

Credit Opinion: N.V. Luchthaven Schiphol

Global Credit Research - 09 Aug 2012

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Ratings

Category	Moody's Rating
Outlook	Negative
Bkd Sr Unsec MTN -Dom Curr	(P)A1
Bkd Commercial Paper -Dom Curr	P-1
Schiphol Nederland B.V.	
Outlook	Negative
Senior Unsecured -Dom Curr	A1
Bkd Commercial Paper -Dom Curr	P-1

Contacts

Analyst	Phone
Johan Verhaeghe/London	44.20.7772.5454
Neil Griffiths-Lambeth/London	
Andrew Blease/London	

Key Indicators

N.V. Luchthaven Schiphol[1]

	12/31/2011	12/31/2010	12/31/2009	12/31/2008	12/31/2007	12/31/2006
EBITA Margin	25.7%	25.3%	22.6%	25.6%	28.7%	29.3%
EBITA / Average Assets	5.9%	5.4%	4.8%	6.1%	7.7%	7.6%
EBITA Interest Coverage	3.1x	2.2x	2.2x	4.4x	6.5x	5.9x
FFO Interest Coverage	4.4x	3.3x	4.2x	5.9x	8.4x	7.1x
FFO / Net Debt	24.4%	20.4%	23.9%	20.5%	43.1%	42.5%
RCF / Net Debt	19.3%	16.1%	19.4%	-16.4%	33.9%	35.1%

[1] Standard adjustments in accordance with "Rating Methodology: Moody's Approach to Global Standard Adjustments in the Analysis of Financial Statements for Non-Financial Corporations, Part 1, Part 2 and Part 3". In addition, Moody's adjusts for one time items.; Source: Moody's Financial MetricsTM

Note: For definitions of Moody's most common ratio terms please see the accompanying [User's Guide](#).

Opinion

Company Profile

N.V. Luchthaven Schiphol ("Schiphol Group", rated A1, negative outlook) is a holding company of a group that owns and operates Amsterdam Airport, Rotterdam Airport, Lelystad Airport, and 51% of Eindhoven Airport, which together comprise most of the airport capacity in the Netherlands. In addition, Schiphol Group has minority investments in a number of overseas airports. The largest of the Dutch airports, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol ("Schiphol"), is the fifth-

largest airport in Europe by passenger numbers. Schiphol Group is currently owned 70% by the Kingdom of the Netherlands (Aaa, negative outlook), 20% by the Municipality of Amsterdam, 2% by the Municipality of Rotterdam, and 8% by Aéroports de Paris ("ADP"). In December 2008, Schiphol Group signed a cross-shareholding and co-operation agreement with ADP, which involved both Schiphol Group and ADP acquiring an 8% interest in each other's share capital.

Rating Rationale

The A1 rating reflects a view of the fundamental credit quality of Schiphol Group represented by (i) a Baseline Credit Assessment ("BCA") of 7 on a scale of 1 to 21, whereby 1 represents lowest credit risk (7 is therefore equivalent to A3 on Moody's Global Rating Scale), and (ii) a two-notch rating uplift for the likelihood of extraordinary support being provided by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in the event that this were ever to be required to avoid a default, as assessed in accordance with Moody's rating methodology for Government Related Issuers.

More particularly, Schiphol Group's A1 rating reflects the combination of the following inputs: (a) a Baseline Credit Assessment of 7, (b) the Aaa local currency rating of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, (c) Moderate Dependence, and (d) Moderate Support.

The Baseline Credit Assessment of 7 reflects: (1) Schiphol Group's ownership of Schiphol (the fourth-largest airport in Europe) and the other Netherlands airports, (2) its relatively high exposure to transfer traffic, and reliance on Air France KLM, (3) its moderate capital expenditure programme, (4) certain operational constraints which may impede the pace of volume growth in future years, and (5) its current financial profile, which is expected to stay broadly constant over the next few years.

Recent Developments

On 24 July 2012 Moody's changed to negative from stable the outlook on Schiphol Group's ratings. This rating action followed Moody's decision on 23 July 2012 to change the outlook on the rating of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to negative from stable. The outlook change for Schiphol Group reflects Moody's view that the credit quality of the Government is one of the main drivers of uplift incorporated in the company's ratings.

For the 12 months ending June 2012, Schiphol's passenger volumes increased 5.9% relative to same period of the year before. This percentage increase is higher compared to what we see with the other major European hub airports.

On 18 April 2012, Schiphol Group published its results for the year ending December 2011. Overall revenues rose 8.3% (to EUR1,278 million). Over this same period, total passenger numbers also rose 10.8%, and aircraft movements grew 9.1%, a stronger performance than seen elsewhere in Europe. The European airport industry in general saw a strong recovery in passenger volumes in 2011 with a strong first half but weaker growth in the second half of the year. We further note that in 2010, Schiphol was affected by the volcanic ash cloud that caused the closure of the airspace for a number of days in April and May, and which somewhat affected the growth numbers of 2011 relative to those reported in 2010. In H1 2012 traffic at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol increased by 3.7%, this lower growth rate can be explained by the current slowdown in the eurozone economies. For airports in core EU countries, Moody's expects a 2% to 4% passenger volume growth for the year ending 2012 and a flat to 3% growth for the year ending in 2013.

Schiphol raised airport charges by an average of 2% in April 2012. The company did not raise airport charges in April 2010, in order to assist its airline customers, which followed on from airport charge reductions in 2009. The company did increase airport charges by 0.6% in April 2011; however, no further increases were introduced as at 1 November 2011 following a consultation process conducted in H1 2011 that factored in the positive developments observed in passenger traffic and transport.

Total revenue in the Aviation business rose by 7.2%, in 2011, to EUR734 million. This increase can largely be explained by the increase in traffic and a moderate rise in airport charges. Revenues in the consumer business area (comprising retail sales, parking charges, concession fees, advertising and management fees) accounted for more than 24% of Schiphol Group's total revenue, and rose by 13.6% in 2011. Overall EBITDA in 2011 and in 2010 rose 6% and 26% to EUR512 million and EUR483 million respectively. EBITDA rose sharply by almost EUR100 million to EUR483 million in 2010 (2009: EUR383 million), this can largely be explained by a (i) change in a non-cash item, specifically a EUR62 million change in property fair value, and (ii) reduced restructuring cost of EUR22 million.

Furthermore, Schiphol is planning an ambitious 10- to 15-year investment programme with respect to the long-term development of the Mainport. Moody's expects that the size of this long-term investment and the impact on revenues will become more clear when the 2025 Master Plan will be finalised in the second half of 2012. Since 2002, Schiphol has been making sizeable investment in its fully automated baggage system which mainly benefitted its transfer traffic. Through this investment, the airport will be able to handle up to 70 million pieces of baggage per year and will further improve its ability to handle peak-capacity requirements. An additional investment of about EUR60-80 million is expected to be completed in the last quarter of 2012, which is less than 10% of the total investment in the system. To a very large extent, these baggage system investments have already been incorporated in the airport charges. Total capex 2011 was EUR252 million (6.8% higher than in 2010) .

Rating Drivers

The six key business and financial factors (detailed below) are assessed in light of the Rating Methodology for Operational Airports outside of the United States (published May 2008). The overall rating methodology grid score maps to an A3 rating, in line with Schiphol Group's current BCA.

Factor 1 - Governance and Rate Setting

Schiphol Group has been designated as the operator of Amsterdam Airport Schiphol for an indefinite period of time, and owns its airport assets outright in perpetuity. Despite its ownership structure, Schiphol Group is a financially independent commercial enterprise. Its legal status does not place any particular legal restrictions on what it can do and hence does not provide any particular protections from bankruptcy. At the same time, the airports operated by Schiphol Group, particularly Amsterdam Airport Schiphol, are regulated in a number of areas, including noise and environment, aviation operations, capacity, safety and airport charges.

Following the implementation of a legislative decree in July 2006, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol is subject to a 'dual till' system of economic regulation, and therefore operates with a regulated return on a 'defined aviation asset base', based on an assumed average cost of capital and a proposed capital expenditure plan based on the forward requirements of users of the airport. The charges are set by Amsterdam Airport Schiphol in accordance with the regulatory framework, and possible disputes with its airline customers are referred to the relevant Dutch Government agency (the Netherlands Competition Authorities). This is a relatively new regulatory framework, which was implemented for the first time in setting aviation charges in November 2007. Under the 'dual till' principle, the non-aviation activities (consumers and real estate segments) at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol as well as all other activities of Schiphol Group, including its other Dutch airport interests, are not subject to economic regulation.

Factor 2 - Market Position

As well as serving Amsterdam - a major trading centre and capital city of an advanced European country - Schiphol Group's ownership of Rotterdam Airport and majority ownership of Eindhoven Airport gives Schiphol Group a virtual monopoly of the international airports in the Netherlands. In addition, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol is the third-largest airport by cargo volumes in Europe, a position underpinned by the Netherlands' role as a major distribution centre for non-European companies in the EU.

The Netherlands is an advanced European country with an open, robust and diversified economy and with a Aaa long-term credit rating. The negative outlook on the Government's rating is driven by the uncertainty about the outlook for the euro area, and the potential impact of plausible scenarios on member states. Particularly, Moody's now has negative outlooks on those Aaa-rated euro area sovereigns, which includes the Netherlands, whose balance sheets are expected to bear the main financial burden of EU related support.

Amsterdam Airport Schiphol has a virtual monopoly of air travel originating and ending in the Netherlands. However, given the very good rail network in continental north-west Europe, the airport is exposed to rail travel competition for certain European travel destinations. The Dutch Government's high-speed rail plans (to better connect the Netherlands to the high speed rail networks of Belgium and Germany) are advanced, which will increase the potential catchment area of Amsterdam Airport Schiphol, but may also serve to increase competition on short-haul routes and bring Amsterdam Airport Schiphol into more direct competition with airports in Paris and Brussels.

Factor 3 - Passenger and Airline Base

Amsterdam Airport Schiphol has a relatively high exposure to transfer traffic (41% of total passengers); in fact the highest of any European airport rated by Moody's, hence leaving it relatively exposed to the fortunes of its main hub

carrier. The Air France KLM Alliance accounted for nearly 63% of total passengers (or 31.3 million) in 2011 and which will have a material impact on Amsterdam Airport Schiphol's future traffic volumes. Although there are inevitable uncertainties over the shape of the Air France KLM route network over the medium term, to date the impact on Schiphol's traffic volumes has been positive, and there remains an understanding between the French and Dutch governments that changes to route networks would be minimised were possible.

Compared to most other airports rated by Moody's, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol had experienced relatively low volatility of passenger traffic since the late 1990s. However, this changed in 2009 with the large annual drop (an 8.1% decline) in passenger numbers. Passenger growth numbers recovered somewhat in 2010 (up 3.8%) and strongly recovered in 2011 (up 10.8%). The standard deviation of the year on year passenger number growth rates over the last ten full years (2002 - 2011) is 5.2%, the Schiphol Group therefore scores A for the corresponding sub-factor in the methodology. The standard deviation, which captures the volatility of passenger volume growth rates, is clearly also affected by the large decline in 2009.

Given the cross-shareholding and co-operation agreement with ADP, there is a potential danger that Air France KLM could become an even more dominant customer in the future. Both ADP and Schiphol Group are subject to an economic regulation / charge setting framework which should mitigate this. However, as we have seen elsewhere in Europe, airlines with political clout and/or strong market positions can make life more challenging for airports.

Factor 4 - Operating Environment & Capital Programme

The existing runway system of Amsterdam Airport Schiphol has the capacity to handle around 600,000 air transport movements a year, and the existing terminal can be upgraded to facilitate over 60 million passengers a year, which is expected to satisfy the demand for air traffic until at least 2015. While physical capacity is substantial, there are environmental constraints that place a limit on the number of aircraft movements. The major constraint on growth is placed by noise regulations. However, an agreement was reached to allow for approximately 510,000 air traffic movements a year as of 2010. In addition, Schiphol Group could reallocate up to 70,000 flights from Amsterdam Airport Schiphol to other Schiphol Group Dutch airports which would free up additional capacity at Amsterdam Airport Schiphol.

Following the completion of the fifth runway in 2003, Amsterdam Airport Schiphol only needs to undertake modularised expenditure to address growth as it arises. This gives the company significant flexibility in downside traffic scenarios. Planned investments in the coming years include taxiways, aprons and piers, security, fire protection and further upgrading of baggage-handling systems. Amsterdam Airport Schiphol has been investing in baggage systems in order to ensure the handling and flow of 70 million pieces of baggage per year. The total investment is about EUR800 million, most of which is already invested and included in the airport charges - only about EUR60-80 million is still to be invested.

Factor 5 - Stability of Business Model and Financial Structure

Schiphol Group's debt covenants do not place any significant limits on its investment activity or business outside airport services. Although the European Investment Bank loan facility conditions include a requirement to comply with an equity / total assets ratio of 30%, currently this covenant does not limit the ability of management to materially increase leverage due to the existence of significant headroom. A lack of legal/contractual restrictions is balanced by the track record of Schiphol Group, which has traditionally had a conservative financial structure with a modest amount of debt leverage. Nevertheless, Schiphol Group paid a one-off special dividend of EUR500 million in 2008 which, together with the net investment in ADP, has increased debt leverage. However, Moody's does not expect similar events to occur in the near future.

The co-operation agreement with ADP appears to suggest the likelihood of more overseas investment in other SkyTeam airports. However, Moody's understands that this is not management's current intention, and therefore this is not considered likely in the near term.

Factor 6 - Key Credit Metrics

Schiphol Group has been scored on the basis of its financial results for the year ending 31 December 2011. The 2011 credit metric scores are in line with Schiphol Group's current A3 BCA. Credit metrics are not expected to have changed materially since that time.

GRI Factors

Our assessment of Moderate Dependence recognises that while the majority of both Schiphol Group and the Kingdom of the Netherlands' revenues are generated domestically, they both have a reasonable level of revenues / income that ultimately derive from economies outside of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Moderate Support assessment reflects (i) the 70% direct ownership of the Kingdom of the Netherlands combined with the possibility that, at some point, Schiphol Group may be partly privatised, although this is not expected within the foreseeable future, (ii) the modest possibility that state aid rules may apply to any extraordinary support provided by the Kingdom of the Netherlands (if required), and the likelihood that the Kingdom of the Netherlands would nevertheless proceed with such support, (iii) the high importance of Schiphol to the Dutch economy, and (iv) the history of government bailouts in the Netherlands and the low likelihood that a default by Schiphol Group would cause a negative market perception of the credit quality of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Liquidity

The current liquidity profile of Schiphol Group is solid.

As at 31 December 2011, Schiphol Group had EUR413.3 million of cash and cash equivalents and EUR101.8 million of borrowings due within 12 months. In addition, in 2011 Schiphol Group signed a EUR175 million syndicated 5 year revolving credit facility with 5 banks which remains undrawn, replacing the previous 1 year + 1 year term out facility. As at 31 December 2011, Schiphol Group had a EUR750 million commercial paper programme but did not have any commercial paper outstanding, having taken the decision to end its exposure to short-term debt markets early in 2009.

Schiphol Group's large cash balances reflect its current policy of accessing debt markets to ensure adequate funding to meet all cash requirements well in advance of requirements. In June 2010, Schiphol Group raised a EUR350 million loan facility from the European Investment Bank and in April 2011 a new bond of EUR438 million with a 10-year maturity was issued.

In 2011, the Schiphol Group made a withdrawal of EUR180 million of its EIB facility to cover current financing requirements and for early repayment of a 40-year lease. The proceeds of the EUR438 million bond were used to purchase EUR403 million in existing bonds with debt maturities in 2013 and 2014 through which the Group extended the maturity of its debt.

Schiphol Group only had one significant loan maturity in 2011 of EUR109 million, and this loan was refinanced by a 4.5 year loan in December 2011. The EUR109 million loan represents the Schiphol Group's 60.25% participation in a EUR180 million loan to the AREB C.V. Fund (a 60.25% owned property joint venture). Schiphol Group's current cash balances and standby bank facilities are more than adequate to meet its cash requirements, and Schiphol Group's liquidity is expected to remain good.

In line with other major airport companies, Schiphol Group generates strong operating cash flow throughout the year, albeit with some cyclicity because the northern hemisphere summer season generates more cash flow than the winter season. Moody's would expect capital expenditure in 2012 to be around EUR300 million, i.e., about EUR 50 million higher than in 2011. Moody's would expect Schiphol Group to generate sufficient cash flow and have sufficient cash balances to cover all cash requirements for at least the next 12 months.

Rating Outlook

The negative outlook on Schiphol Group's ratings reflects the negative outlook on the rating of the Government of Netherlands and the fact that any deterioration in the creditworthiness of the Dutch sovereign rating would likely impact the rating of the company. Given the company's 70% direct state ownership, the credit quality of the Dutch government is one of the main drivers of uplift incorporated in the companies' ratings.

Schiphol Group's BCA, which represents Schiphol's standalone financial strength, is expected to stay constant. Its framework of economic regulation should provide appropriate charges going forward, although the framework needs to be tested over a few years to confirm its robustness, and capital expenditure is expected to be managed in light of expected future traffic growth. Moody's does not anticipate that there will be a step-change in overseas investment or investment in non-core activities, although the industrial co-operation agreement with ADP provides a framework for this.

What Could Change the Rating - Up

Although traffic is recovering from the decline recorded in 2009, given the current economic conditions and the negative outlook on the rating of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Moody's views a ratings upgrade as unlikely at this stage. Upward rating pressure could be warranted if the company were able to revert to a financial profile somewhat in line with that reported prior to 2008 financial statements and if the outlook on the rating of the Government would go back to stable.

What Could Change the Rating - Down

The ratings of Schiphol Group could be downgraded in the event of a downgrade of the Government of Netherlands. Also, the ratings could be downgraded if the financial profile of Schiphol Group deteriorates to the extent that any of the following ratios falls consistently below the identified levels: (i) cash interest coverage below 3.5 times, (ii) funds from operations (FFO) / Debt below 12.5% or (iii) Moody's debt-service coverage ratio (DSCR) below 3.5x.

Furthermore, a programme of material overseas or non-core investments may dilute the existing business profile to the extent that it has negative rating implications.

Rating Factors

N.V. Luchthaven Schiphol

Airports Industry	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa
Factor 1: Governance and Rate Setting (15%)							
a) Legal Status / Corporate Objectives			X				
b) Rate Setting Methodology				X			
c) Nature of Ownership / Control	X						
Factor 2: Market Position (15%)							
a) Size of Service Area	X						
b) Robustness & Diversity of Service Area	X						
c) Competition for Medium to Long Distance Travel		X					
Factor 3: Passenger & Airline Base (10%)							
a) Passenger Mix (O&D / Transfer)					X		
b) Standard Dev of Long Term Average Annual Passenger Growth Rate			X				
c) Carrier Base (Transfer Traffic)				X			
Factor 4: Operating Environment & Capital Programme (10%)							
a) Operational Restrictions				X			
b) Complexity of Airport Capital Expenditure Programme			X				
Factor 5: Stability of Business Model & Financial Structure (10%)							
a) Ability and Willingness to Pursue Opportunistic Corp Activity			X				
b) Ability and Willingness to Increase Leverage				X			
c) Targeted Proportion of Rev outside of Owned Airport Services				X			
Factor 6: Key Credit Metrics (Hist & Projected) (40%) [1][2]							
a) (FFO + Interest Expense) / (Interest Expense - Non-Cash Int)				4.4x			
b) FFO / Debt			19.1%				
c) Debt Service Coverage Ratio			5.2x				
d) Implied Concession Life Coverage Ratio			19.3%				
Rating: Indicated Rating from Grid Factors 1-6			A3				

Rating Lift			0.0				
a) Indicated Rating from Grid			A3				
b) Actual Rating Assigned			A3				

Government-Related Issuer	Factor
a) Baseline Credit Assessment	7 (A3)
b) Government Local Currency Rating	Aaa
c) Default Dependence	Moderate
d) Support	Moderate

[1] Standard adjustments in accordance with "Rating Methodology: Moody's Approach to Global Standard Adjustments in the Analysis of Financial Statements for Non-Financial Corporations, Part 1, Part 2 and Part 3". In addition, Moody's adjusts for one time items. [2] Based on financial data as of 6/30/2010(L); Source: Moody's Financial Metrics



© 2012 Moody's Investors Service, Inc. and/or its licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. ("MIS") AND ITS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S 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. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

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. 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. Under no circumstances shall MOODY'S have any liability to any person or entity for (a) any loss or damage in whole or in part caused by, resulting from, or relating to, any error (negligent or otherwise) or other circumstance or contingency within or outside the control of MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees or agents in connection with the procurement, collection, compilation, analysis, interpretation, communication, publication or delivery of any such information, or (b) any direct, indirect, special, consequential, compensatory or incidental damages whatsoever (including without limitation, lost profits), even if MOODY'S is advised in advance of the possibility of such damages, resulting from the use of or inability to use, any such information. The ratings, financial reporting analysis, projections, and other observations, if any, constituting part of the information contained herein are, and must be construed solely as, statements of opinion and not statements of fact or recommendations to purchase, sell or hold any securities. Each user of the information contained herein must make its own study and evaluation of each security it may consider purchasing, holding or selling. NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, 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 MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moodys.com under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Any publication into Australia of this document is by MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657, which holds Australian Financial Services License no. 336969. 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.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, credit ratings assigned on and after October 1, 2010 by Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") are MJKK's current opinions of the relative future credit risk of entities, credit commitments, or debt or debt-like securities. In such a case, "MIS" in the foregoing statements shall be deemed to be replaced with "MJKK". 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.

This 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. It would be dangerous for retail investors to make any investment decision based on this credit

rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.