



Virtual Spring Conference May 19-21, 2021

www.iacpm.org

Managing Credit Risk and Emerging Threats: Lessons from the Gaps Revealed by the Pandemic

Amnon Levy, Moody's Analytics Libor Pospisil, Moody's Analytics Jim Hempstead, Moody's Investors Service

Presenters for This Session



Amnon Levy

Managing Director Moody's Analytics



San Francisco



amnon.levy@moodys.com



Libor Pospisil

Director Moody's Analytics

San Francisco
+1 (415) 874-6235

libor.pospisil@moodys.com



Jim Hempstead

Managing Director Moody's Investors Service

New York

+1 (212) 553-4318

James.Hempstead@moodys.com



Moody's (NYSE:MCO) is a global integrated risk assessment firm that empowers organizations to make better decisions. Its data, analytical solutions and insights help decision-makers identify opportunities and manage the risks of doing business with others. We believe that greater transparency, more informed decisions, and fair access to information open the door to shared progress. With over 11,400 employees in more than 40 countries, Moody's combines an international presence with local expertise and more than a century of experience in financial markets. Learn more at moodys.com/about.

Moody's Corporation is comprised of two separate companies: Moody's Investors Service (MIS) and Moody's Analytics (MA).

Moody's Investors Service (MIS) provides investors with a comprehensive view of global debt markets through credit ratings and research. Moody's Analytics (MA) provides data, analytics, and insights to equip leaders of financial, non-financial, and government organizations with effective tools to understand a range of risks.



Goals for This Session



Review the gaps in credit models revealed by the COVID-19 Pandemic



Outline a cohesive credit risk framework that assesses emerging threats, such as cyber risk and supply-chain disruptions



Review qualitative methods used in fundamental analysis that overcome data challenges inherent in emerging risks



Use alternative data to describe the varying impact of emerging risks across credit segments







Articulating the Impact of Emerging Risks on Credit

An inherent challenge

Fundamental Analysis

Based on analyst's expertise

- Considers nuanced aspects of each counterparty, along with terms and conditions
- Useful in agency and internal ratings
- Naturally incorporate emerging risks through qualitative overlay

Limitations:

- Difficult to update for portfolios with varying characteristics
- Difficult to level set across segments

Quantitative Credit Models

- Based on statistical analysis
- Automated and applicable to large portfolios
- Useful as early warning indicator
- Useful with level setting across segments
- Needed for regulatory reporting/accounting

Limitations:

- Generic by their nature
- Challenged when environment deviates from historical patterns (emerging risks)

© IACPM

Challenges with Quantifying Emerging Risks

Traditional Expected Credit Loss Models Used in Stress Testing/Impairment

- » Economic scenarios are based on models calibrated to experience with <u>broad-brush</u> variables such as unemployment or GDP, and in of themselves cannot differentiate across credit segments or describe emerging risks
- » Credit data often segmented coarsely, not allowing for variation in sensitivity to emerging risks

Lessons from COVID-19

- » An overlay anchored to traditional models can account for COVID's unique cross-sectional impact
- » That style of overlay can be applied to other emerging risks

Quantifying the cross-sectional impact of emerging risks requires an assessment of:







The Pandemic's Cross-Industry Impact

Empirical patterns lead to new thinking about granularity & data



FAST FOOD RESTAURANTS and DINE-IN

RESTAURANTS are often combined in a single broader sector.

To model the Pandemic properly, they must be separated

Granularity of 121 Industry Segments



The Pandemic's Cross-Industry Impact

Empirical patterns lead to new thinking about granularity & data



FAST FOOD RESTAURANTS and DINE-IN

RESTAURANTS are often combined in a single broader sector.

To model the Pandemic properly, they must be separated

Granularity of 121 Industry Segments

While in the beginning, the **AUTOMOTIVE** and **AIRLINES** experienced a similar shock,

AIRLINES suffered longer thanks to continued social distancing and travel restrictions.

AUTOMOTIVE segment recovered much faster, thanks to improving consumer sentiment.

Naturally, the Pandemic did not have a substantially adverse impact on **PHARMACEUTICALS**

<u>Cross-Sectional Impact Is Unique to</u> <u>The Pandemic</u>



Use of Alternative Data to Describe the Pandemic Cross-Industry and –Country patterns do not follow traditional models





Use of Alternative Data

Traditional models cannot capture cross-sectional patterns



Analytics: Cross-Sectional Overlay

Incorporating observed patterns into credit risk modeling



Cross-Sectional Overlays for Past Crises

This style of analysis can be applied well beyond the Pandemic



© IACPM

Moody's

Lessons from Previous Crises

Overcoming challenges with modeling emerging risks

Traditional Quantitative Credit Models

Models used for loss projections, IFRS9/CECL, stress testing.

© IACPM

Based on longer time series of data, at lower frequencies, such as quarterly.

Broad-brush economic variables, unable to differentiate industry impact.

Quantitative Emerging Risks Framework

Credit Risk Data

Higher frequency, name-level data captures cross-sectional patterns by allowing for empirical analysis with segment granularity descriptive of the emerging risk

Alternative Data

Mobility Indexes Consumer Sentiment Supply chain Vulnerability to cyber events Geo-location of climate hazards

Fundamental Analysis

Emerging risks, by their very nature, are new threats, for which <u>sufficient historical data</u> <u>does NOT exist</u>

In many cases, a qualitative assessment can be applied consistently across asset classes and is an indispensable part of risk analysis



MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE

Fundamental Analysis: Understand Emerging Threats

Upgrades overtaking downgrades; speculative grade default rate to fall

● Rising stars ● Fallen angels → Upgrades → Downgrades --- Represent default rate

Building heights represent the global speculative grade default rate on a trailing twelve months basis



Some highly exposed sectors still under pressure





Hotel, Gaming & Leisure



- Transportation: Consumer
- 🗟 Automotive



Consumer goods Non-durable







% Negative Outlook OR REVIEW



Represents the percentage of issuers within each sector with a negative outlook or under review for downgrade at 30 March 2021.



Four Components to MIS Integration of ESG

New ESG scores will assist in transparently and systematically demonstrating the impact of ESG on credit ratings



Credit Ratings & Research

How is ESG integrated into credit ratings?

ESG factors taken into consideration for all credit ratings. Greater transparency in PRs, as well as Credit opinions. Credit Impact Score (CIS) is an output of the rating process that indicates the extent, if any, to which ESG factors impact the rating of an issuer or transaction.



ESG Scores

How is a specific issuer exposed to ESG risks/benefits?

Issuer Profile Scores (IPS) are issuer-specific scores that assess an entity's exposure to the categories of risks in the ESG classification from a credit perspective. IPSs, where available, are inputs to credit ratings. ESG Classification What is ESG?

Our classification reports describe how we define and categorize E, S and G considerations that are material to credit quality. New environmental classification sharpens focus on physical climate risks.



Heat Maps

Is ESG material to credit quality?

Heat maps provide relative ranking of various sectors along the E and S classification of risks.



ESG

Analytical

Tools

Attacks on global energy infrastructurebecoming more frequent and disruptive

October 2019 – Attack on India's largest nuclear facility breaches IT network. March 2020 – Attack on Europe's Electric Network Transmission Operator breaches IT network.

April 2020 – Ransomware attack against Energias de Portugal impacts global IT network. February 2021 – Eletrobras ransomware attack on IT systems of nuclear power subsidiary.

Feb 2020 – Ransomware attack on US natural gas compression facility.

April 2020 – Attack on Israeli water utility seek to disrupt water supply during COVID epidemic.

June 2020 – ICS-capable SNAKE ransomware attack launched against Enel disrupt corporate networks May 2021 – Colonial pipeline halts operations after ransomware attack on IT systems.



Cyber Risk

Oil and gas companies less likely to have completed tabletop simulation exercises than corporate and banking peers, and less likely to perform cyber assessment on third-party vendors

Percent of respondents by sector that have completed tabletop simulation exercises since May 2020



Percent of respondents by sector requiring cyber assessment of third-party vendors



Moody's Investors Service, self-reported issuer survey results





Oil and gas industry's cybersecurity investment approaching levels of more advanced banking sector



Cybersecurity spend as percentage of IT/OT budget

Source: Moody's Investors Service, self-reported issuer survey results



Global cyber risk Issuer survey – series



4 November 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Detailed servey results

Key takesways from the survey

Reputs by size of total assets

Reputts for midsize and small utilities

(regulated venus not-for-profit)

integrated utilities and transmission

Results comparing state-owned and

Reputts by business model.

Results comparing vertically

privately owned utilities

Hoody's related publications

Results by region

Results by rating lave

a etworks

Appendix

Contacta

Cirtle Nazime

Lepley Ritter

Philip Zielke

VP-Senior Amelyot

Apportate Appaired 3

Leroy Terrelorge

Jin Hempsteed

Hichael Lower

AVP-Order Rist Analyst

Associated, and Analyze

dittle.net/maßmoodys.cr

Lesley.rttter@moodys.com

philip.sielle@moodys.com

larayte relonge@moodys.com

MD-Gbi Pub Real and refra Pin

michaelj.rowan@moodys.com

MD- Global Infrastructure & Orber Ritt is meaberneetes dibrood va.com

21

22

23

23

25

+1,212,353,1631

+1,212,5551607

212-555-0511

1,212,553,2616

+1.212.553.4518

+1.212.553.4465

a Contects continued on last page

Cybersecurity readiness depends on scale, business model and generation ownership

To see how well electric utilities are prepared to defend themselves from cyberattacks, we conducted a survey of global electric utilities and power companies from March through September of this year. The results reflect key differences across what is otherwise a largely homogeneous sector. All observations in this report are based on our survey results and do not represent a definitive assessment of cybersecurity readiness.

Amid growing cyberattacks, survey results reveal disparities in levels of preparedness. Cybersecurity readiness tends to be stronger among large, regulated utilities than among small utilities and those operating in competitive markets. There appears to be little difference among issuers based on geographic location or rating level.

B Greater financial resources give very large utilities an edge over smaller counterparts. Very large utilities exhibit better cyber governance, and risk management practices than midsize and small utilities.

Regulated utilities appear better positioned than unregulated and not-for-profit utilities. Regulated utilities operate critical infrastructure assets and are often judged by their reliability in addition to their profits. As a result, regulators provide cost recovery mechanisms designed to maintain well-rounded cybersecurity practices.

Among midsize and small utilities, cyber insurance helps mitigate weaker resiliency practices of not-for-profit utilities. Not-for-profit utilities with total assets of less than \$10 billion are more likely to have stand-alone cyber insurance and derive greater coverage value from their policy than similarly sized, regulated peers.

Oybersecurity readiness is stronger among vertically integrated utilities than transmission networks. Vertically integrated utilities display stronger cybersecurity readiness, with closer links between cyber managers and the corporate executive team, a more diverse and sophisticated arsenal of cyber defense practices and more prevalent adoption of cyber insurance.

Use of advanced cyber practices are more common at privately owned than stateowned utilities. But utility types rely on similar cyber risk governance practices and are investing in cybersecurity at about the same rate.

Rating levels and regional differences are not major distinguishing factors. Cybersecurity readiness does not differ significantly by rating or region, but there are some differences in terms of cyber employee headcounts and cyber insurance coverage.

2 March 2021

Rate this Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS North American banks have gamerally strong cyber risk practicas Key take-aways from the survey Rating level does not reveal meaningful differences Moody's related peblications

Contacts

+1.212.553.4986 Henen Pas AVP-Analyst mean for Broodyn.com Siri Cinjup al li +1212555.3803 According Amelyon siri.ginjupelä@moodys.com +44.20.7772.1603 Alassandro Roccati Sector Vice President alassandro.roccati@moodys.com

Largy Terrelonge 1,232,553,2695 AVP-Orber Rist Analyst largy templongs@moodys.com Lasley Etter +1.212.553.1607 VP-Senicr Amelyot laskey.rtttas@moodys.com +1.212.555.7857 Andres Usel AssociateMened np Director andrea.usei@moodys.com +1,232,553,4843 H. Celline Vergetti MD-Secting cell sa vanaetti-hutchinaitmoodva.com

CLIENT SERVICES	CLICKT SCHWICES	
American	1-212-333-1653	
Asia Pachi c	832-3531-3077	
Japan	81-3-5408-4100	
EHEA	44-20-7772-3454	

Cybersecurity strength rests on governance

and prevention

region⁴. The results show strong cyber risk practices but with some differences across what is otherwise a largely homogeneous sector. Cyberattacks pose financial, reputational and regulatory risks for banks. Evidence of weak governance, lax risk prevention or poor response and recovery readiness would be credit negative, with the implications of a successful attack

reflecting its nature, severity and duration. All observations in this report are based on our survey results and do not represent a definitive assessment of cybersecurity readiness. Oyber governance is typically more robust at larger banks, Canadian banks and

US government-related issuers (GRIs). Large banks4 and Canadian banks also report greater use of advanced cyber practices. Resource allocation is more substantial at banks where the chief information security officer (CISO) reports directly to the C-suite.

To assess North American banks' cyber risk preparedness, we surveyed 29 banks in the

Most bank cybersecurity managers report directly to the C-suite, which raises awareness and understanding of cyber risk. Most banks report at least one board member with cyber credentials, but large banks have more board-level expertise than mid-size and small banks. Canadian banks and US CRIs report to boards on cyber more frequently than US regional banks.

Head count and budget allocated to cybersecurity continue to grow. Crowth in head count has coincided with material investment to help ensure that banks' digitalization efforts are secure. There is higher growth in full-time cyber employees and cyber budgets at banks where the CISO reports directly to the C-suite.

Advanced cyber defense practices are in wide use. These include sophisticated exercises like red team testing, with formal processes to remediate findings. Sophisticated practices are more common among large banks and Canadian banks.

Cyber risk assessments for external suppliers are also widely adopted. These include periodic review and timely notification of cybersecurity incidents, vulnerabilities, patches and malware affecting suppliers, highly relevant in light of the Sunburst attack.

 Cyber risk transfer is extensive and mitigates financial harm. About 90% of respondents have standalone cyber insurance with extensive coverage, including business Interruption, legal settlements, regulatory fines and ransom payments.

 Cloud adoption will grow. Cloud technology, which can be more secure, is used the most by Canadian banks and small banks.

Survey signals cybersecurity strength, with some differences across sectors, regions

Rate this Research

+1.212.553.1897

+1,212,353,3670

+652.37581529

+1,212,555160

+1,212,553,4912

1-212-353-1655

852-3531-3077

81-3-5408-4100

44-20-7772-3454

Contacts

Hichael Dion, CPA

mits.dion@moodys.con

rokhaya.dase@moodys.com

yong lang@moodys.com

alax. johnsos Zijbmoodys.com

lasley/tttas@moodys.com

AssociateManaging Director

sarah. It Iblan@moodys.com

Marc R. Pinto, CPA

CLIENT SERVICES

Armeni cas

Asia Pactilic

Japan

EHEA.

MO-Pinancial/artibulions

marc pinto@moodys.com

Rokhava Chue, CPA

RVP-Analyst

Yong Kang, CPA

Also: Johnson

Lasley Etter

Sarah Hibler

VP-Senior Amelyot

Accordance Amagived

Accordance Amaliyot

VP-Senicr Amelyot

To assess insurers', insurance brokers' and asset managers' cyber risk preparedness, we surveyed 100 companies across North America and Internationally, primarily in Europe¹. The results indicate cybersecurity strength, as was the case for North American banks, but with some differences across sectors and regions. Cyberattacks pose financial, reputational and regulatory risks for insurers, insurance brokers and asset managers. Evidence of weak governance, lax risk prevention or poor response and recovery readiness would be credit. negative, with the implications of an attack depending on its nature, severity and duration. All observations in this report are based on our survey results and do not represent a

Cyber governance is generally stronger at larger insurers, which report greater use of advanced cyber governance practices. North American insurers also reported higher use of advanced practices than did international insurers. +1.212.555.2979

definitive assessment of cybersecurity readiness.

Smaller to medium-steed asset managers' cyber preparedness has matured but lags that of insurers. Respondents reported cybersecurity governance, management and overall cyber preparedness that is more in line with smaller insurers.

Most cybersecurity managers report directly to the C-suite, increasing companies' awareness and understanding of cyber risk. Larger insurers and higher-rated companies have more board-level expertise than smaller and lower-rated companies

+1,212,353,4352 Hiring and budget allocated to cybersecurity are growing. Crowth in head count has coincided with material investment in cybersecurity.

> Advanced cyber defense practices are widespread. These include sophisticated exercises like red team testing, and are most common among larger companies.

Cyber risk assessments for external supply chain providers are nearly universally adopted, and important given the recent Sunburst and Microsoft attacks. North American insurers were more likely to require third parties to carry cyber insurance than were international insurers.

Cyber risk transfer and coverage is widespread and mitigates financial harm. Most North American respondents have standalone cyber insurance, but it is less prevalent outside North America

Cloud adoption will grow. Cloud technology can be more secure than on premise data storage, and migration to the doud will continue, reducing reliance on site infrastructure.



Moody's analytics

Quantitative Methods for Describing Emerging Threats

Cyber Events and Their Impact on Credit Risk

Select types of cyber events and sources of the resulting loss

Confidential Data Breach	System Failure	Malicious Activity (Dr Ransomware	Theft of IP or Technology
A Sing Equifa	le Company Event ax 2017, Marriott 2018	Large-Scale Event SolarWinds 2020, WannaCry 2017, Net Petya 2016,		vent 17, Net Petya 2016,
Disruption of the comp	any's core business	Recovery costs	Legal costs	Damaged reputation



Cyber Events and Their Impact on Credit Risk

Select types of cyber events and sources of the resulting loss

Confidential Data Breach	System Failure	Malicious Activity (Dr Ransomware	Theft of IP or Technology
A Single Equifax	e Company Event 2017, Marriott 2018	SolarV	Large-Scale E Vinds 2020, WannaCry 20	vent 17, Net Petya 2016,
Disruption of the compa	ny's core business	Recovery costs	Legal costs	Damaged reputation

How can cyber events change the creditworthiness of affected companies?

- Impact EDFs
- Contribute to rating reviews
- Lead to corporate bankruptcies



https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodysplaces-SolarWinds-ratings-on-review-fordowngrade-following-announcement--PR_437591

Rating Action: Moody's places SolarWinds' ratings on review for downgrade following announcement of cyberattack



June 2019: Medical testing giants Quest Diagnostics and LabCorp announced...that personal and medical information of about 19.4 million patients had been compromised due to a breach of American Medical Collection Agency (AMCA), their billing collections vendor.

tps://www.forbes.com/sites/taylorarmerding/2019/ 06/14/more-medical-mega-breaches-thanks-tothird-party-insecurity/?sh=7ce624216111 Retrieva

Retrieval-Masters Creditors Bureau Inc., which does business as AMCA, filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection



When do Markets React to Cyber Events?

Using EDFs to quantify the real-time market reaction



© IACPM

Quantitative Modeling of a Cyber Event Impact Challenges: Data sparsity & heterogeneous nature of cyber events



© IACPM



Alternative Data for Cyber Risk

Searching for measures of segments' sensitivity to cyber events

Verizon Dataset of Cyber Incidents 32,000 Incidents Over 2020, Global Dataset.

Industry	Number of Past Cyber Events		
Segment For challenges of cross-industry comparisons, see the report	Web Application Compromised	Internal Errors	Crimeware Ransomware
Accommodation	18	15	34
Administrative	10	2	5
Construction	10	0	10
Education	65	62	179
Entertainment	30	22	35
Finance	152	128	63
Healthcare	140	163	192
Information	162	1 <mark>1</mark> 5	403
Manufacturing	107	47	393
Mining+Utilities	16	6	21
Other Services	39	20	15
Professional	139	63	135
Public	149	112	800
Real Estate	14	6	1
Retail	66	21	55
Transportation	22	15	24

Annualized Cost of Cyber Sample, 254 organ	r Crime, (nizations	Global
Industry Segment For challenges of cross-industry comparisons, see the report	Cost firm- Millio	: per year n USD
Financial services		18
Utilities and energy		17
Aerospace and defense		14
Technology and software		13
Healthcare		12
Services		11
Industrial/manufacturing		10
Retail		9
Public sector		8
Transportation		7
Consumer products		7
Communications		7
Life science		6
Education		5
Hospitality		5

Ponemon Survey (2017)

MIS – Cyber Risk Heatmap (2019) **Qualitative Assessment**

Sector	Vulnerability	Impact
Hospitals	HIGH	HIGH
Medical Devices	HIGH	MEDIUM
Banks	HIGH	HIGH
Basic Commoditie	es LOW	LOW
Consumer Produc	ts MEDIUM	LOW
Lodging, Gaming	HIGH	MEDIUM
Manufacturing	HIGH	MEDIUM
Oil & Gas	LOW	MEDIUM

Constructing a segment-level score of sensitivity to cyber events

Quantifying a Cyber Scenario

Cross-sectional impact of a large-scale attack on credit

Cyber scenario calibrated to three times WannaCry or Not Petya ransomware attacks

- The segments with the most pronounced PD shocks include HEALTHCARE and FINANCE
- On the other hand, segments such as **REAL ESTATE** see little impact



Quantifying Emerging Threats: Climate Hazards

Natural disasters and affected firms post-event excess asset returns



Ozkanoglu, O., Milonas, K., Zhao, S., Brizhatyuk, D., "An Empirical Assessment of the Financial Impacts of Climate-related Hazard Events" Moody's Analytics Research Paper, December 2020.

Credit Assessments and Emerging Threats By their nature require articulation using alternative data





Credit Assessments and Emerging Threats By their nature require articulation using alternative data



one pandemic." Adam Kucharski

Moody's

© IACPM

31

Q & A



MOODY'S analytics



Amnon Levy Managing Director, Portfolio and Balance Sheet Research Moody's Analytics +1 (415) 874-6279 Amnon.Levy@moodys.com

Libor Pospisil Director, Portfolio and Balance Sheet Research Moody's Analytics +1 (415) 874 6235

Jim Hempstead

Managing Director, North American Infrastructure & Cyber Risk Moody's Investors Service +1 (212) 553-4318 James.Hempstead@moodys.com

moodysanalytics.com

© 2021 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE. INC. AND/OR ITS CREDIT RATINGS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND MATERIALS, PRODUCTS, SERVICES AND INFORMATION PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S (COLLECTIVELY, "PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE SUCH CURRENT OPINIONS. MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT OR IMPAIRMENT. SEE MOODY'S RATING SYMBOLS AND DEFINITIONS PUBLICATION FOR INFORMATION ON THE TYPES OF CONTRACTUAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS ADDRESSED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE CREDIT RATINGS. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK. INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK. MARKET VALUE RISK. OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS. NON-CREDIT ASSESSMENTS ("ASSESSMENTS"), AND OTHER OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. AND/OR ITS AFFILIATES, MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS. ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS. ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES, MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS DO NOT COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS. ASSESSMENTS AND OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLISHES ITS PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE,

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS, AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS OR PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS, ASSESSMENTS, OTHER OPINIONS AND PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY ANY PERSON AS A BENCHMARK AS THAT TERM IS DEFINED FOR REGULATORY PURPOSES AND MUST NOT BE USED IN ANY WAY THAT COULD RESULT IN THEM BEING CONSIDERED A BENCHMARK.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing its Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY CREDIT RATING, ASSESSMENT, OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,000 to approximately \$2,700,000. MCO and Moody's investors Service also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of Moody's Investors Service credit ratings and credit rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold credit ratings from Moody's Investors Service and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at <u>www.moodys.com</u> under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 338569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJKK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJKK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings). No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any credit rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for credit ratings opinions and services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY125,000 to approximately JPY250,000,000.

MJKK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.

