CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORP
Form 10-K
February 23, 2017

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

FORM 10-K

ý ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
For the fiscal year ended December 31, 2016
OR
¨ TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
For the transition period from to
Commission File No. 1-13300

CAPITAL ONE FINANCIAL CORPORATION
(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware	54-1719854
(State or Other Jurisdiction of Incorporation or Organization)	(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)
1680 Capital One Drive, McLean, Virginia	22102
(Address of Principal Executive Offices)	(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (703) 720-1000

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 $.01 per share)	New York Stock Exchange
Warrants (expiring November 14, 2018)	New York Stock Exchange
Depositary Shares, Each Representing a 1/40th Interest in a Share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series B	New York Stock Exchange
Depositary Shares, Each Representing a 1/40th Interest in a Share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series C	New York Stock Exchange
Depositary Shares, Each Representing a 1/40th Interest in a Share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series D	New York Stock Exchange
Depositary Shares, Each Representing a 1/40th Interest in a Share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series F	New York Stock Exchange
Depositary Shares, Each Representing a 1/40th Interest in a Share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series G	New York Stock Exchange
Depositary Shares, Each Representing a 1/40th Interest in a Share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series H	New York Stock Exchange

Securities registered pursuant to section 12(g) of the act: None

---

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is a well-known seasoned issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act. Yes ý No ¨
Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Act. Yes ¨ No ý

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 ý No ¨

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate website, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes ý 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.

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

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a Shell Company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act) Yes ¨ No ý

The aggregate market value of the voting stock held by non-affiliates of the registrant as of the close of business on June 30, 2016 was approximately $31,929,010,767. As of January 31, 2017, there were 480,641,838 shares of the registrant's Common Stock outstanding.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

1. Portions of the Proxy Statement for the annual meeting of stockholders to be held on May 4, 2017, are incorporated by reference into Part III.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PART I		1
Item 1.	Business	1
	Overview	1
	Operations and Business Segments	2
	Supervision and Regulation	3
	Competition	12
	Employees	12
	Additional Information	12
	Forward-Looking Statements	13
Item 1A.	Risk Factors	14
Item 1B.	Unresolved Staff Comments	29
Item 2.	Properties	29
Item 3.	Legal Proceedings	29
Item 4.	Mine Safety Disclosures	29
PART II		30
Item 5.	Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities	30
Item 6.	Summary of Selected Financial Data	33
Item 7.	Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations ("MD&A")	36
	Executive Summary and Business Outlook	36
	Consolidated Results of Operations	38
	Consolidated Balance Sheets Analysis	45
	Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements	49
	Business Segment Financial Performance	49
	Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates	61
	Accounting Changes and Developments	66
	Capital Management	67
	Risk Management	71
	Credit Risk Profile	76
	Liquidity Risk Profile	89
	Market Risk Profile	93
	Supplemental Tables	97
	Glossary and Acronyms	105
Item 7A.	Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures about Market Risk	112
Item 8.	Financial Statements and Supplementary Data	112
	Consolidated Statements of Income	116
	Consolidated Statements of Comprehensive Income	117
	Consolidated Balance Sheets	118
	Consolidated Statements of Changes in Stockholders' Equity	119
	Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows	120

	Notes to Consolidated Financial Statements	121
	Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies	121
	Note 2—Discontinued Operations	122
	Note 3—Investment Securities	123
	Note 4—Loans	130
	Note 5—Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments	145
	Note 6—Variable Interest Entities and Securitizations	148
	Note 7—Goodwill and Intangible Assets	153
	Note 8—Premises, Equipment and Lease Commitments	156
	Note 9—Deposits and Borrowings	157
	Note 10—Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities	160
	Note 11—Stockholders' Equity	165
	Note 12—Regulatory and Capital Adequacy	168
	Note 13—Earnings Per Common Share	170
	Note 14—Stock-Based Compensation Plans	171
	Note 15—Employee Benefit Plans	175
	Note 16—Income Taxes	180
	Note 17—Fair Value Measurement	183
	Note 18—Business Segments	194
	Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others	197
	Note 20—Capital One Financial Corporation (Parent Company Only)	205
	Note 21—Related Party Transactions	207
	Selected Quarterly Financial Information	208
Item 9.	Changes in and Disagreements with Accountants on Accounting and Financial Disclosure	209
Item 9A.	Controls and Procedures	209
Item 9B.	Other Information	209
PART III		210
Item 10.	Directors, Executive Officers and Corporate Governance	210
Item 11.	Executive Compensation	210
Item 12.	Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters	210
Item 13.	Certain Relationships and Related Transactions and Director Independence	210
Item 14.	Principal Accountant Fees and Services	210
PART IV		211
Item 15.	Exhibits, Financial Statements Schedules	211
SIGNATURES		212
EXHIBIT INDEX		213

INDEX OF MD&A AND SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

MD&A Tables:		Page
1	Average Balances, Net Interest Income and Net Interest Margin	39
2	Rate/Volume Analysis of Net Interest Income	40
3	Non-Interest Income	41
4	Non-Interest Expense	43
5	Investment Securities	46
6	Non-Agency Investment Securities Credit Ratings	46
7	Loans Held for Investment	47
8	Business Segment Results	49
9	Credit Card Business Results	50
9.1	Domestic Card Business Results	52
10	Consumer Banking Business Results	54
11	Commercial Banking Business Results	57
12	Other Category Results	59
13	Capital Ratios under Basel III	67
14	Regulatory Capital Reconciliations between Basel III Transition to Fully Phased-in	69
15	Preferred Stock Dividends Paid Per Share	70
16	Loans Held for Investment Portfolio Composition	77
17	Commercial Loans by Industry	78
18	Home Loans—Risk Profile by Lien Priority	79
19	Sensitivity Analysis—PCI Home Loans	79
20	Loan Maturity Schedule	80
21	Credit Score Distribution	80
22	30+ Day Delinquencies	81
23	Aging and Geography of 30+ Day Delinquent Loans	83
24	90+ Day Delinquent Loans Accruing Interest	83
25	Nonperforming Loans and Other Nonperforming Assets	83
26	Net Charge-Offs (Recoveries)	85
27	Troubled Debt Restructurings	86
28	Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments Activity	87
29	Allowance Coverage Ratios	89
30	Liquidity Reserves	89
31	Deposit Composition and Average Deposit Rates	90
32	Maturities of Large-Denomination Domestic Time Deposits—$100,000 or More	91
33	Senior Unsecured Long-Term Debt Credit Ratings	92
34	Contractual Obligations	92
35	Interest Rate Sensitivity Analysis	95
Supplemental Tables:		
A	Loans Held for Investment Portfolio Composition	97
B	Performing Delinquencies	98
C	Nonperforming Loans and Other Nonperforming Assets	99
D	Net Charge-Offs	100
E	Summary of Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Unfunded Lending Commitments	101
F	Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures	102

Table of Contents

PART I

Item 1. Business

OVERVIEW

General

Capital One Financial Corporation, a Delaware corporation established in 1994 and headquartered in McLean, Virginia, is a diversified financial services holding company with banking and non-banking subsidiaries. Capital One Financial Corporation and its subsidiaries (the "Company") offer a broad array of financial products and services to consumers, small businesses and commercial clients through branches, the internet and other distribution channels.

As of December 31, 2016, our principal subsidiaries included:

- Capital One Bank (USA), National Association ("COBNA"), which offers credit and debit card products, other lending products and deposit products; and
- Capital One, National Association ("CONA"), which offers a broad spectrum of banking products and financial services to consumers, small businesses and commercial clients.

The Company is hereafter collectively referred to as "we," "us" or "our." COBNA and CONA are collectively referred to as the "Banks." References to "this Report" or our "2016 Form 10-K" or "2016 Annual Report" are to our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2016. All references to 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013 and 2012, refer to our fiscal years ended, or the dates, as the context requires, December 31, 2016, December 31, 2015, December 31, 2014, December 31, 2013 and December 31, 2012, respectively. Certain business terms used in this document are defined in the "MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms" and should be read in conjunction with the Consolidated Financial Statements included in this Report.

As one of the nation's ten largest banks based on deposits as of December 31, 2016, we service banking customer accounts through the internet and mobile banking, as well as through cafés, ATMs and branch locations primarily across New York, Louisiana, Texas, Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey and the District of Columbia. We also operate the largest online direct banking institution in the United States ("U.S.") by deposits. In addition to bank lending, treasury management and depository services, we offer credit and debit card products, auto loans and mortgage banking in markets across the United States. We were the third largest issuer of Visa® ("Visa") and MasterCard® ("MasterCard") credit cards in the United States based on the outstanding balance of credit card loans as of December 31, 2016.

We also offer products outside of the United States principally through Capital One (Europe) plc ("COEP"), an indirect subsidiary of COBNA organized and located in the United Kingdom ("U.K."), and through a branch of COBNA in Canada. Both COEP and our branch of COBNA in Canada have the authority to provide credit card loans.

Recent Acquisitions and Dispositions

We regularly explore and evaluate opportunities to acquire financial services and financial assets, including credit card and other loan portfolios, and enter into strategic partnerships as part of our growth strategy. We also explore opportunities to acquire digital companies and related assets to improve our information technology infrastructure and to deliver on our digital strategy. We also regularly consider the potential disposition of certain of our assets, branches, partnership agreements or lines of business. We may issue equity or debt in connection with acquisitions, including public offerings, to fund such acquisitions.

On October 3, 2016, we announced that we have entered into a 10-year program agreement to become the exclusive issuing partner of co-branded credit cards to Cabela's customers. In connection with this credit card program, we have entered into a definitive agreement under which we will acquire the credit card operations from Cabela's, including approximately $5.2 billion in credit card receivables and other assets and approximately $5.0 billion in associated funding liabilities. This transaction is subject to the satisfaction of customary closing conditions, including receipt of various regulatory approvals and the approval of the stockholders of Cabela's. In determining whether to approve the proposed acquisition under the Bank Merger Act ("BMA"), the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ("OCC") will consider, among other factors, the convenience and needs of the communities we serve and our effectiveness in combating money laundering, including the acceptability to the OCC of our progress in addressing the

1Capital One Financial Corporation (COF)

requirements of the consent order with the OCC that we previously disclosed in our Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2015 (the "AML Consent Order").

On January 28, 2017, Capital One withdrew its BMA application from the OCC and we do not expect to receive regulatory approval of any BMA application for this transaction prior to October 3, 2017. This is the date when any of the parties involved in the agreement can terminate the agreement. We will not be in a position to refile a BMA application until after we have completed our work under the AML Consent Order.

We will continue to work with Cabela's toward completing the transaction. We cannot be certain when or if, or on what terms and conditions, required regulatory approvals will be granted to complete the acquisition.

On December 1, 2015, we completed the acquisition of the Healthcare Financial Services business of General Electric Capital Corporation ("HFS acquisition"). Including post-closing purchase price adjustments, we recorded approximately $9.2 billion in assets, including $8.2 billion of loans.

Additional Information

Our common stock trades on the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") under the symbol "COF" and is included in the Standard & Poor's ("S&P") 100 Index. Our principal executive office is located at 1680 Capital One Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102, telephone number (703) 720-1000. We maintain a website at www.capitalone.com. Documents available on our website include:

- our Code of Business Conduct and Ethics for the Corporation;
- our Corporate Governance Guidelines; and
- charters for the Audit, Compensation, Governance and Nominating, and Risk Committees of the Board of Directors.

These documents also are available in print to any stockholder who requests a copy.

In addition, we make available free of charge through our website our Annual Reports on Form 10-K, Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q, Current Reports on Form 8-K and amendments to those reports as soon as reasonably practicable after electronically filing or furnishing such material to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC").

OPERATIONS AND BUSINESS SEGMENTS

Our consolidated total net revenues are derived primarily from lending to consumer and commercial customers net of funding costs associated with deposits, short-term borrowings and long-term debt. We also earn non-interest income which primarily consists of interchange income net of reward expenses, and service charges and other customer-related fees. Our expenses primarily consist of the provision for credit losses, operating expenses, marketing expenses and income taxes.

Our principal operations are currently organized for management reporting purposes into three primary business segments, which are defined primarily based on the products and services provided or the type of customer served: Credit Card, Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking. The operations of acquired businesses have been integrated into our existing business segments. Certain activities that are not part of a segment, such as management of our corporate investment portfolio and asset/liability management by our centralized Corporate Treasury group, are included in the Other category.

- Credit Card: Consists of our domestic consumer and small business card lending, and international card lending businesses in Canada and the United Kingdom.
- Consumer Banking: Consists of our branch-based lending and deposit gathering activities for consumers and small businesses, national deposit gathering, national auto lending and consumer home loan lending and servicing activities.
- Commercial Banking: Consists of our lending, deposit gathering and treasury management services to commercial real estate and commercial and industrial customers. Our commercial and industrial customers typically include companies with annual revenues between $10 million and $1 billion.

Customer usage and payment patterns, credit quality, levels of marketing expense and operating efficiency all affect our profitability. In our Credit Card business, we experience fluctuations in purchase volume and the level of outstanding loan receivables due to

2 Capital One Financial Corporation (COF)

seasonal variances in consumer spending and payment patterns which, for example, are highest around the winter holiday season. No individual quarter in 2016, 2015 or 2014 accounted for more than 30% of our total revenues in any of these fiscal years. Net charge-off rates in our Credit Card and Consumer Banking businesses also have historically exhibited seasonal patterns and generally tend to be the highest in the first and fourth quarters of the year.

For additional information on our business segments, including the financial performance of each business, see "Part II—Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations ("MD&A")—Executive Summary and Business Outlook," "MD&A—Business Segment Financial Performance" and "Note 18—Business Segments" o this Report.

SUPERVISION AND REGULATION

General

Capital One Financial Corporation is a bank holding company ("BHC") under Section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended (12 U.S.C. § 1842) ("BHC Act") and is subject to the requirements of the BHC Act, including its approval requirements for investments in or acquisitions of banking organizations, capital adequacy standards and limitations on our nonbanking activities. We are also subject to supervision, examination and regulation by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ("Federal Reserve"). Permissible activities for a BHC include those activities that are so closely related to banking as to be a proper incident thereto, such as consumer lending and other activities that have been approved by the Federal Reserve by regulation or order. Certain servicing activities are also permissible for a BHC if conducted for or on behalf of the BHC or any of its affiliates. Impermissible activities for BHCs generally include nonfinancial activities such as sales of commercial products.

On May 27, 2005, we became a "financial holding company" under the BHC Act. In addition to the activities permissible for a BHC, a financial holding company, and the nonbank companies under its control, are permitted to engage in activities considered to be financial in nature (including, for example, insurance underwriting, agency sales and brokerage, securities underwriting and dealing and merchant banking activities), incidental to financial activities or, if the Federal Reserve determines that they pose no risk to the safety or soundness of depository institutions or the financial system in general, activities complementary to financial activities.

To become and remain eligible for financial holding company status, a BHC and its subsidiary depository institutions must meet certain criteria, including capital, management and Community Reinvestment Act ("CRA") requirements. Failure to meet such criteria could result, depending on which requirements were not met, in the Company facing restrictions on new financial activities or acquisitions or being required to discontinue existing activities that are not generally permissible for BHCs.

The Banks are national associations chartered under the laws of the United States, the deposits of which are insured by the Deposit Insurance Fund ("DIF") of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") up to applicable limits. The Banks are subject to comprehensive regulation and periodic examination by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ("OCC"), the FDIC and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ("CFPB").

We are also registered as a financial institution holding company under the law of the Commonwealth of Virginia and, as such, we are subject to periodic examination by the Virginia Bureau of Financial Institutions. We also face regulation in the international jurisdictions in which we conduct business (see below under "Regulation of Businesses by Authorities Outside the United States").

Regulation of Business Activities

The business activities of the Company and Banks are also subject to regulation and supervision under various laws and regulations.

Regulations of Consumer Lending Activities

The activities of the Banks as consumer lenders are subject to regulation under various federal laws, including the Truth in Lending Act ("TILA"), the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the CRA, the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and the Military Lending Act, as well as under various state laws. We are also subject to the Credit Card Accountability Responsibility and Disclosure Act, which amended the TILA, and which imposes a number of restrictions on credit card practices impacting rates and fees, requires that a consumer's ability to pay be taken into account before issuing credit or increasing credit limits, and imposes revised disclosures required for

open-end credit.

Table of Contents

Depending on the underlying issue and applicable law, regulators may be authorized to impose penalties for violations of these statutes and, in certain cases, to order banks to compensate injured borrowers. Borrowers may also have a private right of action for certain violations. Federal bankruptcy and state debtor relief and collection laws may also affect the ability of a bank, including the Banks, to collect outstanding balances owed by borrowers.

Mortgage Lending

The CFPB has issued several final rules pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ("Dodd-Frank Act") that provide additional disclosure requirements and substantive limitations on our mortgage lending activities. These rules, which include the amendments to the Ability to Repay, Qualified Mortgage Standards and Mortgage Servicing regulations under the TILA (Regulation Z) and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X), could impact the type and amount of mortgage loans CONA offers and services.

Debit Interchange Fees

The Dodd-Frank Act requires that the amount of any interchange fee received by a debit card issuer with respect to debit card transactions be reasonable and proportional to the cost incurred by the issuer with respect to the transaction. Final rules adopted by the Federal Reserve to implement these requirements limit interchange fees per debit card transaction to $0.21 plus five basis points of the transaction amount and provide for an additional $0.01 fraud prevention adjustment to the interchange fee for issuers that meet certain fraud prevention requirements.

Bank Secrecy Act and USA PATRIOT Act of 2001

The Bank Secrecy Act and the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 ("Patriot Act") require financial institutions, among other things, to implement a risk-based program reasonably designed to prevent money laundering and to combat the financing of terrorism, including through suspicious activity and currency transaction reporting, compliance, record-keeping and customer due diligence.

In May 2016, the United States Department of the Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network issued a final rule making customer due diligence a required, stand-alone part of the anti-money laundering programs financial institutions must maintain under the Bank Secrecy Act. For these purposes, the term "customer due diligence" refers to customer identification and verification, beneficial ownership identification and verification, understanding the nature and purpose of customer relationships to develop a customer risk profile, ongoing monitoring for reporting suspicious transactions and, on a risk-adjusted basis, maintaining and updating customer information. The rule became effective on July 11, 2016 and requires full compliance by May 11, 2018 for Capital One and all other covered financial institutions.

The Patriot Act also contains financial transparency laws and provides enhanced information collection tools and enforcement mechanisms to the United States government, including due diligence and record-keeping requirements for private banking and correspondent accounts; standards for verifying customer identification at account opening; rules to produce certain records upon request of a regulator or law enforcement agency; and rules to promote cooperation among financial institutions, regulators and law enforcement agencies in identifying parties that may be involved in terrorism, money laundering and other crimes.

Funding

Under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 ("FDICIA"), as discussed in "MD&A—Liquidity Risk Profile," only well capitalized and adequately capitalized institutions may accept brokered deposits. Adequately capitalized institutions, however, must obtain a waiver from the FDIC before accepting brokered deposits, and such institutions may not pay rates that significantly exceed the rates paid on deposits of similar maturity obtained from the institution's normal market area or, for deposits obtained from outside the institution's normal market area, the national rate on deposits of comparable maturity. The FDIC is authorized to terminate a bank's deposit insurance upon a finding by the FDIC that the bank's financial condition is unsafe or unsound or that the institution has engaged in unsafe or unsound practices or has violated any applicable rule, regulation, order or condition enacted or imposed by the bank's regulatory agency. The termination of deposit insurance could have a material adverse effect on a bank's liquidity and earnings.

Nonbank Activities

Certain of our nonbank subsidiaries are subject to supervision and regulation by various other federal and state authorities. Capital One Securities, Inc. and Capital One Investing, LLC are registered broker-dealers regulated by the SEC and the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority. Our broker-dealer subsidiaries are subject, among other things, to net capital rules designed to measure the

Table of Contents

general financial condition and liquidity of a broker-dealer. Under these rules, broker-dealers are required to maintain the minimum net capital deemed necessary to meet their continuing commitments to customers and others, and to keep a substantial portion of their assets in relatively liquid form. These rules also limit the ability of a broker-dealer to transfer capital to its parent companies and other affiliates. Broker-dealers are also subject to regulations covering their business operations, including sales and trading practices, public offerings, publication of research reports, use and safekeeping of client funds and securities, capital structure, record-keeping and the conduct of directors, officers and employees.

Capital One Asset Management, LLC and Capital One Advisors, LLC are SEC-registered investment advisers regulated under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. Capital One Asset Management, LLC, whose sole client is CONA, provides investment advice to CONA's private banking customers, including trusts, high net worth individuals, institutions, foundations, endowments and other organizations.

Capital One Agency LLC is a licensed insurance agency that provides both personal and business insurance services to retail and commercial clients. It is regulated by state insurance regulatory agencies in the states in which it operates.

Derivatives Activities

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") and the SEC have jointly issued final rules further defining the Dodd-Frank Act's "swap dealer" definitions. Based on these rules, no Capital One entity is currently required to register with the CFTC or SEC as a swap dealer. The Dodd-Frank Act also requires all swap market participants to keep certain swap transaction records and report pertinent information to swap data repositories on a real-time and on-going basis. Further, each swap, group, category, type or class of swap that the CFTC or SEC determines must be cleared through a derivatives clearinghouse (unless the swap is eligible for a clearing exemption) must also be executed on a designated contract market ("DCM"), exchange or swap execution facility ("SEF"), unless no DCM, exchange or SEF has made the swap available for trading.

Volcker Rule

We and each of our subsidiaries, including the Banks, are subject to the "Volcker Rule," a provision of the Dodd-Frank Act that contains prohibitions on proprietary trading and certain investments in, and relationships with, covered funds (hedge funds, private equity funds and similar funds), subject to certain exemptions, in each case as the applicable terms are defined in the Volcker Rule and the implementing regulations. The implementing regulations also require that we, as a banking entity with $50 billion or more in total assets, establish and maintain an enhanced compliance program designed to ensure that we comply with the requirements of such regulations.

Capital and Liquidity Regulation

The Company and the Banks are subject to capital adequacy guidelines adopted by the Federal Reserve and OCC. For a further discussion of the capital adequacy guidelines, see "MD&A—Capital Management" and "Note 12—Regulatory and Capital Adequacy." The Company and the Banks exceeded minimum regulatory requirements under these guidelines as of December 31, 2016.

Basel III and United States Capital Rules

In December 2010, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision ("Basel Committee") published a framework for additional capital and liquidity requirements ("Basel III"), which included detailed capital ratios and buffers, subject to transition periods. The Federal Reserve, OCC and FDIC (collectively, the "Federal Banking Agencies") issued a final rule that implemented Basel III and certain Dodd-Frank Act and other capital provisions and updated the prompt corrective action ("PCA") framework to reflect the new regulatory capital minimums ("Basel III Capital Rule"). The Basel III Capital Rule increased the minimum capital that we and other institutions are required to hold. The Basel III Capital Rule includes the "Basel III Standardized Approach" and the "Basel III Advanced Approaches." The Basel Committee continues to evaluate further modifications to these and other capital standards which, if finalized, would require rulemaking in the United States prior to their effectiveness for United States banking organizations. There is uncertainty around any final modifications that the Basel Committee might adopt, which of those changes thereafter may be adopted in the United States, and how those changes may impact U.S. capital standards.

The Basel III Advanced Approaches are mandatory for institutions with total consolidated assets of $250 billion or more or total consolidated on-balance-sheet foreign exposure of $10 billion or more. We became subject to the

predecessor of these rules at the end of 2012. Prior to full implementation of the Basel III Advanced Approaches, however, a covered organization must complete a qualification period, known as the parallel run, during which it must demonstrate that it meets the requirements of the rule to the

satisfaction of its primary United States banking regulator. We entered parallel run on January 1, 2015. A parallel run must last at least four quarters, but in practice United States banks have taken considerably longer to complete parallel runs.

Notwithstanding the Basel III Advanced Approaches, the Basel III Capital Rule also established a capital floor so that organizations subject to the Basel III Advanced Approaches may not hold less capital than would be required using the Basel III Standardized Approach capital calculations.

The Basel III Capital Rule revised the definition of regulatory capital, established a new common equity Tier 1 capital requirement, set higher minimum capital ratio requirements, introduced a new capital conservation buffer of 2.5%, introduced a new countercyclical capital buffer (currently set at 0.0%) and updated the PCA framework. Compliance with certain aspects of the Basel III Capital Rule went into effect for Capital One as of January 1, 2014 and other provisions have gone or will go into effect according to various start dates and phase-in periods. As of January 1, 2014, the minimum risk-based and leverage capital requirements for Advanced Approaches banking organizations included a common equity Tier 1 capital ratio of at least 4.0%, a Tier 1 risk-based capital ratio of at least 5.5%, a total risk-based capital ratio of at least 8.0% and a Tier 1 leverage capital ratio of at least 4.0%. On January 1, 2015, the minimum risk-based capital ratio requirements increased to 4.5% for the common equity Tier 1 capital ratio and to 6.0% for the Tier 1 risk-based capital ratio, and the minimum requirements for the total risk-based capital ratio and Tier 1 leverage capital ratio remained the same. Both the capital conservation buffer and the countercyclical capital buffer are being phased-in over a transition period of four years that commenced on January 1, 2016. On January 1, 2014, we began to use the Basel III Capital Rule, with transition provisions, to calculate our regulatory capital, including for purposes of calculating our regulatory capital ratios. On January 1, 2015, we began to use the Basel III Standardized Approach for calculating our risk-weighted assets in our regulatory capital ratios.

The Basel III Capital Rule also introduced a new supplementary leverage ratio for all Advanced Approaches banking organizations with a minimum requirement of 3.0%. The supplementary leverage ratio compares Tier 1 capital to total leverage exposure, which includes all on-balance sheet assets and certain off-balance sheet exposures, including derivatives and unused commitments. The supplementary leverage ratio will become effective on January 1, 2018. As an Advanced Approaches banking organization, however, we were required to calculate and publicly disclose our supplementary leverage ratio beginning in the first quarter of 2015. For further information, see “MD&A—Capital Management.”

In July 2015 the Federal Reserve approved a final rule that imposes an additional common equity Tier 1 capital requirement on global systemically important banks (“G-SIBs”) that are based in the United States (“G-SIB Surcharge”). United States BHCs with total consolidated assets of $250 billion or more or total consolidated on-balance-sheet foreign exposure of $10 billion or more are required to determine annually whether they are considered to be a G-SIB for purposes of the G-SIB Surcharge. A BHC whose score using the prescribed methodology equals or exceeds 130 must maintain additional capital in an amount prescribed by the methodologies set out in the G-SIB Surcharge rule. We are not a G-SIB based on the most recent available data and thus we are not subject to a G-SIB Surcharge.

Market Risk Rule

The Market Risk Rule supplements both the Basel III Standardized Approach and the Basel III Advanced Approaches by requiring institutions subject to the Market Risk Rule to adjust their risk-based capital ratios to reflect the market risk in their trading portfolios. The Market Risk Rule applies to institutions with aggregate trading assets and liabilities equal to the lesser of:

- 10% or more of total assets; or
- $1 billion or more.

See “MD&A—Market Risk Profile” below for additional information. We began reporting risk-based capital ratios, including market risk-weighted assets for the Company and CONA, pursuant to the Market Risk Rule for positions covered by such rule in the third quarter of 2016. The imposition of the rule did not have a material impact on the risk-based capital ratios of these two entities. As of December 31, 2016, COBNA is not subject to the Market Risk Rule.

Basel III and United States Liquidity Rules

The Basel Committee has published a liquidity framework, which includes two standards for liquidity risk supervision, each subject to observation periods and transitional arrangements. One standard, the liquidity coverage ratio (“LCR”), seeks to promote short-term resilience by requiring organizations to hold sufficient high-quality liquid assets to survive a stress scenario lasting for 30

Table of Contents

days. The other standard, the net stable funding ratio ("NSFR"), seeks to promote longer-term resilience by requiring sufficient stable funding over a one-year period based on the liquidity characteristics of its assets and activities.

In September 2014, the Federal Banking Agencies issued final rules implementing the LCR in the United States. The rule ("LCR Rule") applies to institutions with total consolidated assets of $250 billion or more or total consolidated on-balance sheet foreign exposure of $10 billion or more, and their respective consolidated subsidiary depository institutions with $10 billion or more in total consolidated assets. As a result, the Company and the Banks are subject to the LCR Rule. The rule requires the Company and each of the Banks to hold an amount of eligible high-quality, liquid assets that equals or exceeds 100% of their respective projected net cash outflows over a 30-day period, each as calculated in accordance with the LCR Rule. The LCR Rule phases in a minimum LCR standard as follows: 80% by January 1, 2015; 90% by January 1, 2016; and 100% by January 1, 2017 and thereafter. The LCR Rule came into effect in January 2015 and required us to calculate the LCR as of the last business day of each month from January 2015 through June 2016, and daily as of July 1, 2016. Each company subject to the LCR Rule is required to make quarterly public disclosures of its LCR and certain related quantitative liquidity metrics, along with a qualitative discussion of its LCR. The Company is required to comply with these disclosure requirements beginning April 1, 2018.

In April 2016, the Federal Banking Agencies issued an interagency notice of proposed rulemaking regarding the United States implementation of the Basel III NSFR (the "Proposed NSFR"), which would apply to the same institutions subject to the LCR Rule. The Proposed NSFR would require us to maintain a sufficient amount of stable funding in relation to our assets, derivatives exposures and commitments over a one-year horizon period. The Proposed NSFR would begin to take effect in January 2018. While the Proposed NSFR is generally consistent with the Basel NSFR standard, it is more stringent in certain areas. The financial and operational impact on us of a final NSFR rule remains uncertain until a final rule is published.

In general, United States implementation of the above capital and liquidity rules has increased capital and liquidity requirements for us and other institutions. We will continue to monitor regulators' implementation of the new capital and liquidity rules and assess the potential impact to us.

FDICIA and Prompt Corrective Action

The FDICIA requires Federal Banking Agencies to take "prompt corrective action" for banks that do not meet minimum capital requirements. The FDICIA establishes five capital ratio levels: well capitalized; adequately capitalized; undercapitalized; significantly undercapitalized; and critically undercapitalized. The three undercapitalized categories are based upon the amount by which a bank falls below the ratios applicable to an adequately capitalized institution. The capital categories are determined solely for purposes of applying the FDICIA's PCA provisions, and such capital categories may not constitute an accurate representation of the Banks' overall financial condition or prospects.

As noted above, the Basel III Capital Rule updated the PCA framework to reflect new, higher regulatory capital minimums. For an insured depository institution to be well capitalized, it must maintain a total risk-based capital ratio of 10% or more; a Tier 1 capital ratio of 8% or more; a common equity Tier 1 capital ratio of 6.5% or more; and a leverage ratio of 5% or more. An adequately capitalized depository institution must maintain a total risk-based capital ratio of 8% or more; a Tier 1 capital ratio of 6% or more; a common equity Tier 1 capital ratio of 4.5% or more; a leverage ratio of 4% or more; and, for Basel III Advanced Approaches institutions, a supplementary leverage ratio, which incorporates a broader set of exposures as noted above, of 3% or more. The revised PCA requirements became effective on January 1, 2015, other than the supplementary leverage ratio, which becomes effective on January 1, 2018. As of December 31, 2016, each of the Banks met the requirements for a well capitalized institution.

Under applicable regulations for 2014, an insured depository institution was considered to be well capitalized if it maintained a total risk-based capital ratio of at least 10%, a Tier 1 risk-based capital ratio of at least 6%, a Tier 1 leverage capital ratio of at least 5% and was not subject to any supervisory agreement, order or directive to meet and maintain a specific capital level for any capital measure. An insured depository institution was considered to be adequately capitalized if it maintained a total risk-based capital ratio of at least 8%, a Tier 1 risk-based capital ratio of at least 4% and a Tier 1 leverage capital ratio of at least 4% (3% for certain highly rated institutions), and did not otherwise meet the definition of well capitalized.

As an additional means to identify problems in the financial management of depository institutions, the FDICIA required the Federal Banking Agencies to establish certain non-capital safety and soundness standards. The standards relate generally to operations and management, asset quality, interest rate exposure and executive compensation. The Federal Banking Agencies are authorized to take action against institutions that fail to meet such standards.

Table of Contents

Enhanced Prudential Standards and Other Requirements Under the Dodd-Frank Act

As a BHC with total consolidated assets of $50 billion or more (a “covered company”), we are subject under the Dodd-Frank Act to certain enhanced prudential standards, including requirements that may be recommended by the Financial Stability Oversight Council (“Council”) and implemented by the Federal Reserve and other regulators. As a result, we are subject to more stringent standards and requirements than those applicable to smaller institutions. The Council may also issue recommendations to the Federal Reserve or other primary financial regulatory agencies to apply new or heightened standards to risky financial activities or practices.

The Federal Reserve and FDIC have issued rules requiring covered companies to implement resolution planning for orderly resolution in the event the Company faces material financial distress or failure. The FDIC issued similar rules regarding resolution planning applicable to the Banks. In addition, the OCC issued final guidelines in September 2016 that require the Banks to develop recovery plans detailing the actions they would take to remain a going concern when they experience considerable financial or operational stress, but have not deteriorated to the point that resolution is imminent.

The Federal Reserve established a rule that implements the requirement in the Dodd-Frank Act that the Federal Reserve conduct annual stress tests on the capacity of our capital to absorb losses as a result of adverse economic conditions. The stress test rule also implements the requirement that we conduct our own semiannual stress tests and requires us to publish the results of the stress tests on our website or other public forum. The OCC adopted a similar stress test rule to implement the requirement that each of the Banks conduct annual stress tests.

The Federal Reserve has finalized other rules implementing certain other aspects of the enhanced prudential standards under the Dodd-Frank Act, which were applicable to us beginning on January 1, 2015 (“Enhanced Standards Rule”). Under the Enhanced Standards Rule, we must meet liquidity risk management standards, conduct internal liquidity stress tests, and maintain a 30-day buffer of highly liquid assets, in each case, consistent with the requirements of the rule. These requirements are in addition to the LCR, discussed above in “Basel III and United States Liquidity Rules.” The Enhanced Standards Rule also requires that we comply with, and hold capital commensurate with, the requirements of, any regulations adopted by the Federal Reserve relating to capital planning and stress tests. Stress testing and capital planning regulations are discussed further below under “Dividends, Stock Repurchases and Transfers of Funds.” The Enhanced Standards Rule also requires that we establish and maintain an enterprise-wide risk management framework that includes a risk committee and a chief risk officer.

While not a requirement of the Dodd-Frank Act, the OCC established regulatory guidelines (“Heightened Standards Guidelines”) that apply heightened standards for risk management to large institutions subject to its supervision, including the Banks. The Heightened Standards Guidelines establish standards for the development and implementation by the Banks of a risk governance framework.

The Dodd-Frank Act also imposes new, more stringent standards and requirements with respect to bank and nonbank acquisitions and mergers and affiliate transactions. The Dodd-Frank Act also includes provisions related to corporate governance and executive compensation and new fees and assessments, among others.

Investment in the Company and the Banks

Certain acquisitions of our capital stock may be subject to regulatory approval or notice under federal or state law. Investors are responsible for ensuring that they do not, directly or indirectly, acquire shares of our capital stock in excess of the amount that can be acquired without regulatory approval, including under the BHC Act and the Change in Bank Control Act.

Federal law and regulations prohibit any person or company from acquiring control of the Company or the Banks without, in most cases, prior written approval of the Federal Reserve or the OCC, as applicable. Control exists if, among other things, a person or company acquires more than 25% of any class of our voting stock or otherwise has a controlling influence over us. For a publicly traded BHC like us, a rebuttable presumption of control arises if a person or company acquires more than 10% of any class of our voting stock.

Additionally, COBNA and CONA are “banks” within the meaning of Chapter 13 of Title 6.1 of the Code of Virginia governing the acquisition of interests in Virginia financial institutions (“Financial Institution Holding Company Act”). The Financial Institution Holding Company Act prohibits any person or entity from acquiring, or making any public

offer to acquire, control of a Virginia financial institution or its holding company without making application to, and receiving prior approval from, the Virginia Bureau of Financial Institutions.

Table of Contents

Dividends, Stock Repurchases and Transfers of Funds

Under the Federal Reserve's capital planning rules applicable to large BHCs including us (commonly referred to as Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review or "CCAR"), a BHC with total consolidated assets of $50 billion or more must submit a capital plan to the Federal Reserve on an annual basis that contains a description of all planned capital actions, including dividends or stock repurchases, over a nine-quarter planning horizon beginning with the fourth quarter of the calendar year prior to the submission of the capital plan ("CCAR cycle"). A covered BHC may take the proposed capital actions if the Federal Reserve does not object to the plan.

Dodd-Frank Act stress testing, described above in "Enhanced Prudential Standards and Other Requirements under the Dodd-Frank Act," is a complementary exercise to CCAR. It is a forward-looking exercise conducted by the Federal Reserve and covered financial companies to help assess whether a company has sufficient capital to absorb losses and support operations during adverse economic conditions. The supervisory stress test, after incorporating a firm's planned capital actions, is used for quantitative assessment in CCAR.

As part of its evaluation of a large BHC's capital plan, the Federal Reserve will consider how comprehensive the plan is, the reasonableness of the assumptions, analysis and methodologies used therein to assess capital adequacy and the ability of the BHC to maintain capital above each minimum regulatory capital ratio on a pro forma basis under expected and stressful conditions throughout a planning horizon of at least nine quarters. The 2017 CCAR cycle will measure our capital levels under the Basel III Standardized Approach, with appropriate phase-in provisions applicable to Capital One. The Federal Reserve has indefinitely delayed incorporation of the Basel III Advanced Approaches into the capital planning and stress testing process. For the 2017 CCAR cycle, the Company must file its capital plan and stress testing results with the Federal Reserve by April 5, 2017, using data as of December 31, 2016. The Federal Reserve is expected to provide its objection or non-objection to the 2017 capital plan in June 2017. The Federal Reserve's objection or non-objection applies to planned capital actions from the third quarter of 2017 through the end of the second quarter of 2018. The Company, along with other BHCs subject to the supplementary leverage ratio, must incorporate for the first time an estimate of its supplementary leverage ratio into its 2017 capital plan and stress tests.

For annual company-run stress tests, a covered BHC is required to disclose the results within 15 calendar days after the Federal Reserve discloses the results of the BHC's supervisory stress test, unless that time period is extended by the Federal Reserve. For the mid-cycle company-run stress test, a BHC must disclose the results within 30 calendar days after the BHC submits the results of the test to the Federal Reserve, unless that time period is extended by the Federal Reserve.

The current capital planning and stress testing rules place supervisory focus on quarterly capital issuances and distributions by establishing a cumulative net distribution requirement. With certain limited exceptions, to the extent a BHC does not issue the amount of a given class of regulatory capital instrument that it projected in its capital plan, as measured on an aggregate basis beginning in the third quarter of the planning horizon, the BHC must reduce its capital distributions.

In December 2015, the Federal Reserve issued guidance on its supervisory expectations for the capital planning process, capital positions and modeling of "large and complex firms" such as the Company in connection with their capital planning and stress testing activities. In January 2017, the Federal Reserve issued revisions to its capital planning and stress testing rules for the 2017 cycle. Among other changes not applicable to Capital One, the revisions decrease the amount of capital a company subject to the quantitative requirements of CCAR can distribute to shareholders outside of an approved capital plan without seeking prior approval from the Federal Reserve (known as the "de minimis exception"). Beginning April 1, 2017, if a company does not receive an objection to its capital plan, it may distribute up to 0.25% of its tier 1 capital above the distributions in its capital plan, a reduction from the 1% of tier 1 capital permitted previously. The revisions also impose a "blackout period," starting with the 2017 CCAR exercise, during the second calendar quarter on the ability of a firm subject to CCAR to submit prior notice of its intention to rely on the aforementioned de minimis exception or to submit a request for prior approval for a capital distribution that is not reflected in the firm's capital plan for which it has received a non-objection from the Federal Reserve.

Historically, dividends from the Company's direct and indirect subsidiaries have represented a major source of the funds we have used to pay dividends on our stock, make payments on corporate debt securities and meet our other obligations. There are various federal law limitations on the extent to which the Banks can finance or otherwise supply funds to us through dividends and loans. These limitations include minimum regulatory capital requirements, federal banking law requirements concerning the payment of dividends out of net profits or surplus, provisions of Sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act and Regulation W governing transactions between an insured depository institution and its affiliates, as well as general federal regulatory oversight to prevent unsafe or unsound practices. In general, federal and applicable state banking laws prohibit insured depository institutions, such as

Table of Contents

the Banks, from making dividend distributions without first obtaining regulatory approval if such distributions are not paid out of available earnings or would cause the institution to fail to meet applicable capital adequacy standards.

Deposit Insurance Assessments

Each of CONA and COBNA, as an insured depository institution, is a member of the DIF maintained by the FDIC. Through the DIF, the FDIC insures the deposits of insured depository institutions up to prescribed limits for each depositor. The FDIC sets a Designated Reserve Ratio ("DRR") for the DIF. To maintain the DIF, member institutions may be assessed an insurance premium, and the FDIC may take action to increase insurance premiums if the DRR falls below its required level.

The Dodd-Frank Act reformed the management of the DIF in several ways. It raised the minimum DRR to 1.35% (from the former minimum of 1.15%); removed the upper limit on the DRR; required that the reserve ratio reach 1.35% by September 30, 2020; required the FDIC, when setting deposit insurance assessments, to offset the effect on small insured depository institutions of meeting the increased reserve ratio; and eliminated the requirement that the FDIC pay dividends from the DIF when the reserve ratio reached certain levels. The FDIC has set the DRR at 2% and, in lieu of dividends, has established progressively lower assessment rate schedules as the reserve ratio meets certain trigger levels. The Dodd-Frank Act also required the FDIC to change the deposit insurance assessment base from deposits to average total consolidated assets minus average tangible equity.

On March 15, 2016, the FDIC issued a final rule implementing Section 334(e) of the Dodd-Frank Act, which requires the FDIC to offset the effect on community banks of increasing the DIF reserve ratio from 1.15% to 1.35%. The rule imposes a new quarterly deposit insurance surcharge assessment, with an annual rate of 4.5 basis points, on insured depository institutions with assets of $10 billion or more, including the Banks. On August 30, 2016, the FDIC provided notice that the DIF Reserve Ratio exceeded the 1.15% threshold level, which triggered two changes in the deposit insurance assessments of the Banks. First, the initial assessment rates for all insured depository institutions, including the Banks, declined. Second, the surcharge assessment was applied. The FDIC has estimated that the reserve ratio will reach 1.35% by June 2018; however, under the final rule, if the reserve ratio does not reach 1.35% by December 31, 2018, the FDIC will impose a one-time shortfall assessment on March 31, 2019 on depository institutions subject to the surcharge, including the Banks.

Source of Strength and Liability for Commonly Controlled Institutions

Under regulations issued by the Federal Reserve, a BHC must serve as a source of financial and managerial strength to its subsidiary banks (the so-called "source of strength doctrine"). The Dodd-Frank Act codified this doctrine. Under the "cross-guarantee" provision of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 ("FIRREA"), insured depository institutions such as the Banks may be liable to the FDIC with respect to any loss incurred, or reasonably anticipated to be incurred, by the FDIC in connection with the default of, or FDIC assistance to, any commonly controlled insured depository institution. The Banks are commonly controlled within the meaning of the FIRREA cross-guarantee provision.

FDIC Orderly Liquidation Authority

The Dodd-Frank Act provides the FDIC with liquidation authority that may be used to liquidate nonbank financial companies and BHCs if the Treasury Secretary, in consultation with the President and based on the recommendation of the Federal Reserve and another federal agency, determines that doing so is necessary, among other criteria, to mitigate serious adverse effects on United States financial stability. Upon such a determination, the FDIC would be appointed receiver and must liquidate the company in a way that mitigates significant risks to financial stability and minimizes moral hazard. The costs of a liquidation of a financial company would be borne by shareholders and unsecured creditors and then, if necessary, by risk-based assessments on large financial companies. The FDIC has issued rules implementing certain provisions of its liquidation authority and may issue additional rules in the future.

In December 2016, the Federal Reserve finalized rules designed to promote United States financial stability and orderly liquidation authority by requiring United States BHCs identified as G-SIBs to maintain outstanding a minimum amount of loss absorbing instruments, including a minimum amount of unsecured long-term debt, and related buffers. Capital One is not subject to this requirement because it is not currently identified as a G-SIB.

Regulation of Businesses by Authorities Outside the United States

COBNA is subject to regulation in foreign jurisdictions where it operates, currently in the United Kingdom and Canada.

Table of Contents

United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom, COBNA operates through COEP, which was established in 2000 and is an authorized payment institution regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority ("FCA") under the Payment Services Regulations 2009 and the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000. COEP's indirect parent, Capital One Global Corporation, is wholly-owned by COBNA and is subject to regulation by the Federal Reserve as an "agreement corporation" under the Federal Reserve's Regulation K.

In April 2014, the FCA took over regulation of the U.K. consumer credit regime previously regulated by the Office of Fair Trading. The FCA's regulatory purview includes credit card lending activities. In addition to enacting a new framework of rules from that date, the FCA only "semi-grandfathered" relevant firms, granting them where appropriate "interim" permissions for consumer credit related activities. COEP, in common with other market participants, was required to apply for "full" permissions for consumer credit related activities; such application was made in October 2015 and approval granted by FCA in September 2016.

Regulatory focus on Payment Protection Insurance ("PPI") complaint handling has continued as PPI continues to be a key driver of consumer complaints to the Financial Ombudsman Service ("FOS"). In January 2015, the FCA announced it would gather evidence on current trends in PPI complaints to assess whether further interventions were required. In May 2015, the FCA also announced that it was considering whether further rules and/or guidance were required to deal with the impact of the decision in the case of Plevin v. Paragon Personal Finance ("Plevin") to the effect that failure to disclose the amount of commission included in the price of the single premium PPI sold to the plaintiff created an unfair relationship between the lender and the borrower under section 140A of the Consumer Credit Act 1974. In November 2015, the FCA launched a consultation on proposed new rules relating to PPI complaint handling, including the introduction of a two-year deadline by which consumers would need to make their PPI complaints or else lose their right to have them assessed by firms or by the FOS. In August 2016, the FCA issued an additional consultation paper, providing feedback on responses it received to its November 2015 consultation and seeking views on suggested amendments to its proposed rules. Among other things, the amendments proposed inclusion of profit share in the assessment of whether a relationship is unfair and in any redress calculation. The FCA did not issue the proposed rules by the end of December 2016, but instead stated that it would make a further announcement in the first quarter of 2017.

In July 2016, the FCA published the final findings report for its Credit Card Market Study. The report confirmed that the FCA will seek certain remedies through new rules (subject to consultation).

COEP was a party to the Sentinel Card Protection ("SCP") redress scheme which enabled customers who bought SCP provided by Affinion International Limited to seek compensation. The redress scheme became effective in August 2015 and closed to all claims on September 18, 2016.

On June 23, 2016 a public referendum was held and the U.K. voted to leave the European Union ("Brexit"). Although COEP has not seen any obvious signs of worsening in portfolio or headline economics as a result of the Brexit vote, this issue may continue to cause uncertainty in the macroeconomic environment affecting COEP.

Canada

In Canada, COBNA operates as an authorized foreign bank pursuant to the Bank Act (Canada) ("Bank Act") and is permitted to conduct its credit card business in Canada through its Canadian branch, Capital One Bank (Canada Branch) ("Capital One Canada"). The primary regulator of Capital One Canada is the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada. Other regulators include the Financial Consumer Agency of Canada, the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada, and the Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada. Capital One Canada is subject to regulation under various Canadian federal laws, including the Bank Act and its regulations, the Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act and the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act.

In September 2014, the Supreme Court of Canada ("Court") released its decision in Bank of Montreal v. Marcotte. The Court found that certain provisions of Quebec provincial consumer protection legislation apply to credit cards issued by federally chartered banks. In October 2016, amendments to the Bank Act to modernize the financial consumer protection framework and reaffirm the intent to have exclusive national standards applicable to banks were tabled in

Parliament, however in December 2016, such proposed amendments were removed from the proposed legislation. It is unclear when these amendments will be reintroduced and/or whether the amendments will be revised.

In April 2015, a voluntary agreement to reduce interchange fees among the Canadian federal government, MasterCard Canada and Visa Canada came into effect. The agreement contains a commitment to reduce interchange fees for consumer credit cards to an average of 1.5% and will remain in effect for 5 years. While the Canadian federal government acknowledges independent audit

Table of Contents

findings that Visa and MasterCard have met their commitments to reduce interchange fees, the government will be conducting a further assessment of the fees charged by the networks and reviewing the effects of such fee reduction.

COMPETITION

Each of our business segments operates in a highly competitive environment, and we face competition in all aspects of our business from numerous bank and non-bank providers of financial services.

Our Credit Card business competes with international, national, regional and local issuers of Visa and MasterCard credit cards, as well as with American Express®, Discover Card®, private-label card brands, and, to a certain extent, issuers of debit cards. In general, customers are attracted to credit card issuers largely on the basis of price, credit limit, reward programs and other product features.

Our Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking businesses compete with national, state and direct banks for deposits, commercial and auto loans, mortgages and trust accounts, as well as with savings and loan associations and credit unions for loans and deposits. Our competitors also include automotive finance companies, mortgage banking companies and other financial services providers that provide loans, deposits, and other similar services and products. In addition, we compete against non-depository institutions that are able to offer these products and services.

Securities firms and insurance companies that elect to become financial holding companies may acquire banks and other financial institutions. Combinations of this type could significantly change the competitive environment in which we conduct business. The financial services industry is also likely to become more competitive as further technological advances enable more companies to provide financial services. These technological advances may diminish the importance of depository institutions and other financial intermediaries in the transfer of funds between parties. In addition, competition among direct banks is intense because online banking provides customers the ability to rapidly deposit and withdraw funds and open and close accounts in favor of products and services offered by competitors.

Our businesses generally compete on the basis of the quality and range of their products and services, transaction execution, innovation and price. Competition varies based on the types of clients, customers, industries and geographies served. Our ability to compete depends, in part, on our ability to attract and retain our associates and on our reputation. We believe that we are able to compete effectively in our current markets. There can be no assurance, however, that our ability to market products and services successfully or to obtain adequate returns on our products and services will not be impacted by the nature of the competition that now exists or may later develop, or by the broader economic environment. For a discussion of the risks related to our competitive environment, please refer to "Part I—Item 1A. Risk Factors."

EMPLOYEES

A central part of our philosophy is to attract and retain highly capable staff. We had approximately 47,300 employees, whom we refer to as "associates," as of December 31, 2016. None of our associates are covered under a collective bargaining agreement, and management considers our associate relations to be satisfactory.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Technology/Systems

We leverage information technology to achieve our business objectives and to develop and deliver products and services that satisfy our customers' needs. A key part of our strategic focus is the development and use of efficient, flexible computer and operational systems, such as cloud technology, to support complex marketing and account management strategies, the servicing of our customers, and the development of new and diversified products. We believe that the continued development and integration of these systems is an important part of our efforts to reduce costs, improve quality and provide faster, more flexible technology services. Consequently, we continuously review capabilities and develop or acquire systems, processes and competencies to meet our unique business requirements.

As part of our continuous efforts to review and improve our technologies, we may either develop such capabilities internally or rely on third-party outsourcers who have the ability to deliver technology that is of higher quality, lower cost, or both. We continue to rely on third-party outsourcers to help us deliver systems and operational infrastructure. These relationships include (but are not limited to): Amazon Web Services, Inc. ("AWS") for our cloud infrastructure, Total System Services, Inc. ("TSYS") for

Table of Contents

processing services for our North American and U.K. portfolios of consumer, commercial and small business credit card accounts, and Fidelity Information Services ("FIS") for certain of our banking systems.

To protect our systems and technologies, we employ security measures, backup and recovery systems and generally require the same of our third-party service providers. In addition, we perform a variety of vulnerability and penetration testing on the network, platforms, systems and applications used to provide our products and services, conducted internally and by independent third parties, in an effort to ensure the security of the systems and data and mitigate against known vulnerabilities and attacks.

Intellectual Property

As part of our overall and ongoing strategy to protect and enhance our intellectual property, we rely on a variety of protections, including copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, patents and certain restrictions on disclosure, solicitation and competition. We also undertake other measures to control access to, or distribution of, our other proprietary information. Despite these precautions, it may be possible for a third party to copy or otherwise obtain and use certain intellectual property or proprietary information without authorization. Our precautions may not prevent misappropriation or infringement of our intellectual property or proprietary information. In addition, our competitors and other third parties also file patent applications for innovations that are used in our industry. The ability of our competitors and other third parties to obtain such patents may adversely affect our ability to compete. Conversely, our ability to obtain such patents may increase our competitive advantage and/or preserve our freedom to operate certain technologies via cross-licenses or other arrangements with third parties. There can be no assurance that we will be successful in such efforts, or that the ability of our competitors to obtain such patents may not adversely impact our financial results.

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

From time to time, we have made and will make forward-looking statements, including those that discuss, among other things, strategies, goals, outlook or other non-historical matters; projections, revenues, income, returns, expenses, capital measures, accruals for claims in litigation and for other claims against us; earnings per share or other financial measures for us; future financial and operating results; our plans, objectives, expectations and intentions; and the assumptions that underlie these matters.

To the extent that any such information is forward-looking, it is intended to fit within the safe harbor for forward-looking information provided by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995.

Numerous factors could cause our actual results to differ materially from those described in such forward-looking statements, including, among other things:

- general economic and business conditions in the U.S., the U.K., Canada or our local markets, including conditions affecting employment levels, interest rates, collateral values, consumer income, credit worthiness and confidence, spending and savings that may affect consumer bankruptcies, defaults, charge-offs and deposit activity;
- an increase or decrease in credit losses, including increases due to a worsening of general economic conditions in the credit environment, and the impact of inaccurate estimates or inadequate reserves;
- financial, legal, regulatory, tax or accounting changes or actions, including the impact of the Dodd-Frank Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder, and other regulatory reforms and regulations governing bank capital and liquidity standards, including Basel-related initiatives and potential changes to financial accounting and reporting standards;
- developments, changes or actions relating to any litigation, governmental investigation or regulatory enforcement action or matter involving us;
- the inability to sustain revenue and earnings growth;
- increases or decreases in interest rates;
- our ability to access the capital markets at attractive rates and terms to capitalize and fund our operations and future growth;
- the success of our marketing efforts in attracting and retaining customers;

Table of Contents

- increases or decreases in our aggregate loan balances or the number of customers and the growth rate and composition thereof, including increases or decreases resulting from factors such as shifting product mix, amount of actual marketing expenses we incur and attrition of loan balances;
- the level of future repurchase or indemnification requests we may receive, the actual future performance of mortgage loans relating to such requests, the success rates of claimants against us, any developments in litigation and the actual recoveries we may make on any collateral relating to claims against us;
- the amount and rate of deposit growth;
- changes in the reputation of, or expectations regarding, the financial services industry or us with respect to practices, products or financial condition;
- changes in retail distribution strategies and channels, including in the behavior and expectations of our customers;
- any significant disruption in our operations or in the technology platforms on which we rely, including security failures or breaches of our systems or those of our customers, partners, service providers or other third parties;
- our ability to maintain a compliance and technology infrastructure suitable for the nature of our business;
- our ability to develop digital technology that addresses the needs of our customers, including the challenges relating to rapid significant technological changes;
- the effectiveness of our risk management strategies;
- our ability to control costs, including the amount of, and rate of growth in, our expenses as our business develops or changes or as it expands into new market areas;
- our ability to execute on our strategic and operational plans;
- the extensive use of models in our business, including those to aggregate and assess various risk exposures and estimate certain financial values;
- any significant disruption of, or loss of public confidence in, the internet affecting the ability of our customers to access their accounts and conduct banking transactions;
- our ability to recruit and retain talented and experienced personnel;
- changes in the labor and employment markets;
- fraud or misconduct by our customers, employees, business partners or third parties;
- competition from providers of products and services that compete with our businesses;
- increased competition for rewards customers resulting in higher rewards expense, or impairing our ability to attract and retain credit card customers;
- merchants' increasing focus on the fees charged by credit card networks; and
- other risk factors listed from time to time in reports that we file with the SEC.

Any forward-looking statements made by us or on our behalf speak only as of the date they are made or as of the date indicated, and we do not undertake any obligation to update forward-looking statements as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. You should carefully consider the factors discussed above in evaluating these forward-looking statements. For additional information on factors that could materially influence forward-looking statements included in this Report, see the risk factors set forth under "Part I—Item 1A. Risk Factors" in this Report.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

This section highlights specific risks that could affect our business. Although we have tried to discuss all material risks of which we are aware at the time this Report has been filed, other risks may prove to be important in the future, including those that are

Table of Contents

not currently ascertainable. In addition to the factors discussed elsewhere in this Report, other factors that could cause actual results to differ materially from our forward looking statements include:

General Economic and Market Risks

Changes And Instability In The Macroeconomic Environment May Adversely Affect Our Industry, Business, Results Of Operations And Financial Condition.

We offer a broad array of financial products and services to consumers, small businesses and commercial clients. We market our credit card products on a national basis throughout the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom and offer banking and other services in many regions within the United States. A prolonged period of slow economic growth or a significant deterioration in economic conditions in the United States or one of these countries could have a material adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations as customers default on their loans or maintain lower deposit levels or, in the case of credit card accounts, carry lower balances and reduce credit card purchase activity.

Although certain economic conditions in the United States have generally recovered in recent years, the macroeconomic environment remains unstable and uneven, and the U.S. economy remains susceptible to global events and volatility. Geopolitical matters, including international political unrest or disturbances, continued concerns over energy prices, and economic instability or recession in certain regions, may impact the stability of financial markets and the U.S. economy.

Some of the risks we may face in connection with adverse changes and instability in macroeconomic environment include the following:

- Payment patterns may change, causing increases in delinquencies and default rates, which could have a negative impact on our results of operations. In addition, changes in consumer confidence levels and behavior, including decreased consumer spending, lower demand for credit and a shift in consumer payment behavior towards avoiding late fees, finance charges and other fees, could have a negative impact on our results of operations.
- Increases in bankruptcies could cause increases in our charge-off rates, which could have a negative impact on our results of operations.
- Our ability to recover debt that we have previously charged-off may be limited, which could have a negative impact on our results of operations.
- The process and models we use to estimate our allowance for loan and lease losses may become less reliable if actual losses diverge from the projections of our models as a result of changes in customer behavior, volatile economic conditions or other unexpected variations in key inputs and assumptions. As a result, our estimates for credit losses may become increasingly subject to management’s judgment and high levels of volatility over short periods of time, which could negatively impact our results of operations. See “There Are Risks Resulting From The Extensive Use Of Models In Our Business.”
- Risks associated with financial market instability and volatility could cause a material adverse effect on our liquidity and our funding costs. For example, increases in interest rates and our credit spreads could negatively impact our results of operations. An inability to accept or maintain deposits or to obtain other sources of funding could materially affect our ability to fund our business and our liquidity position. Many other financial institutions have also increased their reliance on deposit funding and, as such, we expect continued competition in the deposit markets. We cannot predict how this competition will affect our costs. If we are required to offer higher interest rates to attract or maintain deposits, our funding costs will be adversely impacted.
- Our ability to borrow from other financial institutions or to engage in funding transactions on favorable terms or at all could be adversely affected by disruptions in the capital markets or other events, including actions by rating agencies and deteriorating investor expectations, which could limit our access to funding. The interest rates that we pay on the securities we have issued are also influenced by, among other things, applicable credit ratings from recognized rating agencies. A downgrade to any of these credit ratings could affect our ability to access the capital markets, increase our borrowing costs and have a negative impact on our results of operations. Increased charge-offs, rising London Interbank Offering Rate (“LIBOR”) and other events may cause our securitization transactions to amortize earlier than scheduled, which could accelerate our need for additional funding from other sources.

15 Capital One Financial Corporation (COF)

Table of Contents

- While interest rates recently rose off historic lows set in July 2016, both shorter-term and longer-term interest rates remain below historical averages, as well as the yield curve, which has been relatively flat compared to recent years. A flat yield curve combined with low interest rates generally leads to lower revenue and reduced margins because it tends to limit our ability to increase the spread between asset yields and funding costs. Sustained periods of time with a flat yield curve coupled with low interest rates could have a material adverse effect on our earnings and our net interest margin.
- A low interest rate environment increases our exposure to prepayment risk in our mortgage portfolio and the mortgage-backed securities in our investment portfolio. Increased prepayments, refinancing or other factors that impact loan balances could reduce expected revenue associated with mortgage assets and could also lead to a reduction in the value of our mortgage servicing rights, which could have a negative impact on our financial results. Although the Federal Reserve's recent decision to raise short-term interest rates may reduce prepayment risk, debt service requirements for some of our borrowers will increase, which may adversely affect those borrowers' ability to pay as contractually obligated. This could result in additional delinquencies or charge-offs and negatively impact our results of operations.

Regulatory Risk

Compliance With New And Existing Laws, Regulations And Regulatory Expectations May Increase Our Costs, Reduce Our Revenue, Limit Our Ability To Pursue Business Opportunities And Increase Compliance Challenges.

Legislation and regulation with respect to the financial services industry has increased in recent years, and we expect that oversight of our business may continue to expand in scope and complexity. A wide and increasing array of banking and consumer lending laws apply to almost every aspect of our business. Failure to comply with these laws and regulations could result in financial, structural and operational penalties, including significant fines and criminal sanctions, and could result in negative publicity or damage to our reputation with regulators or the public. In addition, establishing systems and processes to achieve compliance with these laws and regulations may increase our costs and limit our ability to pursue certain business opportunities.

We are subject to heightened regulatory oversight by the federal banking regulators to ensure that we build systems and processes that are commensurate with the nature of our business and that meet the heightened risk management and enhanced prudential standards issued by our regulators. For example, over the last several years, state and federal regulators have focused on compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering laws, data integrity and security, use of service providers, fair lending and other consumer protection issues. In July 2015, Capital One entered into a consent order with the OCC to address concerns about our anti-money laundering ("AML") program ("AML Program"). Although we are making substantial progress in taking the steps and making the improvements required by the OCC consent order, we expect heightened oversight of our AML Program will continue for the foreseeable future.

The Dodd-Frank Act, other regulatory reforms and implementing regulations have increased our need to build new compliance processes and infrastructure and to otherwise enhance our risk management throughout all aspects of our business. The cumulative impact of these changes also includes higher expectations for the amount of capital and liquidity we must maintain, as discussed in more detail below under the heading "We May Not Be Able To Maintain Adequate Capital Or Liquidity Levels, Which Could Have A Negative Impact On Our Financial Results And Our Ability To Return Capital To Our Shareholders," and higher operational costs, which may further increase as regulators continue to implement such reforms. United States government agencies charged with adopting and interpreting laws, rules and regulations, including under the Dodd-Frank Act, may do so in an unforeseen manner, including in ways that potentially expand the reach of the laws, rules or regulations more than initially contemplated or currently anticipated.

We have a large number of customer accounts in our credit card and auto lending businesses and we have made the strategic choice to originate and service subprime credit cards and auto loans which typically have higher delinquencies and charge-offs than prime customers. Accordingly, we have significant involvement with credit bureau reporting and the collection and recovery of delinquent and charged-off debt, primarily through customer communications, the filing of litigation against customers in default, the periodic sale of charged-off debt and vehicle repossession. The banking industry is subject to enhanced legal and regulatory scrutiny regarding credit bureau reporting and debt collection practices from regulators, courts and legislators. Any future changes to our business

practices in these areas, including our debt collection practices, whether mandated by regulators, courts, legislators or otherwise, or any legal liabilities resulting from our business practices, including our debt collection practices, could have a material adverse impact on our financial condition.

The legislative and regulatory environment is beyond our control, may change rapidly and unpredictably and may negatively influence our revenue, costs, earnings, growth, liquidity and capital levels. In addition, some rules and regulations may be subject

Table of Contents

to litigation or other challenges that delay or modify their implementation and impact on us. Following the November 2016 federal elections, we expect a higher volume of legislative and regulatory activity. These activities may include changes to the corporate tax code and the Dodd-Frank Act, as well as changes in leadership of key bank regulatory agencies that could change the regulatory, supervisory, or enforcement activity of these agencies. For example, legislative changes to the corporate tax code could result in material impacts to our results of operations due to changes to the valuation of our deferred tax assets, the valuation of other tax assets, customer behavior, tax expense and the effective tax rate.

Certain laws and regulations, and any interpretations and applications with respect thereto, may benefit consumers, borrowers and depositors, but not stockholders. Our success depends on our ability to maintain compliance with both existing and new laws and regulations. For a description of the material laws and regulations to which we are subject, please refer to "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation."

Credit Risk

We May Experience Increased Delinquencies, Credit Losses, Inaccurate Estimates And Inadequate Reserves.

Like other lenders, we face the risk that our customers will not repay their loans. Rising losses or leading indicators of rising losses (such as higher delinquencies, higher rates of non-performing loans, higher bankruptcy rates, lower collateral values or elevated unemployment rates) may require us to increase our allowance for loan and lease losses, which may degrade our profitability if we are unable to raise revenue or reduce costs to compensate for higher losses. In particular, we face the following risks in this area:

- Missed Payments: Our customers may miss payments. Loan charge-offs (including from bankruptcies) are generally preceded by missed payments or other indications of worsening financial condition for our customers. Customers are more likely to miss payments during an economic downturn or prolonged periods of slow economic growth. In addition, we face the risk that consumer and commercial customer behavior may change (for example, an increase in the unwillingness or inability of customers to repay debt, which may be heightened by increasing levels of consumer debt generally), causing a long-term rise in delinquencies and charge-offs.
- Estimates of Inherent Losses: The credit quality of our portfolio can have a significant impact on our earnings. We allow for and reserve against credit risks based on our assessment of credit losses inherent in our loan portfolios. This process, which is critical to our financial results and condition, requires complex judgments, including forecasts of economic conditions. We may underestimate our inherent losses and fail to hold an allowance for loan and lease losses sufficient to account for these losses. Incorrect assumptions could lead to material underestimations of inherent losses and inadequate allowance for loan and lease losses. In cases where we modify a loan, if the modifications do not perform as anticipated we may be required to build additional allowance on these loans. The build or release of allowances impacts our current financial results.
- Underwriting: Our ability to assess the creditworthiness of our customers may diminish, which could result in an increase in our credit losses and a deterioration of our returns. See "Our Risk Management Strategies May Not Be Fully Effective In Mitigating Our Risk Exposures In All Market Environments Or Against All Types Of Risk."
- Business Mix: We engage in a diverse mix of businesses with a broad range of potential credit exposure. Our business mix could change in ways that could adversely affect the credit quality of our portfolio. Because we originate a relatively greater proportion of consumer loans in our loan portfolio compared to other large bank peers and originate both prime and subprime credit card accounts and auto loans, we may experience higher delinquencies and a greater number of accounts charging off compared to other large bank peers, which could result in increased credit losses, operating costs and regulatory scrutiny.
- Charge-off Recognition / Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses: We account for the allowance for loan and lease losses according to accounting and regulatory guidelines and rules, including Financial Accounting Standards Board ("FASB") standards and the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council ("FFIEC") Account Management Guidance. In June 2016, the FASB issued revised guidance for impairments on financial instruments. The guidance, which becomes effective on January 1, 2020 with early adoption permitted no earlier than January 1, 2019, requires use of a current expected credit loss ("CECL") model that is based on expected rather than incurred losses. Adoption of

the CECL model could require changes in our account management or allowance for loan and lease losses practices, and may cause our allowance for loan and lease losses and credit losses to change materially.

Table of Contents

- Industry Developments: Our charge-off and delinquency rates may be negatively impacted by industry developments, including new regulations applicable to our industry.
- Collateral: The collateral we have on secured loans could be insufficient to compensate us for loan losses. When customers default on their secured loans, we attempt to recover collateral where permissible and appropriate. However, the value of the collateral may not be sufficient to compensate us for the amount of the unpaid loan, and we may be unsuccessful in recovering the remaining balance from our customers. Decreases in real estate values adversely affect the collateral value for our commercial lending and home loan activities, while the auto business is similarly exposed to collateral risks arising from the auction markets that determine used car prices. Therefore, the recovery of such property could be insufficient to compensate us for the value of these loans. Borrowers may be less likely to continue making payments on loans if the value of the property used as collateral for the loan is less than what the borrower owes, even if the borrower is still financially able to make the payments. Trends in home prices are a driver of credit costs in our home loan business as they impact both the probability of default and the loss severity of defaults. Additionally, the potential volatility in the number of defaulted and modified loans from changes in home prices can create material impacts on the servicing costs of the business, fluctuations in credit marks and profitability in acquired portfolios and volatility in mortgage servicing rights valuations. Although home prices have generally appreciated recently, the slow economic recovery, shifts in monetary policy and potentially diminishing demands from investors could threaten or limit the recovery. In our auto business, if vehicle prices experience declines, we could be adversely affected. For example, business and economic conditions that negatively affect household incomes, housing prices, and consumer behavior related to our businesses could decrease (i) the demand for new and used vehicles and (ii) the value of the collateral underlying our portfolio of auto loans, which could cause the number of consumers who become delinquent or default on their loans to increase.
- Geographic and Industry Concentration: Although our consumer lending is geographically diversified, approximately 31% of our commercial loan portfolio is concentrated in the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. The regional economic conditions in the tri-state area affect the demand for our commercial products and services as well as the ability of our customers to repay their commercial loans and the value of the collateral securing these loans. An economic downturn or prolonged period of slow economic growth in, or a catastrophic event that disproportionately affects, the tri-state area could have a material adverse effect on the performance of our commercial loan portfolio and our results of operations. In addition, our Commercial Banking strategy includes an industry-specific focus. If any of the industries that we focus in experience changes, we may experience increased credit losses and our results of operations could be adversely impacted. For example, as of December 31, 2016, energy-related loan balances represented approximately 4% of our total commercial loan portfolio. This amount is comprised of loans to commercial entities in the energy industry, such as exploration and production, oil field services, and pipeline transportation of gas and crude oil, as well as loans to entities in industries that are indirectly impacted by energy prices, such as petroleum wholesalers, oil and gas equipment manufacturing, air transportation, and petroleum bulk stations and terminals. In recent years, oil prices have been declining, which has had an adverse effect on many of the borrowers in this portfolio and on the value of the collateral securing our loans to these borrowers, which could impair their ability to service loans outstanding to them and/or reduce demand for loans. If energy-related industries or any of the other industries that we focus on experience adverse changes, we may experience increased credit losses and our results of operations could be adversely impacted.

We May Experience Increased Losses And Inadequate Reserves Associated With Mortgage Repurchases And Indemnification Obligations.

Certain of our subsidiaries, including GreenPoint Mortgage Funding, Inc. ("GreenPoint"), Capital One Home Loans, LLC and Capital One, N.A., as successor to Chevy Chase Bank ("CCB"), may be required to repurchase mortgage loans that have been sold to investors in the event there are breaches of certain representations and warranties contained within the sales agreements. We may be required to repurchase mortgage loans that we sell to investors in the event that there was improper underwriting or fraud or in the event that the loans become delinquent shortly after they are originated. These subsidiaries also may be required to indemnify certain purchasers and others against losses they incur in the event of breaches of representations and warranties and in various other circumstances, including

securities fraud or other public disclosure-related claims, and the amount of such losses could exceed the repurchase amount of the related loans. Consequently, we may be exposed to credit risk associated with sold loans.

We have established reserves in our consolidated financial statements for potential losses that are considered to be both probable and reasonably estimable related to the mortgage loans sold by our originating subsidiaries. The adequacy of the reserve and the ultimate amount of losses incurred will depend on, among other things, the actual future mortgage loan performance, the actual level of future repurchase and indemnification requests, the actual success rate of claimants, developments in litigation and the

regulatory environment related to us and the industry, actual recoveries on the collateral, and macroeconomic conditions (including unemployment levels and housing prices). Due to uncertainties relating to these factors, there can be no assurance that our reserves will be adequate or that the total amount of losses incurred will not have a material adverse effect upon our financial condition or results of operations.

In addition to the subsidiaries discussed above, we originate, sell and service commercial mortgage loans that meet underwriting guidelines established by government-sponsored enterprises ("GSEs"). We are required to meet minimum collateral requirements and share a limited portion of the risk of loss during the remaining terms of these loans. The GSEs may change their collateral requirements for these loans in the future and also increase our loss-sharing obligations if the loans do not meet specific underwriting criteria or default within certain time periods following their sale to the GSEs. Our liability associated with these loss-sharing agreements may not be sufficient to cover any future losses from these loans. We may also be required to share additional losses with GSEs if loan defaults increase, which could impact our results of operations and liquidity.

For additional information related to our mortgage loan repurchase and indemnification obligations and related reserves and our estimate of the reasonably possible future losses from representation and warranty claims beyond the current accrual levels, as well as our loss-sharing agreements, as of December 31, 2016, see "Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others."

Capital and Liquidity Risk

We May Not Be Able To Maintain Adequate Capital Or Liquidity Levels, Which Could Have A Negative Impact On Our Financial Results And Our Ability To Return Capital To Our Shareholders.

As a result of the Dodd-Frank Act and the United States implementation of international accords, financial institutions are subject to new and increased capital and liquidity requirements, and we expect further changes to these regulations. Although United States regulators have finalized regulations for many of these requirements, continued uncertainty remains as to the form additional new requirements will take or how and when they will apply to us. As a result, it is possible that we could be required to increase our capital and/or liquidity levels above the levels assumed in our current financial plans. These new requirements could have a negative impact on our ability to lend, grow deposit balances or make acquisitions and limit our ability to make most capital distributions. Higher capital levels also lower our return on equity.

In addition, as described further above in "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation," for regulatory capital purposes we entered parallel run on January 1, 2015. We will become subject to the Basel III Advanced Approaches framework for purposes of determining our regulatory capital requirements once we receive regulatory approval to do so, although the exact timing of when such approval may be granted is uncertain. Although we have current estimates of risk-weighted asset calculations under that framework, there remains uncertainty around future regulatory interpretations of certain aspects of those calculations. Moreover, the so-called Collins Amendment to the Dodd-Frank Act, as implemented in the Basel III Capital Rule, establishes a capital floor so that organizations subject to the Basel III Advanced Approaches may not hold less capital than would be required using the Basel III Standardized Approach capital calculations. Additionally, the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision continues to evaluate modifications to the Standardized and Advanced Approaches which, if finalized by the Basel Committee and thereafter implemented by the United States federal banking agencies, could alter regulatory capital requirements. Therefore, we cannot assure you that our current estimates will be correct, and we may need to hold significantly more regulatory capital in the future than we currently estimate to maintain a given capital ratio.

In September 2014, the Federal Banking Agencies issued the Final Liquidity Coverage Rules ("Final LCR Rule") and in April 2016, the United States federal banking agencies proposed a rule regarding the United States implementation of the net stable funding ratio ("Proposed NSFR"). See "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation" for further detail regarding the Final LCR Rule and Proposed NSFR. The financial and operational impact on us of a final NSFR rule remains uncertain until a final rule is published, and there remains further uncertainty as to the combined impact of the LCR and any final NSFR on how we manage our business. See "Note 12—Regulatory and Capital Adequacy" and "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation—Dividends, Stock Repurchases and Transfers of Funds" for additional information regarding recent developments in capital and liquidity requirements.

We consider various factors in the management of capital, including the impact of stress on our capital levels, as determined by both our internal modeling and the Federal Reserve's modeling of our capital position in CCAR. In recent capital planning and stress testing cycles, we have observed a large difference between our estimates of our capital levels under stress and the Federal Reserve's estimates of our capital levels under stress. Therefore, although our estimated capital levels under stress suggest that we

Table of Contents

have substantial capacity to return capital to shareholders and remain well capitalized under stress, it is possible that the Federal Reserve's modeling may result in a materially lower capacity to return capital to shareholders than our estimates. This in turn could lead to restrictions on our ability to pay dividends and engage in share repurchase transactions. See "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation" for additional information.

Operational Risk

We Face Risks Related To Our Operational, Technological And Organizational Infrastructure.

Our ability to retain and attract new customers depends on our ability to build or acquire necessary operational, technological and organizational infrastructure or adapt to technological advances involving such infrastructure, which can be a challenge due to the fast pace of digital transformation and advances. We are embedding technology, data and software development deeply into our business model and how we work.

Similar to other large corporations, we are exposed to operational risk that can manifest itself in many ways, such as errors related to failed or inadequate processes, inaccurate models, faulty or disabled computer systems, fraud by employees or persons outside of our company and exposure to external events. In addition, we are heavily dependent on the strength, capability and continuous availability of the technology systems that we use to manage our internal financial and other systems, interface with our customers and develop and implement effective marketing campaigns. In addition, our businesses are dependent on our ability to process, record and monitor a large number of complex transactions. If any of our financial, accounting or other data processing systems fail or have other significant shortcomings, our business and reputation could be materially adversely affected. We may also be subject to disruptions of our operating systems arising from events that are wholly or partially beyond our control, which may include, for example, computer viruses or electrical or telecommunications outages, cyber-attacks, including Distributed Denial of Service ("DDOS") attacks discussed below, natural disasters, other damage to property or physical assets or events arising from local or larger scale politics, including terrorist acts. Any of these occurrences could diminish our ability to operate our businesses, service customer accounts and protect customers' information, or result in potential liability to customers, reputational damage, regulatory intervention and customers' loss of confidence in our businesses, any of which could result in a material adverse effect.

We also rely on the business infrastructure and systems of third parties with which we do business and to whom we outsource the maintenance and development of operational and technological functionality. For example, we are in the process of migrating a number of our core systems and customer-facing applications to Amazon Web Services, Inc., a third party cloud infrastructure platform. If we do not execute the transition to these new environments in a well-managed, secure and effective manner, we may experience unplanned service disruption or unforeseen costs which may harm our business and operating results. In addition, our cloud infrastructure providers, or other service providers, could experience system breakdowns or failures, outages, downtime, cyber-attacks, adverse changes to financial condition, bankruptcy or other adverse conditions, which could have a material adverse effect on our business and reputation. Thus, our plans to increase the amount of our infrastructure that we outsource to "the cloud" or to other third parties may increase our risk exposure.

Our ability to develop and deliver new products that meet the needs of our existing customers and attract new ones and to run our business in compliance with applicable laws and regulations depends on the functionality and reliability of our operational and technology systems. Any disruptions, failures or inaccuracies of our operational and technology systems and models, including those associated with improvements or modifications to such systems and models, could cause us to be unable to market and manage our products and services, manage our risk, meet our regulatory obligations or report our financial results in a timely and accurate manner, all of which could have a negative impact on our results of operations. In addition, our ongoing investments in infrastructure, which are necessary to maintain a competitive business, integrate acquisitions and establish scalable operations, may increase our expenses. As our business develops, changes or expands, additional expenses can arise as a result of a reevaluation of business strategies, management of outsourced services, asset purchases or other acquisitions, structural reorganization, compliance with new laws or regulations or the integration of newly acquired businesses. If we are unable to successfully manage our expenses, our financial results will be negatively affected.

We Could Incur Increased Costs Or Reductions In Revenue Or Suffer Reputational Damage And Business Disruptions In The Event Of The Theft, Loss Or Misuse Of Information, Including As A Result Of A Cyber-Attack.
Our products and services involve the gathering, management, processing, storage and transmission of sensitive and confidential information regarding our customers and their accounts, our employees and other third parties with which we do business. Our ability to provide such products and services, many of which are web-based, depends upon the management and safeguarding of

information, software, methodologies and business secrets. To provide these products and services, we use information systems and infrastructure, including digital technologies, computer and email systems, software, networks and other web-based technologies, that we and third-party service providers operate. We also have arrangements in place with third parties through which we share and receive information about their customers who are or may become our customers.

Like other financial services firms, technologies, systems, networks and devices of Capital One or our customers, employees, service providers or other third parties with whom we interact continue to be the subject of attempted unauthorized access, mishandling or misuse of information, computer viruses or malware, phishing or other forms of social engineering, and other forms of cyber-attacks designed to obtain confidential information, destroy data, disrupt or degrade service, sabotage systems or cause other damage, denial of service attacks and other events. These threats may derive from human error, fraud or malice on the part of our employees or third parties or may result from accidental technological failure. Any of these parties may also attempt to fraudulently induce employees, customers or other third-party users of our systems to disclose sensitive information in order to gain access to our data or that of our customers or third parties with whom we interact. Further, cyber and information security risks for large financial institutions like us have generally increased in recent years in part because of the proliferation of new technologies, the use of the Internet and telecommunications technologies to conduct financial transactions and the increased sophistication and activities of organized crime, perpetrators of fraud, hackers, terrorists, activists, formal and informal instrumentalities of foreign governments and other external parties. In addition, to access our products and services, our customers may use computers, smartphones, tablet PCs and other mobile devices that are beyond our security control systems.

If our information systems or infrastructure or those of our customers, partners, service providers or other market participants experience a significant disruption or breach, it could lead, depending on the nature of the disruption or breach, to the unauthorized access to and release, gathering, monitoring, misuse, loss or destruction of our confidential information or personal or confidential information of our customers, employees or other third parties in our possession. Further, such disruption or breach could also result in unauthorized access to our proprietary information, software, methodologies and business secrets and in unauthorized transactions in Capital One accounts or unauthorized access to personal or confidential information maintained by those entities. For example, there has been a significant proliferation of consumer information available on the Internet resulting from breaches of third-party entities, including personal information, log-in credentials and authentication data. While Capital One was not directly involved in these third-party breach events, the stolen information can create a vulnerability for our customers if their Capital One log-in credentials are the same as or similar to the credentials that have been compromised on other sites. This vulnerability could include the risk of unauthorized account access, data loss and fraud. The use of automation software, or “bots,” can increase the velocity and efficacy of these types of attacks.

As a financial institution, we are subject to and examined for compliance with an array of data protection laws, regulations and guidance, as well as to our own internal privacy and information security policies and programs. However, because the methods and techniques employed by perpetrators of fraud and others to attack, disable, degrade or sabotage platforms, systems and applications change frequently, are increasingly sophisticated and often are not fully recognized or understood until after they have occurred, we and our third-party service providers and partners may be unable to anticipate certain attack methods in order to implement effective preventative measures or mitigate or remediate the damages caused in a timely manner. We may also be unable to hire and develop talent capable of detecting, mitigating or remediating these risks. Although we believe we have a robust suite of authentication and layered information security controls, including our cyber threat analytics, data encryption and tokenization technologies, anti-malware defenses and vulnerability management program, any one or combination of these controls could fail to detect, mitigate or remediate these risks in a timely manner.

A disruption or breach such as those discussed above could result in significant legal and financial exposure, regulatory intervention, remediation costs, card reissuance, supervisory liability, damage to our reputation or loss of confidence in the security of our systems, products and services that could adversely affect our business. We and other U.S. financial services providers continue to be targeted with evolving and adaptive cybersecurity threats from

sophisticated third parties. Although we have not experienced any material losses relating to cyber incidents, there can be no assurance that unauthorized access or cyber incidents will not occur or that we will not suffer such losses in the future. Unauthorized access or cyber incidents could occur more frequently and on a more significant scale. If future attacks like these are successful or if customers are unable to access their accounts online for other reasons, it could adversely impact our ability to service customer accounts or loans, complete financial transactions for our customers or otherwise operate any of our businesses or services. In addition, a breach or attack affecting one of our third-party service providers or partners could harm our business even if we do not control the service that is attacked.

In addition, the increasing prevalence and the evolution of cyber-attacks and other efforts to breach or disrupt our systems or those of our partners, retailers or other market participants has led, and will likely continue to lead, to increased costs to us with respect to preventing, mitigating and remediating these risks, as well as any related attempted fraud. We may be required to expend

Table of Contents

significant additional resources to continue to modify or strengthen our protective security measures, investigate and remediate any vulnerabilities of our information systems and infrastructure or invest in new technology designed to mitigate security risks. For example, various retailers have continued to be victims of cyber-attacks in which customer data, including debit and credit card information, was obtained. In these situations, we incur a variety of costs, including those associated with replacing the compromised cards and remediating fraudulent transaction activity. Further, successful cyber-attacks at other large financial institutions or other market participants, whether or not we are impacted, could lead to a general loss of customer confidence in financial institutions that could negatively affect us, including harming the market perception of the effectiveness of our security measures or the financial system in general which could result in reduced use of our financial products. Though we have insurance against some cyber-risks and attacks, it may not be sufficient to offset the impact of a material loss event.

Legal Risk

Our Businesses Are Subject To The Risk Of Increased Litigation, Government Investigations And Regulatory Enforcement.

Our businesses are subject to increased litigation, government investigations and other regulatory enforcement risks as a result of a number of factors and from various sources, including the highly regulated nature of the financial services industry, the focus of state and federal prosecutors on banks and the financial services industry, the structure of the credit card industry and business practices in the mortgage lending business. Given the inherent uncertainties involved in litigation, government investigations and regulatory enforcement decisions, and the very large or indeterminate damages sought in some matters asserted against us, there can be significant uncertainty as to the ultimate liability we may incur from these kinds of matters. The finding, or even the assertion, of substantial legal liability against us could have a material adverse effect on our business and financial condition and could cause significant reputational harm to us, which could seriously harm our business.

In addition, financial institutions, including us, have faced significant regulatory scrutiny over the past several years, which has increasingly led to public enforcement actions. We and our subsidiaries are subject to comprehensive regulation and periodic examination by the Federal Reserve, the SEC, OCC, FDIC and CFPB. We have been subject to enforcement actions by many of these and other regulators and may continue to be involved in such actions, including governmental inquiries, investigations and enforcement proceedings, including by the Department of Justice. We expect that regulators and governmental enforcement bodies will continue taking formal enforcement actions against financial institutions in addition to addressing supervisory concerns through non-public supervisory actions or findings, which could involve restrictions on our activities, among other limitations that could adversely affect our business. Litigation, government investigations and other regulatory actions generally could subject us to significant fines, increased expenses, restrictions on our activities and damage to our reputation and our brand, and could adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations.

Other Business Risks

We Face Intense Competition In All Of Our Markets.

We operate in a highly competitive environment, both in making loans and attracting deposits, and we expect competitive conditions to continue to intensify with respect to most of our products. We compete on the basis of the rates we pay on deposits and the rates and other terms we charge on the loans we originate or purchase, as well as the quality and range of our customer service, products, innovation and experience. Price competition for loans might result in origination of fewer loans or earning less on our loans. In our credit card business, competition for rewards customers may result in higher rewards expenses, or we may fail to attract new customers or retain existing rewards customers due to increasing competition for these consumers.

Some of our competitors are substantially larger than we are, which may give those competitors advantages, including a more diversified product and customer base, the ability to reach out to more customers and potential customers, operational efficiencies, more versatile technology platforms, the ability to innovate faster, broad-based local distribution capabilities, lower-cost funding and larger existing branch networks. In addition, some of our competitors, including new and emerging competitors in the digital and mobile payments space and other financial technology providers, are not subject to the same regulatory requirements or legislative scrutiny to which we are subject, which

also could place us at a competitive disadvantage. Many of our competitors are also focusing on cross-selling their products and developing new products or technologies, which could affect our ability to maintain or grow existing customer relationships or require us to offer lower interest rates or fees on our lending products or higher interest rates on deposits. This increasingly competitive environment is primarily a result of changes in regulation, changes in technology and product delivery systems, as well as the consolidation of financial service providers, all of which may affect our customers' expectations and demands.

Table of Contents

As of December 31, 2016, we operate the largest online direct banking institution in the U.S. by deposits. While direct banking represents a significant opportunity to attract new customers that value greater and more flexible access to banking services at reduced costs, we face strong competition in the direct banking market. Aggressive pricing throughout the industry may adversely affect the retention of existing balances and the cost-efficient acquisition of new deposit funds and may affect our growth and profitability. In addition, the effects of a competitive environment may be exacerbated by the flexibility of direct banking and the increasing financial and technological sophistication of our customer base. Customers could also close their online accounts or reduce balances or deposits in favor of products and services offered by competitors for other reasons. These shifts, which could be rapid, could result from general dissatisfaction with our products or services, including concerns over pricing, online security or our reputation.

We have expanded our credit card partnership business over the past several years with the additions of a number of credit card partnerships. The market for key business partners, especially in the credit card business, is very competitive, and we may not be able to grow or maintain these partner relationships. We face the risk that we could lose partner relationships, even after we have invested significant resources, time and expense into acquiring and developing the relationships. The loss of any of our key business partners could have a negative impact on our results of operations, including lower returns, excess operating expense and excess funding capacity.

In addition, the global payments industry is highly competitive and is rapidly changing and increasingly subject to regulatory scrutiny. We compete with all forms of payments, including a variety of new and evolving alternative payment mechanisms, systems and products, such as aggregators and web-based and wireless payment platforms or technologies, digital currencies, prepaid systems and payment services targeting users of social networks and online gaming (including those offering billing to the consumer’s mobile phone account). If we are unable to continue to keep pace with innovation, our business and results of operations could be adversely affected.

In such a competitive environment, we may lose entire accounts or may lose account balances to competing firms, or we may find it more costly to maintain our existing customer base. Customer attrition from any or all of our lending products, together with any lowering of interest rates or fees that we might implement to retain customers, could reduce our revenues and therefore our earnings. Similarly, unexpected customer attrition from our deposit products, in addition to an increase in rates or services that we may offer to retain those deposits, may increase our expenses and therefore reduce our earnings.

Our Business, Financial Condition And Results Of Operations May Be Adversely Affected By Merchants’ Increasing Focus On The Fees Charged By Credit Card Networks And By Regulation And Legislation Impacting Such Fees.

Credit card interchange fees are generally one of the largest components of the costs that merchants pay in connection with the acceptance of credit cards and are a meaningful source of revenue for our credit card businesses. Interchange fees are the subject of significant and intense global legal, regulatory and legislative focus, and the resulting decisions, regulations and legislation may have a material adverse impact on our overall business, financial condition and results of operations.

Regulators and legislative bodies in a number of countries are seeking to reduce credit card interchange fees through legislation, competition-related regulatory proceedings, central bank regulation and or litigation. Interchange reimbursement rates in the United States are set by credit card networks such as MasterCard and Visa. In some jurisdictions, such as Canada and certain countries in the European Union, interchange fees and related practices are subject to regulatory activity that have limited the ability of certain networks to establish default rates, including in some cases imposing caps on permissible interchange fees. We have already experienced these impacts in our international credit card portfolio. Legislators and regulators around the world are aware of each other’s approaches to the regulation of the payments industry. Consequently, a development in one country, state or region may influence regulatory approaches in another, such as our primary market, the United States.

In addition to this regulatory activity, merchants are also seeking avenues to reduce interchange fees. During the past few years, merchants and their trade groups have filed numerous lawsuits against Visa, MasterCard, American Express and their card-issuing banks, claiming that their practices toward merchants, including interchange and similar fees, violate federal antitrust laws. In 2005, a number of entities filed antitrust lawsuits against MasterCard and

Visa and several member banks, including our subsidiaries and us, alleging among other things, that the defendants conspired to fix the level of interchange fees. In December 2013, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York granted final approval of the proposed class settlement. The settlement provided, among other things, that merchants would be entitled to join together to negotiate lower interchange fees. The settlement was appealed to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in January 2014; this litigation remains ongoing. See "Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others" for further details.

Table of Contents

Some major retailers may have sufficient bargaining power to independently negotiate lower interchange fees with MasterCard and Visa, which could, in turn, result in lower interchange fees for us when our cardholders undertake purchase transactions with these retailers. In 2016, some of the largest merchants individually negotiated lower interchange rates with MasterCard and/or Visa. These and other merchants also continue to lobby aggressively for caps and restrictions on interchange fees and there can be no assurance that their efforts will not be successful or that they will not in the future bring legal proceedings against us or other credit card and debit card issuers and networks. Beyond pursuing litigation, legislation and regulation, merchants may also promote forms of payment with lower fees, such as ACH-based payments, or seek to impose surcharges at the point of sale for use of credit or debit cards. New payment systems, particularly mobile-based payment technologies, could also gain widespread adoption and lead to issuer transaction fees or the displacement of credit card accounts as a payment method.

The heightened focus by merchants and regulatory and legislative bodies on the fees charged by credit and debit card networks, and the ability of certain merchants to successfully negotiate discounts to interchange fees with MasterCard and Visa or develop alternative payment systems could result in a reduction of interchange fees. Any resulting loss in income to us could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

If We Are Not Able To Invest Successfully In And Introduce Digital And Other Technological Developments Across All Our Businesses, Our Financial Performance May Suffer.

Our industry is subject to rapid and significant technological changes and our ability to meet our customers' needs and expectations is key to our ability to grow revenue and earnings. We expect digital technologies to have a significant impact on banking over time. Consumers increasingly expect robust digital experiences from their financial services providers. The ability for customers to access their accounts and conduct financial transactions using digital technology, including mobile applications, is an increasingly important aspect of the financial services industry and it impacts our ability to deliver products and services to our customers. To that end, financial institutions are rapidly introducing new digital and other technology-driven products and services, which aim to offer a better customer experience and to reduce costs. We continue to invest in digital technology designed to attract new customers, facilitate the ability of existing customers to conduct financial transactions and enhance the customer experience related to our products and services.

Our continued success depends, in part, upon our ability to address the needs of our customers by using digital technology to provide products and services that efficiently meet their expectations in a cost-effective manner. The development and launch of new digital products and services depends in large part on our capacity to invest in and build the technology platforms that can enable them. We continue to actively invest in such technology platforms, however, we may fail to implement the correct technology, or may fail to do so in a timely manner as discussed in more detail above under the headings "We Face Intense Competition In All Of Our Markets" and "We Face Risks Related To Our Operational, Technological And Organizational Infrastructure."

Some of our competitors are substantially larger than we are, which may allow those competitors to invest more money into their technology infrastructure and digital innovation than we do. In addition, we face intense competition from smaller companies which experience lower cost structures and different regulatory requirements and scrutiny than we do, and which may allow them to innovate more rapidly than we can. See "We Face Intense Competition In All Of Our Markets." Further, our success depends on our ability to attract and retain strong digital and technology leaders, engineers and other talent, and competition for such talent is intense. If we are unable to attract and retain digital and technology talent, our ability to offer digital products and services and build the necessary technology infrastructure could be negatively affected, which could negatively impact our business and financial results. A failure to maintain or enhance our competitive position with respect to digital products and services, whether because we fail to anticipate customer expectations or because our technological developments fail to perform as desired or are not implemented in a timely or successful manner, could negatively impact our business and financial results.

We May Fail To Realize All Of The Anticipated Benefits Of Our Mergers, Acquisitions And Strategic Partnerships.

We have engaged in merger and acquisition activity and entered into strategic partnerships over the past several years and may continue to engage in such activity in the future. We continue to evaluate and anticipate engaging in, among other merger and acquisition activity, additional strategic partnerships and selected acquisitions of financial

institutions and other financial assets, including credit card and other loan portfolios.
Any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership we undertake entails certain risks, which may materially and adversely affect our results of operations. If we experience greater than anticipated costs to integrate acquired businesses into our existing operations or are not able to achieve the anticipated benefits of any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership, including cost savings and

Table of Contents

other synergies, our business could be negatively affected. In addition, it is possible that the ongoing integration processes could result in the loss of key employees, errors or delays in systems implementation, the disruption of our ongoing businesses or inconsistencies in standards, controls, procedures and policies that adversely affect our ability to maintain relationships with partners, clients, customers, depositors and employees or to achieve the anticipated benefits of any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership. Integration efforts also may divert management attention and resources. These integration matters may have an adverse effect on us during any transition period.

In addition, we may face the following risks in connection with any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership:

- New Businesses and Geographic or Other Markets: Our merger, acquisition or strategic partnership activity may involve our entry into new businesses and new geographic areas or other markets which present risks resulting from our relative inexperience in these new businesses or markets. These new businesses or markets may change the overall character of our consolidated portfolio of businesses and could react differently to economic and other external factors. We face the risk that we will not be successful in these new businesses or in these new markets.
- Identification and Assessment of Merger and Acquisition Targets and Deployment of Acquired Assets: We cannot assure you that we will identify or acquire suitable financial assets or institutions to supplement our organic growth through acquisitions or strategic partnerships. In addition, we may incorrectly assess the asset quality and value of the particular assets or institutions we acquire. Further, our ability to achieve the anticipated benefits of any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership will depend on our ability to assess the asset quality and value of the particular assets or institutions we partner with, merge with or acquire. We may be unable to profitably deploy any assets we acquire.
- Accuracy of Assumptions: In connection with any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership, we may make certain assumptions relating to the proposed merger, acquisition or strategic partnership that may be, or may prove to be, inaccurate, including as a result of the failure to realize the expected benefits of any merger, acquisition or strategic partnership. The inaccuracy of any assumptions we may make could result in unanticipated consequences that could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial condition.
- Target-specific Risk: Assets and companies that we acquire, or companies that we enter into strategic partnerships with, will have their own risks that are specific to a particular asset or company. These risks include, but are not limited to, particular or specific regulatory, accounting, operational, reputational and industry risks, any of which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations or financial condition. Indemnification rights, if any, may be insufficient to compensate us for any losses or damages resulting from such risks. In addition to regulatory approvals discussed above, certain of our merger, acquisition or partnership activity may require third-party consents in order for us to fully realize the anticipated benefits of any such transaction.

Reputational Risk And Social Factors May Impact Our Results And Damage Our Brand.

Our ability to originate and maintain accounts is highly dependent upon the perceptions of consumer and commercial borrowers and deposit holders and other external perceptions of our business and compliance practices or our financial health. In addition, our brand has historically been, and we expect it to continue to be, very important to us. Maintaining and enhancing our brand will depend largely on our ability to continue to provide high-quality products and services. Adverse perceptions regarding our reputation in the consumer, commercial and funding markets could lead to difficulties in generating and maintaining accounts as well as in financing them. In particular, negative public perceptions regarding our reputation could lead to decreases in the levels of deposits that consumer and commercial customers and potential customers choose to maintain with us or significantly increase the costs of attracting and retaining customers. In addition, negative perceptions regarding certain industries or clients could also prompt us to cease business activities associated with those industries or clients.

Negative public opinion or damage to our brand could also result from actual or alleged conduct in any number of activities or circumstances, including lending practices, regulatory compliance, security breaches (including the use and protection of customer information), corporate governance, and sales and marketing, and from actions taken by regulators or other persons in response to such conduct. Such conduct could fall short of our customers' and the public's heightened expectations of companies of our size with rigorous data, privacy and compliance practices, and could further harm our reputation. In addition, third parties with whom we have important relationships may take actions

over which we have limited control that could negatively impact perceptions about us or the financial services industry. The proliferation of social media may increase the likelihood that negative public opinion from any of the events discussed above will impact our reputation and business.

Table of Contents

In addition, a variety of social factors may cause changes in borrowing activity, including credit card use, payment patterns and the rate of defaults by accountholders and borrowers domestically and internationally. These social factors include changes in consumer confidence levels, the public's perception regarding consumer debt, including credit card use, and changing attitudes about the stigma of bankruptcy. If consumers develop or maintain negative attitudes about incurring debt, or if consumption trends decline or if we fail to maintain and enhance our brand, or we incur significant expenses in this effort, our business and financial results could be materially and negatively affected.

If We Are Not Able To Protect Our Intellectual Property, Our Revenue And Profitability Could Be Negatively Affected.

We rely on a variety of measures to protect and enhance our intellectual property, including copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, patents and certain restrictions on disclosure, solicitation and competition. We also undertake other measures to control access to and distribution of our other proprietary information. These measures may not prevent misappropriation of our proprietary information or infringement of our intellectual property rights and a resulting loss of competitive advantage. In addition, our competitors or other third parties may file patent applications for innovations that are used in our industry or allege that our systems, processes or technologies infringe on their intellectual property rights. If our competitors or other third parties are successful in obtaining such patents or prevail in intellectual property-related litigation against us, we could lose significant revenues, incur significant license, royalty or technology development expenses, or pay significant damages.

There Are Risks Resulting From The Extensive Use Of Models In Our Business.

We rely on quantitative models to aggregate and assess our various risk exposures and to estimate certain financial values. Models may be used in such processes as determining the pricing of various products, grading loans and extending credit, measuring interest rate and other market risks, predicting losses, assessing capital adequacy and calculating economic and regulatory capital levels, as well as to estimate the value of financial instruments and balance sheet items. Poorly designed or implemented models present the risk that our business decisions based on information incorporating models will be adversely affected due to the inadequacy of modeled results. Also, information we provide to the public or to our regulators based on poorly designed or implemented models could be inaccurate or misleading. Some of the decisions that our regulators make, including those related to capital distribution to our shareholders, could be affected adversely due to the perception that the quality of the models used to generate the relevant information is insufficient. Any issues with the quality or effectiveness of our data aggregation and validation procedures, as well as the quality and integrity of data inputs, could result in ineffective risk management practices or inaccurate risk reporting. If our risk management framework proves ineffective, we could suffer unexpected losses which could materially adversely affect our results of operation or financial condition.

Our Risk Management Strategies May Not Be Fully Effective In Mitigating Our Risk Exposures In All Market Environments Or Against All Types Of Risk.

Management of risk, including market, credit, liquidity, compliance and strategic risks, requires, among other things, policies and procedures to record properly and verify a large number of transactions and events. See "MD&A—Risk Management" for further details. We have devoted significant resources to developing our risk management policies and procedures and expect to continue to do so in the future. Nonetheless, our risk management strategies may not be fully effective in identifying and mitigating our risk exposure in all market environments or against all types of risk, including risks that are unidentified or unanticipated, even if our models for assessing risk are properly designed and implemented.

Some of our methods of managing risk are based upon our use of observed historical market behavior and management's judgment. These methods may not accurately predict future exposures, which could be significantly greater than the historical measures indicate. For example, market conditions during the financial crisis involved unprecedented dislocations and highlight the limitations inherent in using historical information to manage risk. In addition, credit risk is inherent in the financial services business and results from, among other things, extending credit to customers. Our ability to assess the creditworthiness of our customers may be impaired if the models and approaches we use to select, manage and underwrite our consumer and commercial customers become less predictive of future charge-offs (due, for example, to rapid changes in the economy, including the unemployment rate).

While we employ a broad and diversified set of risk monitoring and risk mitigation techniques, those techniques and the judgments that accompany their application cannot anticipate every economic and financial outcome or the timing of such outcomes. For example, our ability to implement our risk management strategies may be hindered by adverse changes in the volatility or liquidity conditions in certain markets and as a result, may limit our ability to distribute such risks (for instance, when we seek to syndicate

exposure in bridge financing transactions we have underwritten). We may, therefore, incur losses in the course of our risk management or investing activities.

Changes In Consumer Behavior And Their Adoption of Digital Technology May Change Retail Distribution Strategies And May Adversely Impact Our Investments In Our Bank Premises And Equipment And Other Retail Distribution Assets, Lead To Increased Expenditures And Expose Us To Additional Risk.

We have significant investments in bank premises and equipment for our branch network and other branch banking assets including our full service banking centers, parcels of land held for the development of future banking centers and our retail work force. Advances in technology such as digital and mobile banking, in-branch self-service technologies, proximity or remote payment technologies, as well as progressively changing customer preferences for these other methods of banking, could decrease the value of our branch network or other retail distribution assets. As a result, we may need to further change our retail distribution strategy and close, sell and/or renovate additional branches or parcels of land held for development and restructure or reduce our remaining branches and work force. These actions could lead to losses on these assets or could adversely impact the carrying value of other long-lived assets, reduce our revenues, increase our expenditures, dilute our brand and/or reduce customer demand for our products and services.

Further, to the extent that we change our retail distribution strategy and as a result expand into new business areas, we may face more competitors with more experience in the new business areas and more established relationships with relevant customers, regulators and industry participants, which could adversely affect our ability to compete. Our competitors may also be subject to less burdensome regulations. See “We Face Intense Competition In All Our Markets.”

Fluctuations In Market Interest Rates Or Volatility In The Capital Markets Could Adversely Affect Our Income And Expense, The Value Of Assets And Obligations, Our Regulatory Capital, Cost Of Capital Or Our Liquidity.

Like other financial institutions, our business may be sensitive to market interest rate movement and the performance of the capital markets. Disruptions, uncertainty or volatility across the capital markets could negatively impact market liquidity and limit our access to funding required to operate and grow our business. In addition, changes in interest rates or in valuations in the debt or equity markets could directly impact us. For example, we borrow money from other institutions and depositors, which we use to make loans to customers and invest in debt securities and other earning assets. We earn interest on these loans and assets and pay interest on the money we borrow from institutions and depositors. Fluctuations in interest rates, including changes in the relationship between short-term rates and long-term rates and in the relationship between our funding basis rate and our lending basis rate, may have negative impacts on our net interest income and therefore our earnings. In addition, interest rate fluctuations and competitor responses to those changes may affect the rate of customer prepayments for mortgage, auto and other term loans and may affect the balances customers carry on their credit cards. These changes can reduce the overall yield on our earning asset portfolio. Changes in interest rates and competitor responses to these changes may also impact customer decisions to maintain balances in the deposit accounts they have with us. In addition, changes in valuations in the debt and equity markets could have a negative impact on the assets we hold in our investment portfolio. Such market changes could also have a negative impact on the valuation of assets for which we provide servicing. Finally, the Basel III Capital Rule requires that most amounts reported in Accumulated Other Comprehensive Income (“AOCI”), including unrealized gains and losses on securities designated as available for sale, be included in our regulatory capital calculations. Changes in interest rates or market valuations that result in unrealized losses on components of AOCI could therefore impact our regulatory capital ratios negatively.

We assess our interest rate risk by estimating the effect on our earnings under various scenarios that differ based on assumptions about the direction and the magnitude of interest rate changes. We take risk mitigation actions based on those assessments. We face the risk that changes in interest rates could materially reduce our net interest income and our earnings, especially if actual conditions turn out to be materially different than those we assumed. See “MD&A—Market Risk Management” for additional information.

Our Business Could Be Negatively Affected If We Are Unable To Attract, Retain And Motivate Skilled Senior Leaders.

Our success depends, in large part, on our ability to retain key senior leaders, and competition for such senior leaders is intense. The executive compensation provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act and the regulations issued thereunder, and any further legislation, regulation or regulatory guidance restricting executive compensation, may limit the types of compensation arrangements that we may enter into with our most senior leaders and could have a negative impact on our ability to attract, retain and motivate such leaders in support of our long-term strategy. These laws and regulations may not apply in the same manner to all financial institutions, and we therefore may face more restrictions than other institutions and companies with which we compete for talent. These laws

and regulations may also hinder our ability to compete for talent from other industries. If we are unable to retain talented senior leadership, our business could be negatively affected.

We Face Risks From Unpredictable Catastrophic Events.

Despite our substantial business contingency plans, the impact from natural disasters and other catastrophic events, including terrorist attacks, may have a negative effect on our business and infrastructure, including our information technology systems. In addition, if a natural disaster or other catastrophic event occurs in certain regions where our business and customers are concentrated, such as the mid-Atlantic and New York metropolitan area, we could be disproportionately impacted as compared to our competitors. The impact of such events and other catastrophes on the overall economy may also adversely affect our financial condition and results of operations.

We Face Risks From The Use Of Or Changes To Assumptions Or Estimates In Our Financial Statements.

Pursuant to generally accepted accounting principles in the U.S. ("U.S. GAAP"), we are required to use certain assumptions and estimates in preparing our financial statements, including determining our allowance for loan and lease losses, the fair value of certain assets and liabilities, and asset impairment, among other items. In addition, the FASB, the SEC and other regulatory bodies may change the financial accounting and reporting standards, including those related to assumptions and estimates we use to prepare our financial statements, in ways that we cannot predict and that could impact our financial statements. For example, in June 2016, the FASB issued revised guidance for impairments on financial instruments. The guidance, which becomes effective on January 1, 2020 with early adoption permitted no earlier than January 1, 2019, requires use of a CECL model that is based on expected rather than incurred losses. We are currently assessing the potential impact of this guidance, which may be material to our accounting for credit losses on financial instruments. If actual results differ from the assumptions or estimates underlying our financial statements or if financial accounting and reporting standards are changed, we may experience unexpected material losses. For a discussion of our use of estimates in the preparation of our consolidated financial statements, see "MD&A—Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates" and "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies."

Limitations On Our Ability To Receive Dividends From Our Subsidiaries Could Affect Our Liquidity And Ability To Pay Dividends And Repurchase Common Stock.

We are a separate and distinct legal entity from our subsidiaries, including the Banks. Dividends to us from our direct and indirect subsidiaries, including the Banks, have represented a major source of funds for us to pay dividends on our common and preferred stock, repurchase common stock, make payments on corporate debt securities and meet other obligations. There are various federal law limitations on the extent to which the Banks can finance or otherwise supply funds to us through dividends and loans. These limitations include minimum regulatory capital requirements, federal banking law requirements concerning the payment of dividends out of net profits or surplus, Sections 23A and 23B of the Federal Reserve Act and Regulation W governing transactions between an insured depository institution and its affiliates, as well as general federal regulatory oversight to prevent unsafe or unsound practices. If our subsidiaries' earnings are not sufficient to make dividend payments to us while maintaining adequate capital levels, our liquidity may be affected and we may not be able to make dividend payments to our common or preferred stockholders, repurchase our common stock, make payments on outstanding corporate debt securities or meet other obligations, each and any of which could have a material adverse impact on our results of operations, financial position or perception of financial health.

The Soundness Of Other Financial Institutions And Other Third Parties Could Adversely Affect Us.

Our ability to engage in routine funding and other transactions could be adversely affected by the stability and actions of other financial services institutions. Financial services institutions are interrelated as a result of trading, clearing, servicing, counterparty and other relationships. We have exposure to an increasing number of financial institutions and counterparties. These counterparties include institutions that may be exposed to various risks over which we have little or no control, including European or U.S. sovereign debt that is currently or may become in the future subject to significant price pressure, rating agency downgrade or default risk.

In addition, we routinely execute transactions with counterparties in the financial services industry, including brokers and dealers, commercial banks, investment banks, mutual and hedge funds and other institutional clients, resulting in a significant credit concentration with respect to the financial services industry overall. As a result, defaults by, or even

rumors or questions about, one or more financial services institutions, or the financial services industry generally, have led to market-wide liquidity problems and could lead to losses or defaults by us or by other institutions.

Table of Contents

Likewise, adverse developments affecting the overall strength and soundness of our competitors, the financial services industry as a whole and the general economic climate or sovereign debt could have a negative impact on perceptions about the strength and soundness of our business even if we are not subject to the same adverse developments. In addition, adverse developments with respect to third parties with whom we have important relationships also could negatively impact perceptions about us. These perceptions about us could cause our business to be negatively affected and exacerbate the other risks that we face.

Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments

None.

Item 2. Properties

Our corporate and banking real estate portfolio consists of approximately 14.9 million square feet of owned or leased office and retail space, used to support our business. Of this overall portfolio, approximately 10.8 million square feet of space is dedicated for various corporate office uses and approximately 4.1 million square feet of space is for bank branches and related offices.

Our 10.8 million square feet of corporate office space consists of approximately 6.1 million square feet of leased space and 4.7 million square feet of owned space. Our headquarters is located in McLean, Virginia, and is included in our corporate office space. We maintain corporate office space primarily in Virginia, Illinois, Texas, New York, Delaware, Louisiana and Maryland.

Our 4.1 million square feet of bank branch, café and office space consists of approximately 2.2 million square feet of leased space and 1.9 million square feet of owned space, including branch locations primarily across New York, Louisiana, Texas, Maryland, Virginia, New Jersey and the District of Columbia. See “Note 8—Premises, Equipment and Lease Commitments” for information about our premises.

Item 3. Legal Proceedings

The information required by Item 103 of Regulation S-K is included in “Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others.”

Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures

Not applicable.

Table of Contents

PART II

Item 5. Market for Registrant's Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

Market Information

Our common stock is listed on the NYSE and is traded under the symbol "COF." As of January 31, 2017, there were 11,545 holders of record of our common stock. The table below presents the high and low closing trade prices of our common stock as reported by the NYSE and cash dividends per common share declared by us during each quarter indicated.

	Trade Price		Cash
For the Quarter Ended	High	Low	Dividends
December 31, 2016	$90.62	$71.07	$ 0.40
September 30, 2016	72.50	60.86	0.40
June 30, 2016	75.96	58.15	0.40
March 31, 2016	71.03	58.66	0.40
December 31, 2015	81.42	72.18	0.40
September 30, 2015	91.71	71.55	0.40
June 30, 2015	89.38	79.67	0.40
March 31, 2015	82.49	73.21	0.30

Dividend Restrictions

For information regarding our ability to pay dividends, see the discussion under "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation—Dividends, Stock Repurchases and Transfers of Funds," "MD&A—Capital Management—Dividend Policy and Stock Purchases," and "Note 12—Regulatory and Capital Adequacy."

Securities Authorized for Issuance Under Equity Compensation Plans

Information relating to compensation plans under which our equity securities are authorized for issuance is presented in Part III of this Report under "Part III—Item 12. Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management and Related Stockholder Matters."

Table of Contents

Common Stock Performance Graph

The following graph shows the cumulative total stockholder return on our common stock compared to an overall stock market index, the S&P Composite 500 Stock Index ("S&P 500 Index"), and a published industry index, the S&P Financial Composite Index ("S&P Financial Index"), over the five-year period commencing December 31, 2011 and ending December 31, 2016. The stock performance graph assumes that $100 was invested in our common stock and each index and that all dividends were reinvested. The stock price performance on the graph below is not necessarily indicative of future performance.

	December 31,					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Capital One	$100.00	$137.50	$184.50	$201.95	$179.92	$222.66
S&P 500 Index	100.00	113.41	146.98	163.72	162.53	178.02
S&P Financial Index	100.00	126.26	168.18	190.21	183.60	220.58

Table of Contents

Recent Sales of Unregistered Securities

We did not have any sales of unregistered equity securities in 2016.

Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

The following table presents information related to repurchases of shares of our common stock for each calendar month in the fourth quarter of 2016.

(Dollars in millions, except per share information)	Total Number of Shares Purchased[1]	Average Price Paid per Share[2]	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of Publicly Announced Plans	Maximum Amount That May Yet be Purchased Under the Plan or Program[2]
October	7,461,115	$ 73.33	7,461,115	$ 759
November	3,418,507	75.14	3,353,519	507
December	721,707	87.84	721,707	443
Total	11,601,329	$ 74.77	11,536,341	

(1) Primarily comprised of repurchases under the 2016 Stock Repurchase Program. On June 29, 2016, we announced that our Board of Directors had authorized the repurchase of up to $2.5 billion of shares of our common stock from the third quarter of 2016 through the end of the second quarter of 2017. Also includes 64,988 shares purchased in November related to the withholding of shares to cover taxes on restricted stock awards whose restrictions have lapsed.

(2) Amounts exclude commission costs.

Table of Contents

Item 6. Summary of Selected Financial Data

The following table presents selected consolidated financial data and performance metrics for the five-year period ended December 31, 2016. Certain prior period amounts have been recast to conform to the current period presentation. We prepare our consolidated financial statements based on U.S. GAAP. This data should be reviewed in conjunction with our audited consolidated financial statements and related notes and with the MD&A included in this Report. The historical financial information presented may not be indicative of our future performance.

Five-Year Summary of Selected Financial Data[1]

	Year Ended December 31,					Change	
(Dollars in millions, except per share data and as noted)	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Income statement							
Interest income	$22,891	$20,459	$19,397	$19,898	$18,964	12%	5%
Interest expense	2,018	1,625	1,579	1,792	2,375	24	3
Net interest income	20,873	18,834	17,818	18,106	16,589	11	6
Non-interest income[2]	4,628	4,579	4,472	4,278	4,807	1	2
Total net revenue	25,501	23,413	22,290	22,384	21,396	9	5
Provision for credit losses[3]	6,459	4,536	3,541	3,453	4,415	42	28
Non-interest expense:							
Marketing	1,811	1,744	1,561	1,373	1,364	4	12
Amortization of intangibles	386	430	532	671	609	(10)	(19)
Operating expenses	11,361	10,822	10,087	10,309	9,824	5	7
Total non-interest expense	13,558	12,996	12,180	12,353	11,797	4	7
Income from continuing operations before income taxes	5,484	5,881	6,569	6,578	5,184	(7)	(10)
Income tax provision	1,714	1,869	2,146	2,224	1,475	(8)	(13)
Income from continuing operations, net of tax	3,770	4,012	4,423	4,354	3,709	(6)	(9)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations, net of tax	(19)	38	5	(233)	(217)	**	**
Net income	3,751	4,050	4,428	4,121	3,492	(7)	(9)
Dividends and undistributed earnings allocated to participating securities	(24)	(20)	(18)	(17)	(15)	20	11
Preferred stock dividends	(214)	(158)	(67)	(53)	(15)	35	136
Net income available to common stockholders	$3,513	$3,872	$4,343	$4,051	$3,462	(9)	(11)
Common share statistics							
Basic earnings per common share:							
Net income from continuing operations	$7.00	$7.08	$7.70	$7.39	$6.56	(1)%	(8)%
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	(0.04)	0.07	0.01	(0.40)	(0.39)	**	**
Net income per basic common share	$6.96	$7.15	$7.71	$6.99	$6.17	(3)	(7)
Diluted earnings per common share:							

Net income from continuing operations	$6.93	$7.00	$7.58	$7.28	$6.49	(1)	(8)
Income (loss) from discontinued operations	(0.04)	0.07	0.01	(0.39)	(0.38)	**	**
Net income per diluted common share	$6.89	$7.07	$7.59	$6.89	$6.11	(3)	(7)
Common shares outstanding (period-end, in millions)	480.2	527.3	553.4	572.7	582.2	(9)	(5)
Dividends paid per common share	$1.60	$1.50	$1.20	$0.95	$0.20	7	25
Tangible book value per common share (period-end)[4]	57.76	53.65	50.32	43.64	40.10	8	7
Common dividend payout ratio[5]	22.99 %	20.98 %	15.56 %	13.59 %	3.24 %	201 bps	542 bps
Stock price per common share at period end	$87.24	$72.18	$82.55	$76.61	$57.93	21%	(13)%
Book value per common share at period end	98.95	89.67	81.41	72.69	69.43	10	10
Total market capitalization at period end	41,893	38,061	45,683	43,875	33,727	10	(17)
Balance sheet (average balances)							
Loans held for investment	$233,272	$210,745	$197,925	$192,614	$187,915	11%	6%
Interest-earning assets	307,796	282,581	267,174	266,423	255,079	9	6
Total assets	339,974	313,474	297,659	296,200	285,142	8	5
Interest-bearing deposits	198,304	185,677	181,036	187,700	183,314	7	3
Total deposits	223,714	210,989	205,675	209,045	203,055	6	3

Table of Contents

(Dollars in millions, except per share data and as noted)	Year Ended December 31, 2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	Change 2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Borrowings	$56,878	$45,420	$38,882	$37,807	$38,025	25%	17%
Common equity	45,162	45,072	43,055	40,629	36,934	—	5
Total stockholders' equity	48,753	47,713	44,268	41,482	37,265	2	8
Selected performance metrics							
Purchase volume[6]	$307,138	$271,167	$224,750	$201,074	$180,599	13%	21%
Total net revenue margin[7]	8.29%	8.29%	8.34%	8.40%	8.39%	—	(5)bps
Net interest margin[8]	6.78	6.66	6.67	6.80	6.50	12 bps	(1)
Return on average assets	1.11	1.28	1.49	1.47	1.30	(17)	(21)
Return on average tangible assets[9]	1.16	1.35	1.57	1.55	1.38	(19)	(22)
Return on average common equity[10]	7.82	8.51	10.08	10.54	9.96	(69)	(157)
Return on average tangible common equity ("TCE")[11]	11.93	12.87	15.79	17.35	17.25	(94)	(292)
Equity-to-assets ratio[12]	14.34	15.22	14.87	14.00	13.07	(88)	35
Non-interest expense as a percentage of average loans held for investment[13]	5.81	6.17	6.15	6.41	6.28	(36)	2
Efficiency ratio[14]	53.17	55.51	54.64	55.19	55.14	(234)	87
Effective income tax rate from continuing operations	31.3	31.8	32.7	33.8	28.5	(50)	(90)
Net charge-offs	$5,062	$3,695	$3,414	$3,934	$3,555	37%	8%
Net charge-off rate[15]	2.17%	1.75%	1.72%	2.04%	1.89%	42 bps	3 bps

(Dollars in millions, except as noted)	December 31, 2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	Change 2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Balance sheet (period-end)							
Loans held for investment	$245,586	$229,851	$208,316	$197,199	$205,889	7%	10%
Interest-earning assets	321,807	302,007	277,849	265,170	280,096	7	9
Total assets	357,033	334,048	308,167	296,064	311,682	7	8
Interest-bearing deposits	211,266	191,874	180,467	181,880	190,018	10	6
Total deposits	236,768	217,721	205,548	204,523	212,485	9	6
Borrowings	60,460	59,115	48,457	40,654	49,910	2	22
Common equity	43,154	43,990	43,231	40,779	39,572	(2)	2
Total stockholders' equity	47,514	47,284	45,053	41,632	40,425	—	5
Credit quality metrics							
Allowance for loan and lease losses	$6,503	$5,130	$4,383	$4,315	$5,156	27%	17%
Allowance as a percentage of loans held for investment ("allowance coverage ratio")	2.65%	2.23%	2.10 %	2.19 %	2.50 %	42 bps	13 bps
30+ day performing delinquency rate	2.93	2.69	2.62	2.63	2.70	24	7
30+ day delinquency rate	3.27	3.00	2.91	2.96	3.09	27	9
Capital ratios							
Common equity Tier 1 capital[16]	10.1%	11.1%	12.5%	N/A	N/A	(100)bps	(140)bps
Tier 1 common ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	12.2	10.9	**	**
Tier 1 capital[16]	11.6	12.4	13.2	12.6	11.3	(80)	(80)
Total capital[16]	14.3	14.6	15.1	14.7	13.5	(30)	(50)
Tier 1 leverage[16]	9.9	10.6	10.8	10.1	8.6	(70)	(20)

Tangible common equity[17]	8.1	8.9	9.5	8.9	7.9	(80)	(60)
Supplementary leverage[16]	8.6	9.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	(60)	**
Other							
Employees (period end, in thousands)	47.3	45.4	46.0	45.4	42.2	4%	(1)%

---

(1) As of January 1, 2015, we changed our accounting principle to move from a gross basis of presentation to a net basis, for presenting qualifying derivative assets and liabilities, as well as the related right to reclaim cash collateral or obligation to return cash collateral. See "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for additional information. Prior period results, excluding regulatory ratios, have been recast to conform to this presentation.

(2) Includes a bargain purchase gain of $594 million attributable to the ING Direct acquisition recognized in non-interest income in the first quarter of 2012. The bargain purchase gain represents the excess of the fair value of the net assets acquired from ING Direct as of the acquisition date over the consideration transferred. See "MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms" for the definition of ING Direct acquisition.

Table of Contents

(3) Provision for credit losses for 2012 includes expense of $1.2 billion to establish an initial allowance for the receivables acquired in the 2012 U.S. card acquisition accounted for based on contractual cash flows. See "MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms" for the definition of 2012 U.S. card acquisition.

(4) Tangible book value per common share is a non-GAAP measure calculated based on tangible common equity divided by common shares outstanding. See "MD&A—Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures" for additional information on non-GAAP measures.

(5) Common dividend payout ratio is calculated based on dividends per common share for the period divided by basic earnings per common share for the period.

(6) Purchase volume consists of purchase transactions, net of returns, for the period for loans both classified as held for investment and held for sale. Excludes cash advance and balance transfer transactions.

(7) Total net revenue margin is calculated based on total net revenue for the period divided by average interest-earning assets for the period.

(8) Net interest margin is calculated based on net interest income for the period divided by average interest-earning assets for the period.

(9) Return on average tangible assets is a non-GAAP measure calculated based on income from continuing operations, net of tax, for the period divided by average tangible assets for the period. See "MD&A—Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures" for additional information on non-GAAP measures.

(10) Return on average common equity is calculated based on the sum of (i) income from continuing operations, net of tax; (ii) less dividends and undistributed earnings allocated to participating securities; (iii) less preferred stock dividends, for the period, divided by average common equity. Our calculation of return on average common equity may not be comparable to similarly titled measures reported by other companies.

(11) Return on average tangible common equity ("TCE") is a non-GAAP measure calculated based on the sum of (i) income from continuing operations, net of tax; (ii) less dividends and undistributed earnings allocated to participating securities; (iii) less preferred stock dividends, for the period, divided by average TCE. Our calculation of return on average TCE may not be comparable to similarly titled measures reported by other companies. See "MD&A—Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures" for additional information on non-GAAP measures.

(12) Equity-to-assets ratio is calculated based on average stockholders' equity for the period divided by average total assets for the period.

(13) Non-interest expense as a percentage of average loans held for investment is calculated based on non-interest expense for the period divided by average loans held for investment for the period.

(14) Efficiency ratio is calculated based on non-interest expense for the period divided by total net revenue for the period.

(15) Net charge-off rate is calculated based on net charge-offs for the period divided by average loans held for investment for the period.

(16) Beginning on January 1, 2014, we calculate our regulatory capital under Basel III Standardized Approach subject to transition provisions. Prior to January 1, 2014, we calculated regulatory capital measures under Basel I. See "MD&A—Capital Management" and "MD&A—Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures" for additional information, including the calculation of each of these ratios.

(17) TCE ratio is a non-GAAP measure calculated based on TCE divided by tangible assets. See "MD&A—Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures" for the calculation of this measure and reconciliation to the comparative U.S. GAAP measure.

** Change is not meaningful.

Table of Contents

Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations ("MD&A")

This discussion contains forward-looking statements that are based upon management's current expectations and are subject to significant uncertainties and changes in circumstances. Please review "MD&A—Forward-Looking Statements" for more information on the forward-looking statements in this 2016 Annual Report on Form 10-K ("this Report"). Our actual results may differ materially from those included in these forward-looking statements due to a variety of factors including, but not limited to, those described in "Part I—Item 1A. Risk Factors" in this Report. Unless otherwise specified, references to notes to our consolidated financial statements refer to the notes to our consolidated financial statements as of December 31, 2016 included in this Report.

Management monitors a variety of key indicators to evaluate our business results and financial condition. The following MD&A is intended to provide the reader with an understanding of our results of operations, financial condition and liquidity by focusing on changes from year to year in certain key measures used by management to evaluate performance, such as profitability, growth and credit quality metrics. MD&A is provided as a supplement to, and should be read in conjunction with, our audited consolidated financial statements as of and for the year ended December 31, 2016 and accompanying notes. MD&A is organized in the following sections:

- Executive Summary and Business Outlook
- Consolidated Results of Operations
- Consolidated Balance Sheets Analysis
- Off-Balance Sheet Arrangements
- Business Segment Financial Performance
- Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates
- Accounting Changes and Developments
- Capital Management
- Risk Management
- Credit Risk Profile
- Liquidity Risk Profile
- Market Risk Profile
- Supplemental Tables
- Glossary and Acronyms

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND BUSINESS OUTLOOK

Financial Highlights

We reported net income of $3.8 billion ($6.89 per diluted common share) on total net revenue of $25.5 billion for 2016. In comparison, we reported net income of $4.1 billion ($7.07 per diluted common share) on total net revenue of $23.4 billion for 2015 and $4.4 billion ($7.59 per diluted common share) on total net revenue of $22.3 billion for 2014.

Our common equity Tier 1 capital ratio as calculated under the Basel III Standardized Approach, including transition provisions, was 10.1% and 11.1% as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. See "MD&A—Capital Management" below for additional information.

On June 29, 2016, we announced that our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to $2.5 billion in shares of our common stock ("2016 Stock Repurchase Program") from the third quarter of 2016 through the end of the second quarter of 2017. Through the end of 2016, we repurchased approximately $2.1 billion of common stock as part of the 2016 Stock Repurchase Program and expect to complete the 2016 Stock Repurchase Program by the end of the second quarter of 2017. See "MD&A—Capital Management" below for additional information.

Below are additional highlights of our performance in 2016. These highlights are generally based on a comparison between the results of 2016 and 2015, except as otherwise noted. The changes in our financial condition and credit performance are generally based on our financial condition and credit performance as of December 31, 2016 compared to our financial condition and credit performance as of December 31, 2015. We provide a more detailed

discussion of our financial performance in the sections following this “Executive Summary and Business Outlook.”

Table of Contents

Total Company Performance

- Earnings: Our net income decreased by $299 million to $3.8 billion in 2016 compared to 2015. The decrease was primarily due to:
  - higher provision for credit losses driven by higher charge-offs in our credit card, taxi medallion, and oil and gas lending portfolios, as well as larger allowance builds in our credit card and auto loan portfolios; and
  - higher operating and marketing expenses associated with loan growth, as well as continued investments in technology and infrastructure.

  These higher expenses were partially offset by:
  - higher interest income due to growth in our credit card and commercial loan portfolios.
- Loans Held for Investment:
  - Period-end loans held for investment increased by $15.7 billion to $245.6 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015 primarily driven by growth in our credit card, auto and commercial loan portfolios, partially offset by the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio.
  - Average loans held for investment increased by $22.5 billion to $233.3 billion in 2016 compared to 2015, primarily driven by continued growth in our commercial, credit card and auto loan portfolios, including loans acquired in the HFS acquisition, partially offset by the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio.
- Net Charge-Off and Delinquency Metrics: Our net charge-off rate increased by 42 basis points to 2.17% in 2016 compared to 2015, primarily due to:
  - growth and seasoning of recent credit card loan originations; and
  - rising losses in our taxi medallion and oil and gas lending portfolios.

  These increases were partially offset by:
  - continued growth in our domestic credit card loan portfolio.

  Our 30+ day delinquency rate increased by 27 basis points to 3.27% as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, primarily due to growth and seasoning of recent credit card loan originations, partially offset by continued growth in our domestic credit card and auto loan portfolios.

  We provide additional information on our credit quality metrics below under “MD&A—Business Segment Financial Performance” and “MD&A —Credit Risk Profile.”
- Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses: Our allowance for loan and lease losses increased by $1.4 billion to $6.5 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, and the allowance coverage ratio increased by 42 basis points to 2.65% as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015. The increases were primarily driven by:
  - continued growth and seasoning in our credit card loan portfolio;
  - continued growth in our auto loan portfolio, increasing loss expectations on recent originations and a build reflecting a change in accounting estimate of the timing of charge-offs of bankrupt accounts; and
  - continued adverse industry conditions impacting our taxi medallion and oil and gas lending portfolios in our Commercial Banking business.

Business Outlook

We discuss below our current expectations regarding our total company performance over the near-term based on market conditions, the regulatory environment and our business strategies as of the time we filed this Annual Report on Form 10-K. The statements contained in this section are based on our current expectations regarding our outlook for our financial results and business strategies. Our expectations take into account, and should be read in conjunction with, our expectations regarding economic trends and

Table of Contents

analysis of our business as discussed in "Part I—Item 1. Business" and "Part II—Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations" of this Report. Certain statements are forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Actual results could differ materially from those in our forward-looking statements. Except as otherwise disclosed, forward-looking statements do not reflect:

- any change in current dividend or repurchase strategies;
- the effect of any acquisitions, divestitures or similar transactions that have not been previously disclosed; or
- any changes in laws, regulations or regulatory interpretations, in each case after the date as of which such statements are made.

See "Part I—Item 1. Business—Forward-Looking Statements" in this Report for more information on the forward-looking statements included in this Report and "Part I—Item 1A. Risk Factors" in this Report for factors that could materially influence our results.

We believe we are positioned to deliver attractive growth and returns, as well as significant capital distribution, subject to regulatory approval.

We have improved efficiency by growing revenues and managing costs across the company, realizing analog cost savings and other efficiency gains as we become more digital. We expect that our near-term annual efficiency ratio, excluding adjusting items, will be in the 52%s, plus or minus a reasonable margin of volatility. Over the longer-term, we believe that we should be able to achieve gradual efficiency improvement, driven by growth and digital productivity gains.

We expect our strong growth over the last two years puts us in a position to deliver solid EPS growth in 2017, excluding adjusting items, assuming no substantial change in the broader credit and economic cycles.

We believe our actions have created a well-positioned balance sheet with strong capital and liquidity. Pursuant to our approved 2016 capital plan, our Board of Directors has authorized repurchases of up to $2.5 billion of common stock through the end of the second quarter of 2017. We reduced our net share count by 47 million shares in 2016. The timing and exact amount of any common stock repurchases will depend on various factors, including market conditions, opportunities for growth, utilizing Rule 10b5-1 programs, and may be suspended at any time. See "MD&A—Capital Management—Dividend Policy and Stock Purchases" for more information.

CONSOLIDATED RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

The section below provides a comparative discussion of our consolidated financial performance for 2016 and 2015. We provide a discussion of our business segment results in the following section, "MD&A—Business Segment Financial Performance." You should read this section together with our "MD&A—Executive Summary and Business Outlook," where we discuss trends and other factors that we expect will affect our future results of operations.

Net Interest Income

Net interest income represents the difference between the interest income, including certain fees, earned on our interest-earning assets and the interest expense on our interest-bearing liabilities. Interest-earning assets include loans, investment securities and other interest-earning assets, while our interest-bearing liabilities include interest-bearing deposits, securitized debt obligations, senior and subordinated notes, and other borrowings. Generally, we include in interest income any past due fees on loans that we deem collectible. Our net interest margin, based on our consolidated results, represents the difference between the yield on our interest-earning assets and the cost of our interest-bearing liabilities, including the notional impact of non-interest-bearing funding. We expect net interest income and our net interest margin to fluctuate based on changes in interest rates and changes in the amount and composition of our interest-earning assets and interest-bearing liabilities.

Table of Contents

Table 1 below presents, for each major category of our interest-earning assets and interest-bearing liabilities, the average outstanding balance, interest income earned, interest expense incurred, average yield for 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Table 1: Average Balances, Net Interest Income and Net Interest Margin

	Year Ended December 31,								
	2016			2015			2014		
(Dollars in millions)	Average Balance	Interest Income/ Expense	Average Yield/ Rate	Average Balance	Interest Income/ Expense	Average Yield/ Rate	Average Balance	Interest Income/ Expense	Average Yield/ Rate
Assets:									
Interest-earning assets:									
Loans:[1]									
Credit card	$96,596	$14,173	14.67 %	$86,923	$12,387	14.25 %	$78,956	$11,430	14.48 %
Consumer banking	71,631	4,537	6.33	71,365	4,460	6.25	71,127	4,447	6.25
Commercial banking[2]	66,033	2,290	3.47	53,161	1,710	3.22	48,210	1,649	3.42
Other[3]	78	203	260.26	100	228	228.00	126	136	107.94
Total loans, including loans held for sale	234,338	21,203	9.05	211,549	18,785	8.88	198,419	17,662	8.90
Investment securities	66,260	1,599	2.41	63,738	1,575	2.47	62,547	1,628	2.60
Cash equivalents and other interest-earning assets	7,198	89	1.24	7,294	99	1.36	6,208	107	1.72
Total interest-earning assets	307,796	22,891	7.44	282,581	20,459	7.24	267,174	19,397	7.26
Cash and due from banks	3,235			2,970			2,994		
Allowance for loan and lease losses	(5,675)			(4,582)			(4,151)		
Premises and equipment, net	3,671			3,701			3,790		
Other assets	30,947			28,804			27,852		
Total assets	$339,974			$313,474			$297,659		
Liabilities and stockholders' equity:									
Interest-bearing liabilities:[3]									
Deposits	$198,304	$1,213	0.61	$185,677	$1,091	0.59	$181,036	$1,088	0.60
Securitized debt obligations	16,576	216	1.30	13,929	151	1.08	10,686	145	1.36
Senior and subordinated notes	22,417	476	2.12	20,935	330	1.58	16,543	299	1.81
Other borrowings and liabilities	18,736	113	0.60	11,297	53	0.47	12,325	47	0.38
Total interest-bearing liabilities	256,033	2,018	0.79	231,838	1,625	0.70	220,590	1,579	0.72
Non-interest-bearing deposits	25,410			25,312			24,639		
Other liabilities	9,778			8,611			8,162		

Total liabilities	291,221				265,761				253,391		
Stockholders’ equity	48,753				47,713				44,268		
Total liabilities and stockholders’ equity	$339,974				$313,474				$297,659		
Net interest income/spread		$20,873	6.65			$18,834	6.54			$17,818	6.54
Impact of non-interest-bearing funding			0.13				0.12				0.13
Net interest margin			6.78%				6.66	%			6.67 %

____

(1) Past due fees included in interest income totaled approximately $1.5 billion in 2016 and $1.4 billion in both 2015 and 2014.

(2) Some of our tax-related commercial investments generate tax-exempt income or tax credits. Accordingly, we make certain reclassifications within our Commercial Banking business results to present revenues and yields on a taxable-equivalent basis, calculated assuming an effective tax rate approximately equal to our federal statutory rate of 35% with offsetting reclassifications to the Other category.

(3) Interest income and interest expense and the calculation of average yields on interest-earning assets and average rates on interest-bearing liabilities include the impact of hedge accounting.

Table of Contents

Net interest income increased by $2.0 billion to $20.9 billion in 2016 compared to 2015 primarily driven by:
- growth in our credit card and commercial loan portfolios, including loans acquired from the HFS acquisition; and
- higher yields as a result of higher interest rates.

Net interest margin increased by 12 basis points to 6.78% in 2016 compared to 2015 primarily driven by:
- continued growth in our credit card loan portfolio; and
- continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio in our Consumer Banking business.

This increase was partially offset by:
- the impact of loans acquired from the HFS acquisition, which generally have lower net interest margins compared to our total company portfolio; and
- margin compression in our auto loan portfolio.

Net interest income increased by $1.0 billion to $18.8 billion in 2015 compared to 2014. The increase was primarily driven by growth in our credit card and commercial loan portfolios, as well as our auto loan portfolio in our Consumer Banking business. Net interest margin decreased by 1 basis point to 6.66% in 2015 compared to 2014 primarily driven by:
- the decline of yields in our auto, commercial, credit card and investment securities portfolios.

The decrease was substantially offset by:
- continued growth in our domestic credit card loan portfolio and the continued run-off of the acquired home loan portfolio in our Consumer Banking business; and
- lower wholesale funding costs.

Table 2 displays the change in our net interest income between periods and the extent to which the variance is attributable to:
- changes in the volume of our interest-earning assets and interest-bearing liabilities; or
- changes in the interest rates related to these assets and liabilities.

Table of Contents

Table 2: Rate/Volume Analysis of Net Interest Income[1]

(Dollars in millions)	2016 vs. 2015 Total Variance	Volume	Rate	2015 vs. 2014 Total Variance	Volume	Rate
Interest income:						
Loans:						
Credit card	$1,786	$1,410	$376	$957	$1,135	$(178)
Consumer banking	77	17	60	13	15	(2)
Commercial banking[2]	580	437	143	61	159	(98)
Other	(25)	(50)	25	92	(28)	120
Total loans, including loans held for sale	2,418	1,814	604	1,123	1,281	(158)
Investment securities	24	61	(37)	(53)	30	(83)
Cash equivalents and other interest-earning assets	(10)	(1)	(9)	(8)	15	(23)
Total interest income	2,432	1,874	558	1,062	1,326	(264)
Interest expense:						
Deposits	122	76	46	3	27	(24)
Securitized debt obligations	65	31	34	6	35	(29)
Senior and subordinated notes	146	25	121	31	70	(39)
Other borrowings and liabilities	60	41	19	6	(4)	10
Total interest expense	393	173	220	46	128	(82)
Net interest income	$2,039	$1,701	$338	$1,016	$1,198	$(182)

(1) We calculate the change in interest income and interest expense separately for each item. The portion of interest income or interest expense attributable to both volume and rate is allocated proportionately when the calculation results in a positive value. When the portion of interest income or interest expense attributable to both volume and rate results in a negative value, the total amount is allocated to volume or rate, depending on which amount is positive.

(2) Some of our tax-related commercial investments generate tax-exempt income or tax credits. Accordingly, we make certain reclassifications within our Commercial Banking business results to present revenues and yields on a taxable-equivalent basis, calculated assuming an effective tax rate approximately equal to our federal statutory rate of 35% with offsetting reclassifications to the Other category.

Non-Interest Income

Non-interest income primarily consists of interchange fees net of rewards expense, service charges and other customer-related fees and other non-interest income. Other non-interest income includes the pre-tax net benefit (provision) for mortgage representation and warranty losses related to continuing operations, gains and losses on free-standing derivatives not accounted for in hedge accounting relationships and hedge ineffectiveness.

Table of Contents

Table 3 displays the components of non-interest income for 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Table 3: Non-Interest Income

	Year Ended December 31,		
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015[1]	2014[1]
Interchange fees, net	$2,452	$2,264	$2,046
Service charges and other customer-related fees	1,646	1,856	2,008
Net securities gains (losses)	(11)	(32)	(3)
Other non-interest income:			
Benefit for mortgage representation and warranty losses[2]	2	16	26
Net fair value gains on free-standing derivatives	95	66	52
Other	444	409	343
Total other non-interest income	541	491	421
Total non-interest income	$4,628	$4,579	$4,472

(1) We made certain non-interest income reclassifications in the fourth quarter of 2016 to conform to the current period presentation. The primary net effects of the reclassifications for the years ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 were (i) increases to Service charges and other customer-related fees of $141 million for both periods and (ii) decreases to Other non-interest income of $168 million and $187 million, respectively. We have also consolidated the Non-interest income presentation of Other-than-temporary impairment ("OTTI") with net realized gains or losses from investment securities into a new Net securities gains (losses) line. See "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for additional information.

(2) Represents the benefit (provision) for mortgage representation and warranty losses recorded in continuing operations.

Non-interest income increased by $49 million to $4.6 billion in 2016 compared to 2015, primarily driven by:

- an increase in interchange fees driven by higher purchase volume in our Credit Card business, net of rewards expense from the continued expansion of our rewards franchise; and
- higher revenue attributable to our multifamily business in our Commercial Banking business.

These increases were partially offset by:

- lower service charges and other customer-related fees primarily due to the exit of our legacy payment protection products in our Domestic Card business during the first quarter of 2016.

Non-interest income increased by $107 million to $4.6 billion in 2015 compared to 2014 primarily driven by:

- an increase in interchange fees due to higher purchase volume in our Credit Card business.

This increase was partially offset by:

- increased rewards expense due to a greater proportion of customers with rewards coupled with increased spend on products with higher rewards; and
- lower service charges and other customer-related fees primarily due to the continued run-off of our payment protection products in our Domestic Card business.

Provision for Credit Losses

Our provision for credit losses in each period is driven by net charge-offs, changes to the allowance for loan and lease losses and changes to the reserve for unfunded lending commitments. We recorded a provision for credit losses of $6.5 billion, $4.5 billion and $3.5 billion in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively. The provision for credit losses as a percentage of net interest income was 30.9%, 24.1% and 19.9% in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Table of Contents

Our provision for credit losses increased by $1.9 billion in 2016 compared to 2015, primarily driven by:

- higher charge-offs and a larger allowance build in our credit card loan portfolio due to growth and portfolio seasoning;
- higher charge-offs in our commercial loan portfolio as a result of continued adverse industry conditions impacting our taxi medallion and oil and gas lending portfolios; and
- higher allowance in our auto loan portfolio due to continued loan growth, increasing loss expectations on recent originations and a build reflecting a change in accounting estimate of the timing of charge-offs of bankrupt accounts.

The increase in provision for credit losses of $995 million in 2015 compared to 2014 was primarily driven by:

- a larger allowance build in our domestic credit card loan portfolio in 2015 due to continued loan growth coupled with our expectations for rising charge-off rates; and
- a larger build in both the allowance and reserve for unfunded lending commitments resulting from adverse market conditions impacting our oil and gas portfolio and taxi medallion lending portfolio in our Commercial Banking business.

We provide additional information on the provision for credit losses and changes in the allowance for loan and lease losses within “MD&A—Credit Risk Profile,” “Note 4—Loans” and “Note 5—Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Rese for Unfunded Lending Commitments.” For information on the allowance methodology for each of our loan categories, see “Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies.”

Non-Interest Expense

Non-interest expense consists of ongoing operating expenses, such as salaries and associate benefits, occupancy and equipment costs, professional services, communications and data processing expenses and other non-interest expenses, as well as marketing costs and amortization of intangibles.

Table 4 displays the components of non-interest expense for 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Table 4: Non-Interest Expense

	Year Ended December 31,		
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015 [(1)]	2014 [(1)]
Salaries and associate benefits	$5,202	$4,975	$4,593
Occupancy and equipment	1,944	1,829	1,745
Marketing	1,811	1,744	1,561
Professional services	1,075	1,120	1,053
Communications and data processing	1,169	1,055	961
Amortization of intangibles	386	430	532
Other non-interest expense:			
Collections	313	322	372
Fraud losses	331	316	275
Bankcard, regulatory and other fee assessments	540	444	465
Other	787	761	623
Total other non-interest expense	1,971	1,843	1,735
Total non-interest expense	$13,558	$12,996	$12,180

---

(1) We made certain non-interest expense reclassifications in the fourth quarter of 2016. The net effects of the reclassifications for the year ended 2015 and year ended 2014 were increased Communications and data processing expense by $172 million and $163 million, respectively, with corresponding decreases to Professional services. See “Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies” for additional information.

Non-interest expense increased by $562 million to $13.6 billion in 2016 compared to 2015, primarily due to:

- higher operating and marketing expenses associated with loan growth, as well as continued investments in technology and infrastructure;

Table of Contents

- higher bank optimization charges; and
- higher FDIC surcharges and premiums.

Non-interest expense increased by $816 million to $13.0 billion in 2015 compared to 2014. The increase was primarily due to:

- higher personnel expenses and charges for severance and related benefits pursuant to our ongoing benefit programs and certain site closures, as a result of the realignment of our workforce;
- higher operating and marketing expenses associated with loan growth, as well as acquisition and operating expenses related to the HFS acquisition; and
- continued technology and infrastructure investments.

These increases in 2015 compared to 2014 were partially offset by a decline in the amortization of intangibles.

Income (Loss) from Discontinued Operations, Net of Tax

Income (loss) from discontinued operations consists of results from the discontinued mortgage origination operations of our wholesale mortgage banking unit, GreenPoint Mortgage Funding, Inc. (“GreenPoint”) and the discontinued manufactured housing operations of GreenPoint Credit, LLC, a subsidiary of GreenPoint, both of which were acquired as part of the North Fork Bancorporation, Inc. (“North Fork”) acquisition in December 2006. Loss from discontinued operations, net of tax, was $19 million in 2016, compared to income of $38 million in 2015 and income of $5 million in 2014. We recorded a provision net of tax for mortgage representation and warranty reserve of $13 million ($21 million before tax) in 2016, compared to benefit net of tax of $41 million ($64 million before tax) in 2015 and a benefit net of tax of $4 million ($7 million before tax) in 2014.

We provide additional information on the discontinued operations in “Note 2—Discontinued Operations” and on the net benefit (provision) for mortgage representation and warranty losses and the related reserve for representation and warranty claims in “MD&A—Consolidated Balance Sheets Analysis—Mortgage Representation and Warranty Reserve” and “Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others.”

Income Taxes

We recorded income tax provisions of $1.7 billion (31.3% effective income tax rate), $1.9 billion (31.8% effective income tax rate) and $2.1 billion (32.7% effective income tax rate) in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively. Our effective tax rate on income from continuing operations varies between periods due, in part, to fluctuations in our pre-tax earnings, which affects the relative tax benefit of tax-exempt income, tax credits and other permanent tax items.

The decrease in our effective income tax rate in 2016, compared to 2015, was primarily due to lower income before taxes and increased tax credits. This decrease was partially offset by reduced discrete tax benefits and a reduced benefit of lower taxed foreign earnings.

The decrease in our effective income tax rate in 2015, compared to 2014, was primarily due to lower income before taxes, higher discrete tax benefits and increased net tax credits. This decrease was partially offset by a reduced benefit of lower taxed foreign earnings.

We recorded net discrete tax benefits of $2 million and $15 million in 2016 and 2015, respectively, and net discrete tax expenses of $33 million in 2014. Our effective income tax rate, excluding the impact of discrete tax items discussed above, was 31.3%, 32.0% and 32.2% in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

We provide additional information on items affecting our income taxes and effective tax rate under “Note 16—Income Taxes.”

Table of Contents

CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS ANALYSIS

Total assets increased by $23.0 billion to $357.0 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, primarily due to:

- an increase of $15.7 billion in loans held for investment primarily driven by growth in our credit card, auto and commercial loan portfolios, partially offset by the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio.

Total liabilities increased by $22.8 billion to $309.5 billion as of December 31, 2016, primarily driven by:

- an increase in deposits primarily driven by the issuance of brokered deposits and growth in our Consumer Banking business.

Stockholders' equity increased by $230 million to $47.5 billion as of December 31, 2016, primarily due to:

- our net income of $3.8 billion in 2016; and
- $1.1 billion of proceeds from the issuance of preferred stock.

These increases were partially offset by:

- $3.7 billion of share repurchases under our 2015 and 2016 Stock Repurchase Programs; and
- $1.0 billion of dividend payments to our common and preferred stockholders.

The following is a discussion of material changes in the major components of our assets and liabilities during 2016. Period-end balance sheet amounts may vary from average balance sheet amounts due to liquidity and balance sheet management activities that are intended to ensure the adequacy of capital while managing the liquidity requirements of the Company and our customers and our market risk exposure in accordance with our risk appetite.

Investment Securities

Our investment portfolio consists primarily of the following: U.S. Treasury securities; U.S. government-sponsored enterprise or agency ("Agency") and non-agency residential mortgage-backed securities ("RMBS"); Agency and non-agency commercial mortgage-backed securities ("CMBS"); other asset-backed securities ("ABS"); and other securities. The carrying value of our investments in U.S. Treasury and Agency securities represented 91% and 90% of our total investment securities as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

The fair value of our available for sale securities portfolio was $40.7 billion as of December 31, 2016, an increase of $1.7 billion from $39.1 billion as of December 31, 2015. The fair value of our held to maturity securities portfolio was $26.2 billion as of December 31, 2016, an increase of $879 million from $25.3 billion as of December 31, 2015. The increase in the fair value of both of these portfolios was primarily driven by purchase volume activities, partially offset by decreases in fair value due to higher interest rates.

Gross unrealized gains on our available for sale securities portfolio decreased to $539 million as of December 31, 2016 compared to $578 million as of December 31, 2015 and gross unrealized losses on this portfolio increased to $535 million as of December 31, 2016 compared to $321 million as of December 31, 2015, both of which were primarily driven by an increase in interest rates. Of the $535 million gross unrealized losses as of December 31, 2016, $116 million was related to securities that had been in a loss position for 12 months or longer. We provide information on OTTI recognized in earnings on our investment securities above in "MD&A—Consolidated Results of Operations—Non-Interest Income."

Table of Contents

Table 5 presents the amortized cost, carrying value and fair value for the major categories of our investment securities portfolio as of December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Table 5: Investment Securities

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016 Amortized Cost	2016 Fair Value	2015 Amortized Cost	2015 Fair Value	2014 Amortized Cost	2014 Fair Value
Investment securities available for sale:						
U.S. Treasury securities	$5,103	$5,065	$4,664	$4,660	$4,114	$4,118
Corporate debt securities guaranteed by U.S. government agencies	—	—	—	—	819	800
RMBS:						
Agency[(1)]	26,830	26,527	24,332	24,285	21,804	21,995
Non-agency	2,349	2,722	2,680	3,026	2,938	3,386
Total RMBS	29,179	29,249	27,012	27,311	24,742	25,381
CMBS:						
Agency[(1)]	3,335	3,304	3,690	3,664	3,751	3,723
Non-agency	1,676	1,684	1,723	1,715	1,780	1,796
Total CMBS	5,011	4,988	5,413	5,379	5,531	5,519
Other ABS[(2)]	714	714	1,345	1,340	2,618	2,662
Other securities[(3)]	726	721	370	371	1,035	1,028
Total investment securities available for sale	$40,733	$40,737	$38,804	$39,061	$38,859	$39,508

(Dollars in millions)	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Carrying Value	Fair Value	Carrying Value	Fair Value
Investment securities held to maturity:						
U.S. Treasury securities	$199	$199	$199	$198	—	—
Agency RMBS	22,125	22,573	21,513	22,133	$20,163	$21,210
Agency CMBS	3,388	3,424	2,907	2,986	2,337	2,424
Total investment securities held to maturity	$25,712	$26,196	$24,619	$25,317	$22,500	$23,634

(1) Includes securities guaranteed by Government National Mortgage Association ("Ginnie Mae") and securities issued by Federal National Mortgage Association ("Fannie Mae") and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation ("Freddie Mac").

(2) ABS collateralized by credit card loans constituted approximately 57% and 71% of the other ABS portfolio as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively, and ABS collateralized by auto dealer floor plan inventory loans and leases constituted approximately 23% and 11% of the other ABS portfolio as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

(3) Includes supranational bonds, foreign government bonds and equity investments.

Credit Ratings

Our portfolio of investment securities continues to be concentrated in securities that generally have high credit ratings and low credit risk, such as securities issued and guaranteed by the U.S. Treasury and Agencies. As of both in December 31, 2016 and 2015, approximately 95% of our total investment securities portfolio was rated AA+ or its equivalent, or better, while approximately 4% and 5% was below investment grade, respectively. We categorize the credit ratings of our investment securities based on the lowest credit rating as issued by the following rating agencies: Standard & Poor's Ratings Services ("S&P"), Moody's Investors Service ("Moody's") and Fitch Ratings ("Fitch"). Table 6 provides information on the credit ratings of our non-agency RMBS, non-agency CMBS, other ABS and other securities in our portfolio as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table of Contents

Table 6: Non-Agency Investment Securities Credit Ratings

	December 31, 2016				December 31, 2015			
(Dollars in millions)	Fair Value	AAA	Other Investment Grade	Below Investment Grade[(1)]	Fair Value	AAA	Other Investment Grade	Below Investment Grade[(1)]
Non-agency RMBS	$2,722	—	3%	97%	$3,026	—	3%	97%
Non-agency CMBS	1,684	100%	—	—	1,715	100%	—	—
Other ABS	714	99	1	—	1,340	99	1	—
Other securities	721	62	25	13	371	8	64	28

____
(1) Includes investment securities that were not rated.

For additional information on our investment securities, see "Note 3—Investment Securities."

Loans Held for Investment

Total loans held for investment ("HFI") consists of both unsecuritized loans and loans held in our consolidated trusts. Table 7 summarizes the carrying value of our portfolio of loans held for investment by portfolio segment, net of the allowance for loan and lease losses, as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 7: Loans Held for Investment

	December 31, 2016			December 31, 2015		
(Dollars in millions)	Loans	Allowance	Net Loans	Loans	Allowance	Net Loans
Credit Card	$105,552	$ 4,606	$100,946	$96,125	$ 3,654	$92,471
Consumer Banking	73,054	1,102	71,952	70,372	868	69,504
Commercial Banking	66,916	793	66,123	63,266	604	62,662
Other	64	2	62	88	4	84
Total	$245,586	$ 6,503	$239,083	$229,851	$ 5,130	$224,721

Loans held for investment increased by $15.7 billion to $245.6 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, primarily driven by growth in our credit card, auto and commercial loan portfolios, partially offset by the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio.

We provide additional information on the composition of our loan portfolio and credit quality below in "MD&A—Credit Risk Profile," "MD&A—Consolidated Results of Operations" and "Note 4—Loans."

Deposits

Our deposits represent our largest source of funding for our operations and provide a consistent source of low-cost funds. Total deposits increased by $19.0 billion to $236.8 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015. The increase in deposits was primarily driven by the issuance of brokered deposits and growth in our Consumer Banking business. We provide information on the composition of our deposits, average outstanding balances, interest expense and yield in "MD&A—Liquidity Risk Profile."

Securitized Debt Obligations

Securitized debt obligations increased to $18.8 billion as of December 31, 2016, from $16.2 billion as of December 31, 2015, as debt issuances exceeded maturities during 2016. We provide additional information on our borrowings in "MD&A—Liquidity Risk Profile" and in "Note 9—Deposits and Borrowings."

Other Debt

Other debt, which consists primarily of federal funds purchased and securities loaned or sold under agreements to repurchase, senior and subordinated notes, and Federal Home Loan Banks ("FHLB") advances, totaled $41.6 billion as of December 31, 2016, of which $40.6 billion represented long-term debt and the remainder represented short-term borrowings. Other debt totaled $42.9 billion as of December 31, 2015, of which $42.0 billion represented long-term debt and the remainder represented short-term borrowings.

Table of Contents

The decrease in other debt of $1.3 billion in 2016 was primarily attributable to a decrease in our FHLB advances outstanding, partially offset by an increase in our senior and subordinated notes. We provide additional information on our borrowings in “MD&A—Liquidity Risk Profile” and in “Note 9—Deposits and Borrowings.”

Mortgage Representation and Warranty Reserve

We acquired three subsidiaries that originated residential mortgage loans and sold these loans to various purchasers, including purchasers who created securitization trusts. These subsidiaries are Capital One Home Loans, LLC, which was acquired in February 2005; GreenPoint, which was acquired in December 2006 as part of the North Fork acquisition; and CCB, which was acquired in February 2009 and subsequently merged into CONA.

We have established representation and warranty reserves for losses associated with the mortgage loans sold by each subsidiary that we consider to be both probable and reasonably estimable, including both litigation and non-litigation liabilities. These reserves are reported on our consolidated balance sheets as a component of other liabilities. The reserve setting process relies heavily on estimates, which are inherently uncertain, and requires judgment. We evaluate these estimates on a quarterly basis. We build our representation and warranty reserves through the provision for mortgage representation and warranty losses, which we report in our consolidated statements of income as a component of non-interest income for loans originated and sold by CCB and Capital One Home Loans, LLC and as a component of discontinued operations for loans originated and sold by GreenPoint. The aggregate reserve for all three entities totaled $630 million as of December 31, 2016, compared to $610 million as of December 31, 2015.

As part of our business planning processes, we have considered various outcomes relating to the future representation and warranty liabilities of our subsidiaries that are possible but do not rise to the level of being both probable and reasonably estimable outcomes justifying an incremental reserve under applicable accounting standards. Our current best estimate of reasonably possible future losses from representation and warranty claims beyond what was in our reserve as of December 31, 2016, is approximately $1.5 billion, a decline from our estimate of $1.6 billion as of December 31, 2015. The decrease in this estimate was primarily driven by favorable rulings in representation and warranty-related litigation.

We provide additional information related to the representation and warranty reserve, including factors that may impact the adequacy of the reserve and the ultimate amount of losses incurred by our subsidiaries, in “Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others.”

Deferred Tax Assets and Liabilities

Deferred tax assets and liabilities represent decreases or increases in taxes expected to be paid in the future because of future reversals of temporary differences between the financial reporting and tax bases of assets and liabilities, as well as from net operating loss and tax credit carryforwards. Deferred tax assets are recognized subject to management’s judgment that realization is more likely than not. We evaluate the recoverability of these future tax deductions by assessing the adequacy of expected taxable income from all sources, including taxable income in carryback years, reversal of taxable temporary differences, forecasted operating earnings and available tax planning strategies. These sources of income rely heavily on estimates. We use our historical experience and our short and long-range business forecasts to provide insight.

As of December 31, 2016, we have recorded deferred tax assets, net of deferred tax liabilities and valuation allowances, of approximately $4.3 billion, which is an increase of $648 million from December 31, 2015. We have recorded a valuation allowance of $179 million and $166 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. We expect to fully realize the 2016 net deferred tax asset amounts in future periods. If changes in circumstances lead us to change our judgment about our ability to realize deferred tax assets in future years, we will adjust our valuation allowances in the period that our change in judgment occurs and record a corresponding increase or charge to income. We provide additional information on income taxes in “MD&A—Consolidated Results of Operations” and in “Note 16—Income Taxes.”

Table of Contents

OFF-BALANCE SHEET ARRANGEMENTS

In the ordinary course of business, we engage in certain activities that are not reflected on our consolidated balance sheets, generally referred to as off-balance sheet arrangements. These activities typically involve transactions with unconsolidated variable interest entities ("VIEs") as well as other arrangements, such as letter of credits, loan commitments and guarantees, to meet the financing needs of our customers and support their ongoing operations. We provide additional information regarding these types of activities in the "MD&A—Liquidity Risk Profile" as well as "Note 6—Variable Interest Entities and Securitizations" and "Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others.

BUSINESS SEGMENT FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

Our principal operations are currently organized into three major business segments, which are defined based on the products and services provided or the type of customer served: Credit Card, Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking. The operations of acquired businesses have been integrated into our existing business segments. Certain activities that are not part of a segment, such as management of our corporate investment portfolio and asset/liability management by our centralized Corporate Treasury group, are included in the Other category.

The results of our individual businesses, which we report on a continuing operations basis, reflect the manner in which management evaluates performance and makes decisions about funding our operations and allocating resources.We may periodically change our business segments or reclassify business segment results based on modifications to our management reporting methodologies and changes in organizational alignment. Our business segment results are intended to reflect each segment as if it were a stand-alone business. We use an internal management and reporting process to derive our business segment results. Our internal management and reporting process employs various allocation methodologies, including funds transfer pricing, to assign certain balance sheet assets, deposits and other liabilities and their related revenue and expenses directly or indirectly attributable to each business segment. Total interest income and net fees are directly attributable to the segment in which they are reported. The net interest income of each segment reflects the results of our funds transfer pricing process, which is primarily based on a matched maturity method that takes into consideration of market interest rates. Our funds transfer pricing process provides a funds credit for sources of funds, such as deposits generated by our Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking businesses, and a funds charge for the use of funds by each segment. The allocation process is unique to each business segment and acquired businesses. We regularly assess the assumptions, methodologies and reporting classifications used for segment reporting, which may result in the implementation of refinements or changes in future periods.

We refer to the business segment results derived from our internal management accounting and reporting process as our "managed" presentation, which differs in some cases from our reported results prepared based on U.S. GAAP. There is no comprehensive authoritative body of guidance for management accounting equivalent to U.S. GAAP; therefore, the managed presentation of our business segment results may not be comparable to similar information provided by other financial services companies. In addition, our individual business segment results should not be used as a substitute for comparable results determined in accordance with U.S. GAAP.

Below we summarize our business segment results for 2016, 2015 and 2014 and provide a comparative discussion of these results, as well as changes in our financial condition and credit performance metrics as of December 31, 2016 compared to December 31, 2015. We also provide information on the outlook for each of our business segments. We provide a reconciliation of our total business segment results to our reported consolidated results in "Note 18—Business Segments."

Business Segment Financial Performance

Table 8 summarizes our business segment results, which we report based on revenue and income from continuing operations, net of tax, for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014. We provide information on the allocation methodologies used to derive our business segment results in "Note 18—Business Segments."

Table of Contents

Table 8: Business Segment Results

	Year Ended December 31,											
	2016				2015				2014			
	Total Net Revenue[1]		Net Income[2]		Total Net Revenue[1]		Net Income[2]		Total Net Revenue[1]		Net Income[2]	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total
Credit Card	$16,015	62%	$2,160	58%	$14,582	62%	$2,354	59%	$13,621	61 %	$2,479	56 %
Consumer Banking	6,562	26	870	23	6,465	28	1,034	26	6,432	29	1,195	27
Commercial Banking[3]	2,794	11	575	15	2,352	10	570	14	2,201	10	659	15
Other[4]	130	1	165	4	14	—	54	1	36	—	90	2
Total	$25,501	100%	$3,770	100%	$23,413	100%	$4,012	100%	$22,290	100%	$4,423	100%

____

(1) Total net revenue (loss) consists of net interest income and non-interest income.

(2) Net income (loss) for our business segments and the Other category is based on income (loss) from continuing operations, net of tax.

(3) Some of our tax-related commercial investments generate tax-exempt income or tax credits. Accordingly, we make certain reclassifications within our Commercial Banking business results to present revenues and yields on a taxable-equivalent basis, calculated assuming an effective tax rate approximately equal to our federal statutory tax rate of 35% with offsetting reclassifications to the Other category.

(4) The Other category includes the residual impact of the allocation of our centralized Corporate Treasury group activities, unallocated corporate expenses that do not directly support the operations of the business segments and other items as described in "Note 18—Business Segments."

Credit Card Business

The primary sources of revenue for our Credit Card business are interest income, net interchange income and fees collected from customers. Expenses primarily consist of the provision for credit losses, operating costs and marketing expenses.

Our Credit Card business generated net income from continuing operations of $2.2 billion, $2.4 billion and $2.5 billion in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Table 9 summarizes the financial results of our Credit Card business and displays selected key metrics for the periods indicated.

Table 9: Credit Card Business Results

	Year Ended December 31,			Change	
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Selected income statement data:					
Net interest income	$12,635	$11,161	$10,310	13%	8%
Non-interest income	3,380	3,421	3,311	(1)	3
Total net revenue[1]	16,015	14,582	13,621	10	7
Provision for credit losses	4,926	3,417	2,750	44	24
Non-interest expense	7,703	7,502	7,063	3	6
Income from continuing operations before income taxes	3,386	3,663	3,808	(8)	(4)
Income tax provision	1,226	1,309	1,329	(6)	(2)
Income from continuing operations, net of tax	$2,160	$2,354	$2,479	(8)	(5)
Selected performance metrics:					
Average loans held for investment[2]	$96,560	$86,735	$78,946	11	10
Average yield on loans held for investment[3]	14.68%	14.28%	14.48%	40 bps	(20)bps

Total net revenue margin[4]	16.59	16.81	17.25	(22)	(44)
Net charge-offs	$3,953	$2,918	$2,728	35%	7%
Net charge-off rate	4.09%	3.36%	3.46%	73 bps	(10)bps
Purchased credit card relationship (“PCCR”) intangible amortization	$257	$316	$369	(19)%	(14)%
Purchase volume[5]	307,138	271,167	224,750	13	21

Table of Contents

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015	Change
Selected period-end data:			
Loans held for investment[2]	$ 105,552	$ 96,125	10%
30+ day performing delinquency rate	3.91%	3.36%	55 bps
30+ day delinquency rate	3.94	3.40	54
Nonperforming loan rate	0.04	0.06	(2)
Allowance for loan and lease losses	$ 4,606	$ 3,654	26%
Allowance coverage ratio[6]	4.36%	3.80%	56 bps

---

(1) We recognize billed finance charges and fee income on open-ended loans in accordance with the contractual provisions of the credit arrangements and estimate the uncollectible amount on a quarterly basis. The estimated uncollectible amount of billed finance charges and fees is reflected as a reduction in revenue and is not included in our net charge-offs. Total net revenue was reduced by $1.1 billion, $732 million and $645 million in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively, for the estimated uncollectible amount of billed finance charges and fees and related losses. The finance charge and fee reserve totaled $402 million and $262 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

(2) Period-end loans held for investment and average loans held for investment include billed finance charges and fees, net of the estimated uncollectible amount.

(3) Average yield on loans held for investment is calculated by dividing interest income for the period by average loans held for investment during the period. Interest income excludes various allocations including funds transfer pricing that assigns certain balance sheet assets, deposits and other liabilities and their related revenue and expenses attributable to each business segment.

(4) Total net revenue margin is calculated by dividing total net revenue for the period by average loans held for investment during the period. Interest income also includes interest income on loans held for sale.

(5) Purchase volume consists of purchase transactions, net of returns, for the period for loans both classified as held for investment and held for sale. Excludes cash advance and balance transfer transactions.

(6) Allowance coverage ratio is calculated by dividing the period-end allowance for loan and lease losses by period-end loans held for investment.

Key factors affecting the results of our Credit Card business for 2016 compared to 2015, and changes in financial condition and credit performance between December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015 include the following:

- Net Interest Income: Net interest income increased by $1.5 billion to $12.6 billion in 2016 primarily driven by loan growth in our Domestic Card business.
- Non-Interest Income: Non-interest income was flat at $3.4 billion in 2016 as an increase in interchange fees driven by higher purchase volume was largely offset by:
  - higher rewards expense from the continued expansion of our rewards franchise; and
  - lower service charges and other customer-related fees primarily due to the exit of our legacy payment protection products in our Domestic Card business during the first quarter of 2016.
- Provision for Credit Losses: The provision for credit losses increased by $1.5 billion to $4.9 billion in 2016 primarily driven by higher charge-offs and a larger allowance build due to continued loan growth and portfolio seasoning.
- Non-Interest Expense: Non-interest expense increased by $201 million to $7.7 billion in 2016 primarily attributable to higher operating expenses associated with loan growth as well as continued investments in technology, partially offset by operating efficiencies.
- Loans Held for Investment: Period-end loans held for investment increased by $9.4 billion to $105.6 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, and average loans held for investment increased by $9.8 billion to $96.6 billion in 2016 compared to 2015, both primarily due to continued loan growth in our Domestic Card business.
-

Net Charge-Off and Delinquency Metrics: The net charge-off rate increased by 73 basis points to 4.09% in 2016 compared to 2015, and the 30+ day delinquency rate increased by 54 basis points to 3.94% as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015. These increases were primarily driven by growth and seasoning of credit card loan originations, partially offset by continued growth in our domestic credit card loan portfolio.

Key factors affecting the results of our Credit Card business for 2015 compared to 2014, and changes in financial condition and credit performance between December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 include the following:

Table of Contents

- Net Interest Income: Net interest income increased by $851 million to $11.2 billion in 2015 primarily driven by loan growth in our Domestic Card business.
- Non-Interest Income: Non-interest income increased by $110 million to $3.4 billion in 2015. The increase was primarily attributable to an increase in interchange fees driven by higher purchase volume, partially offset by:
increased rewards expense due to a greater proportion of customers with rewards coupled with increased spend on products with higher rewards; and
lower service charges and other customer-related fees primarily due to the continued run-off of our payment protection products in our Domestic Card business.
- Provision for Credit Losses: The provision for credit losses increased by $667 million to $3.4 billion in 2015 primarily driven by:
a larger allowance build in our domestic credit card loan portfolio in 2015 due to continued loan growth coupled with our expectations for rising charge-off rates; and
higher charge-offs as new loan balances season.
- Non-Interest Expense: Non-interest expense increased by $439 million to $7.5 billion in 2015. The increase was due to higher operating and marketing expenses associated with loan growth, partially offset by operating efficiencies and lower intangibles amortization expense.
- Loans Held for Investment: Period-end loans held for investment increased by $10.2 billion to $96.1 billion as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014, and average loans held for investment increased by $7.8 billion to $86.7 billion in 2015 compared to 2014. The increases were primarily due to loan growth in our domestic credit card loan portfolio, partially offset by the impact of foreign exchange rates in our international card loan portfolio driven by the strengthening of the U.S. dollar in 2015.
- Net Charge-Off and Delinquency Statistics: The net charge-off rate decreased by 10 basis points to 3.36% in 2015 compared to 2014 driven by our international card loan portfolio, which benefited from growth in our international portfolio in Canada. The 30+ day delinquency rate increased by 10 basis points to 3.40% as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014 due to the seasoning of our domestic credit card portfolio growth which has begun to put upward pressure on delinquencies.

Domestic Card Business Expectations

In our Domestic Card business, we expect the full-year 2017 charge-off rate will be in the mid-four percent range, with quarterly variability. The impact of the upward pressure on delinquencies and charge-offs as new loans season and become a larger portion of our overall portfolio is expected to moderate in 2017 and only have a modest effect beyond that.

Domestic Card Business

Domestic Card generated net income from continuing operations of $2.1 billion in 2016 and $2.2 billion in both 2015 and 2014. Over 2016, 2015 and 2014, Domestic Card accounted for greater than 90% of both total net revenues and net income of our Credit Card business.

Table of Contents

Table 9.1 summarizes the financial results for Domestic Card and displays selected key metrics for the periods indicated.

Table 9.1: Domestic Card Business Results

(Dollars in millions)	Year Ended December 31, 2016	2015	2014	Change 2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Selected income statement data:					
Net interest income	$11,571	$ 10,147	$9,241	14%	10%
Non-interest income	3,116	3,183	3,001	(2)	6
Total net revenue[1]	14,687	13,330	12,242	10	9
Provision for credit losses	4,555	3,204	2,493	42	29
Non-interest expense	6,895	6,627	6,264	4	6
Income from continuing operations before income taxes	3,237	3,499	3,485	(7)	—
Income tax provision	1,178	1,267	1,246	(7)	2
Income from continuing operations, net of tax	$2,059	$ 2,232	$2,239	(8)	—
Selected performance metrics:					
Average loans held for investment[2]	$88,394	$ 78,743	$71,262	12	10
Average yield on loans held for investment[3]	14.62%	14.21%	14.26%	41 bps	(5)bps
Total net revenue margin[4]	16.62	16.93	17.18	(31)	(25)
Net charge-offs	$3,681	$ 2,718	$2,445	35%	11%
Net charge-off rate	4.16%	3.45%	3.43%	71 bps	2 bps
PCCR intangible amortization	$257	$ 316	$369	(19)%	(14)%
Purchase volume[5]	280,637	246,740	208,716	14	18

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015	Change
Selected period-end data:			
Loans held for investment[2]	$97,120	$ 87,939	10%
30+ day delinquency rate	3.95%	3.39%	56 bps
Allowance for loan and lease losses	$4,229	$ 3,355	26%
Allowance coverage ratio[6]	4.35%	3.82%	53 bps

---

(1) We recognize billed finance charges and fee income on open-ended loans in accordance with the contractual provisions of the credit arrangements and estimate the uncollectible amount on a quarterly basis. The estimated uncollectible amount of billed finance charges and fees is reflected as a reduction in revenue and is not included in our net charge-offs.

(2) Period-end loans held for investment and average loans held for investment include billed finance charges and fees, net of the estimated uncollectible amount.

(3) Average yield on loans held for investment is calculated by dividing interest income for the period by average loans held for investment during the period. Interest income excludes various allocations including funds transfer pricing that assigns certain balance sheet assets, deposits and other liabilities and their related revenue and expenses attributable to each business segment.

(4) Total net revenue margin is calculated by dividing total net revenue for the period by average loans held for investment during the period.

(5) Purchase volume consists of purchase transactions, net of returns, for the period for loans both classified as held for investment and held for sale. Excludes cash advance and balance transfer transactions.

(6) Allowance coverage ratio is calculated by dividing the period-end allowance for loan and lease losses by period-end loans held for investment.

Because our Domestic Card business accounts for the substantial majority of our Credit Card business, the key factors driving the results are similar to the key factors affecting our total Credit Card business. Net income for our Domestic Card business decreased in 2016 compared to 2015 primarily driven by higher provision for credit losses and higher operating expenses associated with continued loan growth, partially offset by higher net interest income resulting from loan growth.

Net income for our Domestic Card business remained flat in 2015 compared to 2014 as continued loan growth drove increases in revenue, provision for credit losses, operating and marketing expenses.

Table of Contents

Consumer Banking Business Segment Expectations

In our Consumer Banking business, we expect that decreasing margins and modestly rising charge-offs in the auto finance business, as well as continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio, will negatively affect Consumer Banking revenues, efficiency ratio and net income, even as we continue to manage costs.

Consumer Banking Business

The primary sources of revenue for our Consumer Banking business are net interest income from loans and deposits and non-interest income from service charges and customer-related fees. Expenses primarily consist of the provision for credit losses, operating costs and marketing expenses.

Our Consumer Banking business generated net income from continuing operations of $870 million, $1.0 billion and $1.2 billion in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Table 10 summarizes the financial results of our Consumer Banking business and displays selected key metrics for the periods indicated.

Table 10: Consumer Banking Business Results

	Year Ended December 31,			Change	
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Selected income statement data:					
Net interest income	$5,829	$5,755	$5,748	1%	—
Non-interest income	733	710	684	3	4%
Total net revenue	6,562	6,465	6,432	2	1
Provision for credit losses	1,055	819	703	29	17
Non-interest expense	4,139	4,026	3,869	3	4
Income from continuing operations before income taxes	1,368	1,620	1,860	(16)	(13)
Income tax provision	498	586	665	(15)	(12)
Income from continuing operations, net of tax	$870	$1,034	$1,195	(16)	(13)
Selected performance metrics:					
Average loans held for investment:[1]					
Auto	$44,521	$39,967	$34,769	11	15
Home loan	23,358	27,601	32,589	(15)	(15)
Retail banking	3,543	3,582	3,606	(1)	(1)
Total consumer banking	$71,422	$71,150	$70,964	—	—
Average yield on loans held for investment[2]	6.34%	6.26%	6.26%	8 bps	—
Average deposits	$177,129	$170,757	$168,623	4%	1%
Average deposit interest rate	0.56%	0.56%	0.57%	—	(1)bps
Net charge-offs	$820	$731	$675	12	8%
Net charge-off rate	1.15%	1.03%	0.95%	12 bps	8 bps
Net charge-off rate (excluding PCI loans)[3]	1.49	1.45	1.49	4	(4)
Auto loan originations	$25,719	$21,185	$20,903	21%	1 %

Table of Contents

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015	Change
Selected period-end data:			
Loans held for investment:[1]			
Auto	$ 47,916	$ 41,549	15%
Home loan	21,584	25,227	(14)
Retail banking	3,554	3,596	(1)
Total consumer banking	$ 73,054	$ 70,372	4
30+ day performing delinquency rate	4.10%	4.05%	5bps
30+ day performing delinquency rate (excluding PCI loans)[3]	5.12	5.50	(38)
30+ day delinquency rate	4.67	4.67	—
30+ day delinquency rate (excluding PCI loans)[3]	5.82	6.34	(52)
Nonperforming loan rate	0.72	0.79	(7)
Nonperforming loan rate (excluding PCI loans)[3]	0.90	1.08	(18)
Nonperforming asset rate[4]	1.09	1.10	(1)
Nonperforming asset rate (excluding PCI loans)[3][4]	1.36	1.50	(14)
Allowance for loan and lease losses	$ 1,102	$ 868	27%
Allowance coverage ratio[5][6]	1.51%	1.23%	28bps
Deposits	$ 181,917	$ 172,702	5%
Loans serviced for others	8,258	7,530	10

(1) Average consumer banking loans held for investment includes purchased credit-impaired loans (“PCI loans”) of $16.4 billion, $20.7 billion and $25.6 billion in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively. Period-end consumer banking loans held for investment includes PCI loans with carrying values of $14.5 billion and $18.6 billion as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. See “MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms” for the definition of “PCI loans.”

(2) Average yield on loans held for investment is calculated by dividing interest income for the period by average loans held for investment during the period. Interest income excludes various allocations including funds transfer pricing that assigns certain balance sheet assets, deposits and other liabilities and their related revenue and expenses attributable to each business segment.

(3) See “MD&A—Credit Risk Profile” and “Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies” for additional information on the impact of PCI loans on our credit quality metrics.

(4) Nonperforming assets consist of nonperforming loans, real estate owned (“REO”) and other foreclosed assets. The total nonperforming asset rate is calculated based on total nonperforming assets divided by the combined period-end total loans held for investment, REO and other foreclosed assets. Prior to Q4 2016, the nonperforming asset rate for our Consumer Banking business excluded the impact of REOs related to our acquired home loan portfolio which, if included, would increase the nonperforming asset rate by approximately 10 basis points in each of the prior periods presented.

(5) Allowance coverage ratio is calculated by dividing the period-end allowance for loan and lease losses by period-end loans held for investment.

(6) Excluding the impact of the PCI home loan amounts in footnote 1 above, the allowance coverage ratios for our home loan portfolio and total consumer banking were 0.51% and 1.83%, respectively, as of December 31, 2016, compared to 0.50% and 1.60%, respectively, as of December 31, 2015.

Key factors affecting the results of our Consumer Banking business for 2016 compared to 2015, and changes in financial condition and credit performance between December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015 include the following:

- Net Interest Income: Net interest income was flat at $5.8 billion in 2016 as growth in our auto loan portfolio was offset by the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio and margin compression in our auto loan

portfolio.
Consumer Banking loan yield increased by 8 basis points to 6.3% in 2016 compared to 2015. The increase was primarily driven by changes in the product mix in Consumer Banking as a result of the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio and growth in our auto loan portfolio, partially offset by declining yield in our auto loan portfolio.
Average yield on auto loans decreased by 33 basis points to 7.7% in 2016, primarily attributable to a higher proportion of prime auto loans in 2016 compared to 2015.
The average yield on our home loan portfolio increased by 9 basis points to 4.0% in 2016 primarily as a result of higher yield on our acquired home loan portfolio.

- Non-Interest Income: Non-interest income was substantially flat at $733 million in 2016.

Table of Contents

- Provision for Credit Losses: The provision for credit losses increased by $236 million to $1.1 billion in 2016 primarily driven by:
  - a higher allowance in our auto loan portfolio due to continued loan growth, increasing loss expectations on recent originations and a build reflecting a change in accounting estimate of the timing of charge-offs of bankrupt accounts; and
  - higher charge-offs in our auto loan portfolio due to seasoning of recent growth.
- Non-Interest Expense: Non-interest expense increased by $113 million to $4.1 billion in 2016 primarily due to:
  - higher operating expenses driven by growth in our auto loan portfolio; and
  - increased marketing expenses in our retail banking business.
- Loans Held for Investment: Period-end loans held for investment increased by $2.7 billion to $73.1 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, and average loans held for investment increased by $272 million to $71.4 billion in 2016 compared to 2015. The increases were primarily due to growth in our auto loan portfolio, partially offset by the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio.
- Deposits: Period-end deposits increased by $9.2 billion to $181.9 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015 as a result of strong growth in our deposit products that are sold directly to both existing and new customers.
- Net Charge-Off and Delinquency Metrics: The net charge-off rate increased by 12 basis points to 1.15% in 2016 compared to 2015. The increase reflects the greater portion of auto loans in our total consumer banking loan portfolio, which generally have higher charge-off rates than other products within this portfolio. The 30+ day delinquency rate was flat at 4.67% as of both December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015.

Key factors affecting the results of our Consumer Banking business for 2015 compared to 2014 and changes in financial condition and credit performance between December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 include the following:

- Net Interest Income: Net interest income remained flat at $5.8 billion in 2015 as the higher net interest income generated by the growth in our auto loan portfolio was partially offset by lower net interest income from our home loan portfolio attributable to the continued run-off of the acquired portfolio and margin compression in auto loans.
  Consumer Banking loan yield remained flat at 6.3% in 2015 as the decrease in average loan yield in our auto loan portfolio was offset by changes in the product mix in Consumer Banking as a result of growth in our auto loan portfolio and the continued run-off of the acquired home loan portfolio.
  - The increase in our auto loan portfolio in relation to our total consumer banking loan portfolio drove an increase in the total Consumer Banking yield, even as the average yield on auto loans decreased by 65 basis points to 8.0% in 2015. This decrease was primarily attributable to a shift to a higher proportion of prime auto loans and continued competition across the auto business.
  - The average yield on the home loan portfolio increased by 6 basis points to 3.9% in 2015, as a result of higher yield on our acquired home loan portfolio.
- Non-Interest Income: Non-interest income increased by $26 million to $710 million in 2015 primarily due to the gain recognized on loans originated and sold within our home loan portfolio.
- Provision for Credit Losses: The provision for credit losses increased by $116 million to $819 million in 2015 driven by an allowance build across our consumer banking loan portfolios, coupled with higher net charge-offs due to continued growth in our auto loan portfolio.
- Non-Interest Expense: Non-interest expense increased by $157 million to $4.0 billion in 2015 largely due to increased operating expenses due to continued technology and infrastructure investments in our retail banking business and growth in our auto loan portfolio.
- Loans Held for Investment: Period-end loans held for investment decreased by $1.1 billion to $70.4 billion as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014 primarily due to the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio, partially offset

Table of Contents

by growth in our auto loan portfolio. Average loans held for investment were substantially flat, increasing by $186 million, or 0.3%, to $71.2 billion in 2015 compared to 2014.

- Deposits: Period-end deposits increased by $4.6 billion to $172.7 billion as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014 as a result of strong growth in our deposit products, as well as modest growth in products sold through our local franchise.
- Net Charge-Off and Delinquency Statistics: The net charge-off rate increased by 8 basis points to 1.03% in 2015 compared to 2014. The 30+ day delinquency rate increased by 44 basis points to 4.67% as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014. The increases in the net charge-off and 30+ day delinquency rates reflected the continued run-off of our acquired home loan portfolio, which generally does not have charge-offs or delinquencies since these loans were recorded at fair value at acquisition, and a greater portion of auto loans in our portfolio, which have a higher charge-off and delinquency rate than other products within the total consumer banking loan portfolio.

Commercial Banking Business

The primary sources of revenue for our Commercial Banking business are net interest income from loans and deposits and non-interest income from customer fees and other transactions. Because we have some investments that generate tax-exempt income or tax credits, we make certain reclassifications to our Commercial Banking business results to present revenues on a taxable-equivalent basis. Expenses primarily consist of the provision for credit losses, operating costs and marketing expenses.

Our Commercial Banking business generated net income from continuing operations of $575 million, $570 million and $659 million in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively. Table 11 summarizes the financial results of our Commercial Banking business and displays selected key metrics for the periods indicated.

Table 11: Commercial Banking Business Results

	Year Ended December 31,			Change	
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Selected income statement data:					
Net interest income	$2,216	$1,865	$1,751	19%	7%
Non-interest income	578	487	450	19	8
Total net revenue[1]	2,794	2,352	2,201	19	7
Provision for credit losses[2]	483	302	93	60	225
Non-interest expense	1,407	1,156	1,083	22	7
Income from continuing operations before income taxes	904	894	1,025	1	(13)
Income tax provision	329	324	366	2	(11)
Income from continuing operations, net of tax	$575	$570	$659	1	(14)
Selected performance metrics:					
Average loans held for investment:[3]					
Commercial and multifamily real estate	$25,821	$23,728	$22,003	9	8
Commercial and industrial	38,852	28,349	25,028	37	13
Total commercial lending	64,673	52,077	47,031	24	11
Small-ticket commercial real estate	548	692	868	(21)	(20)
Total commercial banking	$65,221	$52,769	$47,899	24	10
Average yield on loans held for investment[1][4]	3.47%	3.21%	3.42%	26 bps	(21)bps
Average deposits	$33,841	$33,058	$31,752	2%	4%
Average deposit interest rate	0.28%	0.25%	0.24%	3 bps	1 bps
Net charge-offs	$292	$47	$10	**	**
Net charge-off rate	0.45%	0.09%	0.02%	36 bps	7 bps

Table of Contents

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015	Change
Selected period-end data:			
Loans held for investment:[3]			
Commercial and multifamily real estate	$ 26,609	$ 25,518	4%
Commercial and industrial	39,824	37,135	7
Total commercial lending	66,433	62,653	6
Small-ticket commercial real estate	483	613	(21)
Total commercial banking	$ 66,916	$ 63,266	6
Nonperforming loan rate	1.53%	0.87%	66 bps
Nonperforming asset rate[5]	1.54	0.87	67
Allowance for loan and lease losses[2]	$ 793	$ 604	31%
Allowance coverage ratio[6]	1.19%	0.95%	24 bps
Deposits	$ 33,866	$ 34,257	(1)
Loans serviced for others[7]	22,321	17,643	27%

____

(1) Some of our tax-related commercial investments generate tax-exempt income or tax credits. Accordingly, we make certain reclassifications within our Commercial Banking business results to present revenues and yields on a taxable-equivalent basis, calculated assuming an effective tax rate approximately equal to our federal statutory tax rate of 35% with offsetting reclassifications to the Other category.

(2) The provision for losses on unfunded lending commitments is included in the provision for credit losses in our consolidated statements of income and the related reserve for unfunded lending commitments is included in other liabilities on our consolidated balance sheets. Our reserve for unfunded lending commitments totaled $129 million, $161 million and $106 million as of December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

(3) Average commercial banking loans held for investment includes PCI loans of $770 million, $215 million and $217 million in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively. Period-end commercial banking loans held for investment includes PCI loans with carrying values of $613 million and $958 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. See “MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms” for the definition of “PCI loans.”

(4) Average yield on loans held for investment is calculated by dividing interest income for the period by average loans held for investment during the period. Interest income excludes various allocations including funds transfer pricing that assigns certain balance sheet assets, deposits and other liabilities and their related revenue and expenses attributable to each business segment.

(5) Nonperforming assets consist of nonperforming loans, real estate owned (“REO”) and other foreclosed assets. The total nonperforming asset rate is calculated based on total nonperforming assets divided by the combined period-end total loans held for investment, REO and other foreclosed assets.

(6) Allowance coverage ratio is calculated by dividing the period-end allowance for loan and lease losses by period-end loans held for investment.

(7) Loans serviced for others represents our portfolio of loans serviced for third parties related to our multifamily finance business.

** Change is not meaningful.

Key factors affecting the results of our Commercial Banking business for 2016 compared to 2015, and changes in financial condition and credit performance between December 31, 2016 and December 31, 2015 include the following:

- Net Interest Income: Net interest income increased by $351 million to $2.2 billion in 2016 primarily driven by loan growth, including loans acquired in the HFS acquisition.
- Non-Interest Income: Non-interest income increased by $91 million to $578 million in 2016 primarily driven by fee-based services, including impacts from the HFS acquisition, and products attributable to our multifamily finance business.

- Provision for Credit Losses: The provision for credit losses increased by $181 million to $483 million in 2016 primarily driven by higher charge-offs, partially offset by a smaller allowance build, due to continued adverse industry conditions impacting our taxi medallion and oil and gas lending portfolios.
- Non-Interest Expense: Non-interest expense increased by $251 million to $1.4 billion in 2016 driven by higher operating expenses due to costs associated with the HFS acquisition and continued growth in our Commercial Banking business.
- Loans Held for Investment: Period-end loans held for investment increased by $3.7 billion to $66.9 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015 driven by growth in our commercial loan portfolios. Average loans held for investment increased by $12.5 billion to $65.2 billion in 2016 compared to 2015 primarily driven by the HFS acquisition and growth in our commercial loan portfolios.
- Deposits: Period-end deposits decreased by $391 million to $33.9 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015.

Table of Contents

- Net Charge-Off and Nonperforming Metrics: The net charge-off rate increased by 36 basis points to 0.45% in 2016 compared to 2015, reflecting rising losses in our taxi medallion and oil and gas lending portfolios. Increased credit risk rating downgrades in these same lending portfolios resulted in the nonperforming loan rate increasing by 66 basis points to 1.53% as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015.

Key factors affecting the results of our Commercial Banking business for 2015 compared to 2014, and changes in financial condition and credit performance between December 31, 2015 and December 31, 2014 include the following:

- Net Interest Income: Net interest income increased by $114 million to $1.9 billion in 2015. The increase was due to growth in commercial and industrial and commercial and multifamily real estate average loans, partially offset by lower loan yields driven by market and competitive pressures.
- Non-Interest Income: Non-interest income increased by $37 million to $487 million in 2015 primarily driven by increased revenue from products and services provided to our commercial customers.
- Provision for Credit Losses: The provision for credit losses increased by $209 million to $302 million in 2015. The increase was primarily driven by a larger build in both the allowance and the reserve for unfunded lending commitments resulting from adverse market conditions impacting our oil and gas portfolio and taxi medallion lending portfolio.
- Non-Interest Expense: Non-interest expense increased by $73 million to $1.2 billion in 2015 driven by higher operating expenses due to costs associated with the HFS acquisition and continued growth in our Commercial Banking business.
- Loans Held for Investment: Period-end loans held for investment increased by $12.4 billion to $63.3 billion as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014 driven by the HFS acquisition as well as growth in our commercial and multifamily real estate loan portfolios. Average loans held for investment increased by $4.9 billion to $52.8 billion in 2015 compared to 2014 primarily driven by growth in our commercial and multifamily real estate loan portfolios.
- Deposits: Period-end deposits increased by $2.3 billion to $34.3 billion as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014 driven by our strategy to strengthen existing relationships with and increase liquidity from our commercial customers.
- Net Charge-Off and Nonperforming Statistics: The net charge-off rate increased by 7 basis points to 0.09% in 2015 compared to 2014. The nonperforming loans rate increased by 53 basis points to 0.87% as of December 31, 2015 from December 31, 2014. The increases in these rates reflect losses and credit risk rating downgrades in our oil and gas portfolio and taxi medallion lending portfolio.

Other Category

Other includes unallocated amounts related to our centralized Corporate Treasury group activities, such as management of our corporate investment portfolio, asset/liability management and certain capital management activities. Other also includes:

- foreign exchange-rate fluctuations on foreign currency-denominated balances;
- unallocated corporate expenses that do not directly support the operations of the business segments or for which the business segments are not considered financially accountable in evaluating their performance, such as certain acquisition and restructuring charges;
- a portion of the net benefit (provision) for representation and warranty losses related to continuing operations; and
- offsets related to certain line-item reclassifications.

Table of Contents

Table 12 summarizes the financial results of our Other category for the periods indicated.

Table 12: Other Category Results

	Year Ended December 31,			Change	
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2016 vs. 2015	2015 vs. 2014
Selected income statement data:					
Net interest income	$193	$53	$9	**	**
Non-interest income	(63)	(39)	27	62%	**
Total net revenue[1]	130	14	36	**	(61)%
Benefit for credit losses	(5)	(2)	(5)	150	(60)
Non-interest expense	309	312	165	(1)	89
Loss from continuing operations before income taxes	(174)	(296)	(124)	(41)	139
Income tax benefit	(339)	(350)	(214)	(3)	64
Income from continuing operations, net of tax	$165	$54	$90	**	(40)

(1) Some of our tax-related commercial investments generate tax-exempt income or tax credits. Accordingly, we make certain reclassifications within our Commercial Banking business results to present revenues and yields on a taxable-equivalent basis, calculated assuming an effective tax rate approximately equal to our federal statutory tax rate of 35% with offsetting reclassifications to the Other category.

** Change is not meaningful.

Net income from continuing operations recorded in the Other category was $165 million in 2016 compared to $54 million in 2015. The increase in 2016 was primarily driven by:

- higher net interest income due to balance sheet growth, as well as the impact of rates on our other treasury-related activities; and
- lower restructuring charges for severance and related benefits pursuant to our ongoing benefit programs as a result of the realignment of our workforce.

These drivers were partially offset by:

- higher bank optimization charges and an impairment charge associated with certain acquired intangible and software assets within non-interest expense;
- lower non-interest income due to rate-driven hedge ineffectiveness; and
- a reduced income tax benefit as a result of higher income before taxes and increased discrete tax expense, partially offset by increased tax credits.

Net income from continuing operations recorded in the Other category was $54 million in 2015 compared to $90 million in 2014. The reduction in net income in 2015 was primarily due to charges associated with:

- severance and related benefits pursuant to our ongoing benefit program as a result of the realignment of our workforce; and
- certain planned site closures.

These drivers were partially offset by higher discrete tax benefits and net tax credits.

Table of Contents

CRITICAL ACCOUNTING POLICIES AND ESTIMATES

The preparation of financial statements in accordance with U.S. GAAP requires management to make a number of judgments, estimates and assumptions that affect the amount of assets, liabilities, income and expenses on the consolidated financial statements. Understanding our accounting policies and the extent to which we use management judgment and estimates in applying these policies is integral to understanding our financial statements. We provide a summary of our significant accounting policies under "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies."

We have identified the following accounting policies as critical because they require significant judgments and assumptions about highly complex and inherently uncertain matters and the use of reasonably different estimates and assumptions could have a material impact on our results of operations or financial condition. These critical accounting policies govern:

- Loan loss reserves
- Asset impairment
- Fair value of financial instruments
- Representation and warranty reserves
- Customer rewards reserve

We evaluate our critical accounting estimates and judgments on an ongoing basis and update them, as necessary, based on changing conditions. Management has discussed our critical accounting policies and estimates with the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors.

Loan Loss Reserves

We maintain an allowance for loan and lease losses that represents management's estimate of incurred loan and lease losses inherent in our held-for-investment credit card, consumer banking and commercial banking loan portfolios as of each balance sheet date. We also separately reserve for binding unfunded lending commitments, letters of credit and financial guarantees.

We build our allowance for loan and lease losses and reserve for unfunded lending commitments through the provision for credit losses. Our provision for credit losses in each period is driven by charge-offs, changes to allowance for loan and lease losses, and changes to the reserve for unfunded lending commitments. We recorded a provision for credit losses of $6.5 billion, $4.5 billion and $3.5 billion in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

We have an established process, using analytical tools and management judgment, to determine our allowance for loan and lease losses. Losses are inherent in our loan portfolio and we calculate the allowance for loan and lease losses by estimating incurred losses for segments of our loan portfolio with similar risk characteristics and record a provision for credit losses. The allowance totaled $6.5 billion as of December 31, 2016, compared to $5.1 billion as of December 31, 2015.

We review and assess our allowance methodologies and adequacy of the allowance for loan and lease losses on a quarterly basis. Our assessment involves evaluating many factors including, but not limited to, historical loss and recovery experience, recent trends in delinquencies and charge-offs, risk ratings, the impact of bankruptcy filings, the value of collateral underlying secured loans, account seasoning, changes in our credit evaluation, underwriting and collection management policies, seasonality, general economic conditions, changes in the legal and regulatory environment and uncertainties in forecasting and modeling techniques used in estimating our allowance for loan and lease losses. Key factors that have a significant impact on our allowance for loan and lease losses include assumptions about unemployment rates, home prices, and the valuation of commercial properties and other collateral, consumer real estate, and automobiles.

In addition to the allowance for loan and lease losses, we review and assess our estimate of probable losses related to binding unfunded lending commitments, such as letters of credit and financial guarantees, and unfunded loan commitments on a quarterly basis. The factors impacting our assessment generally align with those considered in our evaluation of the allowance for loan and lease losses for the Commercial Banking business. Changes to the reserve for losses on unfunded lending commitments are recorded through the provision for credit losses in the consolidated statements of income and to other liabilities on the consolidated balance sheets.

Although we examine a variety of externally available data, as well as our internal loan performance data, to determine our allowance for loan and lease losses and reserve for unfunded lending commitments, our estimation process is subject to risks and

Table of Contents

uncertainties, including a reliance on historical loss and trend information that may not be representative of current conditions and indicative of future performance. Accordingly, our actual credit loss experience may not be in line with our expectations. We provide additional information on the methodologies and key assumptions used in determining our allowance for loan and lease losses for each of our loan portfolio segments in "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies." We provide information on the components of our allowance, disaggregated by impairment methodology, and changes in our allowance in "Note 5—Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments."

Finance Charge and Fee Reserves

Finance charges and fees on credit card loans, net of amounts that we consider uncollectible, are included in loan receivables and revenue when the finance charges and fees are earned. We continue to accrue finance charges and fees on credit card loans until the account is charged-off; however, when we do not expect full payment of billed finance charges and fees, we reduce the balance of our credit card loan receivables by the amount of finance charges and fees billed but not expected to be collected and exclude this amount from revenue. Total net revenue was reduced by $1.1 billion, $732 million and $645 million in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively, for the estimated uncollectible amount of billed finance charges and fees. The finance charge and fee reserve totaled $402 million as of December 31, 2016, compared to $262 million as of December 31, 2015.

We review and assess the adequacy of the uncollectible finance charge and fee reserve on a quarterly basis. Our methodology for estimating the uncollectible portion of billed finance charges and fees is consistent with the methodology we use to estimate the allowance for incurred losses on the principal portion of our credit card loan receivables.

Asset Impairment

In addition to our loan portfolio, we review other assets for impairment on a regular basis in accordance with applicable impairment accounting guidance. This process requires significant management judgment and involves various estimates and assumptions. Our investment securities, goodwill and intangible assets represent a significant portion of our total assets excluding loans. Accordingly, below we describe our process for assessing impairment of these assets and the key estimates and assumptions involved in this process.

Investment Securities

We regularly review our investment securities for other-than-temporary impairment ("OTTI") using both quantitative and qualitative criteria. If we intend to sell a security in an unrealized loss position or it is more likely than not that we will be required to sell the security prior to recovery of its amortized cost basis, the entire difference between the amortized cost basis of the security and its fair value is recognized in income. If we do not intend to sell the security and it is not more likely than not that we will be required to sell the security before recovery of our amortized cost, we evaluate other quantitative and qualitative criteria to determine whether a credit loss exists. Our evaluation requires significant management judgment and a consideration of many factors, including, but not limited to, the extent and duration of the impairment; the health of and specific prospects for the issuer, including whether the issuer has failed to make scheduled interest or principal payments; recent events specific to the issuer and/or industry to which the issuer belongs; the payment structure of the security; external credit ratings; the value of underlying collateral and current market conditions. Quantitative criteria include assessing whether there has been an adverse change in expected future cash flows. See "Note 3—Investment Securities" for additional information.

Goodwill and Intangible Assets

Goodwill represents the excess of the fair value of the consideration transferred, plus the fair value of any non-controlling interests in the acquiree, over the fair value of the net assets acquired and liabilities assumed as of the acquisition date.

Goodwill totaled $14.5 billion as of both December 31, 2016 and 2015. Intangible assets, which we report on our consolidated balance sheets as a component of other assets, consist primarily of purchased credit card relationships ("PCCR"), core deposit and other intangibles. The net carrying amount of intangible assets decreased to $665 million as of December 31, 2016, from $1.0 billion as of December 31, 2015 primarily due to amortization. Goodwill and intangible assets together represented 4% and 5% of our total assets as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

We did not recognize any goodwill impairment in 2016, 2015 or 2014. See “Note 7—Goodwill and Intangible Assets” for additional information.

Table of Contents

Goodwill

We perform our goodwill impairment test annually on October 1 at a reporting unit level. We are also required to test goodwill for impairment whenever events or circumstances make it more-likely-than-not that impairment may have occurred. As of October 1, 2016, we had five reporting units which included Domestic Card, International Card, Auto, Other Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking.

The goodwill impairment test is a two-step process. The first step involves a comparison of the estimated fair value of a reporting unit to its carrying amount, including goodwill. If the estimated fair value exceeds its carrying amount, goodwill of the reporting unit is not impaired and the second step is not necessary. If the estimated fair value of a reporting unit is below its carrying amount, then the second step, which requires measurement of any potential impairment, must be performed. The second step of goodwill impairment testing requires an extensive effort to build the specific reporting unit's balance sheet for the test based on applicable accounting guidance.

For the purpose of our goodwill impairment testing, we calculate the carrying amount of a reporting unit using an allocated capital approach based on each reporting unit's specific regulatory capital, economic capital requirements, and underlying risks. The carrying amount for a reporting unit is the sum of its respective capital requirements, goodwill and intangibles balances. We then compare the carrying amount to our total consolidated stockholders' equity to assess the reasonableness of our methodology. The total carrying amount of our five reporting units was $39.2 billion, as compared to consolidated stockholder's equity of $48.2 billion as of October 1, 2016. The $9.0 billion excess in consolidated stockholder's equity was primarily attributable to capital allocated to our Other category, preferred stock and other future capital needs such as dividends and share buy-backs. There was no remaining unallocated equity after factoring in these items.

Determining the fair value of a reporting unit and the associated assets, liabilities and intangible assets, is a subjective process that requires the use of estimates and the exercise of significant judgment. The fair value of the Domestic Card, Auto, Other Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking reporting units was calculated using a discounted cash flow ("DCF") calculation, a form of the income approach. This income approach calculation used projected cash flows based on each reporting unit's internal forecast and the perpetuity growth method to calculate terminal values. Our DCF analysis requires management to make estimates about future loan, deposit and revenue growth, as well as credit losses and capital rates. These cash flows and terminal values were then discounted using discount rates based on our external cost of equity with adjustments for the risk inherent in each reporting unit. Discount rates used in 2016 ranged from 8% to 13%. The reasonableness of the DCF approach was assessed by reference to a market-based approach using comparable market multiples and recent market transactions where available. The results of the 2016 annual impairment test for the Domestic Card, Auto, Other Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking reporting units indicated that the estimated fair values of these four reporting units significantly exceeded their carrying amounts.

Our International Card businesses operate in Canada and the United Kingdom ("U.K.") and as of October 1, 2016, had goodwill of $913 million. As part of our internal analysis, management forecasted a decline in the excess of fair value above carrying value of the International Card reporting unit as compared to the prior year. These declines were primarily attributable to the adverse changes in foreign exchange rates due to the general uncertainties following the U.K. referendum to leave the European Union. Although the referendum has raised uncertainties, we have not experienced any significant negative impacts to our results of operations in the U.K. attributable specifically to it, nor do we currently forecast significant changes to this business due to the referendum. Our operations in Canada continue to forecast loan growth and strong operating results. As a result of these uncertainties, management engaged an independent valuation specialist to assist in the determination of the International Card reporting unit fair value for the 2016 goodwill impairment test. We employed both the DCF and the market approach to calculate the fair value of our International Card reporting unit. The outputs from both methods were relatively consistent and indicated that the International Card reporting unit's fair value exceed its carrying value by approximately 9%. As a result of this analysis, the second step of the goodwill impairment test was not necessary for our International Card reporting unit.

During December 2016, subsequent to the annual goodwill impairment test described above, as a result of the evolution of the business and certain leadership changes in the overall Credit Card business, management re-evaluated

the organizational structure of this business. We concluded the Domestic and International Card components of the Credit Card operating segment should be aggregated into a single reporting unit because they share similar economic characteristics, products, types of customers, operations, assets and other resources, and goodwill is recoverable from the businesses working in concert. The business has evolved since the International Card reporting unit was created, in particular our Canadian business now comprises the majority of the reporting unit's assets, such that there are now more shared characteristics and resources with our domestic operations, such as common technology platforms. As a result of this change, as of December 31, 2016, Capital One had four reporting units: Credit Card, Auto, Other Consumer Banking and Commercial Banking for the purpose of testing goodwill for impairment. As this change only

impacted the two reporting units both under our Credit Card operating segment and did not impact the reporting units under the Consumer Banking or Commercial Banking operating segments, the goodwill amounts previously allocated to the International Card reporting unit of $913 million and Domestic Card reporting unit of $4.1 billion were combined into the new Credit Card reporting unit. The change did not impact our operating segments and our Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") continues to be the Chief Operating Decision Maker ("CODM").

By definition, assumptions used in estimating the fair value of a reporting unit are judgmental and inherently uncertain. A significant change in the economic conditions of a reporting unit, such as declines in business performance, increases in credit losses, increases in capital requirements, deterioration in market conditions, adverse estimates of regulatory or legislative changes or increases in the estimated cost of equity, could cause the estimated fair values of our reporting units to decline in the future, and increase the risk of a goodwill impairment charge to earnings in a future period.

Intangible Assets

Intangible assets with definitive useful lives are amortized over their estimated lives and evaluated for potential impairment whenever events or changes in circumstances suggest that an asset's or asset group's carrying amount may not be fully recoverable. An impairment loss, generally calculated as the difference between the estimated fair value and the carrying amount of an asset or asset group, is recognized if the sum of the estimated undiscounted cash flows relating to the asset or asset group is less than the corresponding carrying amount. During 2016, we recorded an impairment charge of $17 million related to certain other intangibles. There were no meaningful intangible asset impairments in 2015 or 2014.

See "Note 7—Goodwill and Intangible Assets" for additional information.

Fair Value

Fair value, also referred to as an exit price, is defined as the price that would be received for an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants on the measurement date. The fair value accounting guidance provides a three-level fair value hierarchy for classifying financial instruments. This hierarchy is based on the markets in which the assets or liabilities trade and whether the inputs to the valuation techniques used to measure fair value are observable or unobservable. Fair value measurement of a financial asset or liability is assigned a level based on the lowest level of any input that is significant to the fair value measurement in its entirety. The three levels of the fair value hierarchy are described below:

Level 1: Quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities

Level 2: Observable market-based inputs, other than quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities

Level 3: Unobservable inputs

The degree of management judgment involved in determining the fair value of a financial instrument is dependent upon the availability of quoted prices in active markets or observable market parameters. When quoted prices and observable data in active markets are not fully available, management judgment is necessary to estimate fair value. Changes in market conditions, such as reduced liquidity in the capital markets or changes in secondary market activities, may reduce the availability and reliability of quoted prices or observable data used to determine fair value. We have developed policies and procedures to determine when markets for our financial assets and liabilities are inactive if the level and volume of activity has declined significantly relative to normal conditions. If markets are determined to be inactive, it may be appropriate to adjust price quotes received. When significant adjustments are required to price quotes or inputs, it may be appropriate to utilize an estimate based primarily on unobservable inputs.

Significant judgment may be required to determine whether certain financial instruments measured at fair value are classified as Level 2 or Level 3. In making this determination, we consider all available information that market participants use to measure the fair value of the financial instrument, including observable market data, indications of market liquidity and orderliness, and our understanding of the valuation techniques and significant inputs used. Based upon the specific facts and circumstances of each instrument or instrument category, judgments are made regarding the significance of the Level 3 inputs to the instruments' fair value measurement in its entirety. If Level 3 inputs are considered significant, the instrument is classified as Level 3. The process for determining fair value using unobservable inputs is generally more subjective and involves a high degree of management judgment and

assumptions. We discuss changes in the valuation inputs and assumptions used in determining the fair value of our

Table of Contents

financial instruments, including the extent to which we have relied on significant unobservable inputs to estimate fair value and our process for corroborating these inputs, in "Note 17—Fair Value Measurement."

Fair Value Measurement

We have a governance framework and a number of key controls that are intended to ensure that our fair value measurements are appropriate and reliable. Our governance framework provides for independent oversight and segregation of duties. Our control processes include review and approval of new transaction types, price verification and review of valuation judgments, methods, models, process controls and results.

Groups independent of our trading and investing functions participate in the review and validation process. Tasks performed by these groups include periodic verification of fair value measurements to determine if assigned fair values are reasonable, including comparing prices from third-party pricing services to other available market information.

Our Fair Value Committee ("FVC"), which includes representation from business areas, Risk Management and Finance divisions, provides guidance and oversight to ensure an appropriate valuation control environment. The FVC regularly reviews and approves our fair valuations to ensure that our valuation practices are consistent with industry standards and adhere to regulatory and accounting guidance.

We have a model policy, established by an independent Model Risk Office, which governs the validation of models and related supporting documentation to ensure the appropriate use of models for pricing and fair value measurements. The Model Risk Office validates all models and provides ongoing monitoring of their performance.

The fair valuation governance process is set up in a manner that allows the Chairperson of the FVC to escalate valuation disputes that cannot be resolved by the FVC to a more senior committee called the Valuations Advisory Committee ("VAC") for resolution. The VAC is chaired by the Chief Financial Officer and includes other members of senior management. The VAC is only required to convene to review escalated valuation disputes.

Representation and Warranty Reserve

In connection with the sales of mortgage loans, certain subsidiaries entered into agreements containing varying representations and warranties about, among other things, the ownership of the loan, the validity of the lien securing the loan, the loan's compliance with any applicable loan criteria established by the purchaser, including underwriting guidelines and the ongoing existence of mortgage insurance, and the loan's compliance with applicable federal, state and local laws. We may be required to repurchase the mortgage loan, indemnify the investor or insurer, or reimburse the investor for losses incurred on the loan in the event of a material breach of contractual representations or warranties.

We have established representation and warranty reserves for losses that we consider to be both probable and reasonably estimable associated with the mortgage loans sold by each subsidiary, including both litigation and non-litigation liabilities. The reserve-setting process relies heavily on estimates, which are inherently uncertain, and requires the application of judgment. In establishing the representation and warranty reserves, we rely on historical data and consider a variety of factors, depending on the category of purchaser. These factors include, but are not limited to, the historical relationship between loan losses and repurchase outcomes; the percentage of current and future loan defaults that we anticipate will result in repurchase requests over the lifetime of the loans; the percentage of those repurchase requests that we anticipate will result in actual repurchases; and estimated collateral valuations. We evaluate these factors and update our loss forecast models on a quarterly basis to estimate our lifetime liability.

Our aggregate representation and warranty mortgage reserve, which we report as a component of other liabilities on our consolidated balance sheets, totaled $630 million and $610 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. The adequacy of the reserve and the ultimate amount of losses incurred by us or one of our subsidiaries will depend on, among other things, actual future mortgage loan performance, the actual level of future repurchase and indemnification requests, the actual success rates of claimants, developments in litigation, actual recoveries on the collateral and macroeconomic conditions (including unemployment levels and housing prices).

As part of our business planning processes, we have considered various outcomes relating to the potential future representation and warranty liabilities of our subsidiaries that are possible but do not rise to the level of being both probable and reasonably estimable outcomes justifying an incremental accrual under applicable accounting standards.

Our current best estimate of reasonably possible future losses from representation and warranty claims beyond what was in our reserve as of December 31, 2016 is approximately $1.5 billion, a decline from our estimate of $1.6 billion as of December 31, 2015. Notwithstanding our ongoing

attempts to estimate a reasonably possible amount of future losses beyond our current accrual levels based on current information, it is possible that actual future losses will exceed both the current accrual level and our current estimate of the amount of reasonably possible losses. This estimate involves considerable judgment, and reflects that there is still significant uncertainty regarding the numerous factors that may impact the ultimate loss levels, including, but not limited to, anticipated litigation outcomes, future repurchase and indemnification claim levels, ultimate repurchase and indemnification rates, future mortgage loan performance levels, actual recoveries on the collateral and macroeconomic conditions (including unemployment levels and housing prices). In light of the significant uncertainty as to the ultimate liability our subsidiaries may incur from these matters, an adverse outcome in one or more of these matters could be material to our consolidated results of operations or cash flows for any particular reporting period. See "Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others" for additional information.

Customer Rewards Reserve

We offer products, primarily credit cards, which include programs that allow members to earn rewards, in the form of points, that can be redeemed for cash (primarily in the form of statement credits), gift cards, airline tickets or merchandise, based on account activity. The amount of rewards that a customer earns varies based on the terms and conditions of the rewards program and product. The majority of our rewards do not expire and there is no limit on the number of rewards points an eligible card member can earn. Customer rewards costs, which we generally record as an offset to interchange income, are driven by various factors, such as card member purchase volume, the terms and conditions of the rewards program and rewards redemption cost. We establish a customer rewards reserve that reflects management's judgment regarding rewards earned that are expected to be redeemed and the estimated redemption cost. We use financial models to estimate ultimate redemption rates of rewards earned to date by current card members based on historical redemption trends, current enrollee redemption behavior, card product type, year of program enrollment, enrollment tenure and card spend levels. Our current assumption is that the vast majority of all rewards earned will eventually be redeemed. We use a weighted-average cost per point redeemed during the previous twelve months, adjusted as appropriate for recent changes in redemption costs, including mix of rewards redeemed, to estimate future redemption costs. We continually evaluate our reserve and assumptions based on developments in redemption patterns, cost per point redeemed, changes to the terms and conditions of the rewards program and other factors. Changes in the ultimate redemption rate and weighted-average cost per point have the effect of either increasing or decreasing the reserve through the current period provision by an amount estimated to cover the cost of all points previously earned but not yet redeemed by card members as of the end of the reporting period. We recognized customer rewards expense of $3.2 billion, $2.7 billion and $2.0 billion in 2016, 2015 and 2014, respectively. Our customer rewards liability, which is included in other liabilities on our consolidated balance sheets, totaled $3.6 billion and $3.2 billion as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

ACCOUNTING CHANGES AND DEVELOPMENTS

See "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for information on accounting standards adopted in 2016, as well as recently issued accounting standards not yet required to be adopted and the expected impact of these changes in accounting standards.

Table of Contents

CAPITAL MANAGEMENT

The level and composition of our capital are determined by multiple factors, including our consolidated regulatory capital requirements and internal risk-based capital assessments such as internal stress testing and economic capital. The level and composition of our capital may also be influenced by rating agency guidelines, subsidiary capital requirements, the business environment, conditions in the financial markets and assessments of potential future losses due to adverse changes in our business and market environments.

Capital Standards and Prompt Corrective Action

We are subject to capital adequacy standards adopted by the Federal Reserve, OCC and FDIC (collectively, the "Federal Banking Agencies"), including the capital rules that implemented the Basel III capital framework ("Basel III Capital Rule") developed by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision ("Basel Committee"). Moreover, the Banks, as insured depository institutions, are subject to PCA capital regulations.

In July 2013, the Federal Banking Agencies adopted the Basel III Capital Rule, which, in addition to implementing the Basel III capital framework, also implemented certain Dodd-Frank Act and other capital provisions, and updated the PCA capital framework to reflect the new regulatory capital minimums. The Basel III Capital Rule amended both the Basel I and Basel II Advanced Approaches frameworks, established a new common equity Tier 1 capital requirement and set higher minimum capital ratio requirements. We refer to the amended Basel I framework as the "Basel III Standardized Approach," and the amended Advanced Approaches framework as the "Basel III Advanced Approaches."

At the end of 2012, we met one of the two independent eligibility criteria set by banking regulators for becoming subject to the Advanced Approaches capital rules. As a result, we have undertaken a multi-year process of implementing the Advanced Approaches regime for calculating risk-weighted assets and regulatory capital levels. We entered parallel run under Advanced Approaches on January 1, 2015, during which we are required to calculate capital ratios under both the Basel III Standardized Approach and the Basel III Advanced Approaches, though we continue to use the Standardized Approach for purposes of meeting regulatory capital requirements.

The Basel Committee has proposed, but has not finalized, changes to the Basel III capital framework. There is uncertainty around any final changes that the Basel Committee might adopt, which of those changes thereafter may be adopted in the United States, and how those changes may impact the Basel III Standardized Approach and the Basel III Advanced Approaches.

For additional information about the capital adequacy guidelines we are subject to, see "Part 1—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation."

The Market Risk Rule supplements both the Basel III Standardized Approach and the Basel III Advanced Approaches by requiring institutions subject to the Market Risk Rule to adjust their risk-based capital ratios to reflect the market risk in their trading portfolios. The Market Risk Rule applies to institutions with aggregate trading assets and liabilities equal to the lesser of (i) 10% or more of total assets or (ii) $1 billion or more. See "MD&A—Market Risk Profile" below for additional information. We began reporting risk-based capital ratios including market risk-weighted assets for the Company and CONA pursuant to the Market Risk Rule for positions covered by such rule in the third quarter of 2016. This change did not have a material impact on the risk-based capital ratios of these two entities. As of December 31, 2016, COBNA is not subject to the Market Risk Rule.

Table 13 provides a comparison of our regulatory capital ratios under the Basel III Standardized Approach subject to transition provisions, the regulatory minimum capital adequacy ratios and the PCA well-capitalized level for each ratio (where applicable) as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table of Contents

Table 13: Capital Ratios under Basel III[1]

	December 31, 2016			December 31, 2015		
	Capital Ratio	Minimum Capital Adequacy	Well-Capitalized	Capital Ratio	Minimum Capital Adequacy	Well-Capitalized
Capital One Financial Corp:						
Common equity Tier 1 capital[2]	10.1 %	4.5%	N/A	11.1%	4.5%	N/A
Tier 1 capital[3]	11.6	6.0	6.0%	12.4	6.0	6.0%
Total capital[4]	14.3	8.0	10.0	14.6	8.0	10.0
Tier 1 leverage[5]	9.9	4.0	N/A	10.6	4.0	N/A
Supplementary leverage[6]	8.6	N/A	N/A	9.2	N/A	N/A
Capital One Bank (USA), N.A.:						
Common equity Tier 1 capital[2]	12.0%	4.5%	6.5%	12.2%	4.5%	6.5%
Tier 1 capital[3]	12.0	6.0	8.0	12.2	6.0	8.0
Total capital[4]	14.8	8.0	10.0	15.2	8.0	10.0
Tier 1 leverage[5]	10.8	4.0	5.0	10.8	4.0	5.0
Supplementary leverage[6]	8.9	N/A	N/A	9.0	N/A	N/A
Capital One, N.A.:						
Common equity Tier 1 capital[2]	10.6%	4.5%	6.5%	11.8%	4.5%	6.5%
Tier 1 capital[3]	10.6	6.0	8.0	11.8	6.0	8.0
Total capital[4]	11.8	8.0	10.0	12.9	8.0	10.0
Tier 1 leverage[5]	7.7	4.0	5.0	8.8	4.0	5.0
Supplementary leverage[6]	6.9	N/A	N/A	7.9	N/A	N/A

---

(1) Capital ratios are calculated based on the Basel III Standardized Approach framework, subject to applicable transition provisions, such as the inclusion of the unrealized gains and losses on securities available for sale included in AOCI and adjustments related to intangible assets other than goodwill. The inclusion of AOCI and the adjustments related to intangible assets are phased-in at 40% for 2015, 60% for 2016, 80% for 2017 and 100% for 2018.

(2) Common equity Tier 1 capital ratio is a regulatory capital measure calculated based on common equity Tier 1 capital divided by risk-weighted assets.

(3) Tier 1 capital ratio is a regulatory capital measure calculated based on Tier 1 capital divided by risk-weighted assets.

(4) Total capital ratio is a regulatory capital measure calculated based on total capital divided by risk-weighted assets.

(5) Tier 1 leverage ratio is a regulatory capital measure calculated based on Tier 1 capital divided by adjusted average assets.

(6) Supplementary leverage ratio ("SLR") is a regulatory capital measure calculated based on Tier 1 capital divided by total leverage exposure.

In addition to the above statutory capital ratios, we also disclose a non-GAAP TCE ratio in "Part II—Item 6. Summary of Selected Financial Data." This capital measure is not necessarily comparable to similarly-titled capital measures reported by other companies. We provide information on the calculation of this ratio in "MD&A—Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures."

The Company exceeded the minimum capital requirements and each of the Banks exceeded the minimum regulatory requirements and were well capitalized under PCA requirements as of both December 31, 2016 and 2015.

The Basel III Capital Rule requires banks to maintain a capital conservation buffer of common equity Tier 1 capital of 2.5% above the regulatory minimum ratio and an incremental countercyclical capital buffer of up to 2.5% of common equity Tier 1 capital to be set at the discretion of the Federal Banking Agencies (currently zero percent as of December 31, 2016). Both the capital conservation buffer and the countercyclical capital buffer are being phased in

over a transition period of four years that commenced on January 1, 2016. The combined capital conservation buffer and countercyclical capital buffer is 0.625% in 2016 making the minimum capital requirement plus regulatory buffers for common equity Tier 1 capital, Tier 1 capital and total capital ratios, 5.125%, 6.625% and 8.625%, respectively, for the Company and the Banks during 2016.
A common equity Tier 1 capital ratio, Tier 1 capital ratio, or total capital ratio below the applicable regulatory minimum ratio and the combined capital conservation buffer and the countercyclical buffer might restrict a bank's ability to distribute capital and make discretionary bonus payments. As of December 31, 2016, the Company and each of the Banks are all above the applicable combined thresholds.

Table of Contents

Additionally, banks designated as global systemically important banks ("G-SIBs") are subject to an additional regulatory capital surcharge above the combined capital conservation and countercyclical capital buffers established by the Basel III Capital Rule. We are currently not designated as a G-SIB and therefore not subject to this surcharge.
The following table compares our common equity Tier 1 capital and risk-weighted assets as of December 31, 2016, subject to applicable transition provisions, to our estimated fully phased-in common equity Tier 1 capital and risk-weighted assets, as it applies for Advanced Approaches banks such as ourselves that have not yet exited parallel run. Our estimated common equity Tier 1 capital, risk-weighted assets and common equity Tier 1 capital ratio under the fully phased-in Basel III Standardized Approach are non-GAAP financial measures that we believe provide useful information in evaluating compliance with regulatory capital requirements that are not effective yet. They are calculated based on our interpretations, expectations and assumptions of relevant regulations, as well as interpretations provided by our regulators, and is subject to change based on changes to future regulations and interpretations. As we continue to engage with our regulators, there could be further changes to the calculation.
Table 14: Regulatory Capital Reconciliations between Basel III Transition to Fully Phased-in[1]

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016
Common equity Tier 1 capital under Basel III Standardized Approach	$ 28,803
Adjustments related to AOCI[2]	(275)
Adjustments related to intangibles[2]	(256)
Estimated common equity Tier 1 capital under fully phased-in Basel III Standardized Approach	$ 28,272
Risk-weighted assets under Basel III Standardized Approach[3]	$ 285,756
Adjustments for fully phased-in Basel III Standardized Approach[4]	305
Estimated risk-weighted assets under fully phased-in Basel III Standardized Approach	$ 286,061
Estimated common equity Tier 1 capital ratio under fully phased-in Basel III Standardized Approach[5]	9.9%

---

(1) Estimated common equity Tier 1 capital, risk-weighted assets, and common equity Tier 1 capital ratio under the fully phased-in Basel III Standardized Approach are non-GAAP financial measures.
(2) Assumes adjustments are fully phased-in.
(3) Includes credit and market risk-weighted assets.
(4) Adjustments include higher risk weights for items that are included in capital based on the threshold deduction approach, such as mortgage servicing assets and deferred tax assets. The adjustments also include removal of risk weights for items that are deducted from common equity Tier 1 capital.
(5) Calculated by dividing estimated common equity Tier 1 capital by estimated risk-weighted assets, which are both calculated under the Basel III Standardized Approach, as it applies when fully phased-in for Advanced Approaches banks that have not yet exited parallel run.

Under the Basel III Capital Rule, when we complete our parallel run for the Advanced Approaches, our minimum risk-based capital requirement will be determined by the greater of our risk-weighted assets under the Basel III Standardized Approach and the Basel III Advanced Approaches. See "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation" for additional information. Once we exit parallel run, based on clarification of the Basel III Capital Rule from our regulators, any amount by which our expected credit losses exceed eligible credit reserves, as each term is defined under the Basel III Capital Rule, will be deducted from our Basel III Standardized Approach numerator, subject to transition provisions. Inclusive of this impact, based on current capital rules and our business mix, we estimate that our Basel III Advanced Approaches ratios will be lower than our Basel III Standardized Approach ratios. However, there is uncertainty whether this will remain the case in light of potential changes to the United States capital rules.
Capital Planning and Regulatory Stress Testing
On April 5, 2016, we submitted our capital plan to the Federal Reserve as part of the 2016 CCAR cycle. On June 29, 2016, the Federal Reserve informed us that they had "no objection" to our CCAR 2016 Capital Plan submission. As a result of this non-objection to our capital plan, the Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to $2.5 billion

of shares of our common stock from the third quarter of 2016 through the end of the second quarter of 2017, in addition to share repurchases related to employee compensation. The Board of Directors also authorized the quarterly dividend on our common stock of $0.40 per share. For the description of the regulatory capital planning rules we are subject to, see “Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation.”

Table of Contents

Equity Offerings and Transactions

On July 29, 2016, the Company issued and sold 24,000,000 Depositary Shares, each representing a 1/40th interest in a share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series G, $0.01 par value, with a liquidation preference of $25 per Depositary Share ("Series G Preferred Stock"). The net proceeds of the offering of Series G Preferred Stock were approximately $583 million, after deducting underwriting commissions and offering expenses. Dividends on the Series G Preferred Stock are payable quarterly in arrears at a rate of 5.20% per annum.

On November 29, 2016, the Company issued and sold 20,000,000 Depositary Shares, each representing a 1/40th interest in a share of Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series H, $0.01 par value, with a liquidation preference of $25 per Depositary Share ("Series H Preferred Stock"). The net proceeds of the offering of Series H Preferred Stock were approximately $483 million, after deducting underwriting commissions and offering expenses. Dividends on the Series H Preferred Stock are payable quarterly in arrears at a rate of 6.00% per annum.

Dividend Policy and Stock Purchases

On February 2, 2017, our Board of Directors declared a quarterly common stock dividend of $0.40 per share, payable on February 24, 2017 to stockholders of record at the close of the business on February 13, 2017. Our Board of Directors also approved quarterly dividends on our 6.00% Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series B ("Series B Preferred Stock"), our 6.25% Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series C ("Series C Preferred Stock"), our 6.70% Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series D ("Series D Preferred Stock"), our 6.20% Fixed Rate Non-Cumulative Perpetual Preferred Stock, Series F ("Series F Preferred Stock"), our Series G Preferred Stock and Series H Preferred Stock, payable on March 1, 2017 to stockholders of record at the close of business on February 15, 2017. Based on those declarations, we will pay approximately $195 million in common equity dividends and approximately $53 million in total preferred dividends in the first quarter of 2017. Under the terms of our outstanding preferred stock, our ability to pay dividends on, make distributions with respect to, or to repurchase, redeem or acquire its common stock or any preferred stock ranking on parity with or junior to the preferred stock, is subject to restrictions in the event that we do not declare and either pay or set aside a sum sufficient for payment of dividends on the preferred stock for the immediately preceding dividend period.

We paid common stock dividends of $0.40 per share in each quarter of 2016. The following table summarizes the dividend paid per share on our various series preferred stock in each quarter of 2016.

Table 15: Preferred Stock Dividends Paid Per Share

Series	Description	Issuance Date	Per Annum Dividend Rate	Dividend Frequency	2016 Q4	Q3	Q2	Q1
Series B	6.00% Non-Cumulative	August 20, 2012	6.00%	Quarterly	$15.00	$15.00	$15.00	$15.00
Series C	6.25% Non-Cumulative	June 12, 2014	6.25	Quarterly	15.63	15.63	15.63	15.63
Series D	6.70% Non-Cumulative	October 31, 2014	6.70	Quarterly	16.75	16.75	16.75	16.75
Series E	Fixed-to-Floating Rate Non-Cumulative	May 14, 2015	5.55% through 5/31/2020; 3-mo. LIBOR+ 380 bps thereafter	Semi-Annually through 5/31/2020; Quarterly thereafter	27.75	—	27.75	—
Series F	6.20% Non-Cumulative	August 24, 2015	6.20	Quarterly	15.50	15.50	15.50	15.50
Series G	5.20% Non-Cumulative	July 29, 2016	5.20	Quarterly	17.62	—	—	—
Series H	6.00% Non-Cumulative	November 29, 2016	6.00	Quarterly	—	—	—	—

The declaration and payment of dividends to our stockholders, as well as the amount thereof, are subject to the discretion of our Board of Directors and depend upon our results of operations, financial condition, capital levels, cash requirements, future prospects and other factors deemed relevant by the Board of Directors. As a BHC, our ability to pay dividends is largely dependent upon the receipt of dividends or other payments from our subsidiaries. Regulatory restrictions exist that limit the ability of the Banks

to transfer funds to our BHC. As of December 31, 2016, funds available for dividend payments from COBNA and CONA were $3.9 billion and $1.0 billion, respectively. There can be no assurance that we will declare and pay any dividends to stockholders.

Consistent with our 2016 Stock Repurchase Program, our Board of Directors authorized the repurchase of up to $2.5 billion of shares of common stock beginning in the third quarter of 2016 through the end of the second quarter of 2017. Through the end of 2016, we repurchased approximately $2.1 billion of shares of common stock as part of the 2016 Stock Repurchase Program.

The timing and exact amount of any future common stock repurchases will depend on various factors, including market conditions, opportunities for growth, our capital position and amount of retained earnings. Our stock repurchase program does not include specific price targets, may be executed through open market purchases or privately negotiated transactions, including utilizing Rule 10b5-1 programs, and may be suspended at any time. For additional information on dividends and stock repurchases, see "Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation—Dividends, Stock Repurchases and Transfer of Funds."

RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk Framework

We use a risk framework to provide an overall enterprise-wide approach for effectively managing risk. We execute against our risk framework with the "Three Lines of Defense" risk management model to demonstrate and structure the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities in the organization for taking and managing risk.

The "First Line of Defense" is comprised of the business areas that through their day-to-day business activities take risk on our behalf. As the business owner, the first line is responsible for identifying, assessing, managing and controlling that risk. This principle places ultimate accountability for the management of risks and ownership of risk decisions with the CEO and business heads. The "Second Line of Defense" provides oversight of first line risk taking and management, and is primarily comprised of our Risk Management organization. The second line assists in determining risk appetite and the strategies, policies and structures for managing risks. The second line is both an "expert advisor" to the first line and an "effective challenger" of first line risk activities. The "Third Line of Defense" is comprised of our Internal Audit and Credit Review functions. The third line provides independent and objective assurance to senior management and to the Board of Directors that first and second line risk management and internal control systems and its governance processes are well-designed and working as intended.

The risk framework is also used to guide design of risk programs and performance of risk activity within each risk category and across the entire enterprise.

Our risk framework, which is built around governance, processes and people, consists of the following eight key elements:

Establish Governance Processes, Accountabilities and Risk Appetites

The starting point of our risk framework is the establishment of governance processes, accountabilities and risk appetites. Our Board of Directors and senior management establish the tone at the top regarding the importance of internal control, including standards of conduct and the integrity and ethical values of the Company. Management reinforces expectations at the various levels of the organization. This portion of the framework sets the foundation for the methods for governing risk taking, the interactions within and among the lines of defense, and the risk appetites and tolerance limits for risk taking.

Identify and Assess Risks and Ownership

Identifying and assessing risks and ownership is the beginning of the more detailed day-to-day process of managing risk. This portion of the framework clarifies the importance of strong first-line management and accountability for identifying and assessing risk while specifying the role of the second line to identify and assess risk, particularly when taking on new initiatives.

Develop and Operate Controls, Monitoring and Mitigation Plans

We develop, operate and monitor controls to manage risk within tolerance levels. The first line develops controls to oversee and manage identified risks. Controls may prevent risks from occurring or measure the amount of risk being taken so that the amount may be proactively managed. Whenever possible, plans are implemented to mitigate risks or

reduce them to lower levels. The first line leads mitigation, control and monitoring actions. The second line is a consultant on control design when needed.

Table of Contents

Test and Detect Control Gaps and Perform Corrective Action
While the first line is principally accountable for taking, controlling and monitoring risk, the second line oversees and monitors first line risk taking, including the effectiveness of first line controls, and the third line independently tests and oversees first and second line risk taking. These activities provide the second and third lines of defense with the ability to reduce the likelihood of unauthorized or unplanned risk taking within the organization. Control gaps are closed by first line corrective action.
Escalate Key Risks and Gaps to Executive Management and when appropriate, the Board of Directors
Escalation is an important component of our risk framework. Use of escalation is encouraged and does not necessarily indicate a failure on the part of first, second, or third line risk management. Through escalation in the first line, decisions requiring judgment can be raised to executives who have the broadest possible context and experience to make challenging decisions. Escalation in the second and third lines of defense can also demonstrate part of their core responsibilities of effective challenge. If appropriate, risks are escalated to the Board of Directors to ensure alignment with the most material risk decisions and/or transparency to the largest risks facing the organization.
Calculate and Allocate Capital in Alignment with Risk Management and Measurement Processes (including Stress Testing)
Capital ultimately is held to protect the company from unforeseen risks or unexpected risk severity. As such, it is important that capital planning processes be well linked with risk management practices to ensure the appropriate capital protections are in place for the safety and soundness of the company. Stress testing and economic capital measurement, both of which incorporate inputs from across the risk spectrum, are key tools for evaluating our capital position and risk adjusted returns.
Support with the Right Culture, Talent and Skills
The right culture, talent and skills are critical to effective risk management. Our risk framework is supported with the right culture that promotes the foundation and values of the risk management organization. Skills necessary to effectively manage risk are reinforced through performance management systems. When needed, risk talent is augmented through recruitment of industry experts as well as training and development of internal associates.
Enabled by the Right Data, Infrastructure and Programs
Data, infrastructure and programs are key enablers of our risk management processes and practices. These core requirements enable effective risk modeling, efficient first, second and third line risk activity performance, and cross-line interaction. In addition, effective program design of each risk category is regularly assessed to ensure risk practices continue to evolve with leading industry practices, and continue to interact across categories as desired for a strong overall risk management program.
Risk Appetite
Risk appetite defines the parameters for taking and accepting risks and are used by management and our Board of Directors to make business decisions. Risk appetite refers to the level of risk our business is willing to take in pursuit of our corporate business objectives. The Board of Directors approves our risk appetite including risk appetite statements and associated metrics, Board Notification Thresholds, and Board Limits for each of our eight risk categories. We communicate risk appetite statements, limits and thresholds to the appropriate levels in the organization and monitor adherence. While first line executives manage risk on a day-to-day basis, the Chief Risk Officer provides effective challenge and independent oversight to ensure that risks are within the appetite and specific limits established by the Board of Directors. The Chief Risk Officer reports to the Board of Directors regularly on the nature and level of risk across all eight risk categories. In addition to his broader management responsibilities, our Chief Executive Officer is responsible for developing the strategy and mission of our organization, determining and leading our culture, and reviewing and providing input into our risk appetite.
Risk Categories
We apply our risk framework to protect our company from the eight major categories of risk that we are exposed to through our business activities. Our eight major categories of risk are:
• Compliance Risk: Compliance risk is the risk to current or anticipated earnings or capital arising from violations of laws, rules, or regulations. Compliance risk can also arise from nonconformance with prescribed practices, internal

policies and procedures, contractual obligations, or ethical standards that reinforce those laws, rules, or regulations;

Table of Contents

- Credit Risk: Credit risk is the risk to current or projected financial condition and resilience arising from an obligor's failure to meet the terms of any contract with the Company or otherwise perform as agreed;
- Legal Risk: Legal risk is the risk of material adverse impact due to: new and changed laws and regulations; interpretations of law; drafting, interpretation and enforceability of contracts; adverse decisions/consequences arising from litigation or regulatory action; the establishment, management and governance of our legal entity structure; and the failure to seek/follow appropriate Legal counsel when needed;
- Liquidity Risk: Liquidity risk is the risk that the Company will not be able to meet its future financial obligations as they come due, or invest in future asset growth because of an inability to obtain funds at a reasonable price within a reasonable time period;
- Market Risk: Market risk is the risk that an institution's earnings or the economic value of equity could be adversely impacted by changes in interest rates, foreign exchange rates, or other market factors;
- Operational Risk: Operational risk is the risk of loss, capital impairment, adverse customer experience, or reputational impact resulting from failure to comply with policies and procedures, failed internal processes or systems, or from external events;
- Reputation Risk: Reputation risk is the risk to market value, recruitment and retention of talented associates and maintenance of a loyal customer base due to the negative perceptions of our internal and external constituents regarding our business strategies and activities; and
- Strategic Risk: Strategic risk is the risk of a material impact on current or anticipated earnings, capital, franchise or enterprise value arising from: (i) the Company's competitive and market position and evolving forces in the industry that can affect that position; (ii) lack of responsiveness to these conditions; (iii) strategic decisions to change the Company's scale, market position or operating model; or (iv) failure to appropriately consider implementation risks inherent in the Company's strategy.

Below we provide an overview of how we manage our eight primary risk categories.

Compliance Risk Management

We recognize that compliance requirements for financial institutions are increasingly complex and that there are heightened expectations from our regulators and our customers. In response, we continuously evaluate the regulatory environment and proactively adjust our compliance risk program to fully address these expectations.

Our Compliance Management Program establishes expectations for determining compliance requirements, assessing the risk of new product offerings, creating appropriate controls and training to address requirements, monitoring for control performance, and independently testing for adherence to compliance requirements. The program also establishes regular compliance reporting to senior business leaders, the executive committee and the Board of Directors.

The Chief Compliance Officer is responsible for establishing and overseeing our Compliance Risk Management Program. Business areas incorporate compliance requirements and controls into their business policies, standards, processes and procedures. They regularly monitor and report on the efficacy of their compliance controls and Corporate Compliance periodically independently tests to validate the effectiveness of business controls.

Credit Risk Management

We recognize that we are exposed to cyclical changes in credit quality. Consequently, we try to ensure our credit portfolio is resilient to economic downturns. Our most important tool in this endeavor is sound underwriting. In unsecured consumer loan underwriting, we generally assume that loans will be subject to an environment in which losses are higher than those prevailing at the time of underwriting. In commercial underwriting, we generally require strong cash flow, collateral and covenants and guarantees. In addition to sound underwriting, we continually monitor our portfolio and take steps to collect or work out distressed loans.

The Chief Risk Officer, in conjunction with the Consumer and Commercial Chief Credit Officers, is responsible for establishing credit risk policies and procedures, including underwriting and hold guidelines and credit approval authority, and monitoring credit exposure and performance of our lending-related transactions. These responsibilities are fulfilled by the Chief Consumer Credit Officer and the Chief Commercial Credit Officer who are responsible for evaluating the risk implications of credit strategy and for oversight of credit for both the existing portfolio and any

new credit investments. The Chief Consumer Credit Officer and the

Table of Contents

Chief Commercial Credit Officer have formal approval authority for various types and levels of credit decisions, including individual commercial loan transactions. Division Presidents within each segment are responsible for managing the credit risk within their divisions and maintaining processes to control credit risk and comply with credit policies and guidelines. In addition, the Chief Risk Officer establishes policies, delegates approval authority and monitors performance for non-loan credit exposure entered into with financial counterparties or through the purchase of credit sensitive securities in our investment portfolio.

Our credit policies establish standards in five areas: customer selection, underwriting, monitoring, remediation and portfolio management. The standards in each area provide a framework comprising specific objectives and control processes. These standards are supported by detailed policies and procedures for each component of the credit process. Starting with customer selection, our goal is to generally provide credit on terms that generate above hurdle returns. We use a number of quantitative and qualitative factors to manage credit risk, including setting credit risk limits and guidelines for each of our lines of business. We monitor performance relative to these guidelines and report results and any required mitigating actions to appropriate senior management committees and our Board of Directors.

Legal Risk Management

The General Counsel provides legal evaluation and guidance to the enterprise and business areas and partners with other risk management functions such as Compliance and Internal Audit. This evaluation and guidance is based on an assessment of the type and degree of legal risk associated with the internal business area practices and activities and of the controls the business has in place to mitigate legal risks.

Liquidity Risk Management

The Head of Finance and Corporate Development and the Chief Risk Officer, in conjunction with the Chief Market and Liquidity Risk Officer, are responsible for the establishment of liquidity risk management policies and standards for governance and monitoring of liquidity risk at a corporate level. We assess liquidity strength by evaluating several different balance sheet metrics under severe stress scenarios to ensure we can withstand significant funding degradation through idiosyncratic, systematic, and combined liquidity stress scenarios. We continuously monitor market and economic conditions to evaluate emerging stress conditions and appropriate action plans in accordance with our Contingency Funding Plan. Management reports liquidity metrics to appropriate senior management committees and our Board of Directors no less than quarterly.

We seek to mitigate liquidity risk strategically and tactically. From a strategic perspective, we have acquired and built deposit gathering businesses and significantly reduced our loan to deposit ratio. From a tactical perspective, we have accumulated a sizable liquidity reserve comprised of cash, high-quality, unencumbered securities and committed collateralized credit lines. We also continue to maintain access to secured and unsecured markets through ongoing issuance. This combination of stable and diversified funding sources and our stockpile of liquidity reserves enables us to maintain confidence in our liquidity position.

Market Risk Management

The Head of Finance and Corporate Development and the Chief Risk Officer, in conjunction with the Chief Market and Liquidity Risk Officer, are responsible for the establishment of market risk management policies and standards for the governance and monitoring of market risk at a corporate level. Market risk is inherent from the financial instruments associated with our business operations and activities including loans, deposits, securities, short-term borrowings, long-term debt and derivatives. We manage market risk exposure, which is principally driven by balance sheet interest rate risk, centrally and establish quantitative risk limits to monitor and control our exposure.

We recognize that interest rate and foreign exchange risk is inherent in the banking business due to the nature of the assets and liabilities of banks. Banks typically manage the trade-off between near-term earnings volatility and market value volatility by targeting moderate levels of each. In addition to using industry accepted techniques to analyze and measure interest rate and foreign exchange risk, we perform sensitivity analysis to identify our risk exposures under a broad range of scenarios. Investment securities and derivatives are the main levers for the management of interest rate and foreign exchange risk.

The market risk positions for the Company and each of the Banks are calculated separately and in aggregate, and analyzed against pre-established limits. Results are reported to the Asset Liability Committee monthly and to the Risk

Committee of the Board of Directors no less than quarterly. Management is authorized to utilize financial instruments as outlined in our policy to actively manage market risk exposure.

Table of Contents

Operational Risk Management

We recognize the criticality of managing operational risk on both a strategic and day-to-day basis and that there are heightened expectations from our regulators and our customers. We have implemented appropriate operational risk management policies, standards, processes and controls to enable the delivery of high quality and consistent customer experiences and to achieve business objectives in a controlled manner.

The Chief Operational Risk Officer is responsible for establishing and overseeing our Operational Risk Management Program. In accordance with Basel III Advanced Approaches requirements, the program establishes practices for assessing the operational risk profile and executing key control processes for operational risks. Corporate Operational Risk Management enforces these practices and delivers reporting of operational risk results to senior business leaders, the executive committee and the Board of Directors.

Reputation Risk Management

We recognize that reputation risk is of particular concern for financial institutions in the current environment marked by increased scrutiny and widespread regulatory changes. We manage both strategic and tactical reputation issues and build our relationships with government officials, media, community and consumer advocates, and other constituencies to help strengthen the reputations of both our company and industry. Our actions include implementing pro-customer practices in our business and serving low to moderate income communities in our market area consistent with a quality bank. The General Counsel is responsible for managing our overall reputation risk program. Day-to-day activities are controlled by the frameworks set forth in our Reputation Risk Management Policy and other risk management policies.

Strategic Risk Management

We monitor external market and industry developments to identify potential areas of strategic opportunity or risk. These items provide input for development of the Company's strategy led by the Chief Executive Officer and other senior executives. Through the ongoing development and vetting of the corporate strategy, the Chief Risk Officer identifies and assesses risks associated with the strategy across all risk categories and monitors them throughout the year.

Table of Contents

CREDIT RISK PROFILE

Our loan portfolio accounts for the substantial majority of our credit risk exposure. Our lending activities are governed under our credit policy and are subject to independent review and approval. Below we provide information about the composition of our loan portfolio, key concentrations and credit performance metrics.

We also engage in certain non-lending activities that may give rise to credit and counterparty settlement risk, including the purchase of securities for our investment securities portfolio, entering into derivative transactions to manage our market risk exposure and to accommodate customers, short-term advances on syndication activity (including bridge financing transactions we have underwritten), certain operational cash balances in other financial institutions, foreign exchange transactions and customer overdrafts. We provide additional information on credit risk related to our investment securities portfolio under "MD&A—Consolidated Balance Sheets Analysis—Investment Securities" and credit risk related to derivative transactions in "Note 10—Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities."

Primary Loan Products

We provide a variety of lending products. Our primary loan products include credit cards, auto, home loans and commercial.

- Credit cards: We originate both prime and subprime credit cards through a variety of channels. Our credit cards generally have variable interest rates. Credit card accounts are primarily underwritten using an automated underwriting system based on predictive models that we have developed. The underwriting criteria, which are customized for individual products and marketing programs, are established based on an analysis of the net present value of expected revenues, expenses and losses, subject to further analysis using a variety of stress conditions. Underwriting decisions are generally based on credit bureau information, including payment history, debt burden and credit scores, such as FICO, and on other factors, such as applicant income. We maintain a credit card securitization program and selectively sell charged-off credit card loans.
- Auto: We originate both prime and subprime auto loans. Customers are acquired through a network of auto dealers and direct marketing. Our auto loans generally have fixed interest rates and loan terms of 75 months or less and can go up to 84 months. Loan size limits are customized by program and are generally less than $75,000. Similar to credit card accounts, the underwriting criteria are customized for individual products and marketing programs and based on analysis of net present value of expected revenues, expenses and losses, subject to maintaining resilience under a variety of stress conditions. Underwriting decisions are generally based on an applicant's income, estimated debt-to-income ratio, and credit bureau information, along with collateral characteristics such as loan-to-value ("LTV") ratio. We generally retain all of our auto loans, though we have securitized and sold auto loans in the past and may do so in the future.
- Home loans: Most of the existing home loans in our loan portfolio were originated by banks we acquired. Currently, we originate residential mortgage and home equity loans through our branches, direct marketing, and dedicated home loan officers. Our home loan products include conforming and non-conforming fixed rate and adjustable rate mortgage loans, as well as first and second lien home equity loans and lines of credit. In general, our underwriting policy limits for these loans include:
  - a maximum LTV ratio of 80% for loans without mortgage insurance;
  - a maximum LTV ratio of 95% for loans with mortgage insurance or for home equity products;
  - a maximum debt-to-income ratio of 50%; and
  - a maximum loan amount of $3 million.

  Our underwriting procedures are intended to verify the income of applicants and obtain appraisals to determine home values. We may, in limited instances, use automated valuation models to determine home values. Our underwriting standards for conforming loans are designed to meet the underwriting standards required by the agencies at a minimum, and we sell most of our conforming loans to the agencies. We generally retain non-conforming mortgages and home equity loans and lines of credit.
- Commercial: We offer a range of commercial lending products, including loans secured by commercial real estate and loans to middle market commercial and industrial companies. Our commercial loans may have a fixed or variable interest rate; however, the majority of our commercial loans have variable rates. Our underwriting standards require

an analysis of the

Table of Contents

borrower's financial condition and prospects, as well as an assessment of the industry in which the borrower operates. Where relevant, we evaluate and appraise underlying collateral and guarantees. We maintain underwriting guidelines and limits for major types of borrowers and loan products that specify, where applicable, guidelines for debt service coverage, leverage, LTV ratio and standard covenants and conditions. We assign a risk rating and establish a monitoring schedule for loans based on the risk profile of the borrower, industry segment, source of repayment, the underlying collateral and guarantees (if any) and current market conditions. Although we generally retain commercial loans, we may syndicate positions for risk mitigation purposes (including bridge financing transactions we have underwritten). In addition, we originate and service multifamily commercial real estate loans which are sold to the government-sponsored enterprises.

Loans Held for Investment Portfolio Composition

Our loan portfolio consists of loans held for investment, including loans held in our consolidated trusts, and loans held for sale. Table 16 presents the composition of our portfolio of loans held for investment, including PCI loans, by portfolio segment as of December 31, 2016 and 2015. Table 16 and the credit metrics presented in this section exclude loans held for sale, which are carried at lower of cost or fair value and totaled $1.0 billion and $904 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

Table 16: Loans Held for Investment Portfolio Composition

	December 31, 2016		December 31, 2015	
(Dollars in millions)	Loans	% of Total	Loans	% of Total
Credit Card:				
Domestic credit card	$97,120	39.6%	$87,939	38.2%
International credit card	8,432	3.4	8,186	3.6
Total credit card	105,552	43.0	96,125	41.8
Consumer Banking:				
Auto	47,916	19.5	41,549	18.1
Home loan	21,584	8.8	25,227	11.0
Retail banking	3,554	1.4	3,596	1.5
Total consumer banking	73,054	29.7	70,372	30.6
Commercial Banking:				
Commercial and multifamily real estate	26,609	10.9	25,518	11.1
Commercial and industrial	39,824	16.2	37,135	16.2
Total commercial lending	66,433	27.1	62,653	27.3
Small-ticket commercial real estate	483	0.2	613	0.3
Total commercial banking	66,916	27.3	63,266	27.6
Other loans	64	—	88	—
Total loans held for investment	$245,586	100.0%	$229,851	100.0%

We market our credit card products throughout the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. Our credit card loan portfolio is geographically diversified due to our product and marketing approach, with higher concentrations in California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Our auto loan portfolio is originated in most regions of the United States with a concentration in Texas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Illinois and Ohio. Our home loan portfolio is concentrated in California, New York, Maryland, Illinois, Virginia, New Jersey and Louisiana, which reflects the characteristics of the ING Direct portfolio that comprises the majority of our home loans portfolio. Retail banking includes small business loans and other consumer lending products originated through our branch network with a concentration in Louisiana, New York, Texas, New Jersey, Maryland and Virginia.

Our commercial banking loan portfolio is originated in most regions of the United States with a concentration in the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut, as well as in Texas, California and Louisiana. Our small ticket commercial real estate portfolio, which was originated on a national basis through a broker network, is in a run-off mode.

We provide additional information on the geographic concentration, by loan category, of our loan portfolio in "Note 4—Loans."

Table of Contents

Commercial Loans

For purposes of portfolio risk management, we aggregate our commercial loan portfolio according to market segmentation primarily based on standard industry codes. Table 17 summarizes our commercial loans held for investment portfolio by industry classification as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 17: Commercial Loans by Industry[1]

(Percentage of portfolio)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015
Real estate	40%	39%
Healthcare	14	15
Finance and insurance	13	12
Business services	5	4
Oil and gas[2]	4	5
Public administration	4	4
Educational services	4	4
Retail trade	4	3
Construction and land	3	4
Transportation[3]	2	3
Other	7	7
Total	100%	100%

(1) Industry categories are based on our interpretation of the North American Industry Classification System codes as they pertain to each individual loan.

(2) In addition to loans outstanding, we also have unfunded lending commitments of approximately $2.9 billion and $3.4 billion to oil and gas companies as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. For information on our total unfunded lending commitments to extend credit see "Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others."

(3) Includes our taxi medallion lending portfolio among other portfolios.

Purchased Credit-Impaired Loans

Our portfolio of loans includes certain of our consumer and commercial loans acquired in business acquisitions that were recorded at fair value at acquisition and subsequently accounted for using the guidance for accounting for PCI loans and debt securities, which is based upon expected cash flows. These PCI loans totaled $15.1 billion as of December 31, 2016 compared to $19.5 billion as of December 31, 2015. See "MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms" for the definition of "PCI loans."

The difference between the fair value at acquisition and expected cash flows represents the accretable yield, which is recognized in interest income over the life of the loans. The difference between the contractual payments on the loans and expected cash flows represents the nonaccretable difference or the amount of principal and interest not considered collectible, which incorporates future expected credit losses over the life of the loans. We regularly update our estimate of expected principal and interest to be collected from these loans and evaluate the results for each accounting pool that was established at acquisition based on loans with common risk characteristics. Probable decreases in expected cash flows would trigger the recognition of an allowance for loan and lease losses through our provision for credit losses. Probable and significant increases in expected cash flows would first reverse any previously recorded allowance for loan and lease losses established subsequent to acquisition, with any remaining increase in expected cash flows recognized prospectively in interest income over the remaining estimated life of the underlying loans. See "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for additional information on PCI Loans that are accounted for based on expected cash flows.

Table of Contents

Home Loans

The majority of our home loan portfolio are PCI loans acquired from the ING Direct and CCB acquisitions, representing 67% and 73% of our total home loan portfolio as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. See "MD&A—Glossary and Acronyms" for the definition of ING Direct and CCB acquisitions. The expected cash flows for the PCI loans in our home loan portfolio are significantly impacted by future expectations of home prices and interest rates. Decreases in expected cash flows that result from declining conditions, particularly associated with these variables, could result in an increase in the allowance for loan and lease losses and reduction in accretable yield. Charge-offs on these loans are not recorded until the expected credit losses within the nonaccretable difference are depleted. In addition, PCI loans are not classified as delinquent or nonperforming as we expect to collect our net investment in these loans and the nonaccretable difference is expected to absorb the majority of the losses associated with these loans.

Table 18 presents our total home loan portfolio and the break out of the PCI loans and remaining loans within our home loan portfolio, by lien priority.

Table 18: Home Loans—Risk Profile by Lien Priority

	December 31, 2016					
	Home Loans		PCI Loans		Total Home Loans	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total
Lien type:						
1st lien	$6,182	28.7%	$14,159	65.5%	$20,341	94.2%
2nd lien	974	4.5	269	1.3	1,243	5.8
Total	$7,156	33.2%	$14,428	66.8%	$21,584	100.0%

	December 31, 2015					
	Home Loans		PCI Loans		Total Home Loans	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total
Lien type:						
1st lien	$5,705	22.6%	$18,207	72.2%	$23,912	94.8%
2nd lien	995	4.0	320	1.2	1,315	5.2
Total	$6,700	26.6%	$18,527	73.4%	$25,227	100.0%

See "Note 4—Loans" in this Report for additional credit quality information. See "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for information on our accounting policies for PCI loans, delinquent loans, nonperforming loans, net charge-offs and troubled debt restructurings ("TDRs") for each of our loan categories.

Table 19 provides a sensitivity analysis of PCI loans in our home loan portfolio as of December 31, 2016. The analysis reflects a hypothetical decline of 10% in the home price index and its impact on lifetime future cash flow expectations, accretable yield and allowance for loan and lease losses. Any significant economic events or variables not considered could impact results that are presented below.

Table 19: Sensitivity Analysis—PCI Home Loans[(1)]

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016	Estimated Impact Increase (Decrease)
Expected cash flows	$ 17,395	$ (43)
Accretable yield	2,996	77
Allowance for loan and lease losses	29	120

____

(1) Changes in the accretable yield would be recognized in interest income in our consolidated statements of income over the life of the loans. Changes in the allowance for loan and lease losses would be recognized immediately in the provision for credit losses in the consolidated statements of income.

Table of Contents

Loan Maturity Profile

Table 20 presents the maturities of our loans held for investment portfolio as of December 31, 2016.

Table 20: Loan Maturity Schedule

	December 31, 2016			
(Dollars in millions)	Due Up to 1 Year	> 1 Year to 5 Years	> 5 Years	Total
Fixed rate:				
Credit card[1]	$2,428	$ 15,627	—	$18,055
Consumer banking	674	31,160	$ 23,302	55,136
Commercial banking	1,354	5,716	7,476	14,546
Other	—	—	17	17
Total fixed-rate loans	4,456	52,503	30,795	87,754
Variable rate:				
Credit card[1]	87,496	1	—	87,497
Consumer banking[2]	11,823	5,400	695	17,918
Commercial banking	50,562	1,176	632	52,370
Other	44	—	3	47
Total variable-rate loans	149,925	6,577	1,330	157,832
Total loans	$154,381	$ 59,080	$ 32,125	$245,586

____

(1) Due to the revolving nature of credit card loans, we report the majority of our variable-rate credit card loans as due in one year or less. We report fixed-rate credit card loans with introductory rates that expire after a certain period of time as due in one year or less. We assume that the rest of our remaining fixed-rate credit card loans will mature within one to three years.

(2) We report the maturity period for the home loans portfolio included in the Consumer Banking business based on the earlier of the next re-pricing or contractual maturity date of the loan.

Credit Risk Measurement

We closely monitor economic conditions and loan performance trends to assess and manage our exposure to credit risk. Key metrics we track in evaluating the credit quality of our loan portfolio include delinquency and nonperforming asset rates, as well as net charge-off rates and our internal risk ratings of larger balance commercial loans. Trends in delinquency rates are a primary indicator of credit risk within our consumer loan portfolios, as changes in delinquency rates provide an early warning of changes in credit losses. The primary indicator of credit risk in our commercial loan portfolios is our internal risk ratings. Because we generally classify loans that have been delinquent for an extended period of time and other loans with significant risk of loss as nonperforming, the level of nonperforming assets represents another indicator of the potential for future credit losses. In addition to delinquency rates, the geographic distribution of our loans provides insight as to the exposure of the portfolio to regional economic conditions.

We underwrite most consumer loans using proprietary models, which are typically based on credit bureau data, including borrower credit scores, along with application information and, where applicable, collateral and deal structure data. We continuously adjust our management of credit lines and collection strategies based on customer behavior and risk profile changes. We also use borrower credit scores for subprime classification, for competitive benchmarking and, in some cases, to drive product segmentation decisions.

Table of Contents

The following table provides details on the credit scores of our domestic credit card and auto loans held for investment portfolios as of December 31, 2016, and 2015.

Table 21: Credit Score Distribution

(Percentage of portfolio)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015
Domestic credit card—Refreshed FICO scores[1]:		
Greater than 660	64%	66%
660 or below	36	34
Total	100%	100%
Auto—At origination FICO scores[2]:		
Greater than 660	52%	51%
621 - 660	17	17
620 or below	31	32
Total	100%	100%

(1) Credit scores generally represent FICO scores. These scores are obtained from one of the major credit bureaus at origination and are refreshed monthly thereafter. We approximate non-FICO credit scores to comparable FICO scores for consistency purposes. Balances for which no credit score is available or the credit score is invalid are included in the 660 or below category.

(2) Credit scores generally represent average FICO scores obtained from three credit bureaus at the time of application and are not refreshed thereafter. Balances for which no credit score is available or the credit score is invalid are included in the 620 or below category.

We present information in the section below on the credit performance of our loan portfolio, including the key metrics we use in tracking changes in the credit quality of our loan portfolio.

See "Note 4—Loans" in this Report for additional credit quality information. Also, see "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for information on our accounting policies for delinquent and nonperforming loans, net charge-offs and TDRs for each of our loan categories.

Delinquency Rates

We consider the entire balance of an account to be delinquent if the minimum required payment is not received by the customer's due date, measured at the reporting date. Our 30+ day delinquency metrics include all loans held for investment that are 30 or more days past due, whereas our 30+ day performing delinquency metrics include loans that are 30 or more days past due but are currently classified as performing and accruing interest. The 30+ day delinquency and 30+ day performing delinquency metrics are the same for domestic credit card loans, as we continue to classify loans as performing until the account is charged off, typically when the account is 180 days past due. See "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies" for information on our policies for classifying loans as nonperforming for each of our loan categories. We provide additional information on our credit quality metrics above under "MD&A—Business Segment Financial Performance."

Table of Contents

Table 22 presents our 30+ day performing delinquency rates and 30+ day delinquency rates of our portfolio of loans held for investment, including PCI loans, by portfolio segment, as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 22: 30+ Day Delinquencies

	December 31, 2016				December 31, 2015			
	30+ Day Performing Delinquencies		30+ Day Delinquencies		30+ Day Performing Delinquencies		30+ Day Delinquencies	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	Rate[1]	Amount	Rate[1]	Amount	Rate[1]	Amount	Rate[1]
Credit Card:								
Domestic credit card	$3,839	3.95%	$3,839	3.95%	$2,985	3.39%	$2,985	3.39%
International credit card	283	3.36	317	3.76	244	2.98	283	3.46
Total credit card	4,122	3.91	4,156	3.94	3,229	3.36	3,268	3.40
Consumer Banking:								
Auto	2,931	6.12	3,154	6.58	2,781	6.69	3,000	7.22
Home loan[2]	43	0.20	205	0.95	40	0.16	235	0.93
Retail banking	25	0.70	49	1.39	28	0.76	49	1.36
Total consumer banking[2]	2,999	4.10	3,408	4.67	2,849	4.05	3,284	4.67
Commercial Banking:								
Commercial and multifamily real estate	20	0.07	45	0.17	34	0.13	38	0.15
Commercial and industrial	36	0.09	408	1.02	66	0.18	288	0.78
Total commercial lending	56	0.08	453	0.68	100	0.16	326	0.52
Small-ticket commercial real estate	6	1.31	10	2.14	2	0.37	6	1.04
Total commercial banking	62	0.09	463	0.69	102	0.16	332	0.52
Other loans	2	3.66	8	12.90	3	3.61	11	11.98
Total	$7,185	2.93	$8,035	3.27	$6,183	2.69	$6,895	3.00

(1) The 30+ day performing and 30+ day delinquency rates are calculated by loan category by dividing 30+ day delinquent loans as of the end of the period by period-end loans held for investment for the specified loan category, including PCI loans as applicable.

(2) Excluding the impact of PCI loans, the 30+ day performing delinquency rate for our home loan and total consumer banking portfolios was 0.59% and 5.12%, respectively, as of December 31, 2016, and 0.60% and 5.50%, respectively, as of December 31, 2015. Excluding the impact of PCI loans, the 30+ day delinquency rate for our home loan and total consumer banking portfolios was 2.86% and 5.82%, respectively, as of December 31, 2016, and 3.50% and 6.34%, respectively, as of December 31, 2015.

Table of Contents

Table 23 presents an aging and geography of 30+ day delinquent loans as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 23: Aging and Geography of 30+ Day Delinquent Loans

	December 31, 2016		December 31, 2015	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total Loans[(1)]	Amount	% of Total Loans[(1)]
Delinquency status:				
30 – 59 days	$3,466	1.41%	$3,069	1.33%
60 – 89 days	1,920	0.78	1,668	0.73
> 90 days	2,649	1.08	2,158	0.94
Total	$8,035	3.27%	$6,895	3.00%
Geographic region:				
Domestic	$7,718	3.14%	$6,612	2.88%
International	317	0.13	283	0.12
Total	$8,035	3.27%	$6,895	3.00%
Total loans held for investment	$245,586	100.00%	$229,851	100.00%

(1) Delinquency rates are calculated by dividing loans in each delinquency status category or geographic region as of the end of the period by the total period-end loans held for investment, including PCI loans.

Table 24 summarizes loans that were 90+ days delinquent as to interest or principal, and still accruing interest as of December 31, 2016 and 2015. These loans consist primarily of credit card accounts between 90 days and 179 days past due. As permitted by regulatory guidance issued by the FFIEC, we continue to accrue interest and fees on domestic credit card loans through the date of charge-off, which is typically in the period the account becomes 180 days past due. While domestic credit card loans typically remain on accrual status until the loan is charged off, we reduce the balance of our credit card receivables by the amount of finance charges and fees billed but not expected to be collected and exclude this amount from revenue.

Table 24: 90+ Day Delinquent Loans Accruing Interest

	December 31, 2016		December 31, 2015	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total Loans[(1)]	Amount	% of Total Loans[(1)]
Loan category:				
Credit card	$1,936	1.83%	$1,500	1.56%
Consumer banking	—	—	—	—
Commercial banking	—	—	5	0.01
Total	$1,936	0.79	$1,505	0.65
Geographic region:				
Domestic	$1,840	0.78	$1,426	0.64
International	96	1.14	79	0.96
Total	$1,936	0.79	$1,505	0.65

(1) Delinquency rates are calculated for each loan category by dividing 90+ day delinquent loans accruing interest by period-end loans held for investment, including PCI loans, for the specified loan category.

Nonperforming Loans and Nonperforming Assets

Nonperforming assets consist of nonperforming loans, foreclosed properties and repossessed assets and the net realizable value of auto loans that have been charged off as a result of a bankruptcy. Nonperforming loans include loans that have been placed on nonaccrual status. See “Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies” for information on our policies for classifying loans as nonperforming for each of our loan categories.

Table 25 presents comparative information on nonperforming loans, by portfolio segment, and other nonperforming assets as of December 31, 2016 and 2015. Nonperforming loan rates are calculated based on nonperforming loans for

each category divided

Table of Contents

by period-end total loans held for investment for each respective category. We do not classify loans held for sale as nonperforming, as they are recorded at the lower of cost or fair value. We provide additional information on our credit quality metrics above under "MD&A—Business Segment Financial Performance."

Table 25: Nonperforming Loans and Other Nonperforming Assets[(1)]

	December 31, 2016		December 31, 2015	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total Loans HFI	Amount	% of Total Loans HFI
Nonperforming loans held for investment:				
Credit Card:				
International credit card	$42	0.50%	$53	0.65%
Total credit card	42	0.04	53	0.06
Consumer Banking:				
Auto	223	0.47	219	0.53
Home loan[(2)]	273	1.26	311	1.23
Retail banking	31	0.86	28	0.77
Total consumer banking[(2)]	527	0.72	558	0.79
Commercial Banking:				
Commercial and multifamily real estate	30	0.11	7	0.03
Commercial and industrial	988	2.48	538	1.45
Total commercial lending	1,018	1.53	545	0.87
Small-ticket commercial real estate	4	0.85	5	0.83
Total commercial banking	1,022	1.53	550	0.87
Other loans	8	13.10	9	9.42
Total nonperforming loans held for investment[(3)]	$1,599	0.65	$1,170	0.51
Other nonperforming assets:[(4)]				
Foreclosed property	$75	0.03	$126	0.05
Other assets[(5)]	205	0.08	198	0.09
Total other nonperforming assets	280	0.11	324	0.14
Total nonperforming assets	$1,879	0.76	$1,494	0.65

---

(1) We recognized interest income for loans classified as nonperforming of $45 million and $44 million in 2016 and 2015, respectively. Interest income foregone related to nonperforming loans was $59 million and $53 million in 2016 and 2015, respectively. Foregone interest income represents the amount of interest income that would have been recorded during the period for nonperforming loans as of the end of the period had the loans performed according to their contractual terms.

(2) Excluding the impact of PCI loans, the nonperforming loan rates for our home loan and total consumer banking portfolios were 3.81% and 0.90%, respectively, as of December 31, 2016, compared to 4.68% and 1.08%, respectively, as of December 31, 2015.

(3) Excluding the impact of domestic credit card loans, nonperforming loans as a percentage of total loans held for investment was 1.08% and 0.83% as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

(4) The denominator used in calculating the nonperforming asset ratios consists of total loans held for investment and total other nonperforming assets.

(5) Includes the net realizable value of auto loans that have been charged off as a result of a bankruptcy and repossessed assets obtained in satisfaction of auto loans.

Table of Contents

Net Charge-Offs

Net charge-offs consist of the unpaid principal balance of loans held for investment that we determine to be uncollectible, net of recovered amounts. We charge off loans as a reduction to the allowance for loan and lease losses when we determine the loan is uncollectible and record subsequent recoveries of previously charged off amounts as increases to the allowance for loan and lease losses. We exclude accrued and unpaid finance charges and fees and certain fraud losses from charge-offs. Generally, costs to recover charged-off loans are recorded as collection expenses and included in our consolidated statements of income as a component of other non-interest expense as incurred. Our charge-off policy for loans varies based on the loan type. See “Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies” for information on our charge-off policy for each of our loan categories.

Table 26 presents our net charge-off amounts and rates, by portfolio segment, in 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Table 26: Net Charge-Offs (Recoveries)

	Year Ended December 31,					
	2016		2015		2014	
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	Rate[1]	Amount	Rate[1]	Amount	Rate[1]
Credit Card:						
Domestic credit card	$3,681	4.16%	$2,718	3.45%	$2,445	3.43 %
International credit card	272	3.33	200	2.50	283	3.69
Total credit card	3,953	4.09	2,918	3.36	2,728	3.46
Consumer Banking:						
Auto	752	1.69	674	1.69	619	1.78
Home loan[2]	14	0.06	9	0.03	17	0.05
Retail banking	54	1.53	48	1.33	39	1.07
Total consumer banking[2]	820	1.15	731	1.03	675	0.95
Commercial Banking:						
Commercial and multifamily real estate	(3)	(0.01)	(15)	(0.06)	(5)	(0.02)
Commercial and industrial	293	0.75	60	0.21	10	0.04
Total commercial lending	290	0.45	45	0.09	5	0.01
Small-ticket commercial real estate	2	0.30	2	0.36	5	0.52
Total commercial banking	292	0.45	47	0.09	10	0.02
Other loans	(3)	(3.89)	(1)	(1.66)	1	0.36
Total net charge-offs	$5,062	2.17	$3,695	1.75	$3,414	1.72
Average loans held for investment	$233,272		$210,745		$197,925	

(1) Net charge-off (recovery) rates are calculated by dividing net charge-offs by average loans held for investment for the period for each loan category.

(2) Excluding the impact of PCI loans, the net charge-off rates for our home loan and total consumer banking portfolios were 0.20% and 1.49%, respectively, for the years ended December 31, 2016, compared to 0.13% and 1.45%, respectively, for the year ended December 31, 2015; and 0.24% and 1.49%, respectively, for the year ended December 31, 2014.

For information regarding management’s expectations of net charge-offs, see the Business Outlook provided for each segment in “MD&A—Business Segment Financial Performance.”

Table of Contents

Troubled Debt Restructurings

As part of our loss mitigation efforts, we may provide short-term (three to twelve months) or long-term (greater than twelve months) modifications to a borrower experiencing financial difficulty to improve long-term collectability of the loan and to avoid the need for foreclosure or repossession of collateral.

Table 27 presents our recorded investment of loans modified in Troubled Debt Restructurings (TDRs) as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, which excludes loan modifications that do not meet the definition of a TDR and PCI loans, which we track and report separately.

Table 27: Troubled Debt Restructurings

	December 31, 2016		December 31, 2015		
(Dollars in millions)	Amount	% of Total Modifications	Amount	% of Total Modifications	
Credit card	$715	29.0%	$666	36.7%	
Consumer banking:					
Auto	523	21.2	488	26.8	
Home loan	241	9.8	229	12.6	
Retail banking	43	1.7	42	2.3	
Total consumer banking	807	32.7	759	41.7	
Commercial banking	944	38.3	392	21.6	
Total	$2,466	100.0%	$1,817	100.0%	
Status of TDRs:					
Performing	$1,631	66.1%	$1,367	75.2	%
Nonperforming	835	33.9	450	24.8	
Total	$2,466	100.0%	$1,817	100.0%	

In the Credit Card business, the majority of our credit card loans modified in TDRs involve reducing the interest rate on the account and placing the customer on a fixed payment plan not exceeding 60 months. The effective interest rate in effect immediately prior to the loan modification is used as the effective interest rate for purposes of measuring impairment using the present value of expected cash flows. In some cases, the interest rate on a credit card account automatically increases due to non-payment, late payment or similar events. In all cases, we cancel the customer's available line of credit on the credit card. If the customer does not comply with the modified payment terms, then the credit card loan agreement may revert to its original payment terms, likely resulting in any loan outstanding reflected in the appropriate delinquency category, and charged off in accordance with our standard charge-off policy.

In the Consumer Banking business, the majority of our loans modified in TDRs receive an extension, an interest rate reduction or principal reduction, or a combination of both. In addition, TDRs also occur in connection with bankruptcy of the borrower. In certain bankruptcy discharges, the loan is written down to the collateral value and the charged off amount is reported as principal reduction. Their impairment is determined using the present value of expected cash flows or a collateral evaluation for certain auto and home loans where the collateral value is lower than the recorded investment.

In the Commercial Banking business, the majority of loans modified in TDRs receive an extension, with a portion of these loans receiving an interest rate reduction. The impairment on modified commercial loans is generally determined based on the underlying collateral value. We provide additional information on modified loans accounted for as TDRs, including the performance of those loans subsequent to modification, in "Note 4—Loans."

Impaired Loans

A loan is considered impaired when, based on current information and events, it is probable that we will be unable to collect all amounts due from the borrower in accordance with the original contractual terms of the loan. Generally, we report loans as impaired based on the method for measuring impairment in accordance with applicable accounting guidance. Loans defined as individually impaired include larger balance commercial nonperforming loans and TDRs. Loans held for sale are not reported as impaired, as these loans are recorded at lower of cost or fair value. Impaired loans also exclude PCI loans accounted for based on expected cash flows because this accounting methodology takes

into consideration future credit losses expected to be incurred.

Table of Contents

Impaired loans, including TDRs, totaled $3.2 billion and $2.5 billion as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. Modified TDR loans accounted for $2.5 billion and $1.8 billion of impaired loans as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. We provide additional information on our impaired loans, including the allowance for loan and lease losses established for these loans, in "Note 4—Loans" and "Note 5—Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments."

Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments

Our allowance for loan and lease losses represents management's best estimate of incurred loan and lease credit losses inherent to our held for investment portfolio as of each balance sheet date. The allowance for loan and lease losses is increased through the provision for credit losses and reduced by net charge-offs. We provide additional information on the methodologies and key assumptions used in determining our allowance for loan and lease losses under "Note 1—Summary of Significant Accounting Policies."

Our allowance for loan and lease losses increased by $1.4 billion to $6.5 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, and the allowance coverage ratio increased by 42 basis points to 2.65% as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015. The increases were primarily driven by:

- continued growth and seasoning in our credit card loan portfolio;
- continued growth in our auto loan portfolio, increasing loss expectations on recent originations and a build reflecting a change in accounting estimate of the timing of charge-offs of bankrupt accounts; and
- continued adverse industry conditions impacting our taxi medallion and oil and gas lending portfolios in our Commercial Banking business.

Table 28 presents changes in our allowance for loan and lease losses and reserve for unfunded lending commitments for 2016 and 2015, and details by portfolio segment for the provision for credit losses, charge-offs and recoveries recognized in our consolidated statements of income.

Table of Contents

Table 28: Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments Activity

	Credit Card			Consumer Banking						
(Dollars in millions)	Domestic Card	International Card	Total Credit Card	Auto	Home Loan	Retail Banking	Total Consumer Banking	Commercial Banking	Other[1]	Total
Allowance for loan and lease losses:										
Balance as of December 31, 2014	$2,878	$ 326	$3,204	$661	$62	$ 56	$779	$ 395	$ 5	$4,383
Provision (benefit) for loan and lease losses	3,204	213	3,417	739	16	64	819	256	(2)	4,490
Charge-offs	(3,641)	(387)	(4,028)	(998)	(20)	(64)	(1,082)	(76)	(7)	(5,193)
Recoveries	923	187	1,110	324	11	16	351	29	8	1,498
Net charge-offs	(2,718)	(200)	(2,918)	(674)	(9)	(48)	(731)	(47)	1	(3,695)
Other changes[2]	(9)	(40)	(49)	—	1	—	1	—	—	(48)
Balance as of December 31, 2015	3,355	299	3,654	726	70	72	868	604	4	5,130
Reserve for unfunded lending commitments:										
Balance as of December 31, 2014	—	—	—	—	—	7	7	106	—	113
Provision (benefit) for losses on unfunded lending commitments	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46	—	46
Other changes[2]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	9
Balance as of December 31, 2015	—	—	—	—	—	7	7	161	—	168
Combined allowance and reserve as of December 31, 2015	$3,355	$ 299	$3,654	$726	$70	$ 79	$875	$ 765	$ 4	$5,298
Allowance for loan and lease losses:										
Balance as of December 31, 2015	$3,355	$ 299	$3,654	$726	$70	$ 72	$868	$ 604	$ 4	$5,130
Provision (benefit) for loan and lease losses	4,555	371	4,926	983	9	63	1,055	515	(5)	6,491
Charge-offs	(4,586)	(433)	(5,019)	(1,135)	(22)	(69)	(1,226)	(307)	(3)	(6,555)
Recoveries	905	161	1,066	383	8	15	406	15	6	1,493
Net charge-offs	(3,681)	(272)	(3,953)	(752)	(14)	(54)	(820)	(292)	3	(5,062)
Other changes[2]	—	(21)	(21)	—	—	(1)	(1)	(34)	—	(56)
Balance as of December 31, 2016	4,229	377	4,606	957	65	80	1,102	793	2	6,503
Reserve for unfunded lending commitments:										
Balance as of December 31, 2015	—	—	—	—	—	7	7	161	—	168
Provision (benefit) for losses on unfunded lending	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	(32)	—	(32)

commitments										
Balance as of December 31, 2016	—	—	—	—	—	7	7	129	—	136
Combined allowance and reserve as of December 31, 2016	$4,229	$ 377	$4,606	$957	$65	$ 87	$1,109	$ 922	$ 2	$6,639

(1) Primarily consists of the legacy loan portfolio of our discontinued GreenPoint mortgage operations.
(2) Represents foreign currency translation adjustments and the net impact of loan transfers and sales.

Table of Contents

Table 29 presents the allowance coverage ratios as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 29: Allowance Coverage Ratios

	December 31,	
	2016	2015
Total allowance coverage ratio[1]	2.65%	2.23%
Allowance coverage ratios by loan category:[1]		
Credit card (30+ day delinquent loans)	110.83	111.81
Consumer banking (30+ day delinquent loans)	32.32	26.42
Commercial banking (nonperforming loans)	77.58	109.76

____

(1) Allowance coverage ratio is calculated by dividing the period-end allowance for loan and lease losses by period-end loans held for investment within the specified loan category.

LIQUIDITY RISK PROFILE

We have established liquidity practices that are intended to ensure that we have sufficient asset-based liquidity to withstand the potential impact of deposit attrition or diminished liquidity in the funding markets. Our practices are intended to maintain adequate liquidity reserves to cover our funding requirements as well as any potential deposit run-off and maintain access to diversified funding sources to avoid over-dependence on volatile, less reliable funding markets. Our liquidity reserves consist of readily-marketable or pledgable assets which can be used as a source of liquidity, if needed.

Table 30 below presents the composition of our liquidity reserves as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 30: Liquidity Reserves

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015
Cash and cash equivalents	$ 9,976	$ 8,023
Investment securities available for sale, at fair value	40,737	39,061
Investment securities held to maturity, at fair value	26,196	25,317
Total investment securities portfolio[1][2]	66,933	64,378
FHLB borrowing capacity secured by loans	24,078	30,661
Outstanding FHLB advances and letters of credit secured by loans	(17,646)	(20,514)
Investment securities encumbered for Public Funds and others	(9,265)	(10,602)
Total liquidity reserves	$ 74,076	$ 71,946

____

(1) The weighted-average life of our securities was approximately 6.0 years and 5.8 years as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

(2) As part of our liquidity management strategy, we pledge securities to secure borrowings from counterparties and to secure trust and public deposits and other purposes as required or permitted by law. We pledged securities available for sale with a fair value of $1.9 billion and $1.7 billion as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. We also pledged securities held to maturity with a carrying value of $8.1 billion and $8.7 billion as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

Our liquidity reserves increased by $2.1 billion to $74.1 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015 primarily due to an increase in our investment securities portfolio. See “MD&A—Risk Management” for additional information on our management of liquidity risk.

We are subject to the Final LCR Rule issued by the Federal Banking Agencies. The Final LCR Rule came into effect in January 2015 and required us to calculate the LCR as of the last business day of each month from January 2015 until June 2016, and requires us to calculate the LCR on a daily basis as of July 1, 2016. The minimum LCR standard is phased-in at 80% by January 1, 2015, 90% by January 1, 2016 and 100% by January 1, 2017 and thereafter. At December 31, 2016, we exceeded the fully phased-in LCR requirement. The calculation and the underlying

components are based on our interpretations, expectations and assumptions of relevant regulations, as well as interpretations provided by our regulators, and are subject to change based on

changes to future regulations and interpretations. See “Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation” for additional information.

Borrowing Capacity

We filed a shelf registration statement with the SEC on March 31, 2015, which expires in March 2018. Under this shelf registration, we may periodically offer and sell an indeterminate aggregate amount of senior or subordinated debt securities, preferred stock, depositary shares, common stock, purchase contracts, warrants and units. There is no limit under this shelf registration to the amount or number of such securities that we may offer and sell, subject to market conditions. We also filed a new shelf registration statement with the SEC on January 12, 2016, which expires in January 2019 and allows us to periodically offer and sell up to $23 billion of securitized debt obligations from our credit card loan securitization trust.

In addition to our issuance capacity under the shelf registration statements, we also have access to FHLB advances with a maximum borrowing capacity of $24.9 billion as of December 31, 2016, of which $7.3 billion was still available to us to borrow as of December 31, 2016. We pledged loan collateral with an outstanding balance of $29.3 billion to secure this borrowing capacity. The ability to draw down funding is based on membership status and the amount is dependent upon the Banks’ ability to post collateral. Our FHLB membership is secured by our investment in FHLB stock of $760 million and $884 million as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively, which was determined in part based on our outstanding advances. We also have access to the Federal Reserve Discount Window through which we had a borrowing capacity of $7.9 billion as of December 31, 2016. Although available, we do not view this borrowing capacity as a primary source of liquidity and did not utilize it during 2016 or 2015.

Funding

The Company’s primary source of funding comes from deposits, which provide us with a stable and relatively low cost of funds. In addition to deposits, the Company raises funding through the issuance of senior and subordinated notes, FHLB advances secured by certain portions of our loan and securities portfolios, the issuance of securitized debt obligations, the issuance of brokered deposits, federal funds purchased and other borrowings. A key objective in our use of these markets is to maintain access to a diversified mix of wholesale funding sources.

Deposits

Table 31 provides the composition of deposits as of December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014, as well as a comparison of average balances, interest expense and average deposit rates for the years ended December 31, 2016, 2015 and 2014.

Table 31: Deposit Composition and Average Deposit Rates

	December 31,		
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014
Non-interest-bearing deposits	$25,502	$25,847	$25,081
Interest-bearing checking accounts[1]	45,820	44,720	41,022
Saving deposits[2]	145,142	134,075	130,156
Time deposits less than $100,000	16,949	10,347	6,051
Total core deposits	233,413	214,989	202,310
Time deposits of $100,000 or more	2,875	1,889	2,261
Foreign deposits	480	843	977
Total deposits	$236,768	$217,721	$205,548

Table of Contents

(Dollars in millions)	Year Ended December 31, 2016 Average Balance	Interest Expense	Average Deposit Rate	2015 Average Balance	Interest Expense	Average Deposit Rate	2014 Average Balance	Interest Expense	Average Deposit Rate
Interest-bearing checking accounts[1]	$45,339	$218	0.48%	$42,785	$208	0.49%	$41,702	$204	0.49 %
Saving deposits[2]	137,753	814	0.59	132,658	769	0.58	129,868	752	0.58
Time deposits less than $100,000	12,062	144	1.19	7,213	74	1.03	5,856	75	1.29
Total interest-bearing core deposits	195,154	1,176	0.60	182,656	1,051	0.58	177,426	1,031	0.58
Time deposits of $100,000 or more	2,511	35	1.39	2,043	36	1.76	2,560	53	2.07
Foreign deposits	639	2	0.35	978	4	0.34	1,050	4	0.34
Total interest-bearing deposits	$198,304	$1,213	0.61	$185,677	$1,091	0.59	$181,036	$1,088	0.60

---
(1) Includes Negotiable Order of Withdrawal (“NOW”) accounts.
(2) Includes Money Market Deposit Accounts (“MMDA”).

Our deposits include brokered deposits, which we obtained through the use of third-party intermediaries. Those brokered deposits are reported as interest-bearing checking, saving deposits and time deposits in the above table and totaled $22.5 billion and $12.0 billion as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

The FDIC limits the acceptance of brokered deposits by well-capitalized insured depository institutions and, with a waiver from the FDIC, by adequately-capitalized institutions. COBNA and CONA were well-capitalized, as defined under the federal banking regulatory guidelines, as of both December 31, 2016 and 2015. See “Part I—Item 1. Business—Supervision and Regulation” for additional information.

Table 32 presents the contractual maturities of large-denomination domestic time deposits of $100,000 or more as of December 31, 2016 and 2015. Our funding and liquidity management activities factor into the expected maturities of these deposits.

Table 32: Maturities of Large-Denomination Domestic Time Deposits—$100,000 or More

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016 Amount	% of Total	2015 Amount	% of Total
Up to three months	$656	22.8%	$271	14.3%
> 3 months to 6 months	282	9.8	213	11.3
> 6 months to 12 months	559	19.5	315	16.7
> 12 months	1,378	47.9	1,090	57.7
Total	$2,875	100.0%	$1,889	100.0%

Short-Term Borrowings and Long-Term Debt

We access the capital markets to meet our funding needs through the issuance of senior and subordinated notes, securitized debt obligations, and federal funds purchased and securities loaned or sold under agreements to repurchase. In addition, we may utilize short-term and long-term FHLB advances secured by our investment securities, residential home loans, multifamily real estate loans, commercial real estate loans and home equity lines of credit. Substantially all of our long-term FHLB advances are structured with either a one-month or a three-month call option at our discretion.

Our short-term borrowings include those borrowings with an original contractual maturity of one year or less and do not include the current portion of long-term debt. The short-term borrowings, which consist of federal funds purchased and securities loaned or sold under agreements to repurchase, and short-term FHLB advances, increased by

$11 million to $992 million as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015.
Our long-term debt, which primarily consists of securitized debt obligations, senior and subordinated notes, and long-term FHLB advances, increased by $1.3 billion to $59.5 billion as of December 31, 2016 from December 31, 2015, as issuances outpaced maturities.

Table of Contents

Credit Ratings

Our credit ratings impact our ability to access capital markets and our borrowing costs. Rating agencies base their ratings on numerous factors, including liquidity, capital adequacy, asset quality, quality of earnings and the probability of systemic support. Significant changes in these factors could result in different ratings. Such ratings help to support our cost effective unsecured funding as part of our overall financing programs.

Table 33 provides a summary of the credit ratings for the senior unsecured long-term debt of Capital One Financial Corporation, COBNA and CONA as of December 31, 2016 and 2015.

Table 33: Senior Unsecured Long-Term Debt Credit Ratings

	December 31, 2016			December 31, 2015		
	Capital One Financial Corporation	COBNA	CONA	Capital One Financial Corporation	COBNA	CONA
Moody’s	Baa1	Baa1	Baa1	Baa1	Baa1	Baa1
S&P	BBB	BBB+	BBB+	BBB	BBB+	BBB+
Fitch	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-

As of February 21, 2017, Moody’s, S&P and Fitch have us on a stable outlook.

Contractual Obligations

In the normal course of business, we enter into various contractual obligations that may require future cash payments that affect our short-term and long-term liquidity and capital resource needs. Our future cash outflows primarily relate to deposits, borrowings and operating leases. Table 34 summarizes, by remaining contractual maturity, our significant contractual cash obligations based on the undiscounted future cash payments as of December 31, 2016. The actual timing and amounts of future cash payments may differ from the amounts presented below due to a number of factors, such as discretionary debt repurchases. Table 34 excludes certain obligations where the obligation is short-term or subject to valuation based on market factors, such as trade payables and trading liabilities. The table also excludes the representation and warranty reserve of $630 million as of December 31, 2016 and obligations for pension and post-retirement benefit plans, which are discussed in more detail in “Note 15—Employee Benefit Plans.”

Table 34: Contractual Obligations

	December 31, 2016				
(Dollars in millions)	Up to 1 Year	> 1 Years to 3 Years	> 3 Years to 5 Years	> 5 Years	Total
Interest-bearing time deposits[1][2]	$6,543	$7,835	$5,196	$ 250	$19,824
Securitized debt obligations[2]	7,233	8,003	3,260	330	18,826
Other debt:					
Federal funds purchased and securities loaned or sold under agreements to repurchase	992	—	—	—	992
Senior and subordinated notes	2,814	10,385	3,474	6,758	23,431
Other borrowings[3]	19	1,262	6,652	9,278	17,211
Total other debt[2]	3,825	11,647	10,126	16,036	41,634
Operating leases	317	598	498	1,173	2,586
Purchase obligations[4]	236	329	161	4	730
Total	$18,154	$28,412	$19,241	$ 17,793	$83,600

(1) Includes only those interest-bearing deposits which have a contractual maturity date.

(2) Does not include amounts related to contractual interest obligations. Total contractual interest obligations, including interest-bearing time deposits, securitized debt obligations and total other debt, were approximately $4.3 billion as of December 31, 2016. Interest obligations on floating-rate instruments were calculated using the

contractual interest rate in effect as of December 31, 2016. These amounts include the impact of hedge accounting.

(3) Other borrowings include FHLB advances and capital lease obligations.

(4) Represents substantial agreements to purchase goods or services that are enforceable and legally binding and specify all significant terms. The purchase obligations are included through the termination date of the agreements even if the contract is renewable. These include capital expenditures, contractual commitments to purchase equipment and services, software acquisition/license commitments, contractual minimum media commitments and any contractually required cash payments for acquisitions, and exclude funding commitments entered into in the ordinary course of business. See "Note 19—Commitments, Contingencies, Guarantees and Others" for further details.

MARKET RISK PROFILE

Market risk is inherent in the financial instruments associated with our operations and activities, including loans, deposits, securities, short-term borrowings, long-term debt and derivatives. Below we provide additional information about our primary sources of market risk, our market risk management strategies and the measures we use to evaluate our market risk exposure.

Primary Market Risk Exposures

Our primary source of market risk is interest rate risk. We also have exposure to foreign exchange risk and customer-related trading risk, both of which we believe are minimal after considering the impact of our associated risk management activities discussed below.

Interest Rate Risk

Interest rate risk, which represents exposure to instruments whose yield or price varies with the volatility of interest rates, is our most significant source of market risk exposure. Banks are inevitably exposed to interest rate risk due to differences in the timing between the maturities or re-pricing of assets and liabilities.

Foreign Exchange Risk

Foreign exchange risk represents exposure to changes in the values of current holdings and future cash flows denominated in other currencies. Our primary exposure to foreign exchange risk is related to the operations of our international businesses in the U.K. and Canada. The largest foreign exchange exposure arising from these operations is the funding they are provided in the Great British pound ("GBP") and the Canadian dollar ("CAD"), respectively. We also have foreign exchange exposure through our net equity investments in these operations and through the dollar-denominated value of future earnings and cash flows they generate.

Our intercompany funding exposes our consolidated statements of income to foreign exchange transaction risk, while our equity investments in our foreign operations result in translation risk in AOCI and our capital ratios. We manage our transaction risk by entering into forward foreign currency derivative contracts to hedge our exposure to variability in cash flows related to foreign currency-denominated intercompany borrowings. We use foreign currency derivative contracts as net investment hedges to manage our AOCI exposure. As of December 31, 2016, we apply hedge accounting to both our intercompany funding hedges and our net investment hedges, with the primary net investments subject to hedging those denominated in GBP.

The intercompany borrowings to our international businesses were 786 million GBP and 893 million GBP as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively, and 6.2 billion CAD and 5.9 billion CAD as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively. We hedge all the cash flows associated with these borrowings with forward foreign currency derivative contracts.

In regard to our non-dollar-denominated equity, we measure our total exposure by regularly tracking the value of net equity invested in our foreign operations, the largest of which is in our U.K. and Canadian operations. Our measurement of net equity includes the impact of net investment hedges where applicable. We apply a 30% U.S. dollar appreciation shock against these net investment exposures, which we believe approximates a significant adverse foreign exchange movement over a one-year time horizon. Our gross equity exposures in our U.K. and Canadian operations were 1.5 billion GBP and 1.4 billion GBP as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively, and 863 million CAD and 686 million CAD as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, respectively.

As a result of our derivative management activities, we believe our net exposure to foreign exchange risk is minimal.

Customer-Related Trading Risk

We offer various interest rate, foreign exchange rate and commodity derivatives as an accommodation to our customers within our Commercial Banking business and offset the majority of these exposures through derivative

transactions with other counterparties. These exposures are measured and monitored on a daily basis. As a result of offsetting our customer exposures with other counterparties, we believe our net exposure to customer-related trading risk is minimal.

Table of Contents

We employ value-at-risk ("VaR") as the primary method to both measure and monitor the market risk in our customer-related trading activities. VaR is a statistical-based risk measure used to estimate the potential loss from adverse market movements in a normal market environment. We employ a historical simulation approach using the most recent 500 business days and use a 99 percent confidence level and a holding period of 1 business day. We use internal models to produce a daily VaR measure of the market risk of all customer-related trading exposures.
For further information on our customer-related trading exposures, see "Note 10—Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities."

Market Risk Management

We employ several techniques to manage our interest rate and foreign exchange risk, which include, but are not limited to, altering the duration and re-pricing characteristics of our various assets and liabilities through interest rate derivatives and mitigating the foreign exchange exposure of certain non-dollar-denominated equity or transactions through derivatives. Our current market risk management policies include the use of derivatives, which are one of the primary tools we use in managing interest rate and foreign exchange risk. We execute our derivative contracts in both over-the-counter ("OTC") and exchange-traded derivative markets and have exposure to both bilateral and clearinghouse counterparties. Although the majority of our derivatives are interest rate swaps, we also use a variety of other derivative instruments, including caps, floors, options, futures and forward contracts, to manage both our interest rate and foreign currency risk. The outstanding notional amount of our derivative contracts increased to $142.9 billion as of December 31, 2016 from $105.9 billion as of December 31, 2015 primarily driven by an increase in our hedging activities.

Market Risk Measurement

We have risk management policies and limits established by our market risk management policies and approved by the Board of Directors. Our objective is to manage our asset and liability risk position and exposure to market risk in accordance with these policies and prescribed limits based on prevailing market conditions and long-term expectations. Because no single measure can reflect all aspects of market risk, we use various industry standard market risk measurement techniques and analysis to measure, assess and manage the impact of changes in interest rates on our net interest income and our economic value of equity and the impact of changes in foreign exchange rates on our non-dollar-denominated earnings and non-dollar equity investments in foreign operations. We provide additional information below in "Economic Value of Equity."

We consider the impact on both net interest income and economic value of equity in measuring and managing our interest rate risk. Because the federal funds target range is currently 0.50% to 0.75%, we use a 50 basis points decrease as our declining interest rate scenario, since a scenario where interest rates would decline by 200 basis points is unlikely. In scenarios where a 50 basis points decline would result in a rate less than 0%, we assume a rate of 0%. Below we discuss the assumptions used in calculating each of these measures.

Net Interest Income Sensitivity

This sensitivity measure estimates the impact on our projected 12-month base-line interest rate-sensitive revenue resulting from movements in interest rates. Interest rate-sensitive revenue consists of net interest income and certain components of other non-interest income significantly impacted by movements in interest rates, including changes in the fair value of mortgage servicing rights and free-standing interest rate swaps. Adjusted net interest income consists of net interest income and changes in the fair value of mortgage servicing rights, including related derivative hedging activity, and changes in the fair value of free-standing interest rate swaps. In addition to our existing assets and liabilities, we incorporate expected future business growth assumptions, such as loan and deposit growth and pricing, and plans for projected changes in our funding mix in our baseline forecast. In measuring the sensitivity of interest rate movements on our projected interest rate-sensitive revenue, we assume a hypothetical instantaneous parallel shift in the level of interest rates of +200 basis points, +100 basis points, +50 basis points and -50 basis points to spot rates, with the lower rate scenario limited to zero as described above. At the current level of interest rates, we are asset sensitive in the +50 and +100 basis points scenarios and liability sensitive in the +200 basis points scenario. The switch to liability sensitivity in the +200 basis points scenario compared with the +100 basis points scenario is mainly driven by the assumption that deposit repricing increases with higher interest rates.

Economic Value of Equity

Our economic value of equity sensitivity measure estimates the impact on the net present value of our assets and liabilities, including derivative hedging activity, resulting from movements in interest rates. Our economic value of equity sensitivity measures are calculated based on our existing assets and liabilities, including derivatives, and do not incorporate business growth assumptions

Table of Contents

or projected plans for funding mix changes. In measuring the sensitivity of interest rate movements on our economic value of equity, we assume a hypothetical instantaneous parallel shift in the level of interest rates of +200 basis points, +100 basis points, +50 basis points and -50 basis points to spot rates, with the lower rate scenario limited to zero as described above.

Calculating our economic value of equity and its sensitivity to interest rates requires projecting cash flows for assets, liabilities and derivative instruments and discounting those cash flows at the appropriate discount rates. Key assumptions in our economic value of equity calculation include projecting rate sensitive prepayments for mortgage securities, loans and other assets, term structure modeling of interest rates, discount spreads, and deposit volume and pricing assumptions.

During the second quarter of 2016, we updated our projected deposit re-pricing assumptions as part of our regular evaluation and assessment of the assumptions and models used to measure our interest rate risk sensitivity. This update reduced our estimated asset sensitivity as shown in our projected base-line net interest income measure and had a minor impact to our economic value of equity measures.

Our current economic value of equity sensitivity profile demonstrates that our economic value of equity generally decreases as interest rates increase indicating that the economic value of our assets and derivative positions is more sensitive to interest rate changes than our liabilities.

Table 35 shows the estimated percentage impact on our projected base-line net interest income and economic value of equity calculated under our revised methodology described above as of December 31, 2016 and 2015, as well as under our previous methodology as of December 31, 2015. Our base-line net interest income sensitivity decreased as compared to December 31, 2015 as a result of higher market interest rates as well as the enhancements to our deposit re-pricing assumptions noted above. Our economic value of equity sensitivity increased as compared to December 31, 2015 primarily due to higher market interest rates, updates to long-term cash flow estimates and discount spreads for certain credit card balances and the treatment of intangible assets in this calculation.

Table 35: Interest Rate Sensitivity Analysis

	Revised Methodology		Previous Methodology
	December 31, 2016	December 31, 2015	December 31, 2015
Estimated impact on projected base-line net interest income:			
+200 basis points	(0.1)%	0.3%	2.6%
+100 basis points	0.5	0.8	1.6
+50 basis points	0.4	0.6	0.9
–50 basis points	(1.0)	(1.4)	(1.6)
Estimated impact on economic value of equity:			
+200 basis points	(9.6)	(4.8)	(5.2)
+100 basis points	(3.8)	(1.3)	(1.5)
+50 basis points	(1.5)	(0.3)	(0.4)
–50 basis points	0.5	(0.6)	(0.6)

In addition to these industry standard measures, we will continue to factor into our internal interest rate risk management decisions the potential impact of alternative interest rate scenarios, such as stressed rate shocks as well as steepening and flattening yield curve scenarios.

Limitations of Market Risk Measures

The interest rate risk models that we use in deriving these measures incorporate contractual information, internally-developed assumptions and proprietary modeling methodologies, which project borrower and depositor behavior patterns in certain interest rate environments. Other market inputs, such as interest rates, market prices and interest rate volatility, are also critical components of our interest rate risk measures. We regularly evaluate, update and enhance these assumptions, models and analytical tools as we believe appropriate to reflect our best assessment of the market environment and the expected behavior patterns of our existing assets and liabilities.

Table of Contents

There are inherent limitations in any methodology used to estimate the exposure to changes in market interest rates. The sensitivity analysis described above contemplates only certain movements in interest rates and is performed at a particular point in time based on the existing balance sheet and, in some cases, expected future business growth and funding mix assumptions. The strategic actions that management may take to manage our balance sheet may differ significantly from our projections, which could cause our actual earnings and economic value of equity sensitivities to differ substantially from the above sensitivity analysis.

Table of Contents

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

Table A—Loans Held for Investment Portfolio Composition

	December 31,				
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Credit Card:					
Domestic credit card	$97,120	$87,939	$77,704	$73,255	$83,141
International credit card	8,432	8,186	8,172	8,050	8,614
Total credit card	105,552	96,125	85,876	81,305	91,755
Consumer Banking:					
Auto	47,916	41,549	37,824	31,857	27,123
Home loan	21,584	25,227	30,035	35,282	44,100
Retail banking	3,554	3,596	3,580	3,623	3,904
Total consumer banking	73,054	70,372	71,439	70,762	75,127
Commercial Banking:					
Commercial and multifamily real estate	26,609	25,518	23,137	20,750	17,732
Commercial and industrial	39,824	37,135	26,972	23,309	19,892
Total commercial lending	66,433	62,653	50,109	44,059	37,624
Small-ticket commercial real estate	483	613	781	952	1,196
Total commercial banking	66,916	63,266	50,890	45,011	38,820
Other loans	64	88	111	121	187
Total loans	$245,586	$229,851	$208,316	$197,199	$205,889

Table of Contents

Table B—Performing Delinquencies[1]

(Dollars in millions)	December 31, 2016		2015		2014		2013		2012	
	Loans[2][3]	% of Total Loans[4]	Loans[2][3]	% of Total Loans[4]	Loans[2][3]	% of Total Loans[4]	Loans[2][3]	% of Total Loans[4]	Loans[2][3]	% of Total Loans[4]
Delinquent loans:										
30 – 59 days	$3,416	1.39 %	$3,042	1.33 %	$2,803	1.34 %	$2,584	1.31 %	$2,629	1.28 %
60 – 89 days	1,833	0.75	1,636	0.71	1,394	0.67	1,313	0.67	1,399	0.68
90 – 119 days	771	0.31	603	0.26	508	0.24	512	0.26	628	0.30
120 – 149 days	628	0.26	493	0.21	409	0.20	418	0.21	485	0.24
150 or more days	537	0.22	409	0.18	346	0.17	361	0.18	414	0.20
Total	$7,185	2.93%	$6,183	2.69%	$5,460	2.62%	$5,188	2.63%	$5,555	2.70%
By geographic area:										
Domestic	$6,902	2.81%	$5,939	2.58%	$5,220	2.50%	$4,889	2.48%	$5,247	2.55%
International	283	0.12	244	0.11	240	0.12	299	0.15	308	0.15
Total	$7,185	2.93%	$6,183	2.69%	$5,460	2.62%	$5,188	2.63%	$5,555	2.70%
Total loans held for investment	$245,586	100.00%	$229,851	100.00%	$208,316	100.00%	$197,199	100.00%	$205,889	100.00%

(1) PCI loans are included in loans held for investment but are excluded from delinquent loans, as these loans are considered performing in accordance with our expectations as of the purchase date, as we recorded these loans at estimated fair value when we acquired them. As of December 31, 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013 and 2012 the PCI loan portfolio's contractual 30 to 89 day delinquencies total $94 million, $99 million, $152 million, $223 million and $369 million, respectively. For loans 90+ days past due, see "MD&A—Table C—Nonperforming Loans and Other Nonperforming Assets."

(2) Credit card loan balances are reported net of the finance charge and fee reserve, which totaled $402 million, $262 million, $216 million, $190 million and $307 million as of December 31, 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

(3) Performing loan modifications and restructuring totaled $1.6 billion, $1.4 billion, $1.2 billion, $1.3 billion and $1.4 billion as of December 31, 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

(4) Delinquency rates are calculated by dividing loans in each delinquency status category and geographic region as of the end of the period by the total loan portfolio.

Table of Contents

Table C—Nonperforming Loans and Other Nonperforming Assets

	December 31,				
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Nonperforming loans held for investment:[1]					
Credit Card:					
International credit card	$42	$53	$70	$88	$100
Total credit card	42	53	70	88	100
Consumer Banking:					
Auto	223	219	197	194	149
Home loan	273	311	330	376	422
Retail banking	31	28	22	41	71
Total consumer banking	527	558	549	611	642
Commercial Banking:					
Commercial and multifamily real estate	30	7	62	52	137
Commercial and industrial	988	538	106	93	133
Total commercial lending	1,018	545	168	145	270
Small-ticket commercial real estate	4	5	7	4	12
Total commercial banking	1,022	550	175	149	282
Other loans	8	9	15	19	30
Total nonperforming loans held for investment	$1,599	$1,170	$809	$867	$1,054
Other nonperforming assets:					
Foreclosed property	$75	$126	$139	$113	$204
Other assets[2]	205	198	183	160	109
Total other nonperforming assets	$1,879	$1,494	$1,131	$1,140	$1,367
Nonperforming loans as a percentage of loans held for investment	0.65%	0.51%	0.39%	0.44%	0.51%
Nonperforming assets as a percentage of loans held for investment plus total other nonperforming assets	0.76	0.65	0.54	0.58	0.66

(1) The ratio of nonperforming loans as a percentage of total loans held for investment is calculated based on the nonperforming loans divided by the total outstanding unpaid principal balance of loans held for investment. The denominator used in calculating the nonperforming asset ratios consists of total loans held for investment and other nonperforming assets.

(2) In 2013, we began including the net realizable value of auto loans that have been charged off as a result of bankruptcy and repossessed assets obtained in satisfaction of auto loans. Both of these amounts are included in other assets. Prior period amounts have been adjusted to conform to current period presentation.

Table of Contents

Table D—Net Charge-Offs

	December 31,				
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Average loans held for investment	$233,272	$210,745	$197,925	$192,614	$187,915
Net charge-offs	5,062	3,695	3,414	3,934	3,555
Net charge-off rate[1]	2.17%	1.75%	1.72%	2.04%	1.89%

[1] Net charge-off rate is calculated by dividing net charge-offs by average loans held for investment for the period.

Table of Contents

Table E—Summary of Allowance for Loan and Lease Losses and Reserve for Unfunded Lending Commitments

	December 31,				
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Allowance for loan and lease losses:					
Balance at beginning of period	$5,130	$4,383	$4,315	$5,156	$4,250
Provision for credit losses	6,491	4,490	3,515	3,401	4,446
Charge-offs:					
Credit card	(5,019)	(4,028)	(3,963)	(4,542)	(4,159)
Consumer banking	(1,226)	(1,082)	(989)	(888)	(797)
Commercial banking	(307)	(76)	(34)	(49)	(94)
Other loans	(3)	(7)	(10)	(26)	(43)
Total charge-offs	(6,555)	(5,193)	(4,996)	(5,505)	(5,093)
Recoveries:					
Credit card	1,066	1,110	1,235	1,257	1,215
Consumer banking	406	351	314	272	266
Commercial banking	15	29	24	35	52
Other loans	6	8	9	7	5
Total recoveries	1,493	1,498	1,582	1,571	1,538
Net charge-offs	(5,062)	(3,695)	(3,414)	(3,934)	(3,555)
Other changes	(56)	(48)	(33)	(308)	15
Balance at end of period	$6,503	$5,130	$4,383	$4,315	$5,156
Reserve for unfunded lending commitments:					
Balance at beginning of period	$168	$113	$87	$35	$66
Provision (benefit) for losses on unfunded lending commitments	(32)	46	26	52	(31)
Other changes	—	9	—	—	—
Balance at end of period	136	168	113	87	35
Combined allowance and reserve at end of period	$6,639	$5,298	$4,496	$4,402	$5,191
Allowance for loan and lease losses as a percentage of loans held for investment	2.65%	2.23%	2.10%	2.19%	2.50%
Combined allowance and reserve by geographic distribution:					
Domestic	$6,262	$4,999	$4,170	$4,024	$4,738
International	377	299	326	378	453
Total	$6,639	$5,298	$4,496	$4,402	$5,191
Combined allowance and reserve by loan category:					
Credit card	$4,606	$3,654	$3,204	$3,214	$3,979
Consumer banking	1,109	875	786	759	719
Commercial banking	922	765	501	418	460
Other loans	2	4	5	11	33
Total	$6,639	$5,298	$4,496	$4,402	$5,191

Table of Contents

We report certain non-GAAP measures that management uses in assessing its capital adequacy and the level of return generated. These non-GAAP measures are individually identified and calculations are explained in footnotes below the table. These metrics are considered key financial performance measures for the Company. We believe they provide useful insight to investors and users of our financial information in assessing the results of the Company.
The table below provides the details of the calculation of our non-GAAP and regulatory capital measures. While some of our non-GAAP measures are widely used by investors, analysts and bank regulatory agencies to assess the capital position of financial services companies, they may not be comparable to similarly titled measures reported by other companies.
Table F—Reconciliation of Non-GAAP Measures and Calculation of Regulatory Capital Measures

	December 31,				
(Dollars in millions)	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
Tangible Common Equity (Period End)					
Stockholders’ equity	$47,514	$47,284	$45,053	$41,632	$40,425
Goodwill and intangible assets[1]	(15,420)	(15,701)	(15,383)	(15,784)	(16,224)
Noncumulative perpetual preferred stock[2]	(4,360)	(3,294)	(1,822)	(853)	(853)
Tangible common equity	$27,734	$28,289	$27,848	$24,995	$23,348
Tangible Common Equity (Average)					
Stockholders' equity	$48,753	$47,713	$44,268	$41,482	$37,265
Goodwill and intangible assets[1]	(15,550)	(15,273)	(15,575)	(15,938)	(15,604)
Noncumulative perpetual preferred stock[2]	(3,591)	(2,641)	(1,213)	(853)	(331)
Tangible common equity	$29,612	$29,799	$27,480	$24,691	$21,330
Tangible Assets (Period End)					
Total assets	$357,033	$334,048	$308,167	$296,064	$311,682
Goodwill and intangible assets[1]	(15,420)	(15,701)	(15,383)	(15,784)	(16,224)
Tangible assets	$341,613	$318,347	$292,784	$280,280	$295,458
Tangible Assets (Average)					