.80 |
| Dividends declared | .29 | .29 | .29 | .29 |

| | 2006 | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| | First Quarter | Second Quarter | Third Quarter | Fourth Quarter |
| Common stock prices | | | | |
| High | \$49.45 | \$52.55 | \$52.55 | \$54.65 |
| Low | 46.80 | 47.60 | 47.40 | 51.35 |
| Dividends declared | .25 | .25 | .25 | .25 |

At February 15, 2008, there were approximately 9,300 common shareholders of record.

The declaration and payment of future dividends to Chubb's shareholders will be at the discretion of Chubb's Board of Directors and will depend upon many factors, including the Corporation's operating results, financial condition and capital requirements, and the impact of regulatory constraints discussed in Note (19)(f) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

The following table summarizes the stock repurchased by Chubb during each month in the quarter ended December 31, 2007.

| Period | Total Number of Shares Purchased(a) | Average Price Paid Per Share | Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans or Programs | Maximum Number of Shares that May Yet Be Purchased Under the Plans or Programs(b) |
|---------------|--|---|---|--|
| October 2007 | 1,183,564 | \$53.96 | 1,183,564 | 6,742,558 |
| November 2007 | 2,402,166 | 51.87 | 2,402,166 | 4,340,392 |
| December 2007 | 6,227,722 | 54.07 | 6,227,722 | 26,112,670 |
| Total | 9,813,452 | 53.52 | 9,813,452 | |

- (a) The stated amounts exclude 28,677 shares, 42,773 shares and 6,803 shares delivered to Chubb during the months of October 2007, November 2007 and December 2007, respectively, by employees of the Corporation to cover option exercise prices and withholding taxes in connection with the Corporation's stock-based compensation plans.
- (b) On December 7, 2006, the Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to 20,000,000 shares of common stock. On March 21, 2007, the Board of Directors authorized an increase of 20,000,000 shares to the authorization approved in December 2006. No shares remain under this share repurchase authorization. On December 13, 2007, the Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to 28,000,000 additional shares of common stock. The authorization has no expiration date.

Table of Contents**Stock Performance Graph**

The following performance graph compares the performance of Chubb's common stock during the five-year period from December 31, 2002 through December 31, 2007 with the performance of the Standard & Poor's 500 Index and the Standard & Poor's Property & Casualty Insurance Index. The graph plots the changes in value of an initial \$100 investment over the indicated time periods, assuming all dividends are reinvested.

Cumulative Total Return
Based upon an initial investment of \$100 on December 31, 2002
with dividends reinvested

| | December 31 | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
| Chubb | \$ 100 | \$ 134 | \$ 154 | \$ 200 | \$ 221 | \$ 233 |
| S&P 500 | 100 | 129 | 143 | 150 | 173 | 183 |
| S&P 500 Property & Casualty Insurance | 100 | 126 | 140 | 161 | 181 | 156 |

Our filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) may incorporate information by reference, including this Form 10-K. Unless we specifically state otherwise, the information under this heading "Stock Performance Graph" shall not be deemed to be "soliciting materials" and shall not be deemed to be "filed" with the SEC or incorporated by reference into any of our filings under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

Table of Contents**Item 6. Selected Financial Data**

| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| (in millions except for per share amounts) | | | | | |
| FOR THE YEAR | | | | | |
| Revenues | | | | | |
| Property and Casualty Insurance | | | | | |
| Premiums Earned | \$ 11,946 | \$ 11,958 | \$ 12,176 | \$ 11,636 | \$ 10,183 |
| Investment Income | 1,622 | 1,485 | 1,342 | 1,207 | 1,083 |
| Other Revenues | 11 | | | | |
| Corporate and Other | 154 | 315 | 181 | 116 | 44 |
| Realized Investment Gains | 374 | 245 | 384 | 218 | 84 |
| Total Revenues | \$ 14,107 | \$ 14,003 | \$ 14,083 | \$ 13,177 | \$ 11,394 |
| Income | | | | | |
| Property and Casualty Insurance | | | | | |
| Underwriting Income (a) | \$ 2,116 | \$ 1,905 | \$ 921(b) | \$ 846 | \$ 105 |
| Investment Income | 1,590 | 1,454 | 1,315 | 1,184 | 1,058 |
| Other Income (Charges) | 6 | 10 | (1) | (4) | (30) |
| Property and Casualty Insurance Income | | | | | |
| Insurance Income | 3,712 | 3,369 | 2,235 | 2,026 | 1,133 |
| Corporate and Other | (149) | (89) | (172) | (176) | (283) |
| Realized Investment Gains | 374 | 245 | 384 | 218 | 84 |
| Income Before Income Tax | 3,937 | 3,525 | 2,447 | 2,068 | 934 |
| Federal and Foreign Income Tax | 1,130 | 997 | 621 | 520 | 125 |
| Net Income | \$ 2,807 | \$ 2,528 | \$ 1,826 | \$ 1,548 | \$ 809 |
| Per Share | | | | | |
| Net Income | \$ 7.01 | \$ 5.98 | \$ 4.47 | \$ 4.01 | \$ 2.23 |
| Dividends Declared on Common Stock | 1.16 | 1.00 | .86 | .78 | .72 |
| AT DECEMBER 31 | | | | | |
| Total Assets | \$ 50,574 | \$ 50,277 | \$ 48,061 | \$ 44,260 | \$ 38,361 |
| Long Term Debt | 3,460 | 2,466 | 2,467 | 2,814 | 2,814 |
| Total Shareholders Equity | 14,445 | 13,863 | 12,407 | 10,126 | 8,522 |
| Book Value Per Share | 38.56 | 33.71 | 29.68 | 26.28 | 22.67 |

(a) Underwriting income reflected net losses of \$88 million (\$57 million after-tax or \$0.14 per share) in 2007, \$24 million (\$16 million after-tax or \$0.04 per share) in 2006, \$35 million (\$23 million after-tax or \$0.06 per share) in 2005, \$75 million (\$49 million after-tax or \$0.13 per share) in 2004 and \$250 million (\$163 million after-tax or \$0.45 per share) in 2003 related to asbestos and toxic waste claims.

(b) Underwriting income in 2005 reflected net costs of \$462 million (\$300 million after-tax or \$0.74 per share) related to Hurricane Katrina.

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

Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations addresses the financial condition of the Corporation as of December 31, 2007 compared with December 31, 2006 and the results of operations for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2007. This discussion should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and related notes and the other information contained in this report.

INDEX

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| <u>Cautionary Statement Regarding Forward-Looking Information</u> | 24 |
| <u>Critical Accounting Estimates and Judgments</u> | 26 |
| <u>Overview</u> | 26 |
| <u>Property and Casualty Insurance</u> | 27 |
| <u>Underwriting Operations</u> | 28 |
| <u>Underwriting Results</u> | 28 |
| <i><u>Net Premiums Written</u></i> | 28 |
| <i><u>Reinsurance Ceded</u></i> | 29 |
| <i><u>Profitability</u></i> | 30 |
| <u>Review of Underwriting Results by Business Unit</u> | 32 |
| <i><u>Personal Insurance</u></i> | 32 |
| <i><u>Commercial Insurance</u></i> | 33 |
| <i><u>Specialty Insurance</u></i> | 35 |
| <i><u>Reinsurance Assumed</u></i> | 36 |
| <u>Regulatory Developments</u> | 36 |
| <u>Catastrophe Risk Management</u> | 37 |
| <i><u>Natural Catastrophes</u></i> | 37 |
| <i><u>Terrorism Risk and Legislation</u></i> | 37 |
| <u>Loss Reserves</u> | 39 |
| <i><u>Estimates and Uncertainties</u></i> | 40 |
| <i><u>Reserves Other than Those Relating to Asbestos and Toxic Waste Claims</u></i> | 41 |
| <i><u>Reserves Relating to Asbestos and Toxic Waste Claims</u></i> | 45 |
| <i><u>Asbestos Reserves</u></i> | 45 |
| <i><u>Toxic Waste Reserves</u></i> | 48 |
| <i><u>Reinsurance Recoverable</u></i> | 49 |
| <i><u>Prior Year Loss Development</u></i> | 49 |
| <u>Investment Results</u> | 53 |
| <u>Other Income and Charges</u> | 53 |
| <u>Corporate and Other</u> | 53 |
| <u>Real Estate</u> | 53 |
| <u>Chubb Financial Solutions</u> | 54 |
| <u>Realized Investment Gains and Losses</u> | 54 |
| <u>Income Taxes</u> | 55 |
| <u>Capital Resources and Liquidity</u> | 56 |
| <u>Capital Resources</u> | 56 |
| <u>Ratings</u> | 57 |
| <u>Liquidity</u> | 58 |
| <u>Contractual Obligations and Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements</u> | 59 |
| <u>Invested Assets</u> | 60 |

Change in Accounting Principles

61

23

Table of Contents

CAUTIONARY STATEMENT REGARDING FORWARD-LOOKING INFORMATION

Certain statements in this document are forward-looking statements as that term is defined in the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PSLRA). These forward-looking statements are made pursuant to the safe harbor provisions of the PSLRA and include statements regarding our loss reserve and reinsurance recoverable estimates; the impact of future catastrophes on our results of operations, financial condition or liquidity; asbestos liability developments; the number and severity of surety-related claims; the impact of changes to our reinsurance program in 2006 and 2007 on our results of operations, financial condition or liquidity and the cost and availability of reinsurance in 2008; the adequacy of the rates at which we renewed and wrote new business; premium volume and competition in 2008; the impact of investigations into market practices in the property and casualty insurance industry and any resulting business reforms; changes to our producer compensation program; estimates with respect to our credit derivatives exposure; provisions for impairment of our real estate assets; the repurchase of common stock under our share repurchase program; our capital adequacy and funding of liquidity needs; and the overall effect of interest rate risk on us. Forward-looking statements are made based upon management's current expectations and beliefs concerning trends and future developments and their potential effects on us. These statements are not guarantees of future performance. Actual results may differ materially from those suggested by forward-looking statements as a result of risks and uncertainties, which include, among others, those discussed or identified from time to time in our public filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission and those associated with:

global political conditions and the occurrence of terrorist attacks, including any nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological events;

the effects of the outbreak or escalation of war or hostilities;

premium pricing and profitability or growth estimates overall or by lines of business or geographic area, and related expectations with respect to the timing and terms of any required regulatory approvals;

adverse changes in loss cost trends;

our ability to retain existing business;

our expectations with respect to cash flow projections and investment income and with respect to other income;

the adequacy of loss reserves, including:

our expectations relating to reinsurance recoverables;

the willingness of parties, including us, to settle disputes;

developments in judicial decisions or regulatory or legislative actions relating to coverage and liability, in particular, for asbestos, toxic waste and other mass tort claims;

development of new theories of liability;

our estimates relating to ultimate asbestos liabilities;

the impact from the bankruptcy protection sought by various asbestos producers and other related businesses; and

the effects of proposed asbestos liability legislation, including the impact of claims patterns arising from the possibility of legislation and those that may arise if legislation is not passed;

the availability and cost of reinsurance coverage;

the occurrence of significant weather-related or other natural or human-made disasters, particularly in locations where we have concentrations of risk;

Table of Contents

the impact of economic factors on companies on whose behalf we have issued surety bonds, and in particular, on those companies that file for bankruptcy or otherwise experience deterioration in creditworthiness;

the effects of disclosures by, and investigations of, companies relating to possible accounting irregularities, practices in the financial services industry, investment losses or other corporate governance issues, including: claims and litigation arising out of stock option backdating, spring loading and other option grant practices by public companies;

the effects on the capital markets and the markets for directors and officers and errors and omissions insurance;

claims and litigation arising out of actual or alleged accounting or other corporate malfeasance by other companies;

claims and litigation arising out of practices in the financial services industry; and

legislative or regulatory proposals or changes;
the effects of changes in market practices in the U.S. property and casualty insurance industry, in particular contingent commissions and loss mitigation and finite reinsurance arrangements, arising from any legal or regulatory proceedings, related settlements and industry reform, including changes that have been announced and changes that may occur in the future;

the impact of legislative and regulatory developments on our business, including those relating to terrorism and catastrophes;

any downgrade in our claims-paying, financial strength or other credit ratings;

the ability of our subsidiaries to pay us dividends;

general economic and market conditions including:
changes in interest rates, market credit spreads and the performance of the financial markets;

uncertainty in the credit markets and its impact on specific types of investments as well as on the broader financial markets;

the effects of inflation;

changes in domestic and foreign laws, regulations and taxes;

changes in competition and pricing environments;

regional or general changes in asset valuations;

the inability to reinsure certain risks economically; and

changes in the litigation environment; and
our ability to implement management's strategic plans and initiatives.

The Corporation assumes no obligation to update any forward-looking information set forth in this document, which speak as of the date hereof.

Table of Contents**CRITICAL ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES AND JUDGMENTS**

The consolidated financial statements include amounts based on informed estimates and judgments of management for transactions that are not yet complete. Such estimates and judgments affect the reported amounts in the financial statements. Those estimates and judgments that were most critical to the preparation of the financial statements involved the determination of loss reserves and the recoverability of related reinsurance recoverables. These estimates and judgments, which are discussed within the following analysis of our results of operations, require the use of assumptions about matters that are highly uncertain and therefore are subject to change as facts and circumstances develop. If different estimates and judgments had been applied, materially different amounts might have been reported in the financial statements.

OVERVIEW

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

Net income was \$2.8 billion in 2007 compared with \$2.5 billion in 2006 and \$1.8 billion in 2005. Net income in 2007 and 2006 benefited from substantially higher underwriting income in our property and casualty insurance business compared with 2005.

Underwriting results were significantly more profitable in 2007 and 2006 compared with 2005. Our combined loss and expense ratio was 82.9% in 2007 compared with 84.2% in 2006 and 92.3% in 2005. The impact of catastrophes accounted for 3.0 percentage points of the combined ratio in 2007 compared with 1.4 percentage points in 2006 and 5.6 percentage points in 2005. The greater catastrophe impact in 2005 was due to costs of \$462 million related to Hurricane Katrina, including estimated net losses of \$403 million and net reinsurance reinstatement premium costs of \$59 million.

Total net premiums written decreased by 1% in 2007 and 3% in 2006. Net premiums written in our insurance business increased 1% in 2007 and 2% in 2006. The low growth in our insurance business in both years reflected our continued emphasis on underwriting discipline in an increasingly competitive market environment. In the reinsurance assumed business, net premiums written decreased 65% in 2007 and 57% in 2006, reflecting our sale of the ongoing business to Harbor Point Limited in December 2005.

During 2007, we experienced overall favorable development of \$697 million on loss reserves established as of the previous year end, due primarily to favorable loss trends in recent years in the professional liability classes, lower than expected emergence of losses in the homeowners and commercial property classes and better than expected reported loss activity in the run-off of our reinsurance assumed business. During 2006, we experienced overall favorable development of \$296 million due primarily to lower than expected emergence of losses in the homeowners and commercial property classes. During 2005, we experienced overall unfavorable development of \$163 million due to adverse development in the professional liability and commercial liability classes offset in part by favorable development in the homeowners and commercial property classes.

Property and casualty investment income after tax increased by 9% in 2007 and 10% in 2006. The growth was due to an increase in invested assets over the period. For more information on this non-GAAP financial measure, see Property and Casualty Insurance Investment Results.

Table of Contents

A summary of our consolidated net income is as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Property and casualty insurance | \$3,712 | \$3,369 | \$2,235 |
| Corporate and other | (149) | (89) | (172) |
| Realized investment gains | 374 | 245 | 384 |
| Consolidated income before income tax | 3,937 | 3,525 | 2,447 |
| Federal and foreign income tax | 1,130 | 997 | 621 |
| Consolidated net income | \$2,807 | \$2,528 | \$1,826 |

PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE

A summary of the results of operations of our property and casualty insurance business is as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Underwriting | | | |
| Net premiums written | \$11,872 | \$11,974 | \$12,283 |
| Decrease (increase) in unearned premiums | 74 | (16) | (107) |
| Premiums earned | 11,946 | 11,958 | 12,176 |
| Losses and loss expenses | 6,299 | 6,574 | 7,813 |
| Operating costs and expenses | 3,564 | 3,467 | 3,436 |
| Increase in deferred policy acquisition costs | (52) | (19) | (17) |
| Dividends to policyholders | 19 | 31 | 23 |
| Underwriting income | 2,116 | 1,905 | 921 |
| Investments | | | |
| Investment income before expenses | 1,622 | 1,485 | 1,342 |
| Investment expenses | 32 | 31 | 27 |
| Investment income | 1,590 | 1,454 | 1,315 |
| Other income (charges) | 6 | 10 | (1) |
| Property and casualty income before tax | \$ 3,712 | \$ 3,369 | \$ 2,235 |
| Property and casualty investment income after tax | \$ 1,273 | \$ 1,166 | \$ 1,056 |

Property and casualty income before tax in 2007 was higher than in 2006 which, in turn, was substantially higher than in 2005. Income in each year, but more so in 2007 and 2006, benefited from highly profitable underwriting results. Underwriting income in 2007 was higher than in 2006, particularly in our specialty insurance business unit. Underwriting income in 2006 was substantially higher than in 2005, due largely to significantly lower catastrophe losses, particularly in our commercial insurance business unit, as well as improvement in our specialty insurance business unit. Results in 2007 and 2006 also benefited from significant increases in investment income due to an increase in invested assets in both years.

Table of Contents

The profitability of our property and casualty insurance business depends on the results of both our underwriting and investment operations. We view these as two distinct operations since the underwriting functions are managed separately from the investment function. Accordingly, in assessing our performance, we evaluate underwriting results separately from investment results.

Underwriting Operations**Underwriting Results**

We evaluate the underwriting results of our property and casualty insurance business in the aggregate and also for each of our separate business units.

Net Premiums Written

Net premiums written amounted to \$11.9 billion in 2007, a decrease of 1% compared with 2006. Net premiums written in 2006 decreased 3% compared with 2005. In both years, a slight increase in premiums from our insurance business was more than offset by a substantial decline in premiums from our reinsurance assumed business.

Net premiums written by business unit were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|-----------------|
| | 2007 | % Increase (Decrease) 2007 vs. 2006 | 2006 | % Increase (Decrease) 2006 vs. 2005 | 2005 |
| | (dollars in millions) | | | | |
| Personal insurance | \$ 3,709 | 5% | \$ 3,518 | 6% | \$ 3,307 |
| Commercial insurance | 5,083 | (1) | 5,125 | 2 | 5,030 |
| Specialty insurance | 2,944 | | 2,941 | (3) | 3,042 |
| Total insurance | 11,736 | 1 | 11,584 | 2 | 11,379 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 136 | (65) | 390 | (57) | 904 |
| Total | \$11,872 | (1) | \$11,974 | (3) | \$12,283 |

Net premiums written from our insurance business grew 1% in 2007 and 2% in 2006. Premiums in 2005 were reduced by reinsurance reinstatement premium costs of \$102 million related to Hurricane Katrina. Premiums in 2006 benefited from a \$20 million reduction of previously accrued reinsurance reinstatement premium costs. Premiums in the United States, which represent about 75% of our insurance premiums, decreased 1% in 2007 and increased 1% in 2006. Insurance premiums outside the U.S. grew 10% in 2007 and 4% in 2006. In both years, such growth was 3% when measured in local currencies.

The slight overall growth in net written premiums in our insurance business in both 2007 and 2006 reflected our continued emphasis on underwriting discipline in an increasingly competitive market environment. Rates were under competitive pressure that varied by class of business and geographic area. In both years, we retained a high percentage of our existing customers and renewed these accounts at prices we believe to be appropriate relative to the exposure. In addition, while we continued to be selective, we found opportunities to write new business at acceptable rates; however, we saw fewer such opportunities as 2007 progressed. We expect the competitive market environment to continue in 2008. We expect that overall premiums in our insurance business will be flat to modestly down in 2008 compared with 2007, with a modest increase for personal insurance and modest decreases for both commercial insurance and specialty insurance.

Net reinsurance assumed premiums written decreased by 65% in 2007 and 57% in 2006. Premiums in 2005 included net reinstatement premium revenue of \$43 million related to Hurricane Katrina. The significant premium

decline reflects the sale of our ongoing reinsurance assumed business to Harbor Point Limited in December 2005, which is discussed below.

Table of Contents***Reinsurance Ceded***

Our premiums written are net of amounts ceded to reinsurers who assume a portion of the risk under the insurance policies we write that are subject to the reinsurance.

As a result of the substantial losses incurred by reinsurers from the catastrophes in 2004 and 2005, the cost of property catastrophe reinsurance increased significantly in 2006 and there were capacity restrictions in the marketplace.

Although property catastrophe reinsurance rates increased in 2006, our overall ceded reinsurance premiums for our insurance business, excluding the impact of reinstatement premiums related to Hurricane Katrina, were only modestly higher than in 2005 due to modifications to certain of our reinsurance treaties. On our casualty clash treaty, our initial retention remained at \$75 million. We reduced our reinsurance coverage at the top of the program by \$50 million and increased our participation in the program. On our commercial property per risk treaty, we increased our retention from \$15 million to \$25 million. Our property catastrophe treaty for events in the United States was modified to increase our initial retention from \$250 million to \$350 million and to increase our participation in the program. At the same time, we increased the insurance coverage in the northeastern part of the country by \$400 million. Our property catastrophe treaty for events outside the United States was modified to increase our initial retention from \$50 million to \$75 million.

Reinsurance rates generally remained steady in 2007, due in part to a relatively low level of catastrophes in 2006. However, capacity restrictions continued in some segments of the marketplace. Our overall reinsurance costs in 2007 were similar to those in 2006.

We did not renew our casualty clash treaty in 2007 as we believed the cost was not justified given the limited capacity and terms available. The treaty had provided coverage of approximately 55% of losses between \$75 million and \$150 million per insured event.

On our commercial property per risk treaty, we increased the reinsurance coverage at the top of the program by \$100 million. This treaty now provides approximately \$500 million of coverage per risk in excess of our \$25 million retention.

The structure of our property catastrophe program for events in the United States was modified in 2007 but the overall coverage is similar to the previous program. The principal catastrophe treaty provides coverage of approximately 70% of losses (net of recoveries from other available reinsurance) between \$350 million and \$1.3 billion, with additional coverage of 55% of losses between \$1.3 billion and \$2.05 billion in the northeastern part of the country, where we have our greatest concentration of catastrophe exposure.

We also purchased in April 2007 fully collateralized four-year reinsurance coverage for homeowners-related losses sustained from qualifying hurricane loss events in the northeastern part of the United States. This reinsurance was purchased from East Lane Re Ltd., a Cayman Islands reinsurance company, which financed the provision of reinsurance through the issuance of \$250 million in catastrophe bonds to investors under two separate bond tranches. This reinsurance provides coverage of approximately 30% of covered losses between \$1.3 billion and \$2.05 billion.

We purchased additional reinsurance from the Florida Hurricane Catastrophe Fund, which is a state-mandated fund designed to reimburse insurers for a portion of their residential catastrophic hurricane losses. Our participation in the Fund limits our initial retention in Florida for homeowners related losses to approximately \$150 million.

Our property catastrophe treaty for events outside the United States was renewed in 2007 with no modification of its terms. The treaty provides coverage of approximately 90% of losses (net of recoveries from other available reinsurance) between \$75 million and \$275 million.

Table of Contents

Our property reinsurance treaties generally contain limitations on the losses that we can recover relating to acts of terrorism, depending on the geographic location where the act is committed and the class of business affected.

We do not expect the changes we made to our reinsurance program during 2006 and 2007 to have a material effect on the Corporation's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

Most of our ceded reinsurance arrangements consist of excess of loss and catastrophe contracts that protect against a specified part or all of certain types of losses over stipulated amounts arising from any one occurrence or event. Therefore, unless we incur losses that exceed our initial retention under these contracts, we do not receive any loss recoveries. As a result, in certain years, we cede premiums to other insurance companies and receive few, if any, loss recoveries. However, in a year in which there is a significant catastrophic event (such as Hurricane Katrina) or a series of large individual losses, we may receive substantial loss recoveries. The impact of ceded reinsurance on net premiums written and earned and on net losses and loss expenses incurred for the three years ended December 31, 2007 is presented in Note (11) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Our property reinsurance treaties expire on April 1, 2008. While we expect that reinsurance rates for property risks will decline somewhat in 2008, the final structure of our program and amount of coverage purchased will be determinants of our ceded reinsurance premium cost in 2008. We expect that the availability of reinsurance for certain coverages, such as terrorism, will continue to be very limited in 2008.

Profitability

The combined loss and expense ratio, expressed as a percentage, is the key measure of underwriting profitability traditionally used in the property and casualty insurance business. Management evaluates the performance of our underwriting operations and of each of our business units using, among other measures, the combined loss and expense ratio calculated in accordance with statutory accounting principles. It is the sum of the ratio of losses and loss expenses to premiums earned (loss ratio) plus the ratio of statutory underwriting expenses to premiums written (expense ratio) after reducing both premium amounts by dividends to policyholders. When the combined ratio is under 100%, underwriting results are generally considered profitable; when the combined ratio is over 100%, underwriting results are generally considered unprofitable.

Statutory accounting principles applicable to property and casualty insurance companies differ in certain respects from generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). Under statutory accounting principles, policy acquisition and other underwriting expenses are recognized immediately, not at the time premiums are earned. Management uses underwriting results determined in accordance with GAAP, among other measures, to assess the overall performance of our underwriting operations. To convert statutory underwriting results to a GAAP basis, policy acquisition expenses are deferred and amortized over the period in which the related premiums are earned. Underwriting income determined in accordance with GAAP is defined as premiums earned less losses and loss expenses incurred and GAAP underwriting expenses incurred.

Underwriting results were significantly more profitable in 2007 and 2006 compared with 2005. The combined loss and expense ratio for our overall property and casualty business was as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Loss ratio | 52.8% | 55.2% | 64.3% |
| Expense ratio | 30.1 | 29.0 | 28.0 |
| Combined loss and expense ratio | 82.9% | 84.2% | 92.3% |

Table of Contents

The loss ratio improved in 2006 and again in 2007, reflecting the favorable loss experience which we believe resulted from our disciplined underwriting in recent years as well as relatively mild loss trends in certain classes of business. The loss ratio in 2005 was adversely affected by higher catastrophe losses, primarily from Hurricane Katrina.

In 2007, net catastrophe losses incurred were \$363 million, which represented 3.0 percentage points of the loss ratio. Net catastrophe losses incurred in 2006 were \$173 million, which were offset in part by a \$20 million reduction in previously accrued reinsurance reinstatement premium costs related to Hurricane Katrina. The net impact of catastrophes in 2006 accounted for 1.4 percentage points of the loss ratio. In 2005, we incurred \$630 million of net catastrophe losses and \$59 million in related net reinsurance reinstatement premium costs, which in the aggregate accounted for 5.6 percentage points of the loss ratio. The reinsurance reinstatement premium costs and a substantial portion of the catastrophe losses in 2005 related to Hurricane Katrina.

At the end of 2005, we estimated that our net losses from Hurricane Katrina were \$403 million and our net reinsurance reinstatement premium costs related to the hurricane were \$59 million. In our insurance business, estimated net losses were \$335 million and reinstatement premium costs were \$102 million, for an aggregate cost of \$437 million. In our reinsurance assumed business, estimated net losses were \$68 million and net reinstatement premium revenue was \$43 million, for a net cost of \$25 million. We estimated that our gross losses from Hurricane Katrina were about \$1.2 billion. Almost all of the losses were from property exposure and business interruption claims. Our net losses of \$403 million were significantly lower than the gross amount due to a property per risk treaty that limited our net loss per risk and our property catastrophe treaty.

During 2006, a large percentage of our claims from Hurricane Katrina were settled. As a result, there were many adjustments, both favorable and unfavorable, to our loss estimates for individual claims related to this event. These adjustments produced a reduction in our estimates for gross losses and reinsurance recoverable of \$190 million and \$175 million, respectively, as well as a \$20 million reduction of previously accrued reinsurance reinstatement premium costs.

Other than the reinsurance recoverable related to Hurricane Katrina, we did not have any recoveries from our catastrophe reinsurance treaties during the three year period ended December 31, 2007 because there were no other individual catastrophes for which our losses exceeded our initial retention under the treaties.

Our expense ratio increased in both 2007 and 2006. The increase in 2007 was due primarily to higher commissions, largely the result of premium growth outside the United States in certain classes of business for which commission rates are high. The increase in 2006 was due to a decrease in net premiums written whereas compensation and other operating costs increased.

In lieu of paying contingent commissions, beginning in 2007, we implemented a new guaranteed supplemental compensation program for agents and brokers in the United States with whom we previously had contingent commission agreements. Under this arrangement, agents and brokers are paid a percentage of written premiums on eligible lines of business in a calendar year based upon their prior performance. The total guaranteed supplemental compensation payout for 2007 will be substantially the same as the contingent commission payout for 2006. However, the change in our commission arrangements created a difference in the timing of expense recognition, which resulted in a one-time benefit to income during the 2007 transition year. The impact of the change in 2007 was to increase deferred policy acquisition costs by approximately \$70 million. The change had no effect on the expense ratio.

Table of Contents**Review of Underwriting Results by Business Unit****Personal Insurance**

Net premiums written from personal insurance, which represented 31% of our premiums written in 2007, increased by 5% in 2007 and 6% in 2006. Net premiums written for the classes of business within the personal insurance segment were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|-------------|
| | 2007 | % Increase 2007 vs. 2006 | 2006 | % Increase 2006 vs. 2005 | 2005 |
| | (dollars in millions) | | | | |
| Automobile | \$ 621 | (7)% | \$ 670 | 4% | \$ 645 |
| Homeowners | 2,423 | 7 | 2,268 | 8 | 2,104 |
| Other | 665 | 15 | 580 | 4 | 558 |
| Total personal | \$3,709 | 5 | \$3,518 | 6 | \$3,307 |

Personal automobile premiums in the U.S. decreased in 2007 and 2006 due to an increasingly competitive marketplace. The termination of a collector vehicle program also contributed to the decrease in 2007. The overall growth in personal automobile premiums in 2006 was due to selective initiatives outside the United States. The growth in our homeowners business in both years was due primarily to increased insurance-to-value. The in-force policy count for this class of business was relatively flat over the period. Homeowners premiums in 2005 were reduced by reinsurance reinstatement premium costs of \$17 million related to Hurricane Katrina. Our other personal business includes insurance for excess liability, yacht and accident coverages. The substantial growth in this business in 2007 was due primarily to a significant increase in accident premiums, particularly outside the United States. Excess liability premiums also grew, due in part to a modest increase in rates.

Our personal insurance business produced highly profitable underwriting results in each of the last three years. The combined loss and expense ratios for the classes of business within the personal insurance segment were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|----------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Automobile | 89.8% | 90.4% | 95.3% |
| Homeowners | 80.2 | 74.6 | 81.2 |
| Other | 96.4 | 98.6 | 96.2 |
| Total personal | 84.8% | 81.7% | 86.6% |

Our personal automobile results were profitable in each of the past three years. Results in 2007 and 2006 were more profitable than in 2005 due to lower claim frequency and modest favorable prior year loss development.

Homeowners results were highly profitable in each of the last three years. Results in all three years reflected adequate pricing and a reduction in water damage losses primarily as a result of policy wording changes related to mold coverage and loss remediation measures that we have implemented over the past several years. Results in 2006 benefited from lower catastrophe losses. The impact of catastrophes accounted for 9.6 percentage points of the combined loss and expense ratio for this class in 2007 compared with 5.7 percentage points in 2006 and 9.8 percentage points in 2005.

Other personal business produced modestly profitable results in each of the past three years. Our accident business was highly profitable in all three years. Our yacht business was profitable in 2007 and 2006 compared with unprofitable results in 2005. Our excess liability business was unprofitable in each of the past three years, but more so in 2006, due to inadequate pricing and unfavorable prior year loss development.

Table of Contents**Commercial Insurance**

Net premiums written from commercial insurance, which represented 43% of our premiums written in 2007, decreased by 1% in 2007 and increased by 2% in 2006. Net premiums written for the classes of business within the commercial insurance segment were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| | 2007 | % Increase (Decrease) 2007 vs. 2006 | 2006 | % Increase (Decrease) 2006 vs. 2005 | 2005 |
| | (dollars in millions) | | | | |
| Multiple peril | \$1,252 | (3)% | \$1,290 | % | \$1,286 |
| Casualty | 1,726 | | 1,731 | (1) | 1,755 |
| Workers compensation | 890 | (1) | 901 | (3) | 930 |
| Property and marine | 1,215 | 1 | 1,203 | 14 | 1,059 |
| Total commercial | \$5,083 | (1) | \$5,125 | 2 | \$5,030 |

Growth in our commercial classes in 2007 and 2006 was constrained due to an increasingly competitive marketplace. In 2006, renewal rates were generally stable but were under competitive pressure in some classes of business, particularly non-catastrophe exposed property risks and certain casualty risks. During 2007, rates were down modestly. Certain classes of business and geographic areas, such as non-catastrophe exposed property risks and large company risks, experienced more competitive pressure than others. Rate pressure increased in the second half of the year across all classes of business, particularly for new business. Multiple peril and property and marine premiums in 2005 were reduced by reinsurance reinstatement premium costs of \$19 million and \$66 million, respectively, related to Hurricane Katrina. In 2006, property and marine premiums benefited from a \$20 million reduction of previously accrued reinsurance reinstatement premium costs. Excluding the reinsurance reinstatement premiums, multiple peril premiums declined 1% and property and marine premiums grew 5% in 2006 compared with the prior year.

Retention levels of our existing customers remained steady over the last three years. New business volume was slightly higher in 2006 and again in 2007 compared with the respective prior years. The increase in 2006 came from business outside the U.S. The increase in 2007 was due to a few large accounts written in the first half of the year. New business volume in the second half of 2007 was down as it became more difficult to find new opportunities at acceptable rates.

We have continued to maintain our underwriting discipline in the more competitive market, renewing business and writing new business only where we believe we are securing acceptable rates and appropriate terms and conditions for the exposures.

Our commercial insurance business produced profitable underwriting results in each of the past three years, particularly in 2007 and 2006. Results in all three years benefited from better terms and conditions and disciplined risk selection in recent years as well as low non-catastrophe property losses. Results in 2005 were less profitable than in 2007 and 2006, largely due to substantially higher catastrophe losses, primarily from Hurricane Katrina. The impact of catastrophes accounted for 8.3 percentage points of the combined loss and expense ratio for our commercial insurance business in 2005 whereas such impact was 2.6 percentage points in 2007 and negligible in 2006.

Table of Contents

The combined loss and expense ratios for the classes of business within commercial insurance were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Multiple peril | 80.8% | 75.8% | 87.8% |
| Casualty | 94.6 | 96.8 | 96.1 |
| Workers compensation | 77.6 | 80.4 | 84.8 |
| Property and marine | 84.3 | 72.5 | 98.8 |
| Total commercial | 85.8% | 83.1% | 92.4% |

Multiple peril results were highly profitable in each of the past three years. Results in 2005 were less profitable than in 2007 and 2006, largely due to higher catastrophe losses. The impact of catastrophes accounted for 1.7 percentage points of the combined loss and expense ratio for this class in 2007 compared with 2.9 percentage points in 2006 and 9.1 percentage points in 2005. The property component of this business benefited from low non-catastrophe losses in all three years. Results in the liability component were profitable in all three years, particularly in 2006.

Results for our casualty business were similarly profitable in each of the past three years. The automobile component of our casualty business deteriorated somewhat in 2007 but remained highly profitable. Results in the primary liability component were highly profitable in 2007 compared with marginally profitable results in 2006 and profitable results in 2005. Results in the excess liability component were profitable in 2007 compared with unprofitable results in 2006 and 2005. Excess liability results in 2007 benefited from favorable prior year loss development, whereas results in 2006 and 2005 were adversely affected by unfavorable loss development related to older accident years. Casualty results in 2007 were adversely affected by incurred losses related to asbestos and toxic waste claims. Our analysis of these exposures resulted in an increase in our estimate of the ultimate liabilities for a small number of our insureds. Such losses represented 5.3 percentage points of the combined loss and expense ratio for this class in 2007. The impact of such losses was not significant in 2006 or 2005.

Workers compensation results were highly profitable in each of the past three years. Results were more profitable in each succeeding year due to favorable claim cost trends, resulting in part from the positive effect of reforms in California. Results in all three years benefited from our disciplined risk selection during the past several years.

Property and marine results were highly profitable in 2007 and 2006 compared with marginally profitable results in 2005. The less profitable results in 2005 were due to catastrophe losses, primarily from Hurricane Katrina. Catastrophes accounted for 8.2 percentage points of the combined loss and expense ratio in 2007 and 27.2 percentage points in 2005. The impact of catastrophes was negligible in 2006. Excluding the impact of catastrophes, the combined ratio was 76.1%, 73.4% and 71.6% in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. Results in each year benefited from relatively few large non-catastrophe losses.

Table of Contents***Specialty Insurance***

Net premiums written from specialty insurance, which represented 25% of our premiums written in 2007, were flat in 2007 and decreased by 3% in 2006 compared with the respective prior years. Net premiums written for the classes of business within the specialty insurance segment were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------|--|----------------|
| | 2007 | % Increase (Decrease) 2007 vs. 2006 | 2006 | % Increase (Decrease) 2006 vs. 2005 | 2005 |
| | (dollars in millions) | | | | |
| Professional liability | \$2,605 | (1)% | \$2,641 | (6)% | \$2,798 |
| Surety | 339 | 13 | 300 | 23 | 244 |
| Total specialty | \$2,944 | | \$2,941 | (3) | \$3,042 |

The decline of premiums in 2007 and 2006 for the professional liability classes of business was due to the increasingly competitive pressure on rates, particularly in the directors and officers liability component, and our commitment to maintain underwriting discipline in this environment. The decline in premiums in 2006 was exacerbated by the sale of renewal rights, effective July 1, 2005, on our hospital medical malpractice and managed care errors and omissions business.

Renewal rates for the directors and officers liability class of business were down in 2006 and again in 2007. Rates for professional liability classes other than directors and officers liability, which were generally stable in 2006, trended downward in 2007. Retention levels remained strong over the last three years. New business volume declined in each of the past two years due to the increased competition in the marketplace. We continued to get what we believe are acceptable rates and appropriate terms and conditions on both new business and renewals. In line with our strategy in recent years of directing our focus to small and middle market publicly traded and privately held companies, the percentage of our book of business represented by large public companies has continued to decrease.

The growth in net premiums written for our surety business was substantial in both 2007 and 2006. About half of the growth in 2006 was due to the non-renewal of a high excess reinsurance treaty during 2005. Growth in 2007 was due primarily to a strong public sector construction economy. However, growth slowed as the year progressed due in part to a more competitive rate environment. We expect the increasingly competitive market to continue in 2008.

Our specialty insurance business produced profitable underwriting results in each of the last three years. Results were significantly more profitable in each succeeding year. The combined loss and expense ratios for the classes of business within specialty insurance were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Professional liability | 82.4% | 91.8% | 99.8% |
| Surety | 35.4 | 44.2 | 62.9 |
| Total specialty | 77.4% | 87.5% | 97.3% |

Results for our professional liability business improved substantially in 2006 and again in 2007, producing highly profitable results in 2007 compared with profitable results in 2006 and near breakeven results in 2005. The fidelity class was highly profitable in each of the past three years due to favorable loss experience. The results of the directors and officers liability, errors and omissions liability and fiduciary liability classes improved in 2006 and again in 2007. Results in 2007 and, to a much lesser extent, 2006 benefited from favorable prior year loss development due to the recognition of the increasingly favorable loss trends we have been experiencing in recent years. These trends were largely the result of a favorable business climate in recent years, lower policy limits and better terms

Table of Contents

and conditions. Conversely, results in 2005 were adversely affected by unfavorable loss development related to accident years prior to 2003. This adverse development was predominantly from claims relating to corporate failures and allegations of management misconduct and accounting irregularities. For more information on prior year loss development, see *Property and Casualty Insurance Loss Reserves, Prior Year Loss Development*.

Our surety business produced highly profitable results in each of the past three years due to favorable loss experience. This business tends to be characterized by infrequent but potentially high severity losses. When losses occur, they are mitigated, at times, by recovery rights to the customer's assets, contract payments, collateral and bankruptcy recoveries.

The majority of our surety obligations are intended to be performance-based guarantees. We manage our exposure on an absolute basis and by specific bond type. We have substantial commercial and construction surety exposure for current and prior customers, including exposures related to surety bonds issued on behalf of companies that have experienced deterioration in creditworthiness since we issued bonds to them. We therefore may experience an increase in filed claims and may incur high severity losses. Such losses would be recognized if and when claims are filed and determined to be valid, and could have a material adverse effect on the Corporation's results of operations.

Reinsurance Assumed

In December 2005, we completed a transaction involving a new Bermuda-based reinsurance company, Harbor Point Limited. As part of the transaction, we transferred our ongoing reinsurance assumed business and certain related assets, including renewal rights, to Harbor Point. Harbor Point generally did not assume our reinsurance liabilities relating to reinsurance contracts incepting prior to December 31, 2005. We retained those liabilities and the related assets.

For a transition period of about two years, Harbor Point underwrote specific reinsurance business on our behalf. We retained a portion of this business and ceded the balance to Harbor Point in return for a fronting commission. We receive additional payments based on the amount of business renewed by Harbor Point. These amounts are being recognized in income as earned.

Net premiums written from our reinsurance assumed business, which represented 1% of our premiums written in 2007, decreased by 65% in 2007 and 57% in 2006. The significant decrease in premiums in both years was expected in light of the sale of our ongoing reinsurance assumed business to Harbor Point. Premiums in 2005 included net reinsurance reinstatement premium revenue of \$43 million related to Hurricane Katrina.

Reinsurance assumed results were profitable in each of the past three years, particularly in 2007 and 2006. While the volume of business declined substantially in each of the past two years, results in both years benefited from significant favorable prior year loss development. Results in 2005 were adversely affected by catastrophe losses related to Hurricane Katrina.

Regulatory Developments

To promote and distribute our insurance products, we rely on independent brokers and agents. Accordingly, our business is dependent on the willingness of these brokers and agents to recommend our products to their customers. Prior to 2007, we had agreements in place with certain insurance agents and brokers under which, in addition to the standard commissions that we pay, we agreed to pay commissions that were contingent on the volume and/or the profitability of business placed with us.

We have been involved in the investigations of certain business practices in the property and casualty insurance industry by various Attorneys General and other regulatory authorities of several states, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and certain non-U.S. regulatory authorities with respect to, among other things, (1) potential conflicts of interest and anti-competitive behavior arising from the payment of contingent commissions to brokers and agents and (2) loss mitigation and finite reinsurance arrangements. In

Table of Contents

connection with these investigations, we received subpoenas and other requests for information from various regulators. We have been cooperating fully with these investigations.

In December 2006, we settled with the Attorneys General of New York, Connecticut and Illinois all issues arising out of their investigations. As part of this settlement, we agreed to implement certain business reforms, including discontinuing the payment of contingent commissions in the United States on all insurance lines beginning in 2007.

In August 2007, the Attorney General of Ohio filed an action against us, as well as several other insurers and one broker, as a result of the Ohio Attorney General's business practices investigation.

Although no other Attorney General or regulator has initiated an action against us, it is possible that such an action may be brought against us with respect to some or all of the issues that are the focus of the ongoing investigations described above.

Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries have been named in various legal proceedings brought by private plaintiffs arising out of these investigations. These legal proceedings and the litigation brought by the Ohio Attorney General referred to above are further described in Note (15) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

We cannot predict at this time the ultimate outcome of the ongoing investigations and legal proceedings referred to above, including any potential amounts that we may be required to pay in connection with them. Nevertheless, management believes that it is likely that the outcome will not have a material adverse effect on the Corporation's results of operations or financial condition.

Catastrophe Risk Management

Our property and casualty subsidiaries have exposure to losses caused by natural perils such as hurricanes and other windstorms, earthquakes, severe winter weather and brush fires and from man-made catastrophic events such as terrorism. The frequency and severity of catastrophes are inherently unpredictable.

Natural Catastrophes

The extent of losses from a natural catastrophe is a function of both the total amount of insured exposure in an area affected by the event and the severity of the event. We regularly assess our concentration of risk exposures in catastrophe exposed areas globally and have strategies and underwriting standards to manage this exposure through individual risk selection, subject to regulatory constraints, and through the purchase of catastrophe reinsurance. We have invested in modeling technologies and a risk concentration management tool that allow us to monitor and control our accumulations of potential losses in catastrophe exposed areas in the United States, such as California and the gulf and east coasts, as well as in such areas in other countries. Actual results may differ materially from those suggested by the model. We also continue to actively explore and analyze credible scientific evidence, including the impact of global climate change, that may affect our ability to manage exposure under the insurance policies we issue.

Despite these efforts, the occurrence of one or more severe natural catastrophic events in heavily populated areas could have a material adverse effect on the Corporation's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

Terrorism Risk and Legislation

The September 11, 2001 attack changed the way the property and casualty insurance industry views catastrophic risk. That tragic event demonstrated that numerous classes of business we write are subject to terrorism related catastrophic risks in addition to the catastrophic risks related to natural occurrences. This, together with the limited availability of terrorism reinsurance, has required us to change how we identify and evaluate risk accumulations. We have licensed a terrorism model that

Table of Contents

provides loss estimates under numerous event scenarios. Also, the above noted risk concentration management tool enables us to identify locations and geographic areas that are exposed to risk accumulations. The information provided by the model and the tracking tool has resulted in our non-renewing some accounts and has restricted us from writing others. Actual results may differ materially from those suggested by the model.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (TRIA) established a temporary program under which the federal government will share the risk of loss arising from certain acts of foreign terrorism with the insurance industry. The program, which was applicable to most lines of commercial business, was scheduled to terminate on December 31, 2005. In December 2005, TRIA was extended through December 31, 2007. Certain lines of business previously subject to the provisions of TRIA, including commercial automobile, surety and professional liability insurance, other than directors and officers liability, were excluded from the program. In December 2007, TRIA was extended through December 31, 2014. The amended law eliminated the distinction between foreign and domestic acts of terrorism, now providing protection from all acts of terrorism. Otherwise, there were no significant changes to the key features of the program.

As a precondition to recovery under TRIA, insurance companies with direct commercial insurance exposure in the United States for TRIA lines of business are required to make insurance for covered acts of terrorism available under their policies. Each insurer has a separate deductible that it must meet in the event of an act of terrorism before federal assistance becomes available. The deductible is based on a percentage of direct U.S. earned premiums for the covered lines of business in the previous calendar year. For 2008, that deductible is 20% of direct premiums earned in 2007 for these lines of business. For losses above the deductible, the federal government will pay for 85% of covered losses, while the insurer retains 15%. There is a combined annual aggregate limit for the federal government and all insurers of \$100 billion. If acts of terrorism result in covered losses exceeding the \$100 billion annual limit, insurers are not liable for additional losses. While the provisions of TRIA will serve to mitigate our exposure in the event of a large-scale terrorist attack, our deductible is substantial, approximating \$1 billion in 2008.

For certain classes of business, such as workers compensation, terrorism insurance is mandatory. For those classes of business where it is not mandatory, policyholders may choose not to accept terrorism insurance, which would, subject to other statutory or regulatory restrictions, reduce our exposure.

We will continue to manage this type of catastrophic risk by monitoring terrorism risk aggregations. Nevertheless, given the unpredictability of the targets, frequency and severity of potential terrorist events as well as the very limited terrorism reinsurance coverage available in the market, the occurrence of any such events could have a material adverse effect on the Corporation's results of operations, financial condition or liquidity.

We also have exposure outside the United States to risk of loss from acts of terrorism. In some jurisdictions, we have access to government mechanisms that would mitigate our exposure.

Table of Contents**Loss Reserves**

Unpaid losses and loss expenses, also referred to as loss reserves, are the largest liability of our property and casualty subsidiaries.

Our loss reserves include case estimates for claims that have been reported and estimates for claims that have been incurred but not reported at the balance sheet date as well as estimates of the expenses associated with processing and settling all reported and unreported claims, less estimates of anticipated salvage and subrogation recoveries. Estimates are based upon past loss experience modified for current trends as well as prevailing economic, legal and social conditions. Our loss reserves are not discounted to present value.

We regularly review our loss reserves using a variety of actuarial techniques. We update the reserve estimates as historical loss experience develops, additional claims are reported and/or settled and new information becomes available. Any changes in estimates are reflected in operating results in the period in which the estimates are changed.

Incurred but not reported (IBNR) reserves represent the difference between the estimated ultimate cost of all claims that have occurred and the reported losses and loss expenses. Reported losses include cumulative paid losses and loss expenses plus case reserves. The IBNR reserve includes a provision for claims that have occurred but have not yet been reported to us, some of which are not yet known to the insured, as well as a provision for future development on reported claims. A relatively large proportion of our net loss reserves, particularly for long tail liability classes, are reserves for IBNR losses. In fact, more than 65% of our aggregate net loss reserves at December 31, 2007 were for IBNR losses.

Our gross case and IBNR loss reserves and related reinsurance recoverable by class of business were as follows:

| December 31, 2007 | Gross Loss Reserves | | | Reinsurance Recoverable | Net Loss Reserves |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | Case | IBNR | Total | | |
| | (in millions) | | | | |
| Personal insurance | | | | | |
| Automobile | \$ 226 | \$ 200 | \$ 426 | \$ 15 | \$ 411 |
| Homeowners | 432 | 305 | 737 | 32 | 705 |
| Other | 452 | 526 | 978 | 230 | 748 |
| Total personal | 1,110 | 1,031 | 2,141 | 277 | 1,864 |
| Commercial insurance | | | | | |
| Multiple peril | 646 | 1,010 | 1,656 | 37 | 1,619 |
| Casualty | 1,640 | 4,302 | 5,942 | 402 | 5,540 |
| Workers compensation | 842 | 1,323 | 2,165 | 255 | 1,910 |
| Property and marine | 814 | 395 | 1,209 | 532 | 677 |
| Total commercial | 3,942 | 7,030 | 10,972 | 1,226 | 9,746 |
| Specialty insurance | | | | | |
| Professional liability | 2,079 | 5,999 | 8,078 | 552 | 7,526 |
| Surety | 33 | 52 | 85 | 14 | 71 |
| Total specialty | 2,112 | 6,051 | 8,163 | 566 | 7,597 |
| Total insurance | 7,164 | 14,112 | 21,276 | 2,069 | 19,207 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 400 | 947 | 1,347 | 238 | 1,109 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|---------|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Total | \$7,564 | \$15,059 | \$22,623 | \$2,307 | \$20,316 |
|-------|---------|----------|----------|---------|----------|

Table of Contents

| December 31, 2006 | Gross Loss Reserves | | | Reinsurance Recoverable | Net Loss Reserves |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | Case | IBNR | Total | | |
| (in millions) | | | | | |
| Personal insurance | | | | | |
| Automobile | \$ 261 | \$ 178 | \$ 439 | \$ 14 | \$ 425 |
| Homeowners | 421 | 298 | 719 | 54 | 665 |
| Other | 443 | 459 | 902 | 245 | 657 |
| Total personal | 1,125 | 935 | 2,060 | 313 | 1,747 |
| Commercial insurance | | | | | |
| Multiple peril | 702 | 965 | 1,667 | 74 | 1,593 |
| Casualty | 1,668 | 3,922 | 5,590 | 377 | 5,213 |
| Workers compensation | 827 | 1,223 | 2,050 | 310 | 1,740 |
| Property and marine | 821 | 393 | 1,214 | 536 | 678 |
| Total commercial | 4,018 | 6,503 | 10,521 | 1,297 | 9,224 |
| Specialty insurance | | | | | |
| Professional liability | 2,542 | 5,598 | 8,140 | 852 | 7,288 |
| Surety | 22 | 56 | 78 | 19 | 59 |
| Total specialty | 2,564 | 5,654 | 8,218 | 871 | 7,347 |
| Total insurance | 7,707 | 13,092 | 20,799 | 2,481 | 18,318 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 464 | 1,030 | 1,494 | 113 | 1,381 |
| Total | \$8,171 | \$14,122 | \$22,293 | \$2,594 | \$19,699 |

Loss reserves, net of reinsurance recoverable, increased by \$617 million or 3% in 2007. Loss reserves related to our insurance business increased by \$889 million, including approximately \$290 million related to currency fluctuation due to the weakness of the U.S. dollar. Loss reserves related to our reinsurance assumed business, which is in runoff, decreased by \$272 million.

Gross case reserves related to the professional liability classes decreased by \$463 million in 2007 due to generally low reported loss activity as well as settlements related to previously existing case reserves. The \$300 million decrease in reinsurance recoverable in the professional liability classes was due primarily to the discontinuation of the professional liability per risk treaty in 2005 and the settlement of claims related to years prior to 2005.

In establishing the loss reserves of our property and casualty subsidiaries, we consider facts currently known and the present state of the law and coverage litigation. Based on all information currently available, we believe that the aggregate loss reserves at December 31, 2007 were adequate to cover claims for losses that had occurred as of that date, including both those known to us and those yet to be reported. However, as described below, there are significant uncertainties inherent in the loss reserving process. It is therefore possible that management's estimate of the ultimate liability for losses that had occurred as of December 31, 2007 may change, which could have a material effect on the Corporation's results of operations and financial condition.

Estimates and Uncertainties

The process of establishing loss reserves is complex and imprecise as it must take into consideration many variables that are subject to the outcome of future events. As a result, informed subjective estimates and judgments as to our ultimate exposure to losses are an integral component of our loss reserving process.

Table of Contents

Due to the inherent complexity of the loss reserving process and the potential variability of the assumptions used, the actual emergence of losses could vary, perhaps substantially, from the estimate of losses included in our financial statements, particularly when settlements may not occur until well into the future. Our net loss reserves at December 31, 2007 were \$20.3 billion. Therefore, a relatively small percentage change in the estimate of net loss reserves would have a material effect on the Corporation's results of operations.

Reserves Other than Those Relating to Asbestos and Toxic Waste Claims. Our loss reserves include amounts related to short tail and long tail classes of business. Tail refers to the time period between the occurrence of a loss and the settlement of the claim. The longer the time span between the incidence of a loss and the settlement of the claim, the more the ultimate settlement amount can vary.

Short tail classes consist principally of homeowners, commercial property and marine business. For these classes, claims are generally reported and settled shortly after the loss occurs and the claims relate to tangible property. Consequently, the estimation of loss reserves for these classes is less complex.

Most of our loss reserves relate to long tail liability classes of business. Long tail classes include directors and officers liability, errors and omissions liability and other professional liability coverages, commercial primary and excess liability, workers' compensation and other liability coverages. For many liability claims significant periods of time, ranging up to several years or more, may elapse between the occurrence of the loss, the reporting of the loss to us and the settlement of the claim. As a result, loss experience in the more recent accident years for the long tail liability classes has limited statistical credibility because a relatively small proportion of losses in these accident years are reported claims and an even smaller proportion are paid losses. An accident year is the calendar year in which a loss is incurred or, in the case of claims-made policies, the calendar year in which a loss is reported. Liability claims are also more susceptible to litigation and can be significantly affected by changing contract interpretations and the legal environment. Consequently, the estimation of loss reserves for these classes is more complex and typically subject to a higher degree of variability than for short tail classes.

Most of our reinsurance assumed business is long tail casualty reinsurance. Reserve estimates for this business are therefore subject to the variability caused by extended loss emergence periods. The estimation of loss reserves for this business is further complicated by delays between the time the claim is reported to the ceding insurer and when it is reported by the ceding insurer to us and by our dependence on the quality and consistency of the loss reporting by the ceding company.

Our actuaries perform a comprehensive annual review of loss reserves for each of the numerous classes of business we write prior to the determination of the year end carried reserves. The review process takes into consideration the variety of trends that impact the ultimate settlement of claims in each particular class of business. A similar, but somewhat less comprehensive, review is performed for the major classes of business prior to the determination of the June 30 carried reserves. Prior to the determination of the March 30 and September 30 carried reserves, our actuaries review the emergence of paid and reported losses relative to expectations and, as necessary, conduct reserve reviews for particular classes of business.

The loss reserve estimation process relies on the basic assumption that past experience, adjusted for the effects of current developments and likely trends, is an appropriate basis for predicting future outcomes. As part of that process, our actuaries use a variety of actuarial methods that analyze experience, trends and other relevant factors. The principal standard actuarial methods used by our actuaries in the loss reserve reviews include loss development factor methods, expected loss ratio methods, Bornheutter-Ferguson methods and frequency/severity methods.

Loss development factor methods generally assume that the losses yet to emerge for an accident year are proportional to the paid or reported loss amount observed so far. Historical patterns of the

Table of Contents

development of paid and reported losses by accident year are applied to current paid and reported losses to generate estimated ultimate losses by accident year.

Expected loss ratio methods use loss ratios for prior accident years, adjusted to reflect our evaluation of recent loss trends, the current risk environment, changes in our book of business and changes in our pricing and underwriting, to determine the appropriate expected loss ratio for a given accident year. The expected loss ratio for each accident year is multiplied by the earned premiums for that year to calculate estimated ultimate losses.

Bornheutter-Ferguson methods are combinations of an expected loss ratio method and a loss development factor method, where the loss development factor method is given more weight as an accident year matures.

Frequency/severity methods first project ultimate claim counts (using one or more of the other methods described above) and then multiply those counts by an estimated average claim cost to calculate estimated ultimate losses. The average claim costs are often estimated by fitting historical severity data to an observed trend. Generally, these methods work best for high frequency, low severity classes of business.

In completing their loss reserve analysis, our actuaries are required to determine the most appropriate actuarial methods to employ for each class of business. Within each class, the business is further segregated by accident year and generally by jurisdiction. Each estimation method has its own pattern, parameter and/or judgmental dependencies, with no estimation method being better than the others in all situations. The relative strengths and weaknesses of the various estimation methods when applied to a particular class of business can also change over time, depending on the underlying circumstances. In many cases, multiple estimation methods will be valid for the particular facts and circumstances of the relevant class of business. The manner of application and the degree of reliance on a given method will vary by class of business, by accident year and by jurisdiction based on our actuaries' evaluation of the above dependencies and the potential volatility of the loss frequency and severity patterns. The estimation methods selected or given weight by our actuaries at a particular valuation date are those that are believed to produce the most reliable indication for the loss reserves being evaluated. These selections incorporate input from claims personnel, pricing actuaries and underwriting management on loss cost trends and other factors that could affect the reserve estimates.

For short tail classes, the emergence of paid and incurred losses generally exhibits a reasonably stable pattern of loss development from one accident year to the next. Thus, for these classes, the loss development factor method is generally relatively straightforward to apply and usually requires only modest extrapolation. For long tail classes, applying the loss development factor method often requires more judgment in selecting development factors as well as more significant extrapolation. For those long tail classes with high frequency and relatively low per-loss severity (e.g. workers' compensation), volatility will often be sufficiently modest for the loss development factor method to be given significant weight, except in the most recent accident years.

For certain long tail classes of business, however, anticipated loss experience is less predictable because of the small number of claims and erratic claim severity patterns. These classes include directors and officers liability, errors and omissions liability and commercial excess liability, among others. For these classes, the loss development factor methods may not produce a reliable estimate of ultimate losses in the most recent accident years since many claims either have not yet been reported to us or are only in the early stages of the settlement process. Therefore, the actuarial estimates for these accident years are based on less extrapolatory methods, such as expected loss ratio and Bornheutter-Ferguson methods. Over time, as a greater number of claims are reported and the statistical credibility of loss experience increases, loss development factor methods are given increasingly more weight.

Using all the available data, our actuaries select an indicated loss reserve amount for each class of business based on the various assumptions, projections and methods. The total indicated reserve

Table of Contents

amount determined by our actuaries is an aggregate of the indicated reserve amounts for the individual classes of business. The ultimate outcome is likely to fall within a range of potential outcomes around this indicated amount, but the indicated amount is not expected to be precisely the ultimate liability.

Senior management meets with our actuaries at the end of each quarter to review the results of the latest loss reserve analysis. Based on this review, management determines the carried reserve for each class of business. In making the determination, management considers numerous factors, such as changes in actuarial indications in the period, the maturity of the accident year, trends observed over the recent past and the level of volatility within a particular class of business. Such an assessment requires considerable judgment. It is often not possible to determine whether a change in the data represents credible actionable information or an anomaly. Even if a change is determined to be permanent, it is not always possible to determine the extent of the change until sometime later. As a result, there can be a time lag between the emergence of a change and a determination that the change should be reflected in the carried loss reserves. In general, changes are made more quickly to more mature accident years and less volatile classes of business.

Among the numerous factors that contribute to the inherent uncertainty in the process of establishing loss reserves are the following:

changes in the inflation rate for goods and services related to covered damages such as medical care and home repair costs,

changes in the judicial interpretation of policy provisions relating to the determination of coverage,

changes in the general attitude of juries in the determination of liability and damages,

legislative actions,

changes in the medical condition of claimants,

changes in our estimates of the number and/or severity of claims that have been incurred but not reported as of the date of the financial statements,

changes in our book of business,

changes in our underwriting standards, and

changes in our claim handling procedures.

In addition, we must consider the uncertain effects of emerging or potential claims and coverage issues that arise as legal, judicial and social conditions change. These issues have had, and may continue to have, a negative effect on our loss reserves by either extending coverage beyond the original underwriting intent or by increasing the number or size of claims. Recent examples of such issues include the number of directors and officers liability and errors and omissions liability claims arising out of the ongoing credit crisis, the number of directors and officers liability claims arising out of stock option backdating practices by certain public companies, the number and size of directors and officers liability and errors and omissions liability claims arising out of investment banking practices and accounting and other corporate malfeasance, and exposure to claims asserted for bodily injury as a result of long-term exposure to harmful products or substances. As a result of issues such as these, the uncertainties inherent in estimating ultimate claim costs on the basis of past experience have grown, further complicating the already complex loss reserving process.

As part of our loss reserving analysis, we take into consideration the various factors that contribute to the uncertainty in the loss reserving process. Those factors that could materially affect our loss reserve estimates include loss development patterns and loss cost trends, rate and exposure level changes, the effects of changes in coverage and

policy limits, business mix shifts, the effects of regulatory and legislative developments, the effects of changes in judicial interpretations, the effects of emerging claims and coverage issues and the effects of changes in claim

Table of Contents

handling practices. In making estimates of reserves, however, we do not necessarily make an explicit assumption for each of these factors. Moreover, all estimation methods do not utilize the same assumptions and typically no single method is determinative in the reserve analysis for a class of business. Consequently, changes in our loss reserve estimates generally are not the result of changes in any one assumption. Instead, the variability will be affected by the interplay of changes in numerous assumptions, many of which are implicit to the approaches used.

For each class of business, we regularly adjust the assumptions and actuarial methods used in the estimation of loss reserves in response to our actual loss experience as well as our judgments regarding changes in trends and/or emerging patterns. In those instances where we primarily utilize analyses of historical patterns of the development of paid and reported losses, this may be reflected, for example, in the selection of revised loss development factors. In those long tail classes of business that comprise a majority of our loss reserves and for which loss experience is less predictable due to potential changes in judicial interpretations, potential legislative actions and potential claims issues, this may be reflected in a judgmental change in our estimate of ultimate losses for particular accident years.

The future impact of the various factors that contribute to the uncertainty in the loss reserving process is extremely difficult to predict. There is potential for significant variation in the development of loss reserves, particularly for long tail classes of business. We do not derive statistical loss distributions or outcome confidence levels around our loss reserve estimate. Actuarial ranges of reasonable estimates are not a true reflection of the potential volatility between carried loss reserves and the ultimate settlement amount of losses incurred prior to the balance sheet date. This is due, among other reasons, to the fact that actuarial ranges are developed based on known events as of the valuation date whereas the ultimate disposition of losses is subject to the outcome of events and circumstances that were unknown as of the valuation date.

The following discussion includes disclosure of possible variation from current estimates of loss reserves due to a change in certain key assumptions for particular classes of business. These impacts are estimated individually, without consideration for any correlation among such assumptions or among lines of business. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to take the amounts and add them together in an attempt to estimate volatility for our loss reserves in total. We believe that the estimated variation in reserves detailed below is a reasonable estimate of the possible variation that may occur in the future. However, if such variation did occur, it would likely occur over a period of several years and therefore its impact on the Corporation's results of operations would be spread over the same period. It is important to note, however, that there is the potential for future variation greater than the amounts discussed below.

Two of the larger components of our loss reserves relate to the professional liability classes other than fidelity and to commercial excess liability. The respective reported loss development patterns are key assumptions in estimating loss reserves for these classes of business, both as applied directly to more mature accident years and as applied indirectly (e.g., via Bornheutter-Ferguson methods) to less mature accident years.

Reserves for the professional liability classes other than fidelity were \$7.1 billion, net of reinsurance, at December 31, 2007. Based on a review of our loss experience, if the loss development factor for each accident year changed such that the cumulative loss development factor for the most recent accident year changed by 10%, we estimate that the net reserves for professional liability classes other than fidelity would change by approximately \$700 million, in either direction. This degree of change in the reported loss development pattern is within the historical variation around the averages in our data.

Reserves for commercial excess liability (excluding asbestos and toxic waste claims) were \$2.9 billion, net of reinsurance, at December 31, 2007. These reserves are included within commercial casualty. Based on a review of our loss experience, if the loss development factor for each accident year changed such that the cumulative loss development factor for the most recent accident year

Table of Contents

changed by 15%, we estimate that the net reserves for commercial excess liability would change by approximately \$250 million, in either direction. This degree of change in the reported loss development pattern is within the historical variation around the averages in our data.

Reserves Relating to Asbestos and Toxic Waste Claims. The estimation of loss reserves relating to asbestos and toxic waste claims on insurance policies written many years ago is subject to greater uncertainty than other types of claims due to inconsistent court decisions as well as judicial interpretations and legislative actions that in some cases have tended to broaden coverage beyond the original intent of such policies and in others have expanded theories of liability. The insurance industry as a whole is engaged in extensive litigation over coverage and liability issues and is thus confronted with a continuing uncertainty in its efforts to quantify these exposures.

Reserves for asbestos and toxic waste claims cannot be estimated with traditional actuarial loss reserving techniques that rely on historical accident year loss development factors. Instead, we rely on an exposure-based analysis that involves a detailed review of individual policy terms and exposures. Because each policyholder presents different liability and coverage issues, we generally evaluate our exposure on a policyholder-by-policyholder basis, considering a variety of factors that are unique to each policyholder. Quantitative techniques have to be supplemented by subjective considerations including management's judgment.

We establish case reserves and expense reserves for costs of related litigation where sufficient information has been developed to indicate the involvement of a specific insurance policy. In addition, IBNR reserves are established to cover additional exposures on both known and unasserted claims.

We believe that the loss reserves carried at December 31, 2007 for asbestos and toxic waste claims were adequate. However, given the judicial decisions and legislative actions that have broadened the scope of coverage and expanded theories of liability in the past and the possibilities of similar interpretations in the future, it is possible that our estimate of loss reserves relating to these exposures may increase in future periods as new information becomes available and as claims develop.

Asbestos Reserves. Asbestos remains the most significant and difficult mass tort for the insurance industry in terms of claims volume and dollar exposure. Asbestos claims relate primarily to bodily injuries asserted by those who came in contact with asbestos or products containing asbestos. Tort theory affecting asbestos litigation has evolved over the years. Early court cases established the continuous trigger theory with respect to insurance coverage. Under this theory, insurance coverage is deemed to be triggered from the time a claimant is first exposed to asbestos until the manifestation of any disease. This interpretation of a policy trigger can involve insurance policies over many years and increases insurance companies' exposure to liability. Until recently, judicial interpretations and legislative actions attempted to maximize insurance availability from both a coverage and liability standpoint.

New asbestos claims and new exposures on existing claims have continued despite the fact that usage of asbestos has declined since the mid-1970s. Many claimants were exposed to multiple asbestos products over an extended period of time. As a result, claim filings typically name dozens of defendants. The plaintiffs' bar has solicited new claimants through extensive advertising and through asbestos medical screenings. A vast majority of asbestos bodily injury claims have been filed by claimants who do not show any signs of asbestos related disease. New asbestos cases are often filed in those jurisdictions with a reputation for judges and juries that are extremely sympathetic to plaintiffs.

Approximately 80 manufacturers and distributors of asbestos products have filed for bankruptcy protection as a result of asbestos-related liabilities. A bankruptcy sometimes involves an agreement to a plan between the debtor and its creditors, including current and future asbestos claimants. Although the debtor is negotiating in part with its insurers' money, insurers are generally given only limited opportunity to be heard. In addition to contributing to the overall number of claims, bankruptcy proceedings have also caused increased settlement demands against remaining solvent defendants.

Table of Contents

There have been some positive legislative and judicial developments in the asbestos environment over the past several years:

Various challenges to mass screening claimants have been mounted, including a June 2005 U.S. District Court decision in Texas. Many believe that this decision is leading to higher medical evidentiary standards. For example, several asbestos injury settlement trusts suspended their acceptance of claims that were based on the diagnosis of physicians or screening companies named in the case, citing concerns about their reliability. Further investigations of the medical screening process for asbestos claims are underway.

A number of states have implemented legislative and judicial reforms that focus the courts' resources on the claims of the most seriously injured. Those who allege serious injury and can present credible evidence of their injuries are receiving priority trial settings in the courts, while those who have not shown any credible disease manifestation are having their hearing dates delayed or are placed on an inactive docket, which preserves the right to pursue litigation in the future.

A number of key jurisdictions have adopted venue reform that requires plaintiffs to have a connection to the jurisdiction in order to file a complaint.

In recognition that many aspects of bankruptcy plans are unfair to certain classes of claimants and to the insurance industry, these plans are beginning to be closely scrutinized by the courts and rejected when appropriate.

Our most significant individual asbestos exposures involve products liability on the part of traditional defendants who were engaged in the manufacture, distribution or installation of asbestos products. We wrote excess liability and/or general liability coverages for these insureds. While these insureds are relatively few in number, their exposure has become substantial due to the increased volume of claims, the erosion of the underlying limits and the bankruptcies of target defendants.

Our other asbestos exposures involve products and non-products liability on the part of peripheral defendants, including a mix of manufacturers, distributors and installers of certain products that contain asbestos in small quantities and owners or operators of properties where asbestos was present. Generally, these insureds are named defendants on a regional rather than a nationwide basis. As the financial resources of traditional asbestos defendants have been depleted, plaintiffs are targeting these viable peripheral parties with greater frequency and, in many cases, for large awards.

Asbestos claims against the major manufacturers, distributors or installers of asbestos products were typically presented under the products liability section of primary general liability policies as well as under excess liability policies, both of which typically had aggregate limits that capped an insurer's exposure. In recent years, a number of asbestos claims by insureds are being presented as non-products claims, such as those by installers of asbestos products and by property owners or operators who allegedly had asbestos on their property, under the premises or operations section of primary general liability policies. Unlike products exposures, these non-products exposures typically had no aggregate limits on coverage, creating potentially greater exposure. Further, in an effort to seek additional insurance coverage, some insureds with installation activities who have substantially eroded their products coverage are presenting new asbestos claims as non-products operations claims or attempting to reclassify previously settled products claims as non-products claims to restore a portion of previously exhausted products aggregate limits. It is difficult to predict whether insureds will be successful in asserting claims under non-products coverage or whether insurers will be successful in asserting additional defenses. Accordingly, the ultimate cost to insurers of the claims for coverage not subject to aggregate limits is uncertain.

In establishing our asbestos reserves, we evaluate the exposure presented by each insured. As part of this evaluation, we consider a variety of factors including: the available insurance coverage; limits and deductibles; the jurisdictions involved; past settlement values of similar claims; the potential role of other insurance, particularly underlying coverage below our excess liability policies; potential

Table of Contents

bankruptcy impact; relevant judicial interpretations; and applicable coverage defenses, including asbestos exclusions.

We have assumed a continuing unfavorable legal environment with no benefit from any federal asbestos reform legislation. Various federal proposals to solve the ongoing asbestos litigation crisis have been considered by the U.S. Congress over the past few years, but none have yet been enacted. Thus, the prospect of federal asbestos reform legislation remains uncertain.

Our actuaries and claim personnel perform periodic analyses of our asbestos related exposures. The analyses during 2005 noted an increase in our estimate of the ultimate liabilities for two of our asbestos defendants. The analyses during 2006 noted positive developments, including several settlements, related to certain of our traditional asbestos defendants. At the same time, the analyses indicated that our exposure to loss from claims against our peripheral defendants was somewhat higher than previously expected. The analyses during 2007 noted an increase in our estimate of the ultimate liabilities related to certain of our traditional asbestos defendants. Based on these analyses, we increased our net asbestos loss reserves by \$35 million in 2005, \$18 million in 2006 and \$75 million in 2007.

The following table presents a reconciliation of the beginning and ending loss reserves related to asbestos claims.

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Gross loss reserves, beginning of year | \$841 | \$930 | \$961 |
| Reinsurance recoverable, beginning of year | 52 | 50 | 55 |
| Net loss reserves, beginning of year | 789 | 880 | 906 |
| Net incurred losses | 75 | 18 | 35 |
| Net losses paid | 71 | 109 | 61 |
| Net loss reserves, end of year | 793 | 789 | 880 |
| Reinsurance recoverable, end of year | 45 | 52 | 50 |
| Gross loss reserves, end of year | \$838 | \$841 | \$930 |

The following table presents the number of policyholders for whom we have open asbestos case reserves and the related net loss reserves at December 31, 2007 as well as the net losses paid during 2007 by component.

| | Number of Policyholders | Net Loss Reserves | Net Losses Paid |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | (in millions) | | |
| Traditional defendants | 26 | \$220 | \$ 26 |
| Peripheral defendants | 385 | 411 | 45 |
| Future claims from unknown policyholders | | 162 | |
| | | \$793 | \$ 71 |

Significant uncertainty remains as to our ultimate liability related to asbestos related claims. This uncertainty is due to several factors including:

the long latency period between asbestos exposure and disease manifestation and the resulting potential for involvement of multiple policy periods for individual claims;

plaintiffs increased focus on peripheral defendants;

the volume of claims by unimpaired plaintiffs and the extent to which they can be precluded from making claims;

Table of Contents

the efforts by insureds to claim the right to non-products coverage not subject to aggregate limits;

the number of insureds seeking bankruptcy protection as a result of asbestos-related liabilities;

the ability of claimants to bring a claim in a state in which they have no residency or exposure;

the impact of the exhaustion of primary limits and the resulting increase in claims on excess liability policies we have issued;

inconsistent court decisions and diverging legal interpretations; and

the possibility, however remote, of federal legislation that would address the asbestos problem.

These significant uncertainties are not likely to be resolved in the near future.

Toxic Waste Reserves. Toxic waste claims relate primarily to pollution and related cleanup costs. Our insureds have two potential areas of exposure – hazardous waste dump sites and pollution at the insured site primarily from underground storage tanks and manufacturing processes.

The federal Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund) has been interpreted to impose strict, retroactive and joint and several liability on potentially responsible parties (PRPs) for the cost of remediating hazardous waste sites. Most sites have multiple PRPs.

Most PRPs named to date are parties who have been generators, transporters, past or present landowners or past or present site operators. These PRPs had proper government authorization in many instances. However, relative fault has not been a factor in establishing liability. Insurance policies issued to PRPs were not intended to cover the clean-up costs of pollution and, in many cases, did not intend to cover the pollution itself. In more recent years, however, policies specifically excluded such exposures.

As the costs of environmental clean-up became substantial, PRPs and others increasingly filed claims with their insurance carriers. Litigation against insurers extends to issues of liability, coverage and other policy provisions.

There is substantial uncertainty involved in estimating our liabilities related to these claims. First, the liabilities of the claimants are extremely difficult to estimate. At any given waste site, the allocation of remediation costs among governmental authorities and the PRPs varies greatly depending on a variety of factors. Second, different courts have addressed liability and coverage issues regarding pollution claims and have reached inconsistent conclusions in their interpretation of several issues. These significant uncertainties are not likely to be resolved definitively in the near future.

Uncertainties also remain as to the Superfund law itself. Superfund's taxing authority expired on December 31, 1995 and has not been re-enacted. Federal legislation appears to be at a standstill. At this time, it is not possible to predict the direction that any reforms may take, when they may occur or the effect that any changes may have on the insurance industry.

Without federal movement on Superfund reform, the enforcement of Superfund liability has occasionally shifted to the states. States are being forced to reconsider state-level cleanup statutes and regulations. As individual states move forward, the potential for conflicting state regulation becomes greater. In a few states, we have seen cases brought against insureds or directly against insurance companies for environmental pollution and natural resources damages. To date, only a few natural resource claims have been filed and they are being vigorously defended. Significant uncertainty remains as to the cost of remediating the state sites. Because of the large number of state sites, such sites could prove even more costly in the aggregate than Superfund sites.

Table of Contents

In establishing our toxic waste reserves, we evaluate the exposure presented by each insured. As part of this evaluation, we consider a variety of factors including: the probable liability, available insurance coverage, past settlement values of similar claims, relevant judicial interpretations, applicable coverage defenses as well as facts that are unique to each insured.

Uncertainty remains as to our ultimate liability relating to toxic waste claims. However, toxic waste losses appear to be developing as expected due to relatively stable claim trends. In many cases, claims are being settled for less than initially anticipated due to more efficient site remediation efforts. In other cases, we have been successful at buying back our policies, thus removing the threat of additional losses in the future.

The following table presents a reconciliation of our beginning and ending loss reserves, net of reinsurance recoverable, related to toxic waste claims. The reinsurance recoverable related to these claims is minimal.

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Reserves, beginning of year | \$ 169 | \$ 191 | \$ 208 |
| Inurred losses | 13 | 6 | |
| Losses paid | 28 | 28 | 17 |
| Reserves, end of year | \$ 154 | \$ 169 | \$ 191 |

Of the net toxic waste loss reserves at December 31, 2007, \$58 million was IBNR reserves.

Reinsurance Recoverable. Reinsurance recoverable is the estimated amount recoverable from reinsurers related to the losses we have incurred. At December 31, 2007, reinsurance recoverable included \$363 million recoverable with respect to paid losses and loss expenses, which is included in other assets, and \$2.3 billion recoverable on unpaid losses and loss expenses.

Reinsurance recoverable on unpaid losses and loss expenses represents an estimate of the portion of our gross loss reserves that will be recovered from reinsurers. Such reinsurance recoverable is estimated as part of our loss reserving process using assumptions that are consistent with the assumptions used in estimating the gross loss reserves. Consequently, the estimation of reinsurance recoverable is subject to similar judgments and uncertainties as the estimation of gross loss reserves.

Ceded reinsurance contracts do not relieve our primary obligation to our policyholders. Consequently, an exposure exists with respect to reinsurance recoverable to the extent that any reinsurer is unable to meet its obligations or disputes the liabilities assumed under the reinsurance contracts. We are selective in regard to our reinsurers, placing reinsurance with only those reinsurers who we believe have strong balance sheets and superior underwriting ability, and we monitor the financial strength of our reinsurers on an ongoing basis. Nevertheless, in recent years, certain of our reinsurers have experienced financial difficulties or exited the reinsurance business. In addition, we may become involved in coverage disputes with our reinsurers. A provision for estimated uncollectible reinsurance is recorded based on periodic evaluations of balances due from reinsurers, the financial condition of the reinsurers, coverage disputes and other relevant factors.

Prior Year Loss Development

Because loss reserve estimates are subject to the outcome of future events, changes in estimates are unavoidable given that loss trends vary and time is required for changes in trends to be recognized and confirmed. Reserve changes that increase previous estimates of ultimate cost are referred to as unfavorable or adverse development or reserve strengthening. Reserve changes that decrease previous estimates of ultimate cost are referred to as favorable development or reserve releases.

Table of Contents

A reconciliation of our beginning and ending loss reserves, net of reinsurance, for the three years ended December 31, 2007 is as follows:

| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
|--|---------------|----------|----------|
| | (in millions) | | |
| Net loss reserves, beginning of year | \$19,699 | \$18,713 | \$16,809 |
| Net incurred losses and loss expenses related to | | | |
| Current year | 6,996 | 6,870 | 7,650 |
| Prior years | (697) | (296) | 163 |
| | 6,299 | 6,574 | 7,813 |
| Net payments for losses and loss expenses related to | | | |
| Current year | 1,809 | 1,640 | 1,878 |
| Prior years | 3,873 | 3,948 | 4,031 |
| | 5,682 | 5,588 | 5,909 |
| Net loss reserves, end of year | \$20,316 | \$19,699 | \$18,713 |

During 2007, we experienced overall favorable prior year development of \$697 million, which represented 3.5% of the net loss reserves as of December 31, 2006. This compares with favorable prior year development of \$296 million during 2006, which represented 1.6% of the net loss reserves at December 31, 2005, and unfavorable prior year development of \$163 million during 2005, which represented 1.0% of the net loss reserves at December 31, 2004. Such development was reflected in operating results in these respective years.

The following table presents the overall prior year loss development for the three years ended December 31, 2007 by accident year.

| Accident Year | Calendar Year (Favorable) Unfavorable Development? | | |
|----------------|--|---------|---------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| 2006 | \$(141) | | |
| 2005 | (233) | \$(372) | |
| 2004 | (240) | (276) | \$(304) |
| 2003 | (148) | (83) | (306) |
| 2002 | (71) | 5 | 169 |
| 2001 | 53 | 99 | 149 |
| 2000 | (17) | 102 | 81 |
| 1999 | (10) | 24 | 99 |
| 1998 | (26) | 19 | 36 |
| 1997 and prior | 136 | 186 | 239 |

| | | |
|----------|----------|--------|
| \$ (697) | \$ (296) | \$ 163 |
|----------|----------|--------|

The net favorable development of \$697 million in 2007 was due to various factors. The most significant factors were:

We experienced favorable development of about \$300 million in the professional liability classes other than fidelity, including about \$100 million outside the U.S. A majority of this favorable development was in the 2003 through 2005 accident years. Reported loss activity related to these accident years was less than expected due to a favorable business climate, lower policy limits and better terms and conditions. While these accident years are somewhat immature, we concluded that

Table of Contents

there was sufficient evidence to modestly decrease the expected loss ratios for these accident years. The fact that our initial estimates for accident years 2003 and subsequent are developing favorably was recognized as one factor among several factors in the determination of loss reserves for the 2007 accident year for these classes. Other factors included the specific aspects of the current claim environment and the recent downward trend in prices.

We experienced favorable development of about \$180 million in the short tail homeowners and commercial property classes, primarily related to the 2006 and 2005 accident years. This favorable development arose from the lower than expected emergence of actual losses during 2007 relative to expectations used to establish our loss reserves at the end of 2006. The severity of late reported property claims that emerged during 2007 was lower than expected and case development, including salvage recoveries, on previously reported claims was better than expected. Because the incidence of property losses is subject to a considerable element of fortuity, reserve estimates for these classes are based on an analysis of past loss experience on average over a period of years. As a result, the favorable development in 2007 was recognized but had a relatively modest effect on our determination of carried property loss reserves at December 31, 2007.

We experienced favorable development of about \$135 million in the run-off of our reinsurance assumed business due primarily to better than expected reported loss activity from cedants.

We experienced favorable development of about \$40 million in the fidelity class and \$30 million in the surety class due to lower than expected reported loss emergence, mainly related to more recent accident years. Loss reserve estimates at the end of 2006 in these classes included an expectation of more large late reported losses than actually occurred in 2007. However, since we would still expect such losses to occur in a typical year, factors that resulted in the favorable development in 2007 were given only modest weight in our determination of carried fidelity and surety loss reserves at December 31, 2007.

We experienced favorable development of about \$30 million in the personal automobile class. Case development during 2007 on previously reported claims was better than expected, reflecting improved case management. Also, the number of late reported claims was less than expected, reflecting a continuation of recent generally favorable frequency trends. Both of these factors were reflected in the determination of the carried loss reserves for this class at December 31, 2007.

We experienced adverse development of about \$20 million in the commercial liability classes. Adverse development in accident years prior to 1997, mostly the \$88 million related to asbestos and toxic waste claims, was largely offset by favorable development in these classes in the more recent accident years. The asbestos and toxic waste loss activity primarily related to specific individual excess liability claims and did not change our overall assessment of recent trends. Therefore, this adverse development had little overall effect on our determination of carried loss reserves for these classes at December 31, 2007.

The net favorable development of \$296 million in 2006 was also due to various factors. The most significant factors were:

We experienced favorable development of about \$190 million in the short tail homeowners and commercial property classes, primarily related to the 2005 accident year. This favorable development arose from the lower than expected emergence of actual losses during 2006 relative to expectations used to establish our loss reserves at the end of 2005. The severity of late reported property claims that emerged during 2006 was lower than expected and case development, including salvage recoveries, on previously reported claims was better than expected.

We experienced favorable loss development of about \$70 million in the fidelity class due to lower than expected reported loss emergence, mainly related to more recent accident years.

We experienced favorable development of about \$65 million in the run-off of our reinsurance assumed business due primarily to better than expected reported loss activity from cedants.

Table of Contents

We experienced favorable development of about \$45 million in the professional liability classes other than fidelity. Favorable development in the 2004 and 2005 accident years more than offset continued unfavorable development in accident years 2000 through 2002. Reported loss activity related to accident years 2004 and 2005 was less than expected due to a favorable business climate, lower policy limits and better terms and conditions. While these accident years are somewhat immature, we concluded that there was sufficient evidence to modestly decrease the expected loss ratios for these accident years. On the other hand, we continued to experience significant reported loss activity related to the 2000 through 2002 accident years, largely from claims related to corporate failures and allegations of management misconduct and accounting irregularities. As a result, we increased the expected loss ratios for these accident years.

We experienced favorable development of about \$25 million in the personal automobile class. Case development during 2006 on previously reported claims was better than expected, reflecting improved case management. Also, the number of late reported claims was less than expected, reflecting a continuation of recent generally favorable frequency trends.

We experienced adverse development of about \$100 million in the commercial liability classes, including \$24 million related to asbestos and toxic waste claims. The adverse development was primarily due to reported loss activity in accident years prior to 1997 that was worse than expected, primarily related to specific individual excess liability and other liability claims.

The net unfavorable development of \$163 million in 2005 was due to various factors. The most significant were: We experienced adverse development of about \$200 million in the professional liability classes other than fidelity. The adverse development resulted from continued significant reported loss activity related to accident years 1998 through 2002, largely from claims related to corporate failures and allegations of management misconduct and accounting irregularities. As a result, we increased the expected loss ratios for these accident years. Offsetting this somewhat, reported loss activity related to accident years 2003 and 2004 was less than expected due to a favorable business climate, lower policy limits and better terms and conditions. While these accident years were somewhat immature, we concluded that there was sufficient evidence to modestly decrease the expected loss ratios for these accident years.

We experienced adverse development of about \$175 million in the commercial liability classes related to accident years prior to 1996, including \$35 million related to asbestos claims. There was significant reported loss activity during 2005 related to these older accident years, primarily in the commercial excess liability class, which caused us to extend the expected loss emergence period.

We experienced favorable development of about \$160 million in the short tail homeowners and commercial property classes, primarily related to the 2004 accident year. The favorable development arose from the lower than expected emergence of late reported losses during 2005 relative to expectations used to establish our loss reserves at the end of 2004.

We experienced favorable loss development of about \$60 million in the fidelity class due to lower than expected reported loss emergence, mainly related to more recent accident years.

In Item 1 of this report, we present an analysis of our consolidated loss reserve development on a calendar year basis for each of the ten years prior to 2007. The variability in reserve development over the ten year period illustrates the uncertainty of the loss reserving process.

Our U.S. property and casualty subsidiaries are required to file annual statements with insurance regulatory authorities prepared on an accounting basis prescribed or permitted by such authorities. These annual statements include an analysis of loss reserves, referred to as Schedule P, that presents accident year loss development information by line of business for the nine years prior to 2007. It is our intention to post the Schedule P for our combined U.S. property and casualty subsidiaries on our website as soon as it becomes available.

Table of Contents**Investment Results**

Property and casualty investment income before taxes increased by 9% in 2007 compared with 2006 and by 11% in 2006 compared with 2005. Growth in both years was due to an increase in invested assets, which reflected substantial cash flow from operations over the period.

The effective tax rate on our investment income was 19.9% in 2007 compared with 19.8% in 2006 and 19.7% in 2005. While similar in these years, the effective tax rate does fluctuate as a result of our holding a different proportion of our investment portfolio in tax exempt securities during different periods.

On an after-tax basis, property and casualty investment income increased by 9% in 2007 and 10% in 2006. The after-tax annualized yield on the investment portfolio that supports our property and casualty insurance business was 3.50% in 2007 compared with 3.48% in 2006 and 3.45% in 2005. Management uses property and casualty investment income after-tax, a non-GAAP financial measure, to evaluate its investment performance because it reflects the impact of any change in the proportion of the investment portfolio invested in tax exempt securities and is therefore more meaningful for analysis purposes than investment income before income tax.

Other Income and Charges

Other income and charges, which include miscellaneous income and expenses of the property and casualty subsidiaries, were not significant in the last three years.

CORPORATE AND OTHER

Corporate and other comprises investment income earned on corporate invested assets, interest expense and other expenses not allocated to our operating subsidiaries, and the results of our real estate and other non-insurance subsidiaries, including Chubb Financial Solutions (CFS), which provided customized financial products to corporate clients and has been in run-off since April 2003.

Corporate and other produced a loss before taxes of \$149 million in 2007 compared with losses of \$89 million and \$172 million in 2006 and 2005, respectively. The higher loss in 2007 compared with 2006 was due primarily to higher interest expense as a result of the issuance of \$1.8 billion of new debt during the first half of 2007. The higher interest expense was only modestly offset by an increase in investment income as a substantial portion of the proceeds from the issuance of the debt was used to repurchase Chubb's common stock. The lower loss in 2006 compared with 2005 was primarily due to a significantly smaller loss in our real estate operation and higher investment income. The growth in investment income in 2006 was due to an increase in corporate invested assets, resulting from the issuance of Chubb's common stock upon the settlement of equity unit warrants and purchase contracts and under stock-based employee compensation plans.

Real Estate

Real estate operations resulted in a loss before taxes of \$6 million in 2007 compared with losses of \$3 million in 2006 and \$41 million in 2005. The large loss in 2005 was due to the recognition of a significant impairment loss. During 2005, we committed to a plan to sell a parcel of land in New Jersey that we had previously intended to hold and develop. The decision to sell the property was based on our assessment of the current real estate market and our concern about zoning issues. As a result of our decision to sell this property, we reassessed the recoverability of its carrying value. Based on our reassessment, we recognized an impairment loss of \$48 million during the year to reduce the carrying value of the property to its estimated fair value.

Real estate revenues were \$41 million in 2007, \$202 million in 2006 and \$115 million in 2005. The higher revenues in 2006 were due to the sale of one commercial property for approximately \$110 million.

Table of Contents

At December 31, 2007, we owned approximately \$120 million of land and \$25 million of commercial properties and land parcels under lease. Management believes that it has made adequate provisions for impairment of real estate assets.

Chubb Financial Solutions

CFS's business was primarily structured credit derivatives, principally as a counterparty in portfolio credit default swap contracts. In April 2003, the Corporation announced its intention to exit CFS's business. Since that date, CFS has terminated early or run-off nearly all of its contractual obligations within its financial products portfolio.

The credit derivatives are carried in the financial statements at estimated fair value, which represents management's best estimate of the cost to exit the positions. Changes in fair value are recognized in income in the period of the change.

CFS's results were near breakeven in 2007 and 2006 compared with a loss before taxes of \$9 million in 2005. The loss in 2005 related to the termination of a principal and interest guarantee contract.

CFS's aggregate exposure, or retained risk, from each of its remaining in-force financial products contracts is referred to as notional amount. Notional amounts are used to calculate the exchange of contractual cash flows and are not necessarily representative of the potential for gain or loss. The notional amounts are not recorded on the balance sheet.

CFS's remaining financial products contracts at December 31, 2007 included one credit default swap, a derivative contract linked to an equity market index that terminates in 2012 and a few other insignificant transactions. We estimate that the notional amount under the remaining contracts was about \$400 million and the fair value of our future obligations was \$7 million at December 31, 2007.

REALIZED INVESTMENT GAINS AND LOSSES

Net investment gains realized were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Net realized gains (losses) | | | |
| Equity securities | \$ 135 | \$ 51 | \$ 75 |
| Fixed maturities | 4 | (2) | (35) |
| Other invested assets | 344 | 209 | 162 |
| Transfer of reinsurance assumed business | | | 171 |
| Personal Lines Insurance Brokerage | | | 16 |
| | 483 | 258 | 389 |
| Other-than-temporary impairment losses | | | |
| Equity securities | 79 | 10 | 1 |
| Fixed maturities | 30 | 3 | 4 |
| | 109 | 13 | 5 |
| Realized investment gains before tax | \$ 374 | \$ 245 | \$ 384 |
| Realized investment gains after tax | \$ 243 | \$ 161 | \$ 248 |

The net realized gains on other invested assets represent the aggregate of distributions to us from the limited partnerships in which we have an interest and changes in our equity in the net assets of the partnerships based on valuations provided to us by the manager of each partnership. As a result of the timing of our receipt of valuation data from the investment managers, these investments are reported on a three month lag.

Table of Contents

In 2005, we transferred our ongoing reinsurance business and certain related assets to Harbor Point Limited. In exchange, we received from Harbor Point \$200 million of 6% convertible notes and warrants to purchase common stock of Harbor Point. The notes and warrants represented in the aggregate on a fully diluted basis approximately 16% of the new company. The transaction resulted in a pre-tax gain of \$204 million, of which \$171 million was recognized as a realized investment gain in 2005. The remaining gain of \$33 million was deferred and will be recognized based on the timing of the ultimate disposition of our economic interest in Harbor Point.

In 2005, we completed the sale of Personal Lines Insurance Brokerage, Inc. Based on the terms of the sale, we recognized a gain of \$16 million.

Decisions to sell equity securities and fixed maturities are governed principally by considerations of investment opportunities and tax consequences. As a result, realized gains and losses on the sale of these investments may vary significantly from period to period. However, such gains and losses generally have little, if any, impact on shareholders' equity as all of these investments are carried at fair value, with the unrealized appreciation or depreciation reflected in comprehensive income.

A primary reason for the sale of fixed maturities in each of the last three years has been to improve our after-tax portfolio return without sacrificing quality where market opportunities have existed to do so. In addition, in the fourth quarter of 2005, to reduce our income tax liability, we engaged in a program to sell taxable and tax exempt fixed maturities to generate realized losses to offset a portion of the gain related to the Harbor Point transaction.

We regularly review those invested assets whose fair value is less than cost to determine if an other-than-temporary decline in value has occurred. In evaluating whether a decline in value of any investment is temporary or other than temporary, we consider various quantitative criteria and qualitative factors including the length of time and the extent to which the fair value has been less than the cost, the financial condition and near term prospects of the issuer, whether the issuer is current on contractually obligated interest and principal payments, our intent and ability to hold the investment for a period of time sufficient to allow us to recover our cost, general market conditions and industry or sector specific factors. If a decline in the fair value of an individual security is deemed to be other than temporary, the difference between cost and estimated fair value is charged to income as a realized investment loss. The fair value of the investment becomes its new cost basis. The decision to recognize a decline in the value of a security carried at fair value as other-than-temporary rather than temporary has no impact on shareholders' equity.

During 2007, our investments in several equity securities and one fixed maturity holding were deemed to be other-than-temporarily impaired. We determined that the equity securities were not likely to recover to our cost basis over a near-term period and we were not likely to collect all contractually obligated amounts due us under the terms of the fixed maturity investment.

Information related to investment securities in an unrealized loss position at December 31, 2007 and 2006 is included in Note (4)(b) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

INCOME TAXES

As a result of progress toward the settlement of certain tax matters, we recognized a \$10 million tax benefit in the third quarter of 2006.

In connection with the sale of a subsidiary a number of years ago, we agreed to indemnify the buyer for certain pre-closing tax liabilities. During the first quarter of 2005, we settled this obligation with the purchaser. Accordingly, we reduced our income tax liability, which resulted in the recognition of a benefit of \$22 million.

Table of Contents**CAPITAL RESOURCES AND LIQUIDITY**

Capital resources and liquidity represent a company's overall financial strength and its ability to generate cash flows, borrow funds at competitive rates and raise new capital to meet operating and growth needs.

Capital Resources

Capital resources provide protection for policyholders, furnish the financial strength to support the business of underwriting insurance risks and facilitate continued business growth. At December 31, 2007, the Corporation had shareholders' equity of \$14.4 billion and total debt of \$3.5 billion.

In February 2007, Executive Risk Capital Trust (Trust), wholly owned by Chubb Executive Risk Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Chubb, redeemed \$125 million of its 8.675% capital securities using the funds it received from the repayment of debentures issued by Chubb Executive Risk to the Trust, which constituted the Trust's sole assets. The redemption price of the capital securities included a make-whole premium of \$5 million in the aggregate.

In March 2007, Chubb issued \$1.0 billion of unsecured junior subordinated capital securities. The capital securities will become due on April 15, 2037, the scheduled maturity date, but only to the extent that Chubb has received sufficient net proceeds from the sale of certain qualifying capital securities. Chubb must use its commercially reasonable efforts, subject to certain market disruption events, to sell enough qualifying capital securities to permit repayment of the capital securities on the scheduled maturity date or as soon thereafter as possible. Any remaining outstanding principal amount will be due on March 29, 2067, the final maturity date. The capital securities bear interest at a fixed rate of 6.375% through April 14, 2017. Thereafter, the capital securities will bear interest at a rate equal to the three-month LIBOR rate plus 2.25%. Subject to certain conditions, Chubb has the right to defer the payment of interest on the capital securities for a period not exceeding ten consecutive years. During any such period, interest will continue to accrue and Chubb generally may not declare or pay any dividends on or purchase any shares of its capital stock.

In connection with the issuance of the capital securities, Chubb entered into a replacement capital covenant in which it agreed that it will not repay, redeem or purchase the capital securities before March 29, 2047, unless, subject to certain limitations, it has received proceeds from the sale of replacement capital securities, as defined. Subject to the replacement capital covenant, the capital securities may be redeemed, in whole or in part, at any time on or after April 15, 2017 at a redemption price equal to the principal amount plus any accrued interest or prior to April 15, 2017 at a redemption price equal to the greater of (i) the principal amount or (ii) a make-whole amount, in each case plus any accrued interest.

In May 2007, Chubb issued \$800 million of unsecured 6% senior notes due in 2037.

In 2002, Chubb issued \$600 million of unsecured 4% senior notes due in 2007 and 24 million mandatorily exercisable warrants to purchase its common stock. The notes and warrants were issued together in the form of 7% equity units, each of which initially represented \$25 principal amount of notes and one warrant. In August 2005, the notes were successfully remarketed as required by their terms. The interest rate on the notes was reset to 4.934%, effective August 16, 2005. Each warrant obligated the holder to purchase, on or before November 16, 2005, for a settlement price of \$25, a variable number of shares of Chubb's common stock. The number of shares purchased was determined based on a formula that considered the market price of Chubb's common stock immediately prior to the time of settlement in relation to the \$28.32 per share sale price of the common stock at the time the equity units were offered. Upon settlement of the warrants in November 2005, Chubb issued 17,366,234 shares of common stock and received proceeds of \$600 million. In November 2007, the \$600 million of notes were paid when due.

In December 2007, \$75 million of 7¹/₈% notes issued by Chubb Executive Risk were paid when due.

Table of Contents

In 2003, Chubb issued \$460 million of unsecured 2.25% senior notes due in 2008 and 18.4 million purchase contracts to purchase its common stock. The notes and purchase contracts were issued together in the form of 7% equity units, each of which initially represented \$25 principal amount of notes and one purchase contract. In May 2006, the notes were successfully remarketed as required by their terms. The interest rate on the notes was reset to 5.472% from 2.25%, effective May 16, 2006. The remarketed notes mature on August 16, 2008. Each purchase contract obligated the holder to purchase, on or before August 16, 2006, for a settlement price of \$25, a variable number of shares of Chubb's common stock. The number of shares purchased was determined based on a formula that considered the market price of Chubb's common stock immediately prior to the time of settlement in relation to the \$29.75 per share sale price of the common stock at the time the equity units were offered. Upon settlement of the purchase contracts in August 2006, Chubb issued 12,883,527 shares of common stock and received proceeds of \$460 million.

Chubb also has outstanding \$225 million of 3.95% notes due in April 2008 as well as \$400 million of 6% notes due in 2011, \$275 million of 5.2% notes due in 2013, \$100 million of 6.6% debentures due in 2018 and \$200 million of 6.8% debentures due in 2031, all of which are unsecured.

Management regularly monitors the Corporation's capital resources. In connection with our long-term capital strategy, Chubb from time to time contributes capital to its property and casualty subsidiaries. In addition, in order to satisfy capital needs as a result of any rating agency capital adequacy or other future rating issues, or in the event we were to need additional capital to make strategic investments in light of market opportunities, we may take a variety of actions, which could include the issuance of additional debt and/or equity securities. We believe that our strong financial position and conservative debt level provide us with the flexibility and capacity to obtain funds externally through debt or equity financings on both a short term and long term basis.

In December 2005, the Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to 28,000,000 shares of Chubb's common stock. In December 2006, the Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to an additional 20,000,000 shares of common stock. In March 2007, the Board of Directors authorized an increase of 20,000,000 shares to the December 2006 authorization. In December 2007, the Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to an additional 28,000,000 shares of common stock.

In 2005, we repurchased 2,787,800 shares of Chubb's common stock in open market transactions at a cost of \$135 million. In January 2006, we repurchased 5,100,000 shares under an accelerated stock buyback program at an initial price of \$48.91 per share, for a total cost of \$249 million. The program was completed in March 2006, at which time, under the terms of the agreement, we received a price adjustment based on the volume weighted average price of Chubb's common stock during the program period. The price adjustment could be settled, at our election, in Chubb's common stock or cash. We elected to have the counterparty deliver 125,562 additional shares in settlement of the price adjustment. During the remainder of 2006, we repurchased 20,140,700 shares in the open market. In the aggregate, in 2006, we repurchased 25,366,262 shares of Chubb's common stock at a cost of \$1,257 million. In 2007, we repurchased 41,733,268 shares of Chubb's common stock in open market transactions at a cost of \$2,184 million. As of December 31, 2007, 26,112,670 shares remained under the December 2007 share repurchase authorization, which has no expiration date. Based on our outlook for 2008, we expect to repurchase all of the shares remaining under the December 2007 authorization by the end of 2008, subject to market conditions.

Ratings

Chubb and its insurance subsidiaries are rated by major rating agencies. These ratings reflect the rating agency's opinion of our financial strength, operating performance, strategic position and ability to meet our obligations to policyholders.

Table of Contents

Credit ratings assess a company's ability to make timely payments of interest and principal on its debt. The following table summarizes the Corporation's credit ratings from the major independent rating organizations as of February 26, 2008.

| | A.M. Best | Standard & Poor's | Moody's | Fitch |
|--|------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Senior unsecured debt | aa- | A | A2 | A+ |
| Junior subordinated capital securities | a | BBB+ | A3 | A |
| Commercial paper | AMB-1+ | A-1 | P-1 | F-1 |

Financial strength ratings assess an insurer's ability to meet its financial obligations to policyholders. The following table summarizes our property and casualty subsidiaries' financial strength ratings from the major independent rating organizations as of February 26, 2008.

| | A.M. Best | Standard & Poor's | Moody's | Fitch |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Financial strength | A++ | AA | Aa2 | AA |

Ratings are an important factor in establishing our competitive position in the insurance markets. There can be no assurance that our ratings will continue for any given period of time or that they will not be changed.

It is possible that one or more of the rating agencies may raise or lower our existing ratings in the future. If our credit ratings were downgraded, we might incur higher borrowing costs and might have more limited means to access capital. A downgrade in our financial strength ratings could adversely affect the competitive position of our insurance operations, including a possible reduction in demand for our products in certain markets.

Liquidity

Liquidity is a measure of a company's ability to generate sufficient cash flows to meet the short and long term cash requirements of its business operations.

The Corporation's liquidity requirements in the past have been met by funds from operations as well as the issuance of commercial paper and debt and equity securities. We expect that our liquidity requirements in the future will be met by these sources of funds or borrowings from our credit facility.

Our property and casualty operations provide liquidity in that premiums are generally received months or even years before losses are paid under the policies purchased by such premiums. Historically, cash receipts from operations, consisting of insurance premiums and investment income, have provided more than sufficient funds to pay losses, operating expenses and dividends to Chubb. After satisfying our cash requirements, excess cash flows are used to build the investment portfolio and thereby increase future investment income.

Our strong underwriting results continued to generate substantial new cash in 2007. New cash from operations available for investment by the property and casualty subsidiaries was approximately \$1.6 billion in 2007 compared with \$2.7 billion in 2006 and \$3.4 billion in 2005. New cash available was lower in 2007 than in 2006 due to a \$900 million increase in dividends paid by the property and casualty subsidiaries to Chubb and, to a lesser extent, higher income tax payments. New cash available was lower in 2006 than in 2005 due primarily to substantially higher income tax payments and lower premium receipts.

Table of Contents

Our property and casualty subsidiaries maintain substantial investments in highly liquid, short-term marketable securities. Accordingly, we do not anticipate selling long-term fixed maturity investments to meet any liquidity needs.

Chubb's liquidity requirements primarily include the payment of dividends to shareholders and interest and principal on debt obligations. The declaration and payment of future dividends to Chubb's shareholders will be at the discretion of Chubb's Board of Directors and will depend upon many factors, including our operating results, financial condition, capital requirements and any regulatory constraints.

As a holding company, Chubb's ability to continue to pay dividends to shareholders and to satisfy its debt obligations relies on the availability of liquid assets, which is dependent in large part on the dividend paying ability of its property and casualty subsidiaries. Our property and casualty subsidiaries are subject to laws and regulations in the jurisdictions in which they operate that restrict the amount of dividends they may pay without the prior approval of regulatory authorities. The restrictions are generally based on net income and on certain levels of policyholders surplus as determined in accordance with statutory accounting practices. Dividends in excess of such thresholds are considered extraordinary and require prior regulatory approval. During 2007, 2006 and 2005, these subsidiaries paid to Chubb cash dividends of \$1,550 million, \$650 million and \$520 million, respectively. In 2005, these subsidiaries also paid a dividend of \$97 million in other assets. The maximum dividend distribution that may be made by the property and casualty subsidiaries to Chubb during 2008 without prior approval is approximately \$2.4 billion.

Chubb has a revolving credit agreement with a group of banks that provides for up to \$500 million of unsecured borrowings. There have been no borrowings under this agreement. Various interest rate options are available to Chubb, all of which are based on market interest rates. The agreement contains customary restrictive covenants including a covenant to maintain a minimum consolidated shareholders' equity, as adjusted. At December 31, 2007, Chubb was in compliance with all such covenants. The revolving credit facility is available for general corporate purposes and to support our commercial paper borrowing arrangement. The facility had a termination date of June 22, 2010. In October 2007, the agreement was amended to extend the termination date to October 19, 2012. The terms of the amended agreement allow Chubb to elect in 2008 and again in 2009 to extend the termination date of the agreement by an additional year. On the termination date of the agreement, any borrowings then outstanding become payable.

Contractual Obligations and Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements

The following table provides our future payments due by period under contractual obligations as of December 31, 2007, aggregated by type of obligation.

| | 2008 | 2009 and 2010 | 2011 and 2012 | There- after | Total |
|---|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------|
| | (in millions) | | | | |
| Principal due under long term debt | \$ 685 | \$ | \$ 400 | \$ 2,375 | \$ 3,460 |
| Interest payments on long term debt(a) | 190 | 341 | 317 | 3,144 | 3,992 |
| Future minimum rental payments under operating leases | 89 | 146 | 114 | 181 | 530 |
| | 964 | 487 | 831 | 5,700 | 7,982 |
| Loss and loss expense reserves(b) | 4,977 | 7,013 | 4,072 | 6,561 | 22,623 |
| Total | \$5,941 | \$7,500 | \$4,903 | \$12,261 | \$30,605 |

(a)

Junior subordinated capital securities of \$1 billion bear interest at a fixed rate of 6.375% through April 14, 2017 and at a rate equal to the three-month LIBOR rate plus 2.25% thereafter. For purposes of the above table, interest after April 14, 2017 was calculated using the three-month

Table of Contents

LIBOR rate as of December 31, 2007. The table includes future interest payments through the scheduled maturity date, April 15, 2037. Interest payments for the period from the scheduled maturity date through the final maturity date, March 29, 2067, would increase the contractual obligation by \$2.1 billion. It is our expectation that the capital securities will be redeemed at the end of the fixed interest rate period.

- (b) There is typically no stated contractual commitment associated with property and casualty insurance loss reserves. The obligation to pay a claim arises only when a covered loss event occurs and a settlement is reached. The vast majority of our loss reserves relate to claims for which settlements have not yet been reached. Our loss reserves therefore represent estimates of future payments. These estimates are dependent on the outcome of claim settlements that will occur over many years. Accordingly, the payment of the loss reserves is not fixed as to either amount or timing. The estimate of the timing of future payments is based on our historical loss payment patterns. The ultimate amount and timing of loss payments will likely differ from our estimate and the differences could be material. We expect that these loss payments will be funded, in large part, by future cash receipts from operations.

The above table excludes certain commitments totaling \$1.3 billion at December 31, 2007 to fund limited partnership investments. These capital commitments can be called by the partnerships from time to time during the commitment period (generally five years or less), if and when needed by the partnerships to fund working capital needs or the purchase of new investments. It is uncertain whether and, if so, when we will be required to fund these commitments. There is no predetermined payment schedule.

The Corporation does not have any off-balance sheet arrangements that are reasonably likely to have a material effect on the Corporation's financial condition, results of operations, liquidity or capital resources, other than as disclosed in Note (15) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

INVESTED ASSETS

The main objectives in managing our investment portfolios are to maximize after-tax investment income and total investment returns while minimizing credit risks in order to provide maximum support to the insurance underwriting operations. Investment strategies are developed based on many factors including underwriting results and our resulting tax position, regulatory requirements, fluctuations in interest rates and consideration of other market risks. Investment decisions are centrally managed by investment professionals based on guidelines established by management and approved by the boards of directors of Chubb and its respective operating companies.

Our investment portfolio is primarily comprised of high quality bonds, principally tax exempt, U.S. Treasury and government agency, mortgage-backed securities and corporate issues as well as foreign government and corporate bonds that support our international operations. The portfolio also includes equity securities, primarily publicly traded common stocks, and other invested assets, primarily private equity limited partnerships, all of which are held with the primary objective of capital appreciation.

Limited partnership investments by their nature are less liquid and involve more risk than other investments. We actively manage our risk through type of asset class and domestic and international diversification. At December 31, 2007, we had investments in about 80 separate partnerships. We review the performance of these investments on a quarterly basis and we obtain audited financial statements annually.

In our U.S. operations, during 2007, we invested new cash in tax exempt bonds and, to a lesser extent, taxable bonds, equity securities and limited partnerships. The taxable bonds we invested in were corporate bonds and mortgage-backed securities while we reduced our holdings of U.S. Treasury securities. In 2006, we invested new cash in tax-exempt bonds and, to a lesser extent, equity securities

Table of Contents

and limited partnerships, whereas we decreased our holdings of taxable bonds, principally U.S. Treasury securities. In 2005, we invested new cash primarily in tax-exempt bonds and taxable bonds. The taxable bonds we invested in were mortgage-backed securities and, to a lesser extent, corporate bonds. Our objective is to achieve the appropriate mix of taxable and tax exempt securities in our portfolio to balance both investment and tax strategies. At December 31, 2007, 66% of our U.S. fixed maturity portfolio was invested in tax exempt bonds compared with 65% at December 31, 2006 and 60% at December 31, 2005.

We classify those fixed maturity securities that may be sold prior to maturity to support our investment strategies, such as in response to changes in interest rates and the yield curve or to maximize after-tax returns, as available-for-sale. We classify those fixed maturities that we have the ability and intent to hold to maturity as held-to-maturity. Fixed maturities classified as available-for-sale are carried at market value while fixed maturities classified as held-to-maturity are carried at amortized cost. Only about 1% of the fixed maturity portfolio was classified as held-to-maturity at December 31, 2006 and 2005. During the fourth quarter of 2007, we transferred our remaining held-to-maturity securities to available-for-sale.

Changes in the general interest rate environment affect the returns available on new fixed maturity investments. While a rising interest rate environment enhances the returns available on new investments, it reduces the market value of existing fixed maturity investments and thus the availability of gains on disposition. A decline in interest rates reduces the returns available on new investments but increases the market value of existing investments, creating the opportunity for realized investment gains on disposition.

The unrealized appreciation before tax of investments carried at market value, which consists of fixed maturities classified as available-for-sale and equity securities, was \$810 million, \$603 million and \$478 million at December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. Such unrealized appreciation is reflected in comprehensive income, net of applicable deferred income tax.

Changes in unrealized market appreciation or depreciation of fixed maturities were due primarily to fluctuations in interest rates.

CHANGE IN ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES

Effective December 31, 2006, we adopted Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 158, Employers Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans, an amendment of FASB Statements No. 87, 88, 106 and 132(R). SFAS No. 158 requires an employer to recognize the overfunded or underfunded status of a defined benefit postretirement plan as an asset or liability in its balance sheet and to recognize changes in the funded status as a component of comprehensive income in the year in which the changes occur. Retrospective application is not permitted.

SFAS No. 158 required that any gains or losses and prior service cost that had not yet been included in net benefit costs at the end of the year in which the Statement was adopted be recognized as an adjustment of the ending balance of accumulated other comprehensive income, net of tax. The adoption of SFAS No. 158 reduced shareholders equity at December 31, 2006 by \$281 million. Adoption of the Statement did not have any effect on the Corporation's net income in 2006 and 2007 and will not in future years. The adoption of SFAS No. 158 is discussed further in Note (2)(a) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements.

Item 7A. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk

Market risk represents the potential for loss due to adverse changes in the fair value of financial instruments. Our primary exposure to market risks relates to our investment portfolio, which is sensitive to changes in interest rates and, to a lesser extent, credit quality, prepayment, foreign currency exchange rates and equity prices. We also have exposure to market risks through our debt

Table of Contents

obligations. Analytical tools and monitoring systems are in place to assess each of these elements of market risk.

Investment Portfolio

Interest rate risk is the price sensitivity of a security that promises a fixed return to changes in interest rates. When market interest rates rise, the market value of our fixed income securities decreases. We view the potential changes in price of our fixed income investments within the overall context of asset and liability management. Our actuaries estimate the payout pattern of our liabilities, primarily our property and casualty loss reserves, to determine their duration, which is the present value of the weighted average payments expressed in years. We set duration targets for our fixed income investment portfolios after consideration of the estimated duration of these liabilities and other factors, which we believe mitigates the overall effect of interest rate risk for the Corporation.

The following table provides information about our fixed maturity investments, which are sensitive to changes in interest rates. The table presents cash flows of principal amounts and related weighted average interest rates by expected maturity dates at December 31, 2007 and 2006. The cash flows are based on the earlier of the call date or the maturity date or, for mortgage-backed securities, expected payment patterns. Actual cash flows could differ from the expected amounts.

At December 31, 2007

| | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | There- after | Amortized Cost | Estimated Market Value |
| (in millions) | | | | | | | | |
| Tax exempt | \$ 1,179 | \$ 891 | \$ 1,047 | \$ 1,421 | \$ 1,766 | \$ 11,904 | \$ 18,208 | \$ 18,559 |
| Average interest rate | 5.2% | 5.1% | 4.7% | 4.3% | 4.1% | 4.1% | | |
| Taxable other than mortgage-backed securities | 808 | 1,125 | 1,388 | 1,196 | 1,494 | 4,494 | 10,505 | 10,562 |
| Average interest rate | 5.6% | 4.8% | 4.8% | 5.0% | 5.2% | 5.1% | | |
| Mortgage-backed securities | 623 | 580 | 556 | 529 | 694 | 1,779 | 4,761 | 4,750 |
| Average interest rate | 5.0% | 4.7% | 4.7% | 4.8% | 5.0% | 5.3% | | |
| Total | \$2,610 | \$2,596 | \$2,991 | \$3,146 | \$3,954 | \$18,177 | \$33,474 | \$33,871 |

At December 31, 2006

| | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | There- after | Amortized Cost | Estimated Market Value |

(in millions)

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|
| Tax exempt | \$ 915 | \$ 868 | \$1,007 | \$1,094 | \$1,492 | \$12,073 | \$17,449 | \$17,755 |
| Average interest rate | 5.3% | 5.2% | 5.0% | 4.7% | 4.3% | 4.1% | | |
| Taxable other than mortgage-backed securities | 757 | 1,151 | 1,834 | 1,278 | 1,053 | 3,831 | 9,904 | 9,879 |
| Average interest rate | 5.6% | 4.8% | 4.5% | 4.8% | 5.1% | 5.0% | | |
| Mortgage-backed securities | 473 | 675 | 583 | 550 | 523 | 1,602 | 4,406 | 4,339 |
| Average interest rate | 4.5% | 5.2% | 4.7% | 4.7% | 4.8% | 5.1% | | |
| Total | \$2,145 | \$2,694 | \$3,424 | \$2,922 | \$3,068 | \$17,506 | \$31,759 | \$31,973 |

Credit risk is the potential loss resulting from adverse changes in the issuer's ability to repay the debt obligation. We have consistently invested in high quality marketable securities. Only about 1% of our bond portfolio is below investment grade. Our investment portfolio does not have any direct exposure to either sub-prime mortgages or collateralized debt obligations. Our tax exempt bonds mature on average in nine years, while our taxable bonds have an average maturity of five years.

Table of Contents

About 95% of our tax exempt bonds are rated AA or better by Moody's or Standard and Poor's with about 70% rated AAA. About 57% of the tax exempt bonds are uninsured and have an average credit rating of AA+. The remaining 43% are insured and are therefore rated AAA. Ongoing credit market related events have weakened the monoline bond insurers and raised concerns about the value of the credit insurance. The insured tax exempt bonds in our portfolio have been selected based on the quality of the underlying credit and not the value of the credit insurance enhancement. It is management's belief that even if the insurance provided by the monoline insurers ceased to exist, the aggregate mark-to-market impact on our tax exempt portfolio would not be material.

About 75% of the taxable bonds, other than mortgage-backed securities, in our portfolio are issued by the U.S. Treasury or U.S. government agencies or by foreign governments or are rated AA or better.

Mortgage-backed securities comprised 31% of our taxable bond portfolio at year-end 2007. About 98% of the mortgage-backed securities are rated AAA and the remaining 2% are all investment grade. Of the AAA rated securities, about 60% related to residential mortgages consisting of government agency pass-through securities, government agency collateralized mortgage obligations (CMOs) and AAA rated non-agency CMOs backed by government agency collateral or single family home mortgages. The majority of the CMOs are actively traded in liquid markets and market value information is readily available from broker/dealers. The other 40% of the AAA rated securities are call protected, commercial mortgage-backed securities.

Prepayment risk refers to the changes in prepayment patterns related to decreases and increases in interest rates that can either shorten or lengthen the expected timing of the principal repayments and thus the average life of a security, potentially reducing or increasing its effective yield. Such risk exists primarily within our portfolio of residential mortgage-backed securities. We monitor such risk regularly.

Foreign currency risk is the sensitivity to foreign exchange rate fluctuations of the market value and investment income related to foreign currency denominated financial instruments. The functional currency of our foreign operations is generally the currency of the local operating environment since business is primarily transacted in such local currency. We seek to mitigate the risks relating to currency fluctuations by generally maintaining investments in those foreign currencies in which our property and casualty subsidiaries have loss reserves and other liabilities, thereby limiting exchange rate risk to the net assets denominated in foreign currencies.

At December 31, 2007, the property and casualty subsidiaries held foreign currency denominated investments of \$6.8 billion supporting their international operations. The principal currencies creating foreign exchange rate risk for the property and casualty subsidiaries are the Canadian dollar, the euro and the British pound sterling. The following table provides information about those fixed maturity investments that are denominated in these currencies. The table presents cash flows of principal amounts in U.S. dollar equivalents by expected maturity dates at December 31, 2007. Actual cash flows could differ from the expected amounts.

At December 31, 2007

| | | | | | | | Total | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | There- after | Amortized Cost | Estimated Market Value |
| | (in millions) | | | | | | | |
| Canadian dollar | \$163 | \$227 | \$246 | \$261 | \$231 | \$718 | \$1,846 | \$1,873 |
| Euro | 98 | 161 | 174 | 215 | 144 | 842 | 1,634 | 1,611 |
| British pound sterling | 129 | 114 | 274 | 117 | 191 | 673 | 1,498 | 1,502 |

Table of Contents

Equity price risk is the potential loss in market value of our equity securities resulting from adverse changes in stock prices. In general, equities have more year-to-year price variability than intermediate term high grade bonds. However, returns over longer time frames have been consistently higher. Our publicly traded equity securities are high quality, diversified across industries and readily marketable. A hypothetical decrease of 10% in the market price of each of the equity securities held at December 31, 2007 and 2006 would have resulted in a decrease of \$232 million and \$196 million, respectively, in the fair value of the equity securities portfolio.

All of the above risks are monitored on an ongoing basis. A combination of in-house systems and proprietary models and externally licensed software are used to analyze individual securities as well as each portfolio. These tools provide the portfolio managers with information to assist them in the evaluation of the market risks of the portfolio.

Debt

We also have interest rate risk on our debt obligations. The following table presents expected cash flow of principal amounts and related weighted average interest rates by maturity date of our long term debt obligations at December 31, 2007.

At December 31, 2007

| | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | There- after | Total | Estimated Market Value |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|
| (in millions) | | | | | | | | |
| Expected cash flows of principal amounts | \$685 | \$ | \$ | \$400 | \$ | \$2,375 | \$3,460 | \$3,427 |
| Average interest rate | 5.0% | | | 6.0% | | 6.2% | | |

Item 8. Consolidated Financial Statements and Supplementary Data

Consolidated financial statements of the Corporation at December 31, 2007 and 2006 and for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2007 and the report thereon of our independent registered public accounting firm, and the Corporation's unaudited quarterly financial data for the two-year period ended December 31, 2007 are listed in Item 15(a) of this report.

Item 9. Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure

None.

Item 9A. Controls and Procedures

As of December 31, 2007, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the design and operation of the Corporation's disclosure controls and procedures (as such term is defined in Rule 13a-15(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) was performed under the supervision and with the participation of the Corporation's management, including Chubb's chief executive officer and chief financial officer. Based on that evaluation, the chief executive officer and chief financial officer concluded that the Corporation's disclosure controls and procedures were effective as of December 31, 2007.

During the three month period ended December 31, 2007, there were no changes in internal control over financial reporting that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, the Corporation's internal control over financial reporting.

Table of Contents

Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting

Management of the Corporation is responsible for establishing and maintaining adequate internal control over financial reporting, as such term is defined in Rule 13a-15(f) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The Corporation's internal control over financial reporting was designed under the supervision of and with the participation of the Corporation's management, including Chubb's chief executive officer and chief financial officer, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of the Corporation's financial reporting and the preparation and fair presentation of published financial statements in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect all misstatements. Therefore, even those systems determined to be effective can provide only reasonable assurance with respect to financial statement preparation and presentation.

Management conducted an assessment of the effectiveness of the Corporation's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2007. In making this assessment, management used the framework set forth in *Internal Control - Integrated Framework* issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. Based on this assessment, management has determined that, as of December 31, 2007, the Corporation's internal control over financial reporting is effective.

The Corporation's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2007 has been audited by Ernst & Young LLP, the independent registered public accounting firm who also audited the Corporation's consolidated financial statements. Their attestation report on the Corporation's internal control over financial reporting is shown on page 66.

Item 9B. Other Information

None.

Table of Contents

Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm

Ernst & Young LLP

5 Times Square

New York, New York 10036

The Board of Directors and Shareholders

The Chubb Corporation

We have audited The Chubb Corporation's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2007, based on criteria established in Internal Control – Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (the COSO criteria). The Chubb Corporation's management is responsible for maintaining effective internal control over financial reporting, and for its assessment of the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting included in the accompanying Management's Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the Corporation's internal control over financial reporting based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether effective internal control over financial reporting was maintained in all material respects. Our audit included obtaining an understanding of internal control over financial reporting, assessing the risk that a material weakness exists, testing and evaluating the design and operating effectiveness of internal control based on the assessed risk, and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

A company's internal control over financial reporting is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the reliability of financial reporting and the preparation of financial statements for external purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. A company's internal control over financial reporting includes those policies and procedures that (1) pertain to the maintenance of records that, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the company; (2) provide reasonable assurance that transactions are recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and that receipts and expenditures of the company are being made only in accordance with authorizations of management and directors of the company; and (3) provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the company's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

Because of its inherent limitations, internal control over financial reporting may not prevent or detect misstatements. Also, projections of any evaluation of effectiveness to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, The Chubb Corporation maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2007, based on the COSO criteria.

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), the consolidated balance sheets of The Chubb Corporation as of December 31, 2007 and 2006, and the related consolidated statements of income, shareholders' equity, cash flows and comprehensive income for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2007, and our report dated February 26, 2008 expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

/s/ Ernst & Young LLP

February 26, 2008

Table of Contents

PART III.

Item 10. *Directors and Executive Officers of the Registrant*

Information regarding Chubb's directors is incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders under the caption "Our Board of Directors." Information regarding Chubb's executive officers is included in Part I of this report under the caption "Executive Officers of the Registrant." Information regarding Section 16 reporting compliance of Chubb's directors, executive officers and 10% beneficial owners is incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders under the caption "Section 16(a) Beneficial Ownership Reporting Compliance." Information regarding Chubb's Code of Ethics for CEO and Senior Financial Officers is included in Item 1 of this report under the caption "Business - General." Information regarding the Audit Committee of Chubb's Board of Directors and its Audit Committee financial experts is incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders under the captions "Corporate Governance - Audit Committee" and "Committee Assignments."

Item 11. *Executive Compensation*

Incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders, under the captions "Corporate Governance - Directors' Compensation," "Compensation Discussion and Analysis" and "Executive Compensation."

Item 12. *Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters*

Incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders, under the captions "Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management" and "Equity Compensation Plan Information."

Item 13. *Certain Relationships and Related Transactions*

Incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders, under the caption "Certain Transactions and Other Matters."

Item 14. *Principal Accountant Fees and Services*

Incorporated by reference from Chubb's definitive Proxy Statement for the 2008 Annual Meeting of Shareholders, under the caption "Proposal 2: Ratification of Appointment of Independent Auditor."

PART IV.

Item 15. *Exhibits, Financial Statements and Schedules*

The financial statements and schedules listed in the accompanying index to financial statements and financial statement schedules are filed as part of this report.

The exhibits listed in the accompanying index to exhibits are filed as part of this report.

Table of Contents**SIGNATURES**

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

The Chubb Corporation
(Registrant)

February 21, 2008

By */s/ John D. Finnegan*

**(John D. Finnegan Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer)**

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated:

| Signature | Title | Date |
|--|---|----------------------|
| <i>/s/ John D. Finnegan</i> (John D. Finnegan) | Chairman, President, Chief Executive Officer and Director | February 21, 2008 |
| <i>/s/ Zoë Baird</i> (Zoë Baird) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| <i>/s/ Sheila P. Burke</i> (Sheila P. Burke) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| <i>/s/ James I. Cash, Jr.</i> (James I. Cash, Jr.) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| <i>/s/ Joel J. Cohen</i> (Joel J. Cohen) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| <i>/s/ Klaus J. Mangold</i> (Klaus J. Mangold) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| <i>/s/ Martin G. McGuinn</i> (Martin G. McGuinn) | Director | February 21, 2008 |

Table of Contents

| Signature | Title | Date |
|---|---|----------------------|
| /s/ David G. Scholey (David G. Scholey) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Lawrence M. Small (Lawrence M. Small) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Jess S oderberg (Jess S oderberg) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Daniel E. Somers (Daniel E. Somers) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Karen Hastie Williams (Karen Hastie Williams) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Alfred W. Zollar (Alfred W. Zollar) | Director | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Michael O Reilly (Michael O Reilly) | Vice Chairman and Chief Financial Officer | February 21, 2008 |
| /s/ Henry B. Schram (Henry B. Schram) | Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer | February 21, 2008 |

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
INDEX TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT SCHEDULES
(Item 15(a))

| | Form 10-K Page |
|---|---------------------------|
| Report of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm | F-2 |
| Consolidated Statements of Income for the Years Ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 | F-3 |
| Consolidated Balance Sheets at December 31, 2007 and 2006 | F-4 |
| Consolidated Statements of Shareholders' Equity for the Years Ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 | F-5 |
| Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows for the Years Ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 | F-6 |
| Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income for the Years Ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 | F-7 |
| Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements | F-8 |
| Supplementary Information (unaudited) | |
| Quarterly Financial Data | F-32 |
| Schedules: | |
| I Consolidated Summary of Investments Other than Investments in Related Parties at December 31, 2007 | S-1 |
| II Condensed Financial Information of Registrant at December 31, 2007 and 2006 and for the Years Ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 | S-2 |
| III Consolidated Supplementary Insurance Information at and for the Years Ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 | S-5 |

All other schedules are omitted since the required information is not present or is not present in amounts sufficient to require submission of the schedule, or because the information required is included in the financial statements and notes thereto.

F-1

Table of Contents

**REPORT OF INDEPENDENT REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM
ERNST & YOUNG LLP**

5 Times Square

New York, New York 10036

The Board of Directors and Shareholders

The Chubb Corporation

We have audited the accompanying consolidated balance sheets of The Chubb Corporation as of December 31, 2007 and 2006, and the related consolidated statements of income, shareholders' equity, cash flows and comprehensive income for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2007. Our audits also included the financial statement schedules listed in the Index at Item 15(a). These financial statements and schedules are the responsibility of the Corporation's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements and schedules based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States). Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the consolidated financial position of The Chubb Corporation at December 31, 2007 and 2006, and the consolidated results of its operations and its cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2007, in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. Also, in our opinion, the related financial statement schedules, when considered in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole, present fairly in all material respects the information set forth therein.

We also have audited, in accordance with the standards of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (United States), The Chubb Corporation's internal control over financial reporting as of December 31, 2007, based on criteria established in Internal Control - Integrated Framework issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission and our report dated February 26, 2008 expressed an unqualified opinion thereon.

/s/ Ernst & Young LLP

February 26, 2008

F-2

Table of Contents**THE CHUBB CORPORATION**
Consolidated Statements of Income

| | In Millions, Except For Per Share Amounts Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Revenues | | | |
| Premiums Earned | \$ 11,946 | \$ 11,958 | \$ 12,176 |
| Investment Income | 1,738 | 1,580 | 1,408 |
| Other Revenues | 49 | 220 | 115 |
| Realized Investment Gains | 374 | 245 | 384 |
| TOTAL REVENUES | 14,107 | 14,003 | 14,083 |
| Losses and Expenses | | | |
| Losses and Loss Expenses | 6,299 | 6,574 | 7,813 |
| Amortization of Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs | 3,092 | 2,919 | 2,931 |
| Other Insurance Operating Costs and Expenses | 444 | 550 | 512 |
| Investment Expenses | 35 | 34 | 29 |
| Other Expenses | 48 | 207 | 161 |
| Corporate Expenses | 252 | 194 | 190 |
| TOTAL LOSSES AND EXPENSES | 10,170 | 10,478 | 11,636 |
| INCOME BEFORE FEDERAL AND FOREIGN INCOME TAX | 3,937 | 3,525 | 2,447 |
| Federal and Foreign Income Tax | 1,130 | 997 | 621 |
| NET INCOME | \$ 2,807 | \$ 2,528 | \$ 1,826 |
| Net Income Per Share | | | |
| Basic | \$ 7.13 | \$ 6.13 | \$ 4.61 |
| Diluted | 7.01 | 5.98 | 4.47 |

See accompanying notes.

Table of Contents**THE CHUBB CORPORATION**
Consolidated Balance Sheets

| | In Millions | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 2007 | December 31 |
| | | 2006 |
| Assets | | |
| Invested Assets | | |
| Short Term Investments | \$ 1,839 | \$ 2,254 |
| Fixed Maturities | | |
| Held-to-Maturity Tax Exempt (market \$142 in 2006) | | 135 |
| Available-for-Sale | | |
| Tax Exempt (cost \$18,208 and \$17,314) | 18,559 | 17,613 |
| Taxable (cost \$15,266 and \$14,310) | 15,312 | 14,218 |
| Equity Securities (cost \$1,907 and \$1,561) | 2,320 | 1,957 |
| Other Invested Assets | 2,051 | 1,516 |
| TOTAL INVESTED ASSETS | 40,081 | 37,693 |
| Cash | 49 | 38 |
| Securities Lending Collateral | 1,247 | 2,620 |
| Accrued Investment Income | 440 | 411 |
| Premiums Receivable | 2,227 | 2,314 |
| Reinsurance Recoverable on Unpaid Losses and Loss Expenses | 2,307 | 2,594 |
| Prepaid Reinsurance Premiums | 392 | 354 |
| Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs | 1,556 | 1,480 |
| Deferred Income Tax | 442 | 591 |
| Goodwill | 467 | 467 |
| Other Assets | 1,366 | 1,715 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | \$50,574 | \$50,277 |
| Liabilities | | |
| Unpaid Losses and Loss Expenses | \$22,623 | \$22,293 |
| Unearned Premiums | 6,599 | 6,546 |
| Securities Lending Payable | 1,247 | 2,620 |
| Long Term Debt | 3,460 | 2,466 |
| Dividend Payable to Shareholders | 110 | 104 |
| Accrued Expenses and Other Liabilities | 2,090 | 2,385 |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES | 36,129 | 36,414 |
| Commitments and Contingent Liabilities (Note 9 and 15) | | |
| Shareholders Equity | | |
| Preferred Stock Authorized 8,000,000 Shares; \$1 Par Value; Issued None | | |
| | 375 | 411 |

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

Common Stock Authorized 1,200,000,000 Shares;
 \$1 Par Value; Issued 374,649,923 and 411,276,940 Shares

| | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| Paid-In Surplus | 346 | 1,539 |
| Retained Earnings | 13,280 | 11,711 |
| Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income | 444 | 202 |
| TOTAL SHAREHOLDERS EQUITY | 14,445 | 13,863 |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS EQUITY | \$50,574 | \$50,277 |

See accompanying notes.

F-4

Table of Contents**THE CHUBB CORPORATION**
Consolidated Statements of Shareholders' Equity

| | In Millions | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------|-------|
| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Preferred Stock | | | |
| Balance, Beginning and End of Year | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Common Stock | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | 411 | 210 | 196 |
| Two-for-One Stock Split | | 210 | |
| Treasury Shares Cancelled | | (7) | |
| Repurchase of Shares | (42) | (21) | |
| Shares Issued Upon Settlement of Equity Unit Purchase Contracts and Warrants | | 13 | 9 |
| Shares Issued Under Stock-Based Employee Compensation Plans | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Balance, End of Year | 375 | 411 | 210 |
| Paid-In Surplus | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | 1,539 | 2,364 | 1,319 |
| Two-for-One Stock Split | | (210) | |
| Treasury Shares Cancelled | | (377) | |
| Repurchase of Shares | (1,361) | (987) | |
| Shares Issued Upon Settlement of Equity Unit Purchase Contracts and Warrants | | 447 | 591 |
| Changes Related to Stock-Based Employee Compensation (includes tax benefit of \$16, \$46, and \$84) | 168 | 302 | 454 |
| Balance, End of Year | 346 | 1,539 | 2,364 |
| Retained Earnings | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | 11,711 | 9,600 | 8,119 |
| Net Income | 2,807 | 2,528 | 1,826 |
| Dividends Declared (per share \$1.16, \$1.00 and \$.86) | (457) | (417) | (345) |
| Repurchase of Shares | (781) | | |
| Balance, End of Year | 13,280 | 11,711 | 9,600 |
| Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income | | | |
| Unrealized Appreciation of Investments | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | 392 | 311 | 624 |
| Change During Year, Net of Tax | 134 | 81 | (313) |
| Balance, End of Year | 526 | 392 | 311 |

| | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Foreign Currency Translation Gains | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | 91 | 57 | 79 |
| Change During Year, Net of Tax | 125 | 34 | (22) |
| Balance, End of Year | 216 | 91 | 57 |
| Postretirement Benefit Costs Not Yet Recognized in Net Income | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | (281) | | |
| Change During Year, Net of Tax | (17) | | |
| Adjustment to Recognize Funded Status at December 31, 2006, Net of Tax | | (281) | |
| Balance, End of Year | (298) | (281) | |
| Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income, End of Year | 444 | 202 | 368 |
| Treasury Stock, at Cost | | | |
| Balance, Beginning of Year | | (135) | (211) |
| Repurchase of Shares | | (249) | (135) |
| Cancellation of Shares | | 384 | |
| Shares Issued Under Stock-Based Employee Compensation Plans | | | 211 |
| Balance, End of Year | | | (135) |
| TOTAL SHAREHOLDERS EQUITY | \$14,445 | \$13,863 | \$12,407 |

See accompanying notes.

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows

| | In Millions | | |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Cash Flows from Operating Activities | | | |
| Net Income | \$ 2,807 | \$ 2,528 | \$ 1,826 |
| Adjustments to Reconcile Net Income to Net Cash Provided by Operating Activities | | | |
| Increase in Unpaid Losses and Loss Expenses, Net | 617 | 986 | 1,904 |
| Increase (Decrease) in Unearned Premiums, Net | (74) | 16 | 107 |
| Decrease (Increase) in Reinsurance Recoverable on Paid Losses | 258 | (225) | (51) |
| Amortization of Premiums and Discounts on Fixed Maturities | 233 | 233 | 217 |
| Depreciation | 69 | 81 | 91 |
| Realized Investment Gains | (374) | (245) | (384) |
| Other, Net | (345) | (32) | 46 |
| NET CASH PROVIDED BY OPERATING ACTIVITIES | 3,191 | 3,342 | 3,756 |
| Cash Flows from Investing Activities | | | |
| Proceeds from Fixed Maturities | | | |
| Sales | 4,616 | 3,623 | 7,481 |
| Maturities, Calls and Redemptions | 1,790 | 1,579 | 1,683 |
| Proceeds from Sales of Equity Securities | 360 | 186 | 330 |
| Purchases of Fixed Maturities | (7,909) | (6,758) | (12,206) |
| Purchases of Equity Securities | (650) | (377) | (428) |
| Investments in Other Invested Assets, Net | (164) | (264) | (66) |
| Decrease (Increase) in Short Term Investments, Net | 455 | (355) | (591) |
| Increase (Decrease) in Net Payable from Security Transactions not Settled | (106) | 50 | (111) |
| Purchases of Property and Equipment, Net | (53) | (53) | (40) |
| Other, Net | 12 | | 97 |
| NET CASH USED IN INVESTING ACTIVITIES | (1,649) | (2,369) | (3,851) |
| Cash Flows from Financing Activities | | | |
| Proceeds from Issuance of Long Term Debt | 1,800 | | |
| Repayment of Long Term Debt | (800) | | (301) |
| Decrease in Funds Held Under Deposit Contracts | (8) | (29) | (276) |
| Proceeds from Common Stock Issued Upon Settlement of Equity Unit Purchase Contracts and Warrants | | 460 | 600 |
| Proceeds from Issuance of Common Stock Under Stock-Based Employee Compensation Plans | 130 | 229 | 531 |
| Repurchase of Shares | (2,185) | (1,228) | (135) |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Dividends Paid to Shareholders | (451) | (403) | (330) |
| Other, Net | (17) | | |
| NET CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN) FINANCING ACTIVITIES | (1,531) | (971) | 89 |
| Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash | 11 | 2 | (6) |
| Cash at Beginning of Year | 38 | 36 | 42 |
| CASH AT END OF YEAR | \$ 49 | \$ 38 | \$ 36 |

See accompanying notes.

F-6

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income

| | In Millions | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Net Income | \$2,807 | \$2,528 | \$1,826 |
| Other Comprehensive Income (Loss), Net of Tax | | | |
| Change in Unrealized Appreciation of Investments | 134 | 81 | (313) |
| Foreign Currency Translation Gains (Losses) | 125 | 34 | (22) |
| Change in Postretirement Benefit Costs Not Yet Recognized in Net Income | (17) | | |
| | 242 | 115 | (335) |
| COMPREHENSIVE INCOME | \$3,049 | \$2,643 | \$1,491 |

See accompanying notes.

F-7

Table of Contents**NOTES TO CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS****(1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies***(a) Basis of Presentation*

The Chubb Corporation (Chubb) is a holding company with subsidiaries principally engaged in the property and casualty insurance business. The property and casualty insurance subsidiaries (the P&C Group) underwrite most lines of property and casualty insurance in the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia and parts of Latin America and Asia. The geographic distribution of property and casualty business in the United States is broad with a particularly strong market presence in the Northeast.

The accompanying consolidated financial statements have been prepared in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles and include the accounts of Chubb and its subsidiaries (collectively, the Corporation).

Significant intercompany transactions have been eliminated in consolidation.

The consolidated financial statements include amounts based on informed estimates and judgments of management for transactions that are not yet complete. Such estimates and judgments affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Certain amounts in the consolidated financial statements for prior years have been reclassified to conform with the 2007 presentation.

(b) Invested Assets

Short term investments, which have an original maturity of one year or less, are carried at amortized cost, which approximates market value.

Fixed maturities, which include bonds and redeemable preferred stocks, are purchased to support the investment strategies of the Corporation. These strategies are developed based on many factors including rate of return, maturity, credit risk, tax considerations and regulatory requirements. Fixed maturities that may be sold prior to maturity to support the investment strategies of the Corporation are classified as available-for-sale and carried at market value as of the balance sheet date. Those fixed maturities that the Corporation has the ability and positive intent to hold to maturity are classified as held-to-maturity and carried at amortized cost.

Premiums and discounts arising from the purchase of fixed maturities are amortized using the interest method over the estimated remaining term of the securities. For mortgage-backed securities, prepayment assumptions are reviewed periodically and revised as necessary.

Equity securities, which include common stocks and non-redeemable preferred stocks, are carried at market value as of the balance sheet date.

Unrealized appreciation or depreciation of equity securities and fixed maturities carried at market value is excluded from net income and credited or charged, net of applicable deferred income tax, directly to comprehensive income.

Other invested assets, which include private equity limited partnerships, are carried at the Corporation's equity in the net assets of the partnerships based on valuations provided by the manager of each partnership. As a result of the timing of the receipt of valuation data from the investment managers, these investments are reported on a three month lag. Changes in the Corporation's equity in the net assets of the partnerships are included in income as realized investment gains or losses.

Realized gains and losses on the sale of investments are determined on the basis of the cost of the specific investments sold and are credited or charged to income. When the market value of any investment is lower than its cost, an assessment is made to determine whether the decline is temporary or other-than-temporary. If the decline is deemed to be other-than-temporary, the investment is written down to market value and the amount of the writedown is charged to income as a realized investment loss. The market value of the investment becomes its new cost basis.

The Corporation engages in a securities lending program from which it generates investment income from the lending of certain of its invested assets to other institutions for short periods of time. The Corporation maintains effective control over securities loaned and therefore continues to report such securities as invested assets. The market value of the loaned securities was \$1,510 million and \$2,857 million at December 31, 2007 and 2006, respectively. Of these amounts, \$1,274 million and \$2,499 million, respectively, comprised available-for-sale fixed maturities and the

balance comprised equity securities.

The Corporation's policy is to require initial collateral equal to at least 102% of the market value of the loaned securities. In those instances where cash collateral is obtained from the borrower, the collateral is invested by a lending agent in accordance with the Corporation's guidelines. The cash collateral is recognized as an asset with a corresponding liability for the obligation to return the collateral. In instances where non-cash collateral is obtained from the borrower, the Corporation does not recognize the receipt of the collateral held by the lending agent or the obligation to return the collateral as there exists no right to sell or repledge the collateral. The market value of the non-cash collateral held was \$325 million and \$346 million at December 31, 2007 and 2006, respectively. The Corporation retains a portion of the income earned from the cash collateral or receives a fee from the borrower. Under the terms of the securities lending program, the lending agent indemnifies the Corporation against borrower defaults.

F-8

Table of Contents*(c) Premium Revenues and Related Expenses*

Insurance premiums are earned on a monthly pro rata basis over the terms of the policies and include estimates of audit premiums and premiums on retrospectively rated policies. Assumed reinsurance premiums are earned over the terms of the reinsurance contracts. Unearned premiums represent the portion of direct and assumed premiums written applicable to the unexpired terms of the insurance policies and reinsurance contracts in force.

Ceded reinsurance premiums are charged to income over the terms of the reinsurance contracts. Prepaid reinsurance premiums represent the portion of premiums ceded to reinsurers applicable to the unexpired terms of the reinsurance contracts in force.

Reinsurance reinstatement premiums are recognized in the same period as the loss event that gave rise to the reinstatement premiums.

Acquisition costs that vary with and are primarily related to the production of business are deferred and amortized over the period in which the related premiums are earned. Such costs include commissions, premium taxes and certain other underwriting and policy issuance costs. Commissions received related to reinsurance premiums ceded are considered in determining net acquisition costs eligible for deferral. Deferred policy acquisition costs are reviewed to determine whether they are recoverable from future income. If such costs are deemed to be unrecoverable, they are expensed. Anticipated investment income is considered in the determination of the recoverability of deferred policy acquisition costs.

(d) Unpaid Losses and Loss Expenses

Unpaid losses and loss expenses (also referred to as loss reserves) include the accumulation of individual case estimates for claims that have been reported and estimates of claims that have been incurred but not reported as well as estimates of the expenses associated with processing and settling all reported and unreported claims, less estimates of anticipated salvage and subrogation recoveries. Estimates are based upon past loss experience modified for current trends as well as prevailing economic, legal and social conditions. Loss reserves are not discounted to present value.

Loss reserves are regularly reviewed using a variety of actuarial techniques. Reserve estimates are updated as historical loss experience develops, additional claims are reported and/or settled and new information becomes available. Any changes in estimates are reflected in operating results in the period in which the estimates are changed.

Reinsurance recoverable on unpaid losses and loss expenses represents an estimate of the portion of gross loss reserves that will be recovered from reinsurers. Amounts recoverable from reinsurers are estimated using assumptions that are consistent with those used in estimating the gross losses associated with the reinsured policies. A provision for estimated uncollectible reinsurance is recorded based on periodic evaluations of balances due from reinsurers, the financial condition of the reinsurers, coverage disputes and other relevant factors.

(e) Financial Products

Credit derivatives are carried at estimated fair value as of the balance sheet date. Changes in fair value are recognized in income in the period of the change and are included in other revenues.

Assets and liabilities related to the credit derivatives are included in other assets and other liabilities.

(f) Goodwill

Goodwill represents the excess of the cost of an acquired entity over the fair value of net assets acquired. Goodwill is tested for impairment at least annually.

(g) Property and Equipment

Property and equipment used in operations, including certain costs incurred to develop or obtain computer software for internal use, are capitalized and carried at cost less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is calculated using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the assets.

(h) Real Estate

Real estate properties are carried at cost less accumulated depreciation and any writedowns for impairment. Real estate properties are reviewed for impairment whenever events or circumstances indicate that the carrying value of such properties may not be recoverable. Measurement of such impairment is based on the fair value of the property.

(i) Income Taxes

Deferred income tax assets and liabilities are recognized for the expected future tax effects attributable to temporary differences between the financial reporting and tax bases of assets and liabilities, based on enacted tax rates and other

provisions of tax law. The effect on deferred tax assets and liabilities of a change in tax laws or rates is recognized in income in the period in which such change is enacted. Deferred tax assets are reduced by a valuation allowance if it is more likely than not that all or some portion of the deferred tax assets will not be realized.

The Corporation does not consider the earnings of its foreign subsidiaries to be permanently reinvested. Accordingly, provision has been made for the expected U.S. federal income tax liabilities applicable to undistributed earnings of foreign subsidiaries.

(j) *Stock-Based Employee Compensation*

The fair value method of accounting is used for stock-based employee compensation plans. Under the fair value method, compensation cost is measured based on the fair value of the award at the grant date and recognized over the requisite service period.

Table of Contents**(k) Foreign Exchange**

Assets and liabilities relating to foreign operations are translated into U.S. dollars using current exchange rates as of the balance sheet date. Revenues and expenses are translated into U.S. dollars using the average exchange rates during the year.

The functional currency of foreign operations is generally the currency of the local operating environment since business is primarily transacted in such local currency. Translation gains and losses, net of applicable income tax, are excluded from net income and are credited or charged directly to comprehensive income.

(l) Cash Flow Information

In the statement of cash flows, short term investments are not considered to be cash equivalents. The effect of changes in foreign exchange rates on cash balances was immaterial.

In 2005, the Corporation transferred its ongoing reinsurance assumed business and certain related assets to Harbor Point Limited (see Note (3)). In exchange, the Corporation received from Harbor Point \$200 million of 6% convertible notes and warrants to purchase common stock of Harbor Point.

In 2005, a mortgage payable of \$42 million was assumed by an unaffiliated joint venture in connection with the disposition of the Corporation's interest in a variable interest entity in which it was the primary beneficiary.

These noncash transactions have been excluded from the consolidated statement of cash flows.

(m) Accounting Pronouncements Not Yet Adopted

In September 2006, the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) issued Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 157, Fair Value Measurements. SFAS No. 157 defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value and expands disclosures about fair value measurements. SFAS No. 157 applies whenever other accounting pronouncements require or permit assets or liabilities to be measured at fair value. The Statement does not expand the use of fair value to any new circumstances. SFAS No. 157 is effective for the Corporation for the year beginning January 1, 2008. The adoption of SFAS No. 157 is not expected to have a significant effect on the Corporation's financial position or results of operations.

(2) Adoption of New Accounting Pronouncements

(a) Effective December 31, 2006, the Corporation adopted SFAS No. 158, Employers' Accounting for Defined Benefit Pension and Other Postretirement Plans, an amendment of FASB Statements No. 87, 88, 106 and 132(R). SFAS No. 158 requires an employer to recognize the overfunded or underfunded status of a defined benefit postretirement plan as an asset or liability in its balance sheet and to recognize changes in the funded status as a component of other comprehensive income in the years in which the changes occur. Retrospective application was not permitted.

SFAS No. 158 requires that any gains or losses and prior service cost that had not yet been included in net benefit costs as of the end of the year in which the Statement was adopted be recognized as an adjustment of the ending balance of accumulated other comprehensive income, net of tax. The effect on the Corporation's balance sheet at December 31, 2006 was an increase in other liabilities of \$432 million, an increase in deferred income tax assets of \$151 million and a decrease in accumulated other comprehensive income, a component of shareholders' equity, of \$281 million. Adoption of the Statement did not have any effect on the Corporation's results of operations in 2006 and 2007 and will not in future years.

(b) Effective January 1, 2007, the Corporation adopted FASB Interpretation No. 48 (FIN 48), Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes, an interpretation of SFAS No. 109. FIN 48 clarifies the accounting for uncertainty in income taxes recognized in an enterprise's financial statements. The Interpretation prescribes a recognition threshold and measurement attribute for the financial statement recognition and measurement of a tax position taken or expected to be taken in a tax return. The adoption of FIN 48 did not have a significant effect on the Corporation's financial position or results of operations.

(3) Transfer of Ongoing Reinsurance Assumed Business

In December 2005, the Corporation completed a transaction involving a new Bermuda-based reinsurance company, Harbor Point Limited.

As part of the transaction, the Corporation transferred its ongoing reinsurance assumed business and certain related assets, including renewal rights, to Harbor Point. In exchange, the Corporation received from Harbor Point \$200 million of 6% convertible notes and warrants to purchase common stock of Harbor Point. The notes and warrants represented in the aggregate on a fully diluted basis approximately 16% of the new company.

Harbor Point generally did not assume the reinsurance liabilities relating to reinsurance contracts incepting prior to December 31, 2005. The P&C Group retained those liabilities and the related assets.

The transaction resulted in a pre-tax gain of \$204 million, of which \$171 million was recognized in 2005 and \$33 million was deferred. The portion of the gain that was deferred was based on the Corporation's economic interest in Harbor Point.

For a transition period of about two years, Harbor Point underwrote specific reinsurance business on the P&C Group's behalf. The P&C Group retained a portion of this business and ceded the balance to Harbor Point in return for a fronting commission.

The P&C Group receives additional payments based on the amount of business renewed by Harbor Point. These amounts are being recognized in income as earned.

F-10

Table of Contents**(4) Invested Assets and Related Income**

(a) The amortized cost and estimated market value of fixed maturities were as follows:

| | | December 31 | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | 2007 | | | 2006 | | | | |
| | Tax | Gross Amortized Cost | Gross Unrealized Appreciation | Gross Unrealized Depreciation | Estimated Market Value | Gross Amortized Cost | Gross Unrealized Appreciation | Gross Unrealized Depreciation | Estimated Market Value |
| (in millions) | | | | | | | | | |
| Held-to-maturity | exempt | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ 135 | \$ 7 | \$ | \$ 142 |
| Available-for-sale | | | | | | | | | |
| Tax exempt | | 18,208 | 385 | 34 | 18,559 | 17,314 | 341 | 42 | 17,613 |
| Taxable | | | | | | | | | |
| U.S. Government and government agency and authority obligations | | 671 | 36 | 2 | 705 | 1,936 | 1 | 26 | 1,911 |
| Corporate bonds | | 2,888 | 42 | 22 | 2,908 | 2,379 | 42 | 24 | 2,397 |
| Foreign bonds | | 6,946 | 66 | 63 | 6,949 | 5,589 | 39 | 57 | 5,571 |
| Mortgage-backed securities | | 4,761 | 31 | 42 | 4,750 | 4,406 | 21 | 88 | 4,339 |
| | | 15,266 | 175 | 129 | 15,312 | 14,310 | 103 | 195 | 14,218 |
| Total available-for-sale | | 33,474 | 560 | 163 | 33,871 | 31,624 | 444 | 237 | 31,831 |
| Total fixed maturities | | \$33,474 | \$ 560 | \$ 163 | \$33,871 | \$31,759 | \$ 451 | \$ 237 | \$31,973 |

During the fourth quarter of 2007, the Corporation transferred its remaining \$86 million of held-to-maturity securities to available-for-sale. The unrealized appreciation was \$6 million at the date of transfer.

The amortized cost and estimated market value of fixed maturities at December 31, 2007 by contractual maturity were as follows:

| Amortized Cost | Estimated Market Value |
|----------------|------------------------|
|----------------|------------------------|

(in millions)

| | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| Available-for-sale | | |
| Due in one year or less | \$ 1,062 | \$ 1,065 |
| Due after one year through five years | 8,206 | 8,301 |
| Due after five years through ten years | 11,862 | 12,071 |
| Due after ten years | 7,583 | 7,684 |
| | 28,713 | 29,121 |
| Mortgage-backed securities | 4,761 | 4,750 |
| | \$33,474 | \$33,871 |

Actual maturities could differ from contractual maturities because borrowers may have the right to call or prepay obligations.

(b) The components of unrealized appreciation or depreciation of investments carried at market value were as follows:

| | December 31 | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions) | |
| Equity securities | | |
| Gross unrealized appreciation | \$490 | \$417 |
| Gross unrealized depreciation | 77 | 21 |
| | 413 | 396 |
| Fixed maturities | | |
| Gross unrealized appreciation | 560 | 444 |
| Gross unrealized depreciation | 163 | 237 |
| | 397 | 207 |
| | 810 | 603 |
| Deferred income tax liability | 284 | 211 |
| | \$526 | \$392 |

Table of Contents

When the market value of any investment is lower than its cost, an assessment is made to determine whether the decline is temporary or other-than-temporary. The assessment is based on both quantitative criteria and qualitative information and considers a number of factors including, but not limited to, the length of time and the extent to which the market value has been less than the cost, the financial condition and near term prospects of the issuer, whether the issuer is current on contractually obligated interest and principal payments, the intent and ability of the Corporation to hold the investment for a period of time sufficient to allow for the recovery of cost, general market conditions and industry or sector specific factors. Based on a review of the securities in an unrealized loss position at December 31, 2007 and 2006, management believes that none of the declines in market value at those dates were other-than-temporary.

The following table summarizes, for all investment securities in an unrealized loss position at December 31, 2007, the aggregate market value and gross unrealized depreciation by investment category and length of time that individual securities have continuously been in an unrealized loss position.

| | Less Than 12 Months | | 12 Months or More | | Total | |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Estimated Market Value | Gross Unrealized Depreciation | Estimated Market Value | Gross Unrealized Depreciation | Estimated Market Value | Gross Unrealized Depreciation |
| (in millions) | | | | | | |
| Fixed maturities available-for-sale | | | | | | |
| Tax exempt | \$ 1,109 | \$ 19 | \$ 1,556 | \$ 15 | \$ 2,665 | \$ 34 |
| Taxable | | | | | | |
| U.S. Government and government agency and authority obligations | | | 66 | 2 | 66 | 2 |
| Corporate bonds | 262 | 8 | 610 | 14 | 872 | 22 |
| Foreign bonds | 1,302 | 20 | 2,052 | 43 | 3,354 | 63 |
| Mortgage-backed securities | 813 | 8 | 2,263 | 34 | 3,076 | 42 |
| | 2,377 | 36 | 4,991 | 93 | 7,368 | 129 |
| Total fixed maturities available-for-sale | 3,486 | 55 | 6,547 | 108 | 10,033 | 163 |
| Equity securities | 373 | 52 | 81 | 25 | 454 | 77 |
| | \$ 3,859 | \$ 107 | \$ 6,628 | \$ 133 | \$ 10,487 | \$ 240 |

The total gross unrealized depreciation amount at December 31, 2007 comprised approximately 1,260 securities, of which 1,210 were fixed maturities. There were no securities with a market value of less than 80% of the security's amortized cost for the previous six continuous months. Of the fixed maturities in an unrealized loss position, substantially all were investment grade securities for which market values declined due to increases in interest rates from the date of purchase. Fixed maturity securities in an unrealized loss position for less than twelve months

comprised approximately 550 securities, of which 95% were securities with a market value to amortized cost ratio at or greater than 90%. Fixed maturity securities in an unrealized loss position for twelve months or more comprised approximately 660 securities, of which 99% were securities with a market value to amortized cost ratio at or greater than 90%.

The following table summarizes, for all investment securities in an unrealized loss position at December 31, 2006, the aggregate market value and gross unrealized depreciation by investment category and length of time that individual securities have continuously been in an unrealized loss position.

| | Less Than 12 Months | | 12 Months or More | | Total | |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Estimated Market Value | Gross Unrealized Depreciation | Estimated Market Value | Gross Unrealized Depreciation | Estimated Market Value | Gross Unrealized Depreciation |
| (in millions) | | | | | | |
| Fixed maturities available-for-sale | | | | | | |
| Tax exempt | \$ 1,136 | \$ 4 | \$ 2,985 | \$ 38 | \$ 4,121 | \$ 42 |
| Taxable | | | | | | |
| U.S. Government and government agency and authority obligations | 1,014 | 8 | 766 | 18 | 1,780 | 26 |
| Corporate bonds | 229 | 3 | 928 | 21 | 1,157 | 24 |
| Foreign bonds | 2,893 | 37 | 976 | 20 | 3,869 | 57 |
| Mortgage-backed securities | 584 | 4 | 2,763 | 84 | 3,347 | 88 |
| | 4,720 | 52 | 5,433 | 143 | 10,153 | 195 |
| Total fixed maturities available-for-sale | 5,856 | 56 | 8,418 | 181 | 14,274 | 237 |
| Equity securities | 148 | 12 | 68 | 9 | 216 | 21 |
| | \$ 6,004 | \$ 68 | \$ 8,486 | \$ 190 | \$ 14,490 | \$ 258 |

Table of Contents

The change in unrealized appreciation of investments carried at market value was as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------|---------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Change in unrealized appreciation of equity securities | \$ 17 | \$ 272 | \$ (29) |
| Change in unrealized appreciation of fixed maturities | 190 | (147) | (453) |
| | 207 | 125 | (482) |
| Deferred income tax (credit) | 73 | 44 | (169) |
| | \$ 134 | \$ 81 | \$(313) |

(c) The sources of net investment income were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Fixed maturities | \$ 1,516 | \$ 1,433 | \$ 1,296 |
| Equity securities | 46 | 33 | 30 |
| Short term investments | 119 | 74 | 53 |
| Other | 57 | 40 | 29 |
| Gross investment income | 1,738 | 1,580 | 1,408 |
| Investment expenses | 35 | 34 | 29 |
| | \$ 1,703 | \$ 1,546 | \$ 1,379 |

(d) Realized investment gains and losses were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Fixed maturities | | | |
| Gross realized gains | \$ 57 | \$ 29 | \$ 74 |
| Gross realized losses | (53) | (31) | (109) |
| Other-than-temporary impairments | (30) | (3) | (4) |
| | (26) | (5) | (39) |

Equity securities

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|--------|
| Gross realized gains | 136 | 60 | 84 |
| Gross realized losses | (1) | (9) | (9) |
| Other-than-temporary impairments | (79) | (10) | (1) |
| | 56 | 41 | 74 |
| Other invested assets | 344 | 209 | 162 |
| Transfer of reinsurance business | | | 171 |
| Sale of Personal Lines Insurance Brokerage | | | 16 |
| | \$374 | \$245 | \$ 384 |

In December 2005, the Corporation transferred its ongoing reinsurance assumed business and certain related assets to Harbor Point Limited. This transaction is further described in Note (3).

In September 2005, the Corporation sold Personal Lines Insurance Brokerage, Inc., an insurance brokerage subsidiary.

(5) Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs

Policy acquisition costs deferred and the related amortization charged against income were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Balance, beginning of year | \$ 1,480 | \$ 1,445 | \$ 1,435 |
| Costs deferred during year | | | |
| Commissions and brokerage | 1,713 | 1,534 | 1,636 |
| Premium taxes and assessments | 253 | 265 | 260 |
| Salaries and operating costs | 1,178 | 1,139 | 1,052 |
| | 3,144 | 2,938 | 2,948 |
| Increase (decrease) due to foreign exchange | 24 | 16 | (7) |
| Amortization during year | (3,092) | (2,919) | (2,931) |
| Balance, end of year | \$ 1,556 | \$ 1,480 | \$ 1,445 |

(6) Real Estate

The carrying value of real estate assets, primarily land under development and unimproved land, included in other assets was \$174 million and \$201 million at December 31, 2007 and 2006, respectively. Impairment losses of \$11 million and \$66 million were recognized in 2006 and 2005, respectively, to write down the carrying value of certain properties to their estimated fair value. No impairment losses were recognized in 2007.

(7) Property and Equipment

Property and equipment included in other assets were as follows:

| | December 31 | |
|--|-------------|------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |

| | (in millions) | |
|--------------------------|---------------|-------|
| Cost | \$839 | \$814 |
| Accumulated depreciation | 490 | 451 |
| | \$349 | \$363 |

Depreciation expense related to property and equipment was \$69 million, \$77 million and \$85 million for 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

F-13

Table of Contents**(8) Debt and Credit Arrangements**

(a) Long term debt consisted of the following:

| | December 31 | |
|---|---------------|---------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions) | |
| 4.934% notes due November 16, 2007 | \$ | \$ 600 |
| 7 ¹ / ₈ % notes due December 15, 2007 | | 75 |
| 3.95% notes due April 1, 2008 | 225 | 225 |
| 5.472% notes due August 16, 2008 | 460 | 460 |
| 6% notes due November 15, 2011 | 400 | 400 |
| 5.2% notes due April 1, 2013 | 275 | 275 |
| 6.6% debentures due August 15, 2018 | 100 | 100 |
| 8.675% capital securities due February 1, 2027 | | 125 |
| 6.8% debentures due November 15, 2031 | 200 | 200 |
| 6% notes due May 11, 2037 | 800 | |
| 6.375% capital securities due March 29, 2067 | 1,000 | |
| | 3,460 | 2,460 |
| Fair value of interest rate swap | | 6 |
| | \$3,460 | \$2,466 |

In May 2007, Chubb issued \$800 million of 6% senior notes due May 11, 2037.

In March 2007, Chubb issued \$1.0 billion of unsecured junior subordinated capital securities. The capital securities will become due on April 15, 2037, the scheduled maturity date, but only to the extent that Chubb has received sufficient net proceeds from the sale of certain qualifying capital securities. Chubb must use its commercially reasonable efforts, subject to certain market disruption events, to sell enough qualifying capital securities to permit repayment of the capital securities on the scheduled maturity date or as soon thereafter as possible. Any remaining outstanding principal amount will be due on March 29, 2067, the final maturity date. The capital securities bear interest at a fixed rate of 6.375% through April 14, 2017. Thereafter, the capital securities will bear interest at a rate equal to the three-month LIBOR rate plus 2.25%. Subject to certain conditions, Chubb has the right to defer the payment of interest on the capital securities for a period not exceeding ten consecutive years. During any such period, interest will continue to accrue and Chubb generally may not declare or pay any dividends on or purchase any shares of its capital stock.

In connection with the issuance of the capital securities, Chubb entered into a replacement capital covenant in which it agreed that it will not repay, redeem, or purchase the capital securities before March 29, 2047, unless, subject to certain limitations, it has received proceeds from the sale of replacement capital securities, as defined. The replacement capital covenant is not intended for the benefit of holders of the capital securities and may not be enforced by them. The replacement capital covenant is for the benefit of holders of one or more designated series of Chubb's indebtedness, which will initially be its 6.8% debentures due November 15, 2031.

Subject to the replacement capital covenant, the capital securities may be redeemed, in whole or in part, at any time on or after April 15, 2017 at a redemption price equal to the principal amount plus any accrued interest or prior to April 15, 2017 at a redemption price equal to the greater of (i) the principal amount or (ii) a make-whole amount, in each case plus any accrued interest.

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

The 3.95% notes, the 5.472% notes, the 6% notes due in 2011, the 5.2% notes, the 6.6% debentures, the 6.8% debentures and the 6% notes due in 2037 are all unsecured obligations of Chubb. Chubb generally may redeem some or all of the notes and debentures prior to maturity in accordance with the terms of each debt instrument.

Executive Risk Capital Trust, wholly owned by Chubb Executive Risk Inc., which in turn is wholly owned by Chubb, had outstanding \$125 million of 8.675% capital securities. The sole assets of the Trust were debentures issued by Chubb Executive Risk. The capital securities were subject to mandatory redemption in 2027 upon repayment of the debentures. The capital securities were also subject to mandatory redemption in certain other specified circumstances beginning in 2007. On February 1, 2007, the debentures were repaid and the Trust redeemed the capital securities at a price that included a make-whole premium of \$5 million in the aggregate.

At December 31, 2006, Chubb was a party to a cancelable interest rate swap agreement with a notional amount of \$125 million that replaced the fixed rate of the capital securities with the 3-month LIBOR rate plus 204 basis points. The swap agreement had a maturity date of February 1, 2027 and provided only for the exchange of interest on the notional amount. The fair value of the swap was included in other assets, offset by a corresponding increase to long term debt. On February 1, 2007, the interest rate swap was terminated.

The amounts of long term debt due annually during the five years subsequent to December 31, 2007 are as follows:

Years Ending
December 31

| | (in millions) |
|------|---------------|
| 2008 | \$685 |
| 2009 | |
| 2010 | |
| 2011 | 400 |
| 2012 | |

(b) Interest costs of \$206 million, \$134 million and \$135 million were incurred in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. Interest paid was \$191 million, \$129 million and \$138 million in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

F-14

Table of Contents

(c) Chubb has a revolving credit agreement with a group of banks that provides for up to \$500 million of unsecured borrowings. There have been no borrowings under this agreement. Various interest rate options are available to Chubb, all of which are based on market interest rates. Chubb pays a fee to have this revolving credit facility available. The agreement contains customary restrictive covenants including a covenant to maintain a minimum consolidated shareholders' equity, as adjusted. At December 31, 2007, Chubb was in compliance with all such covenants. The revolving credit facility is available for general corporate purposes and to support Chubb's commercial paper borrowing arrangement. The facility had a termination date of June 22, 2010. In October 2007, the agreement was amended to extend the termination date to October 19, 2012. The terms of the amended agreement allow Chubb to elect in 2008 and again in 2009 to extend the termination date of the agreement by an additional year. On the termination date of the agreement, any borrowings then outstanding become payable.

(9) Unpaid Losses and Loss Expenses

(a) The process of establishing loss reserves is complex and imprecise as it must take into consideration many variables that are subject to the outcome of future events. As a result, informed subjective estimates and judgments as to the P&C Group's ultimate exposure to losses are an integral component of the loss reserving process. The loss reserve estimation process relies on the basic assumption that past experience, adjusted for the effects of current developments and likely trends, is an appropriate basis for predicting future outcomes.

Most of the P&C Group's loss reserves relate to long tail liability classes of business. For many liability claims, significant periods of time, ranging up to several years or more, may elapse between the occurrence of the loss, the reporting of the loss and the settlement of the claim. The longer the time span between the incidence of a loss and the settlement of the claim, the more the ultimate settlement amount can vary.

There are numerous factors that contribute to the inherent uncertainty in the process of establishing loss reserves. Among these factors are changes in the inflation rate for goods and services related to covered damages such as medical care and home repair costs; changes in the judicial interpretation of policy provisions relating to the determination of coverage; changes in the general attitude of juries in the determination of liability and damages; legislative actions; changes in the medical condition of claimants; changes in the estimates of the number and/or severity of claims that have been incurred but not reported as of the date of the financial statements; and changes in the P&C Group's book of business, underwriting standards and/or claim handling procedures.

In addition, the uncertain effects of emerging or potential claims and coverage issues that arise as legal, judicial and social conditions change must be taken into consideration. These issues have had, and may continue to have, a negative effect on loss reserves by either extending coverage beyond the original underwriting intent or by increasing the number or size of claims. As a result of such issues, the uncertainties inherent in estimating ultimate claim costs on the basis of past experience have grown, further complicating the already complex loss reserving process.

Management believes that the aggregate loss reserves of the P&C Group at December 31, 2007 were adequate to cover claims for losses that had occurred as of that date, including both those known and those yet to be reported. In establishing such reserves, management considers facts currently known and the present state of the law and coverage litigation. However, given the significant uncertainties inherent in the loss reserving process, it is possible that management's estimate of the ultimate liability for losses that had occurred as of December 31, 2007 may change, which could have a material effect on the Corporation's results of operations and financial condition.

(b) A reconciliation of the beginning and ending liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses, net of reinsurance recoverable, and a reconciliation of the net liability to the corresponding liability on a gross basis is as follows:

| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
|--|---------------|----------|----------|
| | (in millions) | | |
| Gross liability, beginning of year | \$22,293 | \$22,482 | \$20,292 |
| Reinsurance recoverable, beginning of year | 2,594 | 3,769 | 3,483 |
| Net liability, beginning of year | 19,699 | 18,713 | 16,809 |

Net incurred losses and loss expenses related to

| | | | |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Current year | 6,996 | 6,870 | 7,650 |
| Prior years | (697) | (296) | 163 |
| | 6,299 | 6,574 | 7,813 |

Net payments for losses and loss expenses related to

| | | | |
|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Current year | 1,809 | 1,640 | 1,878 |
| Prior years | 3,873 | 3,948 | 4,031 |
| | 5,682 | 5,588 | 5,909 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Net liability, end of year | 20,316 | 19,699 | 18,713 |
| Reinsurance recoverable, end of year | 2,307 | 2,594 | 3,769 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Gross liability, end of year | \$22,623 | \$22,293 | \$22,482 |
|------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|

The gross liability for unpaid losses and loss expenses and reinsurance recoverable included \$83 million and \$40 million, respectively, at December 31, 2007, \$178 million and \$107 million, respectively, at December 31, 2006 and \$967 million and \$756 million, respectively, at December 31, 2005 related to Hurricane Katrina.

F-15

Table of Contents

Because loss reserve estimates are subject to the outcome of future events, changes in estimates are unavoidable given that loss trends vary and time is required for changes in trends to be recognized and confirmed. During 2007, the P&C Group experienced overall favorable development of \$697 million on net unpaid losses and loss expenses established as of the previous year end. This compares with favorable prior year development of \$296 million in 2006 and unfavorable prior year development of \$163 million in 2005. Such development was reflected in operating results in these respective years.

The net favorable development of \$697 million in 2007 was due to various factors. Favorable development of about \$300 million was experienced in the professional liability classes other than fidelity, including about \$100 million outside the United States. A majority of this favorable development was in the 2003 through 2005 accident years. Reported loss activity related to these accident years was less than expected due to a favorable business climate, lower policy limits and better terms and conditions. Favorable development of about \$180 million was experienced in the short tail homeowners and commercial property classes, primarily related to the 2006 and 2005 accident years. This favorable development arose from the lower than expected emergence of actual losses during 2007 relative to expectations used to establish the loss reserves at the end of 2006. Favorable development of about \$135 million was experienced in the run-off of the reinsurance assumed business due primarily to better than expected reported loss activity from cedants. Favorable development of about \$40 million and \$30 million was experienced in the fidelity class and the surety class, respectively, due to lower than expected reported loss emergence, mainly related to more recent accident years. Favorable development of about \$30 million was experienced in the personal automobile class. Case development during 2007 on previously reported claims was better than expected and the number of late reported claims was less than expected. Unfavorable development of about \$20 million was experienced in the commercial liability classes. Unfavorable development in accident years prior to 1997, mostly the \$88 million related to asbestos and toxic waste claims, was largely offset by favorable development in these classes in the more recent accident years.

The net favorable development of \$296 million in 2006 was also due to various factors. Favorable development of about \$190 million was experienced in the short tail homeowners and commercial property classes, primarily related to the 2005 accident year. This favorable development arose from the lower than expected emergence of losses during 2006 relative to expectations used to establish loss reserves at the end of 2005. Favorable development of about \$70 million was experienced in the fidelity class due to lower than expected reported loss emergence, mainly related to more recent accident years. Favorable development of about \$65 million was experienced in the run-off of the reinsurance assumed business due primarily to better than expected reported loss activity from cedants. Favorable development of about \$45 million was experienced in the professional liability classes other than fidelity. Favorable development in the 2004 and 2005 accident years more than offset continued unfavorable development in the 2000 through 2002 accident years. Reported loss activity related to accident years 2004 and 2005 was less than expected due to a favorable business climate, lower policy limits and better terms and conditions. On the other hand, the P&C Group continued to experience significant reported loss activity related to the 2000 through 2002 accident years, largely from claims related to corporate failures and allegations of management misconduct and accounting irregularities. Favorable development of about \$25 million was experienced in the personal automobile class. Case development during 2006 on previously reported claims was better than expected and the number of late reported claims was also less than expected. Unfavorable development of about \$100 million was experienced in the commercial liability classes, including \$24 million related to asbestos and toxic waste claims. Reported loss activity in accident years prior to 1997 was worse than expected, primarily related to specific individual excess liability and other liability claims.

The net unfavorable development of \$163 million in 2005 was the result of various factors. Unfavorable development of about \$200 million was experienced in the professional liability classes other than fidelity. Adverse development related to accident years 1998 through 2002, largely from claims related to corporate failures and allegations of management misconduct and accounting irregularities, was offset in part by favorable development related to accident years 2003 and 2004. Reported loss activity related to accident years 2003 and 2004 was less than expected due to a favorable business climate, lower policy limits and better terms and conditions. Unfavorable development of about \$175 million was experienced in the commercial liability classes related to accident years prior

to 1996, including \$35 million related to asbestos claims. There was significant reported loss activity during 2005 related to these older accident years, primarily in the commercial excess liability class, which resulted in a lengthening of the expected loss emergence period. Favorable development of about \$160 million was experienced in the short tail homeowners and commercial property classes, primarily related to the 2004 accident year. The favorable development arose from the lower than expected emergence of late reported losses during 2005 relative to expectations used to establish loss reserves at the end of 2004. Favorable development of about \$60 million was experienced in the fidelity class due to lower than expected reported loss emergence, mainly related to more recent accident years.

F-16

Table of Contents

(c) The estimation of loss reserves relating to asbestos and toxic waste claims on insurance policies written many years ago is subject to greater uncertainty than other types of claims due to inconsistent court decisions as well as judicial interpretations and legislative actions that in some cases have tended to broaden coverage beyond the original intent of such policies and in others have expanded theories of liability. The insurance industry as a whole is engaged in extensive litigation over these coverage and liability issues and is thus confronted with a continuing uncertainty in its efforts to quantify these exposures.

Asbestos remains the most significant and difficult mass tort for the insurance industry in terms of claims volume and dollar exposure. Asbestos claims relate primarily to bodily injuries asserted by those who came in contact with asbestos or products containing asbestos. Tort theory affecting asbestos litigation has evolved over the years. Early court cases established the continuous trigger theory with respect to insurance coverage. Under this theory, insurance coverage is deemed to be triggered from the time a claimant is first exposed to asbestos until the manifestation of any disease. This interpretation of a policy trigger can involve insurance policies over many years and increases insurance companies' exposure to liability.

New asbestos claims and new exposures on existing claims have continued despite the fact that usage of asbestos has declined since the mid-1970s. Many claimants were exposed to multiple asbestos products over an extended period of time. As a result, claim filings typically name dozens of defendants. The plaintiffs' bar has solicited new claimants through extensive advertising and through asbestos medical screenings. A vast majority of asbestos bodily injury claims are filed by claimants who do not show any signs of asbestos related disease. New asbestos cases are often filed in those jurisdictions with a reputation for judges and juries that are extremely sympathetic to plaintiffs.

Approximately 80 manufacturers and distributors of asbestos products have filed for bankruptcy protection as a result of asbestos related liabilities. A bankruptcy sometimes involves an agreement to a plan between the debtor and its creditors, including current and future asbestos claimants. Although the debtor is negotiating in part with its insurers' money, insurers are generally given only limited opportunity to be heard. In addition to contributing to the overall number of claims, bankruptcy proceedings have also caused increased settlement demands against remaining solvent defendants.

There have been some positive legislative and judicial developments in the asbestos environment over the past several years. Various challenges to mass screening claimants have been mounted. Also, a number of states have implemented legislative and judicial reforms that focus the courts' resources on the claims of the most seriously injured. Those who allege serious injury and can present credible evidence of their injuries are receiving priority trial settings in the courts, while those who have not shown any credible disease manifestation are having their hearing dates delayed or are placed on an inactive docket, which preserves the right to pursue litigation in the future. Further, a number of key jurisdictions have adopted venue reform that requires plaintiffs to have a connection to the jurisdiction in order to file a complaint. Finally, in recognition that many aspects of bankruptcy plans are unfair to certain classes of claimants and to the insurance industry, these plans are beginning to be closely scrutinized by the courts and rejected when appropriate.

The P&C Group's most significant individual asbestos exposures involve products liability on the part of traditional defendants who were engaged in the manufacture, distribution or installation of asbestos products. The P&C Group wrote excess liability and/or general liability coverages for these insureds. While these insureds are relatively few in number, their exposure has become substantial due to the increased volume of claims, the erosion of the underlying limits and the bankruptcies of target defendants.

The P&C Group's other asbestos exposures involve products and non-products liability on the part of peripheral defendants, including a mix of manufacturers, distributors and installers of certain products that contain asbestos in small quantities and owners or operators of properties where asbestos was present. Generally, these insureds are named defendants on a regional rather than a nationwide basis. As the financial resources of traditional asbestos defendants have been depleted, plaintiffs are targeting these viable peripheral parties with greater frequency and, in many cases, for large awards.

Asbestos claims against the major manufacturers, distributors or installers of asbestos products were typically presented under the products liability section of primary general liability policies as well as under excess liability policies, both of which typically had aggregate limits that capped an insurer's exposure. In recent years, a number of

asbestos claims by insureds are being presented as non-products claims, such as those by installers of asbestos products and by property owners or operators who allegedly had asbestos on their property, under the premises or operations section of primary general liability policies. Unlike products exposures, these non-products exposures typically had no aggregate limits on coverage, creating potentially greater exposure. Further, in an effort to seek additional insurance coverage, some insureds with installation activities who have substantially eroded their products coverage are presenting new asbestos claims as non-products operations claims or attempting to reclassify previously settled products claims as non-products claims to restore a portion of previously exhausted products aggregate limits. It is difficult to predict whether insureds will be successful in asserting claims under non-products coverage or whether insurers will be successful in asserting additional defenses. Accordingly, the ultimate cost to insurers of the claims for coverage not subject to aggregate limits is uncertain.

Various federal proposals to solve the ongoing asbestos litigation crisis have been considered by the U.S. Congress over the past few years, but none have yet been enacted. Thus, the prospect of federal asbestos reform legislation remains uncertain.

F-17

Table of Contents

In establishing asbestos reserves, the exposure presented by each insured is evaluated. As part of this evaluation, consideration is given to a variety of factors including the available insurance coverage; limits and deductibles; the jurisdictions involved; past settlement values of similar claims; the potential role of other insurance, particularly underlying coverage below excess liability policies; potential bankruptcy impact; relevant judicial interpretations; and applicable coverage defenses, including asbestos exclusions.

Significant uncertainty remains as to the ultimate liability of the P&C Group related to asbestos related claims. This uncertainty is due to several factors including the long latency period between asbestos exposure and disease manifestation and the resulting potential for involvement of multiple policy periods for individual claims; plaintiffs increased focus on peripheral defendants; the volume of claims by unimpaired plaintiffs and the extent to which they can be precluded from making claims; the efforts by insureds to claim the right to non-products coverage not subject to aggregate limits; the number of insureds seeking bankruptcy protection as a result of asbestos related liabilities; the ability of claimants to bring a claim in a state in which they have no residency or exposure; the impact of the exhaustion of primary limits and the resulting increase in claims on excess liability policies that the P&C Group has issued; inconsistent court decisions and diverging legal interpretations; and the possibility, however remote, of federal legislation that would address the asbestos problem. These significant uncertainties are not likely to be resolved in the near future.

Toxic waste claims relate primarily to pollution and related cleanup costs. The P&C Group's insureds have two potential areas of exposure: hazardous waste dump sites and pollution at the insured site primarily from underground storage tanks and manufacturing processes.

The federal Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (Superfund) has been interpreted to impose strict, retroactive and joint and several liability on potentially responsible parties (PRPs) for the cost of remediating hazardous waste sites. Most sites have multiple PRPs.

Most PRPs named to date are parties who have been generators, transporters, past or present landowners or past or present site operators. Insurance policies issued to PRPs were not intended to cover the clean-up costs of pollution and, in many cases, did not intend to cover the pollution itself. As the costs of environmental clean-up became substantial, PRPs and others increasingly filed claims with their insurance carriers. Litigation against insurers extends to issues of liability, coverage and other policy provisions.

There is substantial uncertainty involved in estimating the P&C Group's liabilities related to these claims. First, the liabilities of the claimants are extremely difficult to estimate. At any given waste site, the allocation of remediation costs among governmental authorities and the PRPs varies greatly depending on a variety of factors. Second, different courts have addressed liability and coverage issues regarding pollution claims and have reached inconsistent conclusions in their interpretation of several issues. These significant uncertainties are not likely to be resolved definitively in the near future.

Uncertainties also remain as to the Superfund law itself. Superfund's taxing authority expired on December 31, 1995 and has not been re-enacted. Federal legislation appears to be at a standstill. At this time, it is not possible to predict the direction that any reforms may take, when they may occur or the effect that any changes may have on the insurance industry.

Without federal movement on Superfund reform, the enforcement of Superfund liability has occasionally shifted to the states. States are being forced to reconsider state-level cleanup statutes and regulations. As individual states move forward, the potential for conflicting state regulation becomes greater. In a few states, cases have been brought against insureds or directly against insurance companies for environmental pollution and natural resources damages. To date, only a few natural resources claims have been filed and they are being vigorously defended. Significant uncertainty remains as to the cost of remediating the state sites. Because of the large number of state sites, such sites could prove even more costly in the aggregate than Superfund sites.

In establishing toxic waste reserves, the exposure presented by each insured is evaluated. As part of this evaluation, consideration is given to the probable liability, available insurance coverage, past settlement values of similar claims, relevant judicial interpretations, applicable coverage defenses as well as facts that are unique to each insured.

Management believes that the loss reserves carried at December 31, 2007 for asbestos and toxic waste claims were adequate. However, given the judicial decisions and legislative actions that have broadened the scope of coverage and

expanded theories of liability in the past and the possibilities of similar interpretations in the future, it is possible that the estimate of loss reserves relating to these exposures may increase in future periods as new information becomes available and as claims develop.

F-18

Table of Contents**(10) Federal and Foreign Income Tax**

(a) Income tax expense consisted of the following components:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Current tax | | | |
| United States | \$ 952 | \$735 | \$421 |
| Foreign | 168 | 154 | 116 |
| Deferred tax, principally United States | 10 | 108 | 84 |
| | \$1,130 | \$997 | \$621 |

Federal and foreign income taxes paid were \$1,140 million, \$847 million and \$409 million in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

(b) The effective income tax rate is different than the statutory federal corporate tax rate. The reasons for the different effective tax rate were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | 2007 | | 2006 | | 2005 | |
| | Amount | % of Pre-Tax Income | Amount | % of Pre-Tax Income | Amount | % of Pre-Tax Income |
| | (in millions) | | | | | |
| Income before federal and foreign income tax | \$3,937 | | \$3,525 | | \$2,447 | |
| Tax at statutory federal income tax rate | \$1,378 | 35.0% | \$1,234 | 35.0% | \$ 856 | 35.0% |
| Tax exempt interest income | (232) | (5.9) | (215) | (6.1) | (195) | (8.0) |
| Other, net | (16) | (.4) | (22) | (.6) | (40) | (1.6) |
| Actual tax | \$1,130 | 28.7% | \$ 997 | 28.3% | \$ 621 | 25.4% |

(c) The tax effects of temporary differences that gave rise to deferred income tax assets and liabilities were as follows:

| | December 31 | |
|----------------------------|---------------|------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions) | |
| Deferred income tax assets | | |

| | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| Unpaid losses and loss expenses | \$ 729 | \$ 690 |
| Unearned premiums | 357 | 363 |
| Foreign tax credits | 631 | 524 |
| Employee compensation | 175 | 167 |
| Postretirement benefits | 138 | 132 |
| Total | 2,030 | 1,876 |
| Deferred income tax liabilities | | |
| Deferred policy acquisition costs | 447 | 430 |
| Unremitted earnings of foreign subsidiaries | 630 | 487 |
| Unrealized appreciation of investments | 284 | 211 |
| Other, net | 227 | 157 |
| Total | 1,588 | 1,285 |
| Net deferred income tax asset | \$ 442 | \$ 591 |

Although realization of deferred income tax assets is not assured, management believes that it is more likely than not that the deferred tax assets will be realized. Accordingly, no valuation allowance was recorded at December 31, 2007 or 2006.

(d) Chubb and its domestic subsidiaries file a consolidated federal income tax return with the U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The Corporation also files income tax returns with various state and foreign tax authorities. The U.S. income tax returns for years prior to 2004 are no longer subject to examination by the IRS. The examination of the U.S. income tax returns for 2004, 2005 and 2006 is expected to be completed in 2010. Management does not anticipate any assessments for tax years that remain subject to examination that would have a material effect on the Corporation's financial position or results of operations.

Table of Contents**(11) Reinsurance**

In the ordinary course of business, the P&C Group assumes and cedes reinsurance with other insurance companies. Reinsurance is ceded to provide greater diversification of risk and to limit the P&C Group's maximum net loss arising from large risks or catastrophic events.

A large portion of the P&C Group's ceded reinsurance is effected under contracts known as treaties under which all risks meeting prescribed criteria are automatically covered. Most of these arrangements consist of excess of loss and catastrophe contracts that protect against a specified part or all of certain types of losses over stipulated amounts arising from any one occurrence or event. In certain circumstances, reinsurance is also effected by negotiation on individual risks.

Ceded reinsurance contracts do not relieve the P&C Group of the primary obligation to its policyholders. Thus, an exposure exists with respect to reinsurance ceded to the extent that any reinsurer is unable or unwilling to meet its obligations assumed under the reinsurance contracts. The P&C Group monitors the financial strength of its reinsurers on an ongoing basis.

Premiums earned and insurance losses and loss expenses are reported net of reinsurance in the consolidated statements of income.

The effect of reinsurance on the premiums written and earned of the P&C Group was as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Direct premiums written | \$12,432 | \$12,224 | \$12,180 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 775 | 954 | 1,120 |
| Reinsurance ceded | (1,335) | (1,204) | (1,017) |
| Net premiums written | \$11,872 | \$11,974 | \$12,283 |
| Direct premiums earned | \$12,457 | \$12,084 | \$12,111 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 789 | 971 | 1,175 |
| Reinsurance ceded | (1,300) | (1,097) | (1,110) |
| Net premiums earned | \$11,946 | \$11,958 | \$12,176 |

The ceded reinsurance premiums written and earned included \$386 million and \$344 million, respectively, in 2007 and \$283 million and \$190 million, respectively, in 2006 that were ceded to Harbor Point.

Ceded losses and loss expenses, which reduce losses and loss expenses incurred, were \$460 million, \$86 million and \$1,031 million in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. The ceded losses and loss expenses in 2007 and 2006 included \$183 million and \$75 million, respectively, that were ceded to Harbor Point. The 2005 ceded amount included \$775 million related to Hurricane Katrina and the 2006 amount reflected a \$175 million reduction of ceded losses and loss expenses related to the hurricane.

(12) Segments Information

The principal business of the Corporation is the sale of property and casualty insurance. The profitability of the property and casualty insurance business depends on the results of both underwriting operations and investments, which are viewed as two distinct operations. The underwriting operations are managed and evaluated separately from the investment function.

The P&C Group underwrites most lines of property and casualty insurance. Underwriting operations consist of four separate business units: personal insurance, commercial insurance, specialty insurance and reinsurance assumed. The

personal segment targets the personal insurance market. The personal classes include automobile, homeowners and other personal coverages. The commercial segment includes those classes of business that are generally available in broad markets and are of a more commodity nature. Commercial classes include multiple peril, casualty, workers compensation and property and marine. The specialty segment includes those classes of business that are available in more limited markets since they require specialized underwriting and claim settlement. Specialty classes include professional liability coverages and surety. The reinsurance assumed business is effectively in runoff following the sale, in December 2005, of the ongoing business to Harbor Point (see Note (3)).

Corporate and other includes investment income earned on corporate invested assets, corporate expenses and the Corporation's real estate and other non-insurance subsidiaries.

Performance of the property and casualty underwriting segments is measured based on statutory underwriting results. Statutory underwriting profit is arrived at by reducing premiums earned by losses and loss expenses incurred and statutory underwriting expenses incurred. Under statutory accounting principles applicable to property and casualty insurance companies, policy acquisition and other underwriting expenses are recognized immediately, not at the time premiums are earned.

Management uses underwriting results determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) to assess the overall performance of the underwriting operations. Underwriting income determined in accordance with GAAP is defined as premiums earned less losses and loss expenses incurred and GAAP underwriting expenses incurred. To convert statutory underwriting results to a GAAP basis, policy acquisition expenses are deferred and amortized over the period in which the related premiums are earned.

Investment income performance is measured based on investment income net of investment expenses, excluding realized investment gains and losses.

Table of Contents

Distinct investment portfolios are not maintained for each underwriting segment. Property and casualty invested assets are available for payment of losses and expenses for all classes of business. Therefore, such assets and the related investment income are not allocated to underwriting segments.

Revenues, income before income tax and assets of each operating segment were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------|----------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Revenues | | | |
| Property and casualty insurance | | | |
| Premiums earned | | | |
| Personal insurance | \$ 3,642 | \$ 3,409 | \$ 3,217 |
| Commercial insurance | 5,120 | 5,079 | 5,020 |
| Specialty insurance | 2,971 | 2,953 | 2,981 |
| Total insurance | 11,733 | 11,441 | 11,218 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 213 | 517 | 958 |
| | 11,946 | 11,958 | 12,176 |
| Investment income | 1,622 | 1,485 | 1,342 |
| Other revenues | 11 | | |
| | | | |
| Total property and casualty insurance | 13,579 | 13,443 | 13,518 |
| Corporate and other | 154 | 315 | 181 |
| Realized investment gains | 374 | 245 | 384 |
| | | | |
| Total revenues | \$14,107 | \$14,003 | \$14,083 |
| Income (loss) before income tax | | | |
| Property and casualty insurance | | | |
| Underwriting | | | |
| Personal insurance | \$ 532 | \$ 590 | \$ 405 |
| Commercial insurance | 738 | 840 | 376 |
| Specialty insurance | 678 | 371 | 67 |
| Total insurance | 1,948 | 1,801 | 848 |
| Reinsurance assumed | 116 | 85 | 56 |
| | 2,064 | 1,886 | 904 |
| Increase in deferred policy acquisition costs | 52 | 19 | 17 |
| | | | |
| Underwriting income | 2,116 | 1,905 | 921 |
| Investment income | 1,590 | 1,454 | 1,315 |
| Other income (charges) | 6 | 10 | (1) |
| | | | |
| Total property and casualty insurance | 3,712 | 3,369 | 2,235 |
| Corporate and other loss | (149) | (89) | (172) |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Realized investment gains | 374 | 245 | 384 |
| Total income before income tax | \$ 3,937 | \$ 3,525 | \$ 2,447 |

| | December 31 | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Assets | | | |
| Property and casualty insurance | \$47,931 | \$47,671 | \$45,110 |
| Corporate and other | 2,785 | 2,811 | 3,054 |
| Adjustments and eliminations | (142) | (205) | (103) |
| Total assets | \$50,574 | \$50,277 | \$48,061 |

The international business of the property and casualty insurance segment is conducted primarily through subsidiaries that operate solely outside of the United States. Their assets and liabilities are located principally in the countries where the insurance risks are written. International business is also written by branch offices of certain domestic subsidiaries.

Revenues of the P&C Group by geographic area were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Revenues | | | |
| United States | \$10,624 | \$10,807 | \$11,013 |
| International | 2,955 | 2,636 | 2,505 |
| Total | \$13,579 | \$13,443 | \$13,518 |

Table of Contents**(13) Stock-Based Employee Compensation Plans**

The Corporation has two stock-based employee compensation plans, the Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan and the Stock Purchase Plan. The compensation cost charged against income with respect to these plans was \$87 million, \$88 million and \$65 million in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. The total income tax benefit included in income with respect to these stock-based compensation arrangements was \$31 million in 2007 and 2006 and \$22 million in 2005.

As of December 31, 2007, there was \$82 million of unrecognized compensation cost related to nonvested awards. That cost is expected to be charged against income over a weighted average period of 1.7 years.

(a) The Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan provides for the granting of restricted stock units, restricted stock, performance shares, stock options, and other stock-based awards to key employees. The maximum number of shares of Chubb's common stock in respect to which stock-based awards may be granted under the Plan is 15,834,000 shares. At December 31, 2007, 9,575,399 shares were available for grant under the Plan.

Restricted Stock Units, Restricted Stock and Performance Shares

Restricted stock unit awards are payable in cash, in shares of Chubb's common stock, or in a combination of both. Restricted stock units are not considered to be outstanding shares of common stock, have no voting rights and are subject to forfeiture during the restriction period. Holders of restricted stock units may receive dividend equivalents. Restricted stock awards consist of shares of Chubb's common stock granted at no cost to the employees. Shares of restricted stock become outstanding when granted, receive dividends and have voting rights. The shares are subject to forfeiture and to restrictions that prevent their sale or transfer during the restriction period. Performance share awards are based on the achievement of performance goals over three year performance periods. Performance share awards are payable in cash, in shares of Chubb's common stock or in a combination of both.

An amount equal to the fair value at the date of grant of restricted stock unit awards, restricted stock awards and performance share awards is expensed over the vesting period. The weighted average fair value per share of the restricted stock units and restricted stock granted was \$50.10, \$47.54 and \$39.67 in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively. The weighted average fair value per share of the performance shares granted was \$52.99, \$44.73 and \$37.02 in 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively.

Additional information with respect to restricted stock units and restricted stock and performance shares is as follows:

| | Restricted Stock Units and Restricted Stock | | Performance Shares* | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|
| | Number of Shares | Weighted Average Grant Date Fair Value | Number of Shares | Weighted Average Grant Date Fair Value |
| Nonvested, January 1, 2007 | 3,829,530 | \$39.98 | 1,472,352 | \$40.58 |
| Granted | 1,039,903 | 50.10 | 646,211 | 52.99 |
| Vested | (1,419,364) | 34.75 | (782,908)** | 37.02 |
| Forfeited | (143,376) | 44.07 | (26,626) | 45.76 |
| Nonvested, December 31, 2007 | 3,306,693 | 45.23 | 1,309,029 | 48.73 |

* The number of shares earned may range from 0% to 200% of the performance shares shown in the table above.

** The performance shares earned in 2007 were 136.6% of the vested shares shown in the table, or 1,069,452 shares.

The total fair value of restricted stock units and restricted stock that vested during 2007, 2006 and 2005 was \$77 million, \$34 million and \$20 million, respectively. The total fair value of performance shares that vested during 2007 and 2006 was \$58 million and \$63 million, respectively. No performance shares were granted that would have vested during 2005.

Stock Options

Stock options are granted at exercise prices not less than the fair market value of Chubb's common stock on the date of grant. The terms and conditions upon which options become exercisable may vary among grants. Options expire no later than ten years from the date of grant.

An amount equal to the fair market value of stock options at the date of grant is expensed over the period that such options become exercisable. The weighted average fair value per stock option granted during 2007, 2006 and 2005 was \$8.39, \$7.65 and \$7.56, respectively. The fair value of each stock option was estimated on the date of grant using the Black-Scholes option pricing model with the following weighted average assumptions.

| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Risk-free interest rate | 4.4% | 4.8% | 4.0% |
| Expected volatility | 16.9% | 15.9% | 22.1% |
| Dividend yield | 2.2% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| Expected average term (in years) | 4.3 | 3.4 | 3.5 |

Table of Contents

Additional information with respect to stock options is as follows:

| | Number of Shares | Weighted Average Exercise Price | Weighted Average Remaining Contractual Term (in years) | Aggregate Intrinsic Value (in millions) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Outstanding, January 1, 2007 | 11,508,056 | \$33.94 | | |
| Granted | 203,481 | 51.78 | | |
| Exercised | (3,592,569) | 34.85 | | |
| Forfeited | (11,037) | 29.91 | | |
| Outstanding, December 31, 2007 | 8,107,931 | 33.99 | 3.5 | \$166 |
| Exercisable, December 31, 2007 | 7,883,973 | 33.63 | 3.3 | 165 |

The total intrinsic value of the stock options exercised during 2007, 2006 and 2005 was \$66 million, \$110 million and \$229 million, respectively. The Corporation received cash of \$115 million, \$185 million and \$528 million during 2007, 2006 and 2005, respectively, from the exercise of stock options. The tax benefit realized with respect to stock options exercised during 2007, 2006 and 2005 was \$19 million, \$40 million and \$69 million, respectively.

(b) Under the Stock Purchase Plan, substantially all employees are eligible to receive rights to purchase shares of Chubb's common stock at a fixed price at the end of the offering period. The price is determined on the date the purchase rights are granted and the offering period cannot exceed 27 months. The number of shares an eligible employee may purchase is based on the employee's compensation. An amount equal to the fair market value of purchase rights at the date of grant is expensed over the offering period. No purchase rights have been granted since 2002.

(14) Employee Benefits

(a) The Corporation has several non-contributory defined benefit pension plans covering substantially all employees. Prior to 2001, benefits were generally based on an employee's years of service and average compensation during the last five years of employment. Effective January 1, 2001, the Corporation changed the formula for providing pension benefits from the final average pay formula to a cash balance formula. Under the cash balance formula, a notional account is established for each employee, which is credited semi-annually with an amount equal to a percentage of eligible compensation based on age and years of service plus interest based on the account balance. Employees hired prior to 2001 will generally be eligible to receive vested benefits based on the higher of the final average pay or cash balance formulas.

The Corporation's funding policy is to contribute amounts that meet regulatory requirements plus additional amounts determined by management based on actuarial valuations, current market conditions and other factors. This may result in no contribution being made in a particular year.

The Corporation also provides certain other postretirement benefits, principally health care and life insurance, to retired employees and their beneficiaries and covered dependents. Substantially all employees hired before January 1, 1999 may become eligible for these benefits upon retirement if they meet minimum age and years of service requirements. Health care coverage is contributory. Retiree contributions vary based upon a retiree's age, type of coverage and years of service with the Corporation. Life insurance coverage is non-contributory.

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

The Corporation funds a portion of the health care benefits obligation where such funding can be accomplished on a tax effective basis. Benefits are paid as covered expenses are incurred.

The Corporation uses December 31 as the measurement date for its pension and other postretirement benefit plans.

The funded status of the pension and other postretirement benefit plans at December 31, 2007 and 2006 was as follows:

| | Pension Benefits | | Other Postretirement Benefits | |
|---|------------------|----------|-------------------------------|--------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions) | | | |
| Benefit obligation | \$ 1,658 | \$ 1,533 | \$ 289 | \$ 269 |
| Plan assets at fair value | 1,409 | 1,304 | 37 | 26 |
| Funded status at end of year, included in other liabilities | \$ 249 | \$ 229 | \$ 252 | \$ 243 |

F-23

Table of Contents

Net loss and prior service cost included in accumulated other comprehensive income that were not yet recognized as components of net benefit costs at December 31, 2007 and 2006 were as follows:

| | Pension Benefits | | Other Postretirement Benefits | |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------|-------------------------------|-------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions) | | | |
| Net loss | \$ 383 | \$ 357 | \$ 33 | \$ 31 |
| Prior service cost (benefit) | 44 | 47 | (2) | (3) |
| | \$ 427 | \$ 404 | \$ 31 | \$ 28 |

The accumulated benefit obligation for the pension plans was \$1,328 million and \$1,224 million at December 31, 2007 and 2006, respectively. The accumulated benefit obligation is the present value of pension benefits earned as of the measurement date based on employee service and compensation prior to that date. It differs from the pension benefit obligation in the table on the previous page in that the accumulated benefit obligation includes no assumptions regarding future compensation levels.

The weighted average assumptions used to determine the benefit obligations were as follows:

| | Pension Benefits | | Other Postretirement Benefits | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 |
| Discount rate | 6.0% | 5.75% | 6.0% | 5.75% |
| Rate of compensation increase | 4.5 | 4.5 | | |

The Corporation made pension plan contributions of \$93 million and \$109 million during 2007 and 2006, respectively. The Corporation made other postretirement benefit plan contributions of \$12 million and \$2 million during 2007 and 2006, respectively.

The components of net pension and other postretirement benefit costs reflected in net income and other changes in plan assets and benefit obligations recognized in other comprehensive income for the years ended December 31, 2007, 2006 and 2005 were as follows:

| | Pension Benefits | | | Other Postretirement Benefits | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|------|------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | | | | |
| Costs reflected in net income | | | | | | |
| Service cost | \$ 79 | \$ 67 | \$ 58 | \$ 10 | \$ 9 | \$ 8 |
| Interest cost | 89 | 75 | 69 | 16 | 14 | 15 |

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Expected return on plan assets | (100) | (85) | (74) | (2) | (2) | (1) |
| Amortization of net loss and prior service cost | 32 | 34 | 20 | 1 | 1 | |
| | \$ 100 | \$ 91 | \$ 73 | \$ 25 | \$ 22 | \$ 22 |
| Changes in plan assets and benefit obligations recognized in other comprehensive income | | | | | | |
| Net loss | \$ 54 | | | \$ 4 | | |
| Prior service cost | 1 | | | | | |
| Amortization of net loss and prior service cost | (32) | | | (1) | | |
| | \$ 23 | | | \$ 3 | | |

The estimated aggregate net loss and prior service cost that will be amortized from accumulated other comprehensive income into net benefit costs during 2008 for the pension and other postretirement benefit plans is \$27 million.

F-24

Table of Contents

The weighted average assumptions used to determine net pension and other postretirement benefit costs were as follows:

| | Pension Benefits | | | Other Postretirement Benefits | | |
|--|------------------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| Discount rate | 5.75% | 5.75% | 6.25% | 5.75% | 5.75% | 6.25% |
| Rate of compensation increase | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | | | |
| Expected long term rate of return on plan assets | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.25 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.25 |

The weighted average health care cost trend rate assumptions used to measure the expected cost of medical benefits were as follows:

| | December 31 | |
|---|-------------|------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |
| Health care cost trend rate for next year | 8.75% | 9.5% |
| Rate to which the cost trend rate is assumed to decline (the ultimate trend rate) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Year that the rate reaches the ultimate trend rate | 2014 | 2014 |

The health care cost trend rate assumption has a significant effect on the amount of the accumulated other postretirement benefit obligation and the net other postretirement benefit cost reported. To illustrate, a one percent increase or decrease in the trend rate for each year would increase or decrease the accumulated other postretirement benefit obligation at December 31, 2007 by approximately \$51 million and the aggregate of the service and interest cost components of net other postretirement benefit cost for the year ended December 31, 2007 by approximately \$5 million.

The long term objective of the pension plan is to provide sufficient funding to cover expected benefit obligations, while assuming a prudent level of portfolio risk. Plan assets are invested in a diversified portfolio of predominately U.S. equity securities and fixed maturities. The Corporation seeks to obtain a rate of return that over time equals or exceeds the returns of the broad markets in which the plan assets are invested. The target allocation of plan assets is 55% to 65% invested in equity securities, with the remainder invested in fixed maturities. The portfolio is rebalanced periodically to remain within the target allocation range. The Corporation determined the expected long term rate of return assumption for each asset class based on an analysis of the historical returns and the expectations for future returns. The expected long-term rate of return for the portfolio is a weighted aggregation of the expected returns for each asset class.

The weighted average allocation of the pension plan assets was as follows:

| | December 31 | |
|-------------------|-------------|------|
| | 2007 | 2006 |
| Equity securities | 60% | 62% |
| Fixed maturities | 40 | 38 |
| | 100% | 100% |

The estimated benefits expected to be paid in each of the next five years and in the aggregate for the following five years are as follows:

| Years Ending December 31 | Pension Benefits | Other Postretirement Benefits |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | (in millions) | |
| 2008 | \$ 55 | \$ 9 |
| 2009 | 62 | 10 |
| 2010 | 67 | 11 |
| 2011 | 72 | 12 |
| 2012 | 78 | 13 |
| 2013-2017 | 541 | 88 |

(b) The Corporation has a defined contribution benefit plan, the Capital Accumulation Plan, in which substantially all employees are eligible to participate. Under this plan, the employer makes a matching contribution annually equal to 100% of each eligible employee's pre-tax elective contributions, up to 4% of the employee's eligible compensation. Contributions are invested at the election of the employee in Chubb's common stock or in various other investment funds. Employer contributions charged against income were \$27 million in 2007 and \$25 million in both 2006 and 2005.

F-25

Table of Contents**(15) Commitments and Contingent Liabilities**

(a) Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries have been involved in the investigations of certain business practices in the property and casualty insurance industry by various Attorneys General and other regulatory authorities of several states, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York and certain non-U.S. regulatory authorities with respect to, among other things, (1) potential conflicts of interest and anti-competitive behavior arising from the payment of contingent commissions to brokers and agents and (2) loss mitigation and finite reinsurance arrangements. In connection with these investigations, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries received subpoenas and other requests for information from various regulators. The Corporation has been cooperating fully with these investigations. In December 2006, the Corporation settled with the Attorneys General of New York, Connecticut and Illinois all issues arising out of their investigations. As described in more detail below, the Attorney General of Ohio in August 2007 filed an action against Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries, as well as several other insurers and one broker, as a result of the Ohio Attorney General's business practices investigation. Although no other Attorney General or regulator has initiated an action against the Corporation, it is possible that such an action may be brought against the Corporation with respect to some or all of the issues that are the focus of these ongoing investigations.

Individual actions and purported class actions arising out of the investigations into the payment of contingent commissions to brokers and agents have been filed in a number of federal and state courts. On August 1, 2005, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries were named in a putative class action entitled *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation* in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. This action, brought against several brokers and insurers on behalf of a class of persons who purchased insurance through the broker defendants, asserts claims under the Sherman Act and state law and the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) arising from the alleged unlawful use of contingent commission agreements. Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries have also been named as defendants in two purported class actions relating to allegations of unlawful use of contingent commission arrangements that were originally filed in state court. The first was filed on February 16, 2005 in Seminole County, Florida. The second was filed on May 17, 2005 in Essex County, Massachusetts. Both cases were removed to federal court and then transferred by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey for consolidation with the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. Since being transferred to the District of New Jersey, the plaintiff in the former action has been inactive, and that action currently is stayed. The latter action has been voluntarily dismissed. On September 28, 2007, the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey dismissed the second amended complaint filed by the plaintiffs in *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation* in its entirety. In so doing, the court dismissed the plaintiffs' Sherman Act and RICO claims with prejudice for failure to state a claim, and it dismissed the plaintiffs' state law claims without prejudice because it declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over them. The plaintiffs have appealed the dismissal of their second amended complaint to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and that appeal is currently pending.

In December 2005, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries were named in a putative class action similar to the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. The action is pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey and has been assigned to the judge who is presiding over the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. The complaint has never been served in this matter. Separately, in April 2006, Chubb and one of its subsidiaries were named in an action similar to the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia and subsequently was transferred by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey for consolidation with the *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action currently is stayed. On May 21, 2007, Chubb and one of its subsidiaries were named as defendants in another action similar to *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey and consolidated with *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action currently is stayed.

On October 12, 2007, certain of Chubb's subsidiaries were named as defendants in an action similar to *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. This action was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. This action has been identified to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation as a potential tag-along action to *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*. The Corporation currently anticipates that this action will be

transferred by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey and consolidated with *In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litigation*.

On August 24, 2007, Chubb and certain of its subsidiaries were named as defendants in an action filed by the Ohio Attorney General against several insurers and one broker. This action alleges violations of Ohio's antitrust laws. On November 18, 2007, the Corporation filed a motion to dismiss the Attorney General's complaint which is still pending.

F-26

Table of Contents

In these actions, the plaintiffs generally allege that the defendants unlawfully used contingent commission agreements and conspired to reduce competition in the insurance markets. The actions seek treble damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, and attorneys' fees. The Corporation believes it has substantial defenses to all of the aforementioned legal proceedings and intends to defend the actions vigorously.

The Corporation cannot predict at this time the ultimate outcome of the aforementioned ongoing investigations and legal proceedings, including any potential amounts that the Corporation may be required to pay in connection with them. Nevertheless, management believes that it is likely that the outcome will not have a material adverse effect on the Corporation's results of operations or financial condition.

(b) Chubb Financial Solutions (CFS), a wholly owned subsidiary of Chubb, participated in derivative financial instruments, principally as a counterparty in portfolio credit default swaps. Chubb issued unconditional guarantees with respect to all obligations of CFS arising from these transactions. CFS has been in run-off since April 2003.

CFS's aggregate exposure, or retained risk, from its in-force financial products contracts is referred to as notional amount. Notional amounts are used to calculate the exchange of contractual cash flows and are not necessarily representative of the potential for gain or loss. Notional amounts are not recorded on the balance sheet.

Future obligations with respect to the financial products contracts are carried at estimated fair value at the balance sheet date and are included in other liabilities. The notional amount and fair value of future obligations under CFS's financial products contracts were as follows:

| | December 31 | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Notional Amount | | Fair Value | |
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in billions) | | (in millions) | |
| Credit default swaps | \$.1 | \$ 1.1 | \$ 1 | \$ 2 |
| Other | .3 | .3 | 6 | 6 |
| Total | \$.4 | \$ 1.4 | \$ 7 | \$ 8 |

(c) A property and casualty insurance subsidiary issued a reinsurance contract to an insurer that provides financial guarantees on debt obligations. At December 31, 2007, the aggregate principal commitments related to this contract for which the subsidiary was contingently liable amounted to approximately \$350 million, net of reinsurance. These commitments expire by 2023.

(d) The Corporation occupies office facilities under lease agreements that expire at various dates through 2019; such leases are generally renewed or replaced by other leases. Most facility leases contain renewal options for increments ranging from two to ten years. The Corporation also leases data processing, office and transportation equipment. All leases are operating leases.

Rent expense was as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions) | | |
| Office facilities | \$ 81 | \$ 89 | \$ 87 |

| | | | |
|-----------|------|------|-------|
| Equipment | 12 | 9 | 14 |
| | \$93 | \$98 | \$101 |

At December 31, 2007, future minimum rental payments required under non-cancellable operating leases were as follows:

| Years Ending December 31 | (in millions) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| 2008 | \$ 89 |
| 2009 | 80 |
| 2010 | 66 |
| 2011 | 60 |
| 2012 | 54 |
| After 2012 | 181 |
| | \$530 |

(e) The Corporation had certain commitments totaling \$1.3 billion at December 31, 2007 to fund limited partnership investments. These capital commitments can be called by the partnerships during the commitment period (generally 5 years or less) to fund working capital needs or the purchase of new investments.

F-27

Table of Contents**(16) Earnings Per Share**

Basic earnings per common share is computed by dividing net income by the weighted average number of common shares outstanding during the year. The computation of diluted earnings per share reflects the potential dilutive effect, using the treasury stock method, of outstanding awards under stock-based employee compensation plans and of outstanding purchase contracts and mandatorily exercisable warrants to purchase Chubb's common stock.

The following table sets forth the computation of basic and diluted earnings per share:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|--|--|---------|---------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (in millions except for per share amounts) | | |
| Basic earnings per share: | | | |
| Net income | \$2,807 | \$2,528 | \$1,826 |
| Weighted average number of common shares outstanding | 393.6 | 412.5 | 396.4 |
| Basic earnings per share | \$ 7.13 | \$ 6.13 | \$ 4.61 |
| Diluted earnings per share: | | | |
| Net income | \$2,807 | \$2,528 | \$1,826 |
| Weighted average number of common shares outstanding | 393.6 | 412.5 | 396.4 |
| Additional shares from assumed exercise of stock-based compensation awards | 6.7 | 7.7 | 7.3 |
| Additional shares from assumed issuance of common stock upon settlement of purchase contracts and mandatorily exercisable warrants | | 2.2 | 4.7 |
| Weighted average number of common shares and potential common shares assumed outstanding for computing diluted earnings per share | 400.3 | 422.4 | 408.4 |
| Diluted earnings per share | \$ 7.01 | \$ 5.98 | \$ 4.47 |

(17) Comprehensive Income

Comprehensive income is defined as all changes in shareholders' equity, except those arising from transactions with shareholders. Comprehensive income includes net income and other comprehensive income, which for the Corporation consists of changes in unrealized appreciation or depreciation of investments carried at market value, changes in foreign currency translation gains or losses and, beginning in 2007, changes in postretirement benefit costs not yet recognized in net income.

The components of other comprehensive income or loss were as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|--|-------------------------|------|------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

| | Before Tax | Income Tax | Net | Before Tax | Income Tax | Net | Before Tax | Income Tax | Net |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------|---------------|---------------|-------|---------------|---------------|---------|
| (in millions) | | | | | | | | | |
| Unrealized holding gains (losses) arising during the year | \$237 | \$ 83 | \$154 | \$161 | \$ 55 | \$106 | \$(447) | \$(157) | \$(290) |
| Reclassification adjustment for realized gains included in net income | 30 | 10 | 20 | 36 | 11 | 25 | 35 | 12 | 23 |
| Net unrealized gains (losses) recognized in other comprehensive income | 207 | 73 | 134 | 125 | 44 | 81 | (482) | (169) | (313) |
| Foreign currency translation gains (losses) | 193 | 68 | 125 | 52 | 18 | 34 | (35) | (13) | (22) |
| Change in postretirement benefit costs not yet recognized in net income | (26) | (9) | (17) | | | | | | |
| Total other comprehensive income (loss) | \$374 | \$132 | \$242 | \$177 | \$ 62 | \$115 | \$(517) | \$(182) | \$(335) |

F-28

Table of Contents**(18) Fair Values of Financial Instruments**

Fair values of financial instruments are determined using valuation techniques that maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs. Fair values are generally measured using quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities or other inputs, such as quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities, that are observable, either directly or indirectly. In those instances where observable inputs are not available, fair values are measured using unobservable inputs for the asset or liability. Unobservable inputs reflect the Corporation's own assumptions about the assumptions that market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability and are developed based on the best information available in the circumstances. Fair value estimates derived from unobservable inputs are significantly affected by the assumptions used, including the discount rates and the estimated amounts and timing of future cash flows. The derived fair value estimates cannot be substantiated by comparison to independent markets and are not necessarily indicative of the amounts that would be realized in a current market exchange. Certain financial instruments, particularly insurance contracts, are excluded from fair value disclosure requirements.

The methods and assumptions used to estimate the fair value of financial instruments are as follows:

- (i) The carrying value of short term investments approximates fair value due to the short maturities of these investments.
- (ii) Fair values of fixed maturities are generally obtained from independent pricing services. The pricing services utilize market quotations for fixed maturities that have quoted prices in active markets. For the fixed maturities that do not trade on a daily basis, the pricing services estimate fair values using proprietary pricing applications based on observable inputs in most instances. Fair values of fixed maturities are principally a function of current interest rates. Care should be used in evaluating the significance of these estimated market values, which can fluctuate based on such factors as interest rates, inflation, monetary policy and general economic conditions.
- (iii) Fair values of equity securities are based on quoted market prices obtained from independent pricing services.
- (iv) The fair value of the interest rate swap is based on a price quoted by a broker-dealer.
- (v) Fair values of long term debt are obtained from independent pricing services or based on prices quoted by broker-dealers.
- (vi) Fair values of credit derivatives are determined using internal valuation models that are similar to external valuation models.

The carrying values and fair values of financial instruments were as follows:

| | December 31 | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|
| | 2007 | | 2006 | |
| | Carrying Value | Fair Value | Carrying Value | Fair Value |
| (in millions) | | | | |
| Assets | | | | |
| Invested assets | | | | |
| Short term investments | \$ 1,839 | \$ 1,839 | \$ 2,254 | \$ 2,254 |
| Fixed maturities (Note 4) | | | | |
| Held-to-maturity | | | 135 | 142 |

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Available-for-sale | 33,871 | 33,871 | 31,831 | 31,831 |
| Equity securities | 2,320 | 2,320 | 1,957 | 1,957 |
| Interest rate swap | | | 6 | 6 |
| Liabilities | | | | |
| Long term debt (Note 8) | 3,460 | 3,427 | 2,460 | 2,504 |
| Credit derivatives (Note 15) | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 |

F-29

Table of Contents**(19) Shareholders Equity**

(a) The authorized but unissued preferred shares may be issued in one or more series and the shares of each series shall have such rights as fixed by the Board of Directors.

(b) On February 8, 2006, the Board of Directors authorized the cancellation of all treasury shares, which were thereupon restored to the status of authorized but unissued common shares. The change had no effect on total shareholders equity.

The activity of Chubb's common stock was as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
| | (number of shares) | | |
| Common stock issued | | | |
| Balance, beginning of year | 411,276,940 | 420,864,596 | 391,607,648 |
| Treasury shares cancelled | | (7,887,800) | |
| Repurchase of shares | (41,733,268) | (20,266,262) | |
| Shares issued upon settlement of equity unit purchase contracts and warrants | | 12,883,527 | 17,366,234 |
| Share activity under stock-based employee compensation plans | 5,106,251 | 5,682,879 | 11,890,714 |
| Balance, end of year | 374,649,923 | 411,276,940 | 420,864,596 |
| Treasury stock | | | |
| Balance, beginning of year | | 2,787,800 | 6,254,564 |
| Repurchase of shares | | 5,100,000 | 2,787,800 |
| Cancellation of shares | | (7,887,800) | |
| Share activity under stock-based employee compensation plans | | | (6,254,564) |
| Balance, end of year | | | 2,787,800 |
| Common stock outstanding, end of year | 374,649,923 | 411,276,940 | 418,076,796 |

In November 2002, Chubb issued 24 million mandatorily exercisable warrants to purchase its common stock and \$600 million of senior notes due in 2007. The warrants and notes were issued together in the form of equity units. Each warrant obligated the holder to purchase, and obligated Chubb to sell, on or before the settlement date of November 16, 2005, for a settlement price of \$25, a variable number of newly issued shares of Chubb's common stock. The number of shares of Chubb's common stock purchased was determined based on a formula that considered the market price of the common stock immediately prior to the time of settlement in relation to the \$28.32 per share sale price of the common stock at the time the equity units were offered. Upon settlement of the warrants, Chubb issued 17,366,234 shares of common stock and received proceeds of \$600 million.

In June 2003, Chubb issued 18.4 million purchase contracts to purchase its common stock and \$460 million of senior notes due in 2008. The purchase contracts and notes were issued together in the form of equity units. Each purchase contract obligated the holder to purchase, and obligated Chubb to sell, on or before the settlement date of August 16, 2006, for a settlement price of \$25, a variable number of newly issued shares of Chubb's common stock. The number of shares of Chubb's common stock purchased was determined based on a formula that considered the

market price of the common stock immediately prior to the time of settlement in relation to the \$29.75 per share sale price of the common stock at the time the equity units were offered. Upon settlement of the purchase contracts, Chubb issued 12,883,527 shares of common stock and received proceeds of \$460 million.

(c) As of December 31, 2007, 26,112,670 shares remained under the current share repurchase authorization that was approved by the Board of Directors in December 2007. The authorization has no expiration date.

(d) Chubb has a shareholders rights plan under which each shareholder has one-half of a right for each share of Chubb's common stock held. Each right entitles the holder to purchase from Chubb one one-thousandth of a share of Series B Participating Cumulative Preferred Stock at an exercise price of \$240. The rights are attached to all outstanding shares of common stock and trade with the common stock until the rights become exercisable. The rights are subject to adjustment to prevent dilution of the interests represented by each right.

The rights will become exercisable and will detach from the common stock ten days after a person or group either acquires 20% or more of the outstanding shares of Chubb's common stock or announces a tender or exchange offer which, if consummated, would result in that person or group owning 20% or more of the outstanding shares of Chubb's common stock.

Table of Contents

In the event that any person or group acquires 20% or more of the outstanding shares of Chubb's common stock, each right will entitle the holder, other than such person or group, to purchase that number of shares of Chubb's common stock having a market value of two times the exercise price of the right. In the event that, following the acquisition of 20% or more of Chubb's outstanding common stock by a person or group, the Corporation is acquired in a merger or other business combination transaction or 50% or more of the Corporation's assets or earning power is sold, each right will entitle the holder to purchase common stock of the acquiring company having a value equal to two times the exercise price of the right. At any time after any person or group acquires 20% or more of Chubb's common stock, but before such person or group acquires 50% or more of such stock, Chubb may exchange all or part of the rights, other than the rights owned by such person or group, for shares of Chubb's common stock at an exchange ratio of one share of common stock per one-half of a right.

The rights do not have the right to vote or to receive dividends. The rights may be redeemed in whole, but not in part, at a price of \$0.01 per right by Chubb at any time until the tenth day after the acquisition of 20% or more of Chubb's outstanding common stock by a person or group. The rights will expire at the close of business on March 12, 2009, unless previously exchanged or redeemed by Chubb.

(e) The property and casualty insurance subsidiaries are required to file annual statements with insurance regulatory authorities prepared on an accounting basis prescribed or permitted by such authorities (statutory basis). For such subsidiaries, statutory accounting practices differ in certain respects from GAAP.

A comparison of shareholders' equity on a GAAP basis and policyholders' surplus on a statutory basis is as follows:

| | December 31 | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | 2007 | | 2006 | |
| | GAAP | Statutory | GAAP | Statutory |
| | (in millions) | | | |
| P&C Group | \$15,490 | \$12,998 | \$13,868 | \$11,357 |
| Corporate and other | (1,045) | | (5) | |
| | \$14,445 | | \$13,863 | |

A comparison of GAAP and statutory net income (loss) is as follows:

| | Years Ended December 31 | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| | 2007 | | 2006 | | 2005 | |
| | GAAP | Statutory | GAAP | Statutory | GAAP | Statutory |
| | (in millions) | | | | | |
| P&C Group | \$2,992 | \$2,859 | \$2,637 | \$2,575 | \$1,963 | \$1,897 |
| Corporate and other | (185) | | (109) | | (137) | |
| | \$2,807 | | \$2,528 | | \$1,826 | |

(f) As a holding company, Chubb's ability to continue to pay dividends to shareholders and to satisfy its obligations, including the payment of interest and principal on debt obligations, relies on the availability of liquid assets, which is dependent in large part on the dividend paying ability of its property and casualty insurance subsidiaries. The Corporation's property and casualty insurance subsidiaries are subject to laws and regulations in the jurisdictions in which they operate that restrict the amount of dividends they may pay without the prior approval of regulatory authorities. The restrictions are generally based on net income and on certain levels of policyholders' surplus as determined in accordance with statutory accounting practices. Dividends in excess of such thresholds are considered extraordinary and require prior regulatory approval. During 2007, these subsidiaries paid dividends of \$1.55 billion to Chubb.

The maximum dividend distribution that may be made by the property and casualty insurance subsidiaries to Chubb during 2008 without prior regulatory approval is approximately \$2.4 billion.

F-31

Table of Contents**QUARTERLY FINANCIAL DATA**

Summarized unaudited quarterly financial data for 2007 and 2006 are shown below. In management's opinion, the interim financial data contain all adjustments, consisting of normal recurring items, necessary to present fairly the results of operations for the interim periods.

| | Three Months Ended | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------|---------|---------|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| | March 31 | | June 30 | | September 30 | | December 31 | |
| | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 |
| | (in millions except for per share amounts) | | | | | | | |
| Revenues | \$3,519 | \$3,506 | \$3,521 | \$3,445 | \$3,549 | \$3,451 | \$3,518 | \$3,601 |
| Losses and expenses | 2,518 | 2,554 | 2,534 | 2,611 | 2,502 | 2,620 | 2,616 | 2,693 |
| Federal and foreign income tax | 291 | 280 | 278 | 236 | 309 | 227 | 252 | 254 |
| Net income | \$ 710 | \$ 672 | \$ 709 | \$ 598 | \$ 738 | \$ 604 | \$ 650 | \$ 654 |
| Basic earnings per share | \$ 1.74 | \$ 1.62 | \$ 1.78 | \$ 1.45 | \$ 1.90 | \$ 1.47 | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.59 |
| Diluted earnings per share | \$ 1.71 | \$ 1.58 | \$ 1.75 | \$ 1.41 | \$ 1.87 | \$ 1.43 | \$ 1.68 | \$ 1.56 |
| Underwriting ratios | | | | | | | | |
| Losses to premiums earned | 53.0% | 53.8% | 53.1% | 56.7% | 51.8% | 56.9% | 53.3% | 53.2% |
| Expenses to premiums written | 30.4 | 29.1 | 29.6 | 28.5 | 29.8 | 28.6 | 30.5 | 29.9 |
| Combined | 83.4% | 82.9% | 82.7% | 85.2% | 81.6% | 85.5% | 83.8% | 83.1% |

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Schedule I
CONSOLIDATED SUMMARY OF INVESTMENTS OTHER THAN INVESTMENTS IN RELATED
PARTIES
(in millions)
December 31, 2007

| Type of Investment | Cost or Amortized Cost | Market Value | Amount at Which Shown in the Balance Sheet |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Short term investments | \$ 1,839 | \$ 1,839 | \$ 1,839 |
| Fixed maturities | | | |
| United States Government and government agencies and authorities | 3,151 | 3,165 | 3,165 |
| States, municipalities and political subdivisions | 18,247 | 18,595 | 18,595 |
| Foreign | 6,946 | 6,949 | 6,949 |
| Public utilities | 582 | 590 | 590 |
| All other corporate bonds | 4,548 | 4,572 | 4,572 |
| Total fixed maturities | 33,474 | 33,871 | 33,871 |
| Equity securities | | | |
| Common stocks | | | |
| Public utilities | 154 | 190 | 190 |
| Banks, trusts and insurance companies | 379 | 577 | 577 |
| Industrial, miscellaneous and other | 1,274 | 1,449 | 1,449 |
| Total common stocks | 1,807 | 2,216 | 2,216 |
| Non-redeemable preferred stocks | 100 | 104 | 104 |
| Total equity securities | 1,907 | 2,320 | 2,320 |
| Other invested assets | 2,051 | 2,051 | 2,051 |
| Total invested assets | \$39,271 | \$40,081 | \$40,081 |

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Schedule II
CONDENSED FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF REGISTRANT
BALANCE SHEETS PARENT COMPANY ONLY
(in millions)
December 31

| | 2007 | 2006 |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| Assets | | |
| Invested Assets | | |
| Short Term Investments | \$ 881 | \$ 748 |
| Taxable Fixed Maturities Available-for-Sale (cost \$1,027 and \$1,134) | 1,022 | 1,113 |
| Equity Securities (cost \$289 and \$289) | 478 | 416 |
| TOTAL INVESTED ASSETS | 2,381 | 2,277 |
| Cash | | 1 |
| Investment in Consolidated Subsidiaries | 15,633 | 13,848 |
| Net Receivable from Consolidated Subsidiaries | 15 | 19 |
| Other Assets | 168 | 243 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | \$18,197 | \$16,388 |
| Liabilities | | |
| Long Term Debt | \$ 3,460 | \$ 2,266 |
| Dividend Payable to Shareholders | 110 | 104 |
| Accrued Expenses and Other Liabilities | 182 | 155 |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES | 3,752 | 2,525 |
| Shareholders Equity | | |
| Preferred Stock Authorized 8,000,000 Shares; \$1 Par Value; Issued None | | |
| Common Stock Authorized 1,200,000,000 Shares; \$1 Par Value; Issued 374,649,923 and 411,276,940 Shares | 375 | 411 |
| Paid-In Surplus | 346 | 1,539 |
| Retained Earnings | 13,280 | 11,711 |
| Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income | 444 | 202 |
| TOTAL SHAREHOLDERS EQUITY | 14,445 | 13,863 |
| TOTAL LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS EQUITY | \$18,197 | \$16,388 |

The condensed financial statements should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and notes thereto.

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Schedule II
(continued)
CONDENSED FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF REGISTRANT
STATEMENTS OF INCOME PARENT COMPANY ONLY
(in millions)
Years Ended December 31

| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Revenues | | | |
| Investment Income | \$ 125 | \$ 111 | \$ 82 |
| Other Revenues | (5) | 17 | 3 |
| Realized Investment Gains (Losses) | (31) | | 16 |
| TOTAL REVENUES | 89 | 128 | 101 |
| Expenses | | | |
| Investment Expenses | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Real Estate Impairment Loss | | | 48 |
| Corporate Expenses | 249 | 192 | 188 |
| TOTAL EXPENSES | 252 | 195 | 238 |
| Loss before Federal and Foreign Income Tax and Equity in Net Income of Consolidated Subsidiaries | (163) | (67) | (137) |
| Federal and Foreign Income Tax (Credit) | 7 | 16 | (48) |
| Loss before Equity in Net Income of Consolidated Subsidiaries | (170) | (83) | (89) |
| Equity in Net Income of Consolidated Subsidiaries | 2,977 | 2,611 | 1,915 |
| NET INCOME | \$2,807 | \$2,528 | \$1,826 |

Chubb and its domestic subsidiaries file a consolidated federal income tax return. The federal income tax provision represents an allocation under the Corporation's tax allocation agreements.

The condensed financial statements should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and notes thereto.

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Schedule II
(continued)
CONDENSED FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF REGISTRANT
STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS PARENT COMPANY ONLY
(in millions)
Years Ended December 31

| | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Cash Flows from Operating Activities | | | |
| Net Income | \$ 2,807 | \$ 2,528 | \$ 1,826 |
| Adjustments to Reconcile Net Income to Net Cash | | | |
| Provided by Operating Activities | | | |
| Equity in Net Income of Consolidated Subsidiaries | (2,977) | (2,611) | (1,915) |
| Realized Investment Losses (Gains) | 31 | | (16) |
| Other, Net | 15 | (7) | (23) |
| NET CASH USED IN OPERATING ACTIVITIES | (124) | (90) | (128) |
| Cash Flows from Investing Activities | | | |
| Proceeds from Fixed Maturities | | | |
| Sales | 49 | 121 | 548 |
| Maturities, Calls and Redemptions | 86 | 113 | 102 |
| Purchases of Fixed Maturities | (61) | (75) | (703) |
| Decrease (Increase) in Short Term Investments, Net | (133) | 168 | (730) |
| Capital Contributions to Consolidated Subsidiaries | (20) | (10) | (200) |
| Dividends Received from Consolidated Insurance Subsidiaries | 1,550 | 650 | 520 |
| Distributions Received from Consolidated Non-Insurance Subsidiaries | 40 | 17 | |
| Other, Net | (65) | 49 | 225 |
| NET CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN) INVESTING ACTIVITIES | 1,446 | 1,033 | (238) |
| Cash Flows from Financing Activities | | | |
| Proceeds from Issuance of Long Term Debt | 1,800 | | |
| Repayment of Long Term Debt | (600) | | (300) |
| Proceeds from Common Stock Issued Upon Settlement of Equity Unit Purchase Contracts and Warrants | | 460 | 600 |
| Proceeds from Issuance of Common Stock Under Stock-Based Employee Compensation Plans | 130 | 229 | 531 |
| Repurchase of Shares | (2,185) | (1,228) | (135) |
| Dividends Paid to Shareholders | (451) | (403) | (330) |
| Other, Net | (17) | | |
| NET CASH PROVIDED BY (USED IN) FINANCING ACTIVITIES | (1,323) | (942) | 366 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|------|----|
| Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash | (1) | 1 | |
| Cash at Beginning of Year | 1 | | |
| CASH AT END OF YEAR | \$ | \$ 1 | \$ |

The condensed financial statements should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements and notes thereto.

In 2007, Chubb forgave a receivable and related interest in the amount of \$216 million in the aggregate due from a consolidated subsidiary. In 2005, consolidated subsidiaries paid noncash dividends in the amount of \$196 million to Chubb. These transactions have been excluded from the statement of cash flows.

S-4

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
Schedule III
CONSOLIDATED SUPPLEMENTARY INSURANCE INFORMATION
(in millions)

| Segment | December 31 | | | Year Ended December 31 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---|--|------------------|
| | Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs | Unpaid Losses | Unearned Premiums | Premiums Earned | Net Investment Income* | Insurance Losses | Amortization of Deferred Policy Acquisition Costs | Other Insurance Operating Costs and Expenses** | Premiums Written |
| 2007 | | | | | | | | | |
| Property and Casualty Insurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal | \$ 509 | \$ 2,141 | \$ 1,932 | \$ 3,642 | | \$ 1,942 | \$ 1,039 | \$ 106 | \$ 3,709 |
| Commercial | 637 | 10,972 | 2,718 | 5,120 | | 2,822 | 1,301 | 224 | 5,083 |
| Specialty | 374 | 8,163 | 1,748 | 2,971 | | 1,551 | 635 | 90 | 2,944 |
| Reinsurance Assumed | 36 | 1,347 | 201 | 213 | | (16) | 117 | 19 | 136 |
| Investments | | | | | \$ 1,590 | | | | |
| | \$ 1,556 | \$ 22,623 | \$ 6,599 | \$ 11,946 | \$ 1,590 | \$ 6,299 | \$ 3,092 | \$ 439 | \$ 11,872 |
| 2006 | | | | | | | | | |
| Property and Casualty Insurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal | \$ 478 | \$ 2,060 | \$ 1,848 | \$ 3,409 | | \$ 1,735 | \$ 911 | \$ 145 | \$ 3,518 |
| Commercial | 591 | 10,521 | 2,716 | 5,079 | | 2,726 | 1,215 | 290 | 5,125 |
| Specialty | 352 | 8,218 | 1,746 | 2,953 | | 1,865 | 602 | 104 | 2,941 |
| Reinsurance Assumed | 59 | 1,494 | 236 | 517 | | 248 | 191 | 21 | 390 |
| Investments | | | | | \$ 1,454 | | | | |
| | \$ 1,480 | \$ 22,293 | \$ 6,546 | \$ 11,958 | \$ 1,454 | \$ 6,574 | \$ 2,919 | \$ 560 | \$ 11,974 |
| 2005 | | | | | | | | | |
| Property and Casualty Insurance | | | | | | | | | |
| Personal | \$ 445 | \$ 2,059 | \$ 1,730 | \$ 3,217 | | \$ 1,822 | \$ 845 | \$ 123 | \$ 3,307 |
| Commercial | 576 | 10,803 | 2,615 | 5,020 | | 3,187 | 1,180 | 269 | 5,030 |
| Specialty | 337 | 8,082 | 1,744 | 2,981 | | 2,217 | 603 | 97 | 3,042 |
| Reinsurance Assumed | 87 | 1,538 | 272 | 958 | | 587 | 303 | 22 | 904 |

Reinsurance
Assumed

Investments \$1,315

\$1,445 \$22,482 \$6,361 \$12,176 \$1,315 \$7,813 \$2,931 \$511 \$12,283

* Property and casualty assets are available for payment of losses and expenses for all classes of business; therefore, such assets and the related investment income have not been allocated to the underwriting segments.

** Other insurance operating costs and expenses does not include other income and charges.

S-5

Table of Contents

THE CHUBB CORPORATION
EXHIBITS INDEX
(Item 15(a))

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|---------------------------|---|
| | Articles of incorporation and by-laws |
| 3.1 | Restated Certificate of Incorporation incorporated by reference to Exhibit (3) of the registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended June 30, 1996. |
| 3.2 | Certificate of Amendment to the Restated Certificate of Incorporation incorporated by reference to Exhibit (3) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1998. |
| 3.3 | Certificate of Correction of Certificate of Amendment to the Restated Certificate of Incorporation incorporated by reference to Exhibit (3) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1998. |
| 3.4 | Certificate of Amendment to the Restated Certificate of Incorporation incorporated by reference to Exhibit (3.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on April 18, 2006. |
| 3.5 | Certificate of Amendment to the Restated Certificate of Incorporation incorporated by reference to Exhibit (3.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on April 30, 2007. |
| 3.6 | By-Laws incorporated by reference to Exhibit (3.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on December 9, 2003. |
| | Instruments defining the rights of security holders, including indentures |
| | The registrant is not filing any instruments evidencing any indebtedness since the total amount of securities authorized under any single instrument does not exceed 10% of the total assets of the registrant and its subsidiaries on a consolidated basis. Copies of such instruments will be furnished to the Securities and Exchange Commission upon request. |
| 4.1 | Rights Agreement dated as of March 12, 1999 between The Chubb Corporation and First Chicago Trust Company of New York, as Rights Agent incorporated by reference to Exhibit (99.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 30, 1999. |
| | Material contracts |
| 10.1 | The Chubb Corporation Asset Managers Incentive Compensation Plan (2005) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2004. |
| 10.2 | Corporate Aircraft Policy incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.12) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.3 | The Chubb Corporation Annual Incentive Plan (2006) incorporated by reference to Annex A of the registrant's definitive proxy statement for the Annual Meeting of Shareholders held on April 25, 2006. |
| 10.4 | The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) incorporated by reference to Annex B of the registrant's definitive proxy statement for the Annual Meeting of Shareholders held on April 27, 2004. |
| 10.5 | The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2000) incorporated by reference to Exhibit A of the registrant's definitive proxy statement for the Annual Meeting of Shareholders held on April 25, 2000. |
| 10.6 | The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (1996), as amended, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year |

Edgar Filing: CHUBB CORP - Form 10-K
ended December 31, 1998.

E-1

Table of Contents

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|---------------------------|---|
| 10.7 | The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Annex C of the registrant's definitive proxy statement for the Annual Meeting of Shareholders held on April 27, 2004. |
| 10.8 | The Chubb Corporation Stock Option Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2001) incorporated by reference to Exhibit C of the registrant's definitive proxy statement for the Annual Meeting of Shareholders held on April 24, 2001. |
| 10.9 | The Chubb Corporation Stock Option Plan for Non-Employee Directors (1996), as amended, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1998. |
| 10.10 | The Chubb Corporation Stock Option Plan for Non-Employee Directors (1992), as amended, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1998. |
| 10.11 | Non-Employee Director Special Stock Option Agreement, dated as of December 5, 2002, between The Chubb Corporation and Joel J. Cohen, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on December 9, 2002. |
| 10.12 | Non-Employee Director Special Stock Option Agreement, dated as of December 5, 2002, between The Chubb Corporation and Lawrence M. Small, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.3) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on December 9, 2002. |
| 10.13 | The Chubb Corporation Key Employee Deferred Compensation Plan (2005) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.9) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.14 | Amendment to the registrant's Key Employee Deferred Compensation Plan (2005) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on September 12, 2005. |
| 10.15 | The Chubb Corporation Executive Deferred Compensation Plan incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1998. |
| 10.16 | The Chubb Corporation Deferred Compensation Plan for Directors, as amended, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on December 11, 2006. |
| 10.17 | The Chubb Corporation Estate Enhancement Program incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 1999. |
| 10.18 | The Chubb Corporation Estate Enhancement Program for Non-Employee Directors incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 1999. |
| 10.19 | Change in Control Employment Agreement, dated as of December 1, 2002, between The Chubb Corporation and John D. Finnegan, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on January 21, 2003. |
| 10.20 | Amendment, dated as of December 1, 2003, to Change in Control Employment Agreement, dated as of December 1, 2002, between The Chubb Corporation and John D. Finnegan, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.2) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on December 2, 2003. |
| 10.21 | Employment Agreement, dated as of December 1, 2002, between The Chubb Corporation and John D. Finnegan, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Current |

Table of Contents

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|---------------------------|---|
| 10.22 | Amendment, dated as of December 1, 2003, to Employment Agreement, dated as of December 1, 2002, between The Chubb Corporation and John D. Finnegan, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on December 2, 2003. |
| 10.23 | Executive Severance Agreement, dated as of November 16, 1998, between The Chubb Corporation and Thomas F. Motamed, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1998. |
| 10.24 | Executive Severance Agreement, dated as of June 30, 1997, between The Chubb Corporation and Michael O. Reilly, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1997. |
| 10.25 | Executive Severance Agreement, dated as of December 8, 1995, between The Chubb Corporation and John J. Degnan, incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10) of the registrant's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 1995. |
| 10.26 | Form of 2006 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (for Chief Executive Officer and Vice Chairmen) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.2) of the registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 2006. |
| 10.27 | Form of 2006 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (for Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.3) of the registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 2006. |
| 10.28 | Form of 2006 Restricted Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (for Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.4) of the registrant's Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 2006. |
| 10.29 | Form of 2006 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.5) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 8, 2006. |
| 10.30 | Form of 2006 Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.6) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 8, 2006. |
| 10.31 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (for Chief Executive Officer and Vice Chairmen) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.3) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.32 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (for Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.4) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.33 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (for recipients other than Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.5) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |

Table of Contents

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|---------------------------|---|
| 10.34 | Form of Restricted Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.6) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.35 | Amendment to the form of restricted stock unit award agreement for all eligible participants in The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.2) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on September 12, 2005. |
| 10.36 | Form of Non-Statutory Stock Option Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (three year vesting schedule) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.7) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.37 | Form of Non-Statutory Stock Option Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004) (four year vesting schedule) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.8) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.38 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.10) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.39 | Form of Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.11) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 9, 2005. |
| 10.40 | Schedule of 2007 Base Salaries for Named Executive Officers incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.1) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.41 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.2) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.42 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for recipients of performance share awards other than Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.3) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.43 | Form of Amendment No. 1 to the form of 2006 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.4) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.44 | Form of Amendment No. 1 to the form of 2006 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for 2006 performance share award recipients other than Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.5) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |

Table of Contents

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|---------------------------|---|
| 10.45 | Form of Amendment No. 1 to the form of 2005 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.6) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.46 | Form of Amendment No. 1 to the form of 2005 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for 2005 performance share award recipients other than Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.7) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.47 | Form of Restricted Stock Unit Agreement under the Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for Chief Executive Officer and Vice Chairmen) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.8) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.48 | Form of Restricted Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.9) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.49 | Form of Restricted Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan (2004)(for recipients of restricted stock unit awards other than Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairmen, Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.10) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.50 | Form of Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.11) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.51 | Form of Amendment No. 1 to the form of 2006 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.12) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.52 | Form of Amendment No. 1 to the form of 2005 Performance Share Award Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.13) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 10.53 | Form of Stock Unit Agreement under The Chubb Corporation Long-Term Stock Incentive Plan for Non-Employee Directors (2004) incorporated by reference to Exhibit (10.14) of the registrant's Current Report on Form 8-K filed on March 7, 2007. |
| 11.1 | Computation of earnings per share included in Note (16) of the Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements. |
| 12.1 | Computation of ratio of consolidated earnings to fixed charges filed herewith. |
| 21.1 | Subsidiaries of the registrant filed herewith. |

Table of Contents

| Exhibit Number | Description |
|---------------------------|--|
| 23.1 | Consent of Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm filed herewith. Rule 13a-14(a)/15d-14(a) Certifications. |
| 31.1 | Certification by John D. Finnegan filed herewith. |
| 31.2 | Certification by Michael O Reilly filed herewith. Section 1350 Certifications. |
| 32.1 | Certification by John D. Finnegan filed herewith. |
| 32.2 | Certification by Michael O Reilly filed herewith. |

E-6