MOODY'S
INVESTORS SERVICE

RATING METHODOLOGY Telecommunications Service Providers

Table of Contents:

SUMMARY 1
ABOUT THE RATED UNIVERSE 2
ABOUT THIS RATING METHODOLOGY 3
DISCUSSION OF THE SCORECARD FACTORS 6
ASSUMPTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RATING CONSIDERATIONS THAT ARE NOT COVERED IN THE SCORECARD 18
OTHER RATING CONSIDERATIONS 19
APPENDIX A: TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDERS METHODOLOGY SCORECARD 23
MOODY'S RELATED RESEARCH 28

Analyst Contacts:

MADRID +34.91.768.8200

Carlos Winzer +34.91.768.8238
Senior Vice President
carlos.winzer@moodys.com

Ivan Palacios +34.91.768.8229
Associate Managing Director - Corporate Finance
ivan.palacios@moodys.com

LONDON +44.20.7772.5454

Sandra Veseli +44.20.7772.5593
Managing Director - Corporate Finance
sandra.veseli@moodys.com

NEW YORK +1.212.553.1653

John Diaz +1.212.553.1977
Managing Director - Corporate Finance
john.diaz@moodys.com

SINGAPORE +65.6398.8308

Laura Acres +65.6398.8335
Managing Director - Corporate Finance
laura.acres@moodys.com

This rating methodology replaces Global Telecommunications Industry Methodology published in December 2010. While reflecting many of the same core principles as the 2010 methodology, this updated document provides a more transparent presentation of the rating considerations that are usually most important for issuers in this sector and incorporates refinements in our analysis that better reflect credit fundamentals of the industry.

Summary

This rating methodology explains Moody's approach to assessing credit risk for rated issuers in the telecommunications service provider industry globally.

Highlights of this report include:

» An overview of the rated universe

» A summary of the rating methodology

» A description of factors that drive credit quality and ratings

» Comments on the rating methodology assumptions and limitations, including a discussion of rating considerations that are not included in the scorecard

This document provides general guidance intended to help the reader understand how qualitative and quantitative risk characteristics are likely to affect rating outcomes for issuers in the telecommunications service providers industry. This document does not include an exhaustive treatment of all factors that are considered by our analysts and reflected in Moody's ratings. For instance, our analysis for ratings in this sector covers factors that are common across all industries such as ownership, management, liquidity, corporate legal structure, governance, and country related risks which are not explained in detail in this document, as well as factors that can be meaningful on a company-specific basis. However, this methodology should enable the reader to understand the qualitative and quantitative considerations, including financial information and metrics that are usually most important for ratings in this sector.

This report includes a scorecard[1], which is a reference tool that can be used to approximate credit profiles within this sector in most cases and to explain, in summary form, the factors that are generally most important in assigning ratings to companies in this industry. The scorecard used for this methodology reflects a decision to use a relatively simple and transparent presentation rather than a more complex scorecard that might map scorecard-indicated outcomes more closely to actual ratings. The scorecard is a summary that does not include every rating consideration, and other quantitative or qualitative considerations that may not

[1] In our methodologies and research, the terms "scorecard" and "grid" are used interchangeably.

lend themselves to a transparent presentation in a scorecard format can also affect assigned ratings. Furthermore, the weights shown for each factor in the scorecard represent an approximation of their importance for rating decisions, but actual importance may vary substantially. In addition, ratings are based on our forward-looking expectations, which may vary from historical financial statements, and our long-term forward view may different than our near-term forward view.

This rating methodology is not intended to provide an exhaustive description of all factors that our analysts consider in assigning ratings in this sector. We seek to incorporate all risks into our ratings, whether long-term or short term, with the most forward looking view that visibility into these risks permits. In most cases, nearer-term risks are more meaningful to issuer credit profiles and thus have a more direct impact on ratings. However, in some cases, our views of longer-term trends may have an impact on ratings. As a result, the scorecard-indicated outcome is not expected to match the actual rating of each company.

This methodology describes the analytical framework used in determining credit ratings in this sector. In some instances our analysis is also guided by additional methodologies, which describe our approach for analytical considerations that are not specific to any single sector. Examples of such considerations include but are not limited to: the assignment of short-term ratings, the relative ranking of different classes of debt and hybrid securities, how sovereign credit quality affects non-sovereign issuers, and the assessment of credit support from other entities. A link to documents that describe our approach to such cross-sector methodological considerations can be found in the Moody's Related Research section of this report.

The scorecard contains five factors that are important in our assessments for ratings in the telecommunications sector:

1. Scale
2. Business Profile
3. Profitability and Efficiency
4. Leverage and Coverage
5. Financial Policy

Some of these factors are comprised of a number of sub-factors.

About the Rated Universe

This methodology is applicable to companies that derive the majority of their revenues from providing telecommunications services to other businesses or consumers.

The global telecommunications service providers are a broadly diverse group of companies, differentiated by operating history, products and services and customer and service areas. Companies with stronger credit profiles tend to be large diversified carriers that have evolved from historic monopoly providers, or major wireless-only companies with significant financial resources. Speculative grade issuers typically are smaller, more recent industry participants, which have limited product diversity and are more leveraged, or in some cases operate in countries where ratings are constrained by the sovereign credit. The telecommunication sector frequently undergoes changes mainly due to the emergence of new technologies, intense market competition as well as continued high degree of government regulation. The telecommunications industry's roots used to be in government-sanctioned (and in some cases, government-owned) monopolies. Following a worldwide move to deregulate and privatize the dominant national carriers, along with the proliferation of wireless technologies and the global adoption of Internet Protocol ("IP") transmissions, intense competition

from new players like cable providers and over-the-top (OTT) providers and growing fragmentation are rapidly reshaping the industry.

Telecommunications is a highly capital intensive industry. The significant investment in network infrastructure for maintenance and the introduction of new services to replace declining legacy products is likely to be a permanent characteristic of all segments of the telecommunications industry, worldwide. Despite the expanding use of telecommunications networks to deliver a broader array of service offerings, telecom revenue growth rates are unlikely to deviate much from GDP growth levels in the developed markets, while the expanding capital spending to elevate the standards of emerging markets will likely hinder free cash flow growth for the global telecommunications industry. Furthermore, increased competition and fast moving technological trends have generally reduced asset life cycles, with the result that the industry's return on investment has become less certain than it was historically.

Other typical credit challenges in the industry include consolidation and shareholder activism that pressures companies to re-direct a substantial share of cash flow to equity in the form of dividends, distributions and share buy-backs. While consolidation potentially allows some market players to extract value from scale benefits or to achieve synergies that may ultimately improve financial performance, debt-financed acquisition activity remains a key credit risk in the sector.

About This Rating Methodology

This report explains the rating methodology for issuers in the telecommunications service providers industry, summarized in the five sections below:

1. Identification of the Scorecard Factors

The scorecard in this rating methodology is comprised of five factors. Some of the five factors are comprised of sub-factors.

EXHIBIT 1

Telecommunications Service Providers Scorecard

Rating Factors	Factor Weighting	Sub-Factors	Sub-Factor Weighting
Scale	12.5%	Revenue	12.5%
Business Profile	27.5%	Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning	12.5%
		Regulatory Environment	7.5%
		Market Share	7.5%
Profitability and Efficiency	10%	Revenue Trend and Margin Sustainability	10%
Leverage and Coverage	35%	Debt/EBITDA	15%
		RCF/Debt	10%
		(EBITDA-CAPEX)/ Interest Expense	10%
Financial Policy	15%	Financial Policy	15%
Total	**100%**	**Total**	**100%**

2. Measurement or Estimation of Factors in the Scorecard

We explain our general approach for scoring each scorecard factor and show the weights used in the scorecard. We also provide a rationale for why each of these grid components is meaningful as a credit indicator. The information used in assessing the sub-factors is generally found in or calculated from information in company financial statements, derived from other observations or estimated by Moody's analysts.

Our ratings are forward-looking and reflect our expectations for future financial and operating performance. However, historical results are helpful in understanding patterns and trends of a company's performance as well as for peer comparisons. Financial ratios, unless otherwise indicated, are typically calculated based on an annual or 12 month period. However, the factors in the scorecard can be assessed using various time periods. For example, rating committees may find it analytically useful to examine both historic and expected future performance for periods of several years or more.

All of the quantitative credit metrics incorporate Moody's standard adjustments to the income statement, cash flow statement and balance sheet amounts for restructuring and impairment charges, off-balance sheet accounts, receivable securitization programs, under-funded pension obligations, and recurring operating leases. Moody's may also make other analytical adjustments that are specific to a particular company.

For definitions of Moody's most common ratio terms, please see 'Moody's Basic Definitions for Credit Statistics, User's Guide'. For a description of Moody's standard adjustments, please see our cross-sector methodology that discusses financial statement adjustments in the analysis of non-financial corporations. Links to these can be found in the Moody's Related Research section of this report.

3. Mapping Scorecard Factors to a Numerical Score

After estimating or calculating each sub-factor, the outcomes for each of the sub-factors are mapped to a broad Moody's rating category (Aaa, Aa, A, Baa, Ba, B, Caa, or Ca, also called alpha categories) and to a numerical score.

Qualitative factors are scored based on the description by broad rating category in the scorecard. The numeric value of each alpha score is based upon the scale below.

Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
1	3	6	9	12	15	18	20

Quantitative factors are scored on a linear continuum. For each metric, the scorecard shows the range by alpha category. We use the scale below and linear interpolation to convert the metric, based on its placement within the scorecard range, to a numeric score, which may be a fraction. For example, given a Baa interest coverage range of 3.5x to 5x, the numerical score for an issuer with (relatively strong) coverage of 4.9x will score closer to 7.5, and an issuer with (relatively weak) coverage of only 3.6x will score closer to 10.5. In the text or footnotes, we define the end points of the line (i.e., the value of the metric that constitutes the lowest possible numeric score, and the value that constitutes the highest possible numeric score).

Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
0.5-1.5	1.5-4.5	4.5-7.5	7.5-10.5	10.5-13.5	13.5-16.5	16.5-19.5	19.5-20.5

4. Determining the Overall Scorecard - Indicated Outcome

The numeric score for each sub-factor (or each factor, when the factor has no sub-factors) is multiplied by the weight for that sub-factor (or factor), with the results then summed to produce an aggregate numeric score. The aggregate numeric score is then mapped back to an alphanumeric scorecard indicated outcome based on the ranges in the table below.

EXHIBIT 2

Scorecard - Indicated Outcome

Scorecard - Indicated Outcome	Aggregate Weighted Factor Score
Aaa	x ≤ 1.5
Aa1	1.5 < x ≤ 2.5
Aa2	2.5 < x ≤ 3.5
Aa3	3.5 < x ≤ 4.5
A1	4.5 < x ≤ 5.5
A2	5.5 < x ≤ 6.5
A3	6.5 < x ≤ 7.5
Baa1	7.5 < x ≤ 8.5
Baa2	8.5 < x ≤ 9.5
Baa3	9.5 < x ≤ 10.5
Ba1	10.5 < x ≤ 11.5
Ba2	11.5 < x ≤ 12.5
Ba3	12.5 < x ≤ 13.5
B1	13.5 < x ≤ 14.5
B2	14.5 < x ≤ 15.5
B3	15.5 < x ≤ 16.5
Caa1	16.5 < x ≤ 17.5
Caa2	17.5 < x ≤ 18.5
Caa3	18.5 < x ≤ 19.5
Ca	19.5 < x ≤ 20.5
C	x > 20.5

For example, an issuer with an aggregate weighted factor score of 11.7 would have a Ba2 scorecard-indicated outcome[2].

5. Assumptions, Limitations and Rating Considerations Not Included in the Scorecard

This section, which follows the detailed description of the scorecard factors, discusses limitations in the use of the scorecard to map against actual ratings, some of the additional factors that are not included in the

[2] In general, the scorecard-indicated outcome is oriented to the Corporate Family Rating (CFR) for speculative-grade issuers and the senior unsecured rating for investment-grade issuers. For issuers that benefit from rating uplift from parental support, government ownership or other institutional support, we consider the underlying credit strength or baseline credit assessment for comparison to the scorecard-indicated outcome. For an explanation of baseline credit assessment please refer to Moody's cross-sector methodology for government-related issuers. Individual debt instrument ratings also factor in decisions on notching for seniority level and collateral. The documents that provide broad guidance for such notching decisions are the rating methodology on loss given default for speculative grade non-financial companies and the methodology for aligning corporate instrument ratings based on differences in security and priority of claim. A link to these cross-sector methodologies can be found in the Moody's Related Research section of this report.

scorecard but can be important in determining ratings, and limitations and assumptions that pertain to the overall rating methodology.

6. Appendices

Appendix A shows the full scorecard.

Discussion of the Scorecard Factors

Factor 1: Scale (12.5% Weight)

Why it Matters

Size typically plays an important role in gauging the credit strength of a telecommunications company as it influences many of the core attributes that drive its resiliency to stress. These attributes may include, among other aspects, the breadth of a company's customer base, the depth of its business, economies of scale, operational and financial flexibility, and greater pricing power. Larger companies may have a greater ability to harness business trends, support a stable or growing market position and withstand competitive pressures. For service providers in the telecommunication industry, scale can enhance a company's ability to bundle products, increasingly a competitive advantage, and may be accompanied by market leadership that can bring superior access to customers, which positively influences its long-term business viability.

Scale also typically enhances a company's ability to absorb a temporary disruption, acquisition or misjudgment in the execution of capital investments. Larger companies are generally more broadly diversified, which can help reduce volatility and provide flexibility to generate cash from the divestiture of certain operations, if needed. Larger companies also benefit from greater financial resources as well as access to capital markets, which enhances financial flexibility. These attributes are particularly meaningful in a capital intensive industry characterized by reduced asset life cycles due to fast-moving technological trends.

How We Assess it For the Scorecard

Scale is measured or estimated using total reported revenue in USD billion terms.

FACTOR 1

Scale (12.5%)

Sub-Factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Revenue (USD Billion)*	12.5%	≥100	50-100	25-50	12.5-25	5-12.5	2-5	0.5-2	<0.5

* For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is $300 billion. A value of $300 billion or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is $0.05 billion. A value of $0.05 billion or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5.

Factor 2: Business Profile (27.5% Weight)

Why it Matters

A telecommunications company's business profile has a large degree of influence on its ability to generate operating cash flows and on the stability and sustainability of those flows. Core aspects of a business profile that drive success or failure typically include the depth and breadth of the company's product offering, its competitive environment and the position it occupies in its operating markets.

A company's business model is an important differentiator when assessing its long-term sustainability, in particular in the telecommunications sector where substantially different business models co-exist and/or

compete, widening the array of credit profiles in the sector. Because convergence is a key consideration in affecting many markets, a diversified business model generally enables a company to more effectively compete than either a stand-alone fixed-line operation or wireless business, thereby generally precluding the latter from scoring highly under business model. A diversified player would typically benefit from a sounder platform for adopting a range of new products, providing it with a stronger capacity to fulfill customers' needs as technologies rapidly evolve. It may also strategically invest in emerging technologies and ramp up investments, depending on market acceptance of these new technologies, widening the opportunity for success.

Beyond broad product differentiation, diversification has other dimensions such as customer segments or geographic reach, both of which can enable a company to mitigate the effects of variation in demand or pricing in a given product or market. Serving a diversity of customers may help to partly offset rapidly evolving trends within the industry. New product categories and customers' needs are constantly emerging, and reliance on any one line or customer segment can carry significant risks. Similarly, geographic diversification may help telecom operators, in particular non-incumbent ones, shield from market vagaries, customer switching behavior or technological disruption. However, while international diversification in highly rated countries or in mature and stable markets is typically viewed as beneficial to a company's creditworthiness, investments in lower rated countries or in less developed or predictable telecommunication markets often carry a number of challenges that may offset the benefits stemming from geographic diversification. Those challenges typically come in various forms such as political or regulatory interference, trapped cash, exposure to currency risks or corruption, or diversion of management attention away from the strategies and markets that are core to its business. Hence, a large degree of diversification (especially if debt financed) into emerging markets, which generally offer the highest growth opportunities but also entail the most risk, can in some cases have a negative credit impact.

The competitive environment typically is a key driver of credit quality because the degree of competition a company faces impacts its pricing power, marketing expenses and customer churn, and hence the sustainability and level of its operating margins. It may also drive the level and pace of capital spending on adopting new technologies, either as a means to differentiate product offerings or reduce costs. The telecommunication sector has been characterized by increasing competitive pressure, in particular for incumbents as regulatory liberalization and technology have created an environment where a host of competitors threaten the value of incumbents' assets.

In that context, and because of the high technology content of the telecommunications industry, the technical positioning of an operator can provide a substantial competitive advantage or conversely weigh on its capacity to retain or expand its customer base. Hence, a company's investment strategy can be critical to its future prospects. For example, we typically view the ownership of a mix of frequencies[3] to be crucial for a mobile operator's business model, in order to handle increasing traffic volume and provide broad geographical coverage across its area of operation. While the cost of adopting new technology may be significant, both in terms of capital required and the risk of failure, the failure to quickly adopt a new technology before competition erodes the incumbent's position may carry some significant business cost.

Due to the essentiality of the product, including the growing demand for high service levels, the public objectives of maintaining fair competition and competitive prices, and the high capital costs associated with its infrastructure, the telecom industry is subject to a high degree of government regulation and oversight. As such, the regulatory framework under which a telecom company operates is an important determinant

[3] The wider the spectrum, the more traffic can be carried between mobile sites (the base stations) and mobile phone users. In any given area, the spectrum is allocated between simultaneous users of the network. Low frequencies allow the signal to be distributed over a long distance and penetrate through buildings. These frequencies are typically well suited to the roll out of a broad network coverage at relatively low cost. Conversely, higher frequencies are better suited to providing the capacity necessary to meet demand for high data rates from a large number of users in urban areas, airports and other densely populated or visited locations.

of its business profile, primarily because it influences the competitive environment and can help or hinder the company's ability to predictably earn a return on its investment. In many markets, one of the dominant challenges facing former government-sanctioned (and in some cases, government-owned) companies is adapting to the transition from monopolies to competitive enterprises. The balance that regulators in these regions strike between increasing competition in their markets and protecting employment and price levels in the former monopolies has a major impact on business profiles. The potential for new concessions or licenses and the way regulation enables prospective carriers to build new networks, access other carriers' networks, interconnect their networks with incumbents, and obtain "equitable" access pricing can heavily influence the future competitive landscape and operators' financial trajectory. For example, in most mature markets, incumbents have to offer access to these new entrants, but do not have reciprocal access to their competitors' services at regulated prices. Telecom operators are often responsible for making investments in high-speed networks but are unlikely to have the exclusivity in exploiting that investment, while some new entrants have asset light businesses and hold dominant positions in their services. Wireless operators can themselves also be impacted by regulatory decisions as additional spectrum sales can increase the overall number of competitors and provide the foundation for the introduction of competing technologies. For services that are price-regulated, the sufficiency and predictability of tariffs have a major influence on cash flows, as regulators seek to balance stabilizing or lowering prices for consumers while allowing companies to earn an adequate return on the investment made in their networks.

Market share is important for credit assessment as it can indicate the level of competitive success, the strength of customer relationships, the potential to benefit from operating leverage and likely prospects for future performance. Indeed, the relative positioning of a telecom within its market segments may provide some indication of the sustainability of its operating position and whether it will be able to lead or be required to react to the nature and pace of development in the industry. Furthermore, the strength of a telecom within its markets can influence customer perceptions, its ability to leverage existing capabilities to develop and support revenue, the flexibility to innovate without having to make large bets, and its degree of influence with regulators and government officials. In many cases, the large market share of incumbent service providers, combined with established infrastructure and network coverage, has been a significant advantage.

The three scorecard sub-factors related to Business Profile are:

A. Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning

B. Regulatory Environment

C. Market Share

How We Assess it For the Scorecard

2.A. Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning

The scoring of this sub-factor is based on a qualitative assessment of the market structure, customer count and revenue trends as well as a company's exposure to technological advancement and how well positioned it may be in handling such developments.

<u>Business Model</u>. The key metrics considered for assessing a firm's business model include geographical diversification (i.e. international, national, regional[4]) and revenue mix (i.e. wireless and wireline, voice, data and video (if applicable), business and residential).

[4] Regional dimension makes reference to geographical footprint in large countries such as the US.

Competitive Environment. In assessing the level of competitive challenge we typically consider, among other things, revenue trends, number of players, rate of access line change relative to demand growth and, for wireless carriers, gross additions, churn[5] levels and Average Revenue Per User trends in the company's core markets.

Technical Positioning. We consider how exposed a company may be to technological advancement and how well positioned it may be in handling such developments. Our assessment of a company's technology typically includes an evaluation of the lifetime service capabilities and scalability of the company's existing network architecture. In order to assess the risk associated with a company's ongoing infrastructure plans, we generally consider the technologies that the company is deploying, specifically with regard to whether it is a proven or unproven technology, time to market, the size of the investment required, and the technology's expected life-time. While this assessment is largely qualitative, a quantitative measure that can prove helpful in this evaluation is CAPEX/Revenues, with a higher level typically indicating a lower risk of technology obsolescence. A ratio in the single digit percentage typically would indicate some degree of risk.

There are somewhat different scoring grids for diversified, wireless and wireline carriers, and truncation of the grid on the upper end for the latter two segments of the industry are based on our view that the business models for these entities expose them to greater levels of risk that is inconsistent with the highest scoring levels.

2.B Regulatory Environment

The scoring of this sub-factor is based on a qualitative assessment of the regulatory environment in which a telecom company operates. We typically consider four different aspects of the regulatory environment as the most useful indicators for assessing this sub-factor: (i) support for return on investment; (ii) regulatory barriers to entry, such as propensity for additional licenses or concessions to be issued; (iii) predictability; and (iv) level of reliance on a regulated revenue stream or service subsidies. If a company relies on regulated revenues that might be at risk due to possible changes in regulation, our perception of business risk increases.

Our assessment of how developed the regulatory framework typically considers the strength of the political and legal underpinnings of the regulatory framework; the regulator's track record for predictability and stability in terms of decision making; its independence from political interference; and our forward looking view on whether these conditions will persist. Our assessment would typically be based not only on the relative degree of credit support or challenge a regulatory environment may create for telecommunication operators in a given jurisdiction, but also on how this environment or any change to it may impact a specific issuer. For example, we may consider how the regulatory environment will handle the industry's convergence, and whether regulations tend to favor incumbents or their competitors. We also usually view high reliance on a government-regulated revenue stream negatively. The predictability of the regulatory environment is a key aspect for gauging its credit impact. Regulatory uncertainty generally weighs on all players in a given jurisdiction.

2.C Market Share

The scoring of this sub-factor is based on an assessment of the relative market shares a company exhibits in its different markets/segments of operations.

[5] The churn rate is the percentage of subscribers to a service who discontinue their subscriptions within a given time period.

FACTOR 2

Business Profile (27.5%)

Sub-Factor	Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Diversified Carriers									
Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning	12.5%	Strong geographically diversified incumbent national provider of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base with wireline and wireless segments exposed to very limited competitive challenges; and very successful international expansion; and very low technology risk.	National incumbent provider of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base with wireline and wireless segments exposed to limited competitive challenges; and successful international expansion; and low technology risk.	National incumbent provider of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base wireline and wireless segments exposed to increasing competitive challenges; and. moderate international expansion; and low to moderate technology risk. OR Regional provider* of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base with wireline and wireless segments exposed to moderate competitive challenges; and moderate expansion outside of home market with typically about 50% to 60% of sales in one market, country or region; and low to moderate technology risk.	National provider of full suite of integrated services to a fairly broad customer base and substantial competitive challenges; and moderate technology risk. OR Regional provider of full suite of integrated services to a fairly broad customer base and increasing competitive challenges and limited expansion outside of home market with typically about 60% to 80% of sales in one market, country or region; and moderate technology risk.	Regional provider of full suite of integrated services to a narrow customer base with increasing competitive challenges; or typically about 80% to 90% of sales in one market, country or region; or moderate to high technology risk.	Regional provider of full suite of integrated services to a narrow customer base with increasing competitive challenges; or typically more than 90% of sales in one market, country or region; or high technology risk.	Provider of full suite of integrated services highly dependent on access to incumbent's network; or very high technology risk.	Provider of full suite of integrated services with very limited access to incumbent's network; or extremely high technology risk; or high probability of disruption in service because of the poor quality of network.

* Regional dimension makes reference to geographical footprint in large countries such as the US.

FACTOR 2

Business Profile (27.5%)

Sub-Factor	Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Wireless Carriers									
Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning	12.5%	N.A.	N.A.	Multi-national operator with successful expansion outside its area, with stable business; and low to moderate technology risk. OR Firmly established national or super-regional operator with stable business; and low to moderate technology risk. OR Emerging operator in developing markets with high growth potential and very low existing competition with less than 50% of sales to one market, country or region; and low to moderate technology risk.	Multi-national operator expanding in emerging markets with existing competition with less than 70% of sales to one market, country or region and moderate technology risk. OR National operator with strong business; and moderate technology risk. OR Emerging operator in developing markets with high growth potential and low existing competition; and moderate technology risk.	National operator with stabilizing business OR Established regional operator with stable business and minimal dependence on roaming or subsidy revenues. OR Emerging operator in developing markets with moderate growth potential or stable performance and moderate existing competition; or typically around 85% of sales to one market, country or region; OR Moderate to high technology risk.	National operator with below industry-average performance OR Established regional operator with below average performance. OR Emerging regional operator or established regional operator with deteriorating performance on a sustained basis or typically around 90% of sales to one market, country or region; OR High technology risk.	National operator with very poor performance compared to industry average OR Established regional operator with very poor performance. OR Emerging regional operator or established regional operator with meaningful deterioration in performance and no prospects of recovery in the short-term or typically almost 100% of sales to one market, country or region; OR Very high technology risk.	Mobile Virtual Network Operator or affiliate without spectrum. OR Extremely high technology risk.
Wireline-only Carriers									
Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning	12.5%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Incumbent exposed to moderate to low competitive challenges; and moderate to low technology risk.	Incumbent with steadily increasing competitive challenges OR Non-incumbent provider with significant end-to-end network infrastructure. Company dependent on access to incumbents' network. OR Moderate to high technology risk.	Incumbent with rapidly declining business (i.e. revenues declining by about 10% per year) OR Non-incumbent based operator with significant core network infrastructure with high dependence on access to incumbents' network. OR High technology risk.	Incumbent with extremely rapidly declining business and margins OR Non-incumbent based operator with poor core network infrastructure With very high dependence on access to incumbents' network. OR Very high technology risk.	Competitive entrant reliant on other providers for significant portion of termination OR Reseller. OR Extremely high technology risk.

FACTOR 2

Business Profile (27.5%)

Sub-Factor	Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Regulatory Environment	7.5%	Regulatory framework is fully developed, has a very long-track record of being extremely predictable and stable, and is extremely supportive of Return on Investment (ROI) for incumbent telecom providers and is very unlikely to change; and regulatory body is located in a highly rated sovereign with very strong institutional framework and effectiveness or strong independent regulator with unquestioned authority over telecom regulation that is national in scope; and very unlikely awards of new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is fully developed, has a long track record of being very predictable and stable, and is highly supportive of ROI for incumbent telecom providers and is unlikely to change; and regulatory body is typically located in a high to moderate rated sovereign with strong institutional framework and effectiveness or strong independent regulator with authority over most telecom regulation that is national in scope; and unlikely awards of new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is fully developed, is very predictable and stable in balancing the interests of the incumbent telecom providers and the new comers but with less track-record and is highly supportive of ROI for incumbent telecom providers; and regulatory body is a sovereign, sovereign agency or independent regulator with authority over most telecom regulation that is national in scope; and unlikely awards of new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is fully developed, has a short track-record of being predictable and stable in overall supporting the interests of the incumbent telecom providers while being somewhat more supportive to new entrants, still allowing an adequate ROI for incumbent telecom providers; and regulatory body is a sovereign, sovereign agency or independent regulator with authority over most telecom regulation that is national in scope with change in administration having some potential to alter outlook; and potential awards of limited new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is a) well-developed, with evidence of some inconsistency or unpredictability in the way framework has been applied, or framework is new and untested, but based on well-developed and established precedents, or b) jurisdiction has history of independent and transparent regulation in other sectors; or regulatory environment may sometimes be challenging and politically charged; or regulatory support for increased facilities and non-facilities based competition. OR Regulation generally favors new market entrants. OR Likely awards of new operating concessions. OR Regulatory bodies in active deliberations to negatively alter the regulatory framework.	Regulatory framework is developed, but there is a high degree of inconsistency or unpredictability in the way the framework has been applied; or regulatory environment is consistently challenging and politically charged; or there is no consistent track record of independent and transparent regulation. Jurisdiction has a history of difficult or less supportive regulatory decisions, or regulatory authority has been or may be challenged or eroded by political or legislative action.; or regulatory support for non-facilities based competition. OR Regulation strongly favors new market entrants. OR Regulatory change to have strong negative impact on the regulatory framework.	Regulatory framework is not developed, is unclear, is undergoing substantial change or has a history of being unpredictable or adverse to telecom operators; or regulatory body lacks a consistent track record or appears unsupportive, uncertain, or highly unpredictable; or may face high risk of significant government intervention in operations or markets; or strong regulatory support for non-facilities based competition. OR Regulation is highly unbalanced towards favoring new market entrants.	Regulatory framework or regulatory body carry extremely high risk for the business continuity of telecom operators.

Factor 2

Business Profile (27.5%)

Sub-Factor	Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Market Share	7.5%	Company is the principal player in the local market and in most of the regions where it operates. OR Company has monopoly-type presence in its local region.	Company is a clear market leader in the local market and holds competitive positions in all regions where it operates. OR Company is the principal player and very strong market leader in its local region.	Company is a very solid competitor in the local market and holds competitive positions in most of the regions where it operates. OR Company is a clear market leader in its local region.	Company is a well-positioned competitor in its local market and holds competitive positions in many regions where it operates. OR Company is a very solid competitor in its local region.	Company is a mid to lower-tier competitor in its local market and holds competitive positions in some of the markets where it operates. OR Company is a well-positioned competitor in its local region.	Company is a small competitor in its local market and holds minor competitive positions in other markets. OR Company is a mid to lower-tier competitor in its local region.	Company is a small competitor in its local market.	Company is a start-up with no track record.

Factor 3: Profitability and Efficiency (10% weight)

Why it Matters

Profits matter because they are necessary to maintain a business' competitive position, including sufficient reinvestment in marketing, research, facilities, and human capital. The breadth of business models and diversity of operating environments in the telecommunications sector (i.e. diversified, wireline, wireless, regional, national, postpaid, prepaid, etc.) makes it important to adopt a multidimensional approach when assessing profitability. While the level and stability of operating margins is a key consideration in assessing risk to debt holders, revenue trends may also drive an operator's capacity to sustain its profitability levels over the medium to long-term. As revenues decline, a company may be able to cut costs to maintain margins on a short-term basis but this may not be achievable indefinitely without putting at risk its business model and thereby its profitability prospects. Conversely, high margins may be supported by strong revenue growth, as can be the case in some emerging markets, but an operator may have little pricing power or cost control to mitigate any impact a slowdown in market dynamics may have on its margins. Hence, the strength of an entity's profitability would typically be a function of both the sustainability of its margins and its revenue trajectory.

How We Assess it For The Scorecard

Revenue Trend and Margin Sustainability:

The scoring of this sub-factor is based on a forward-looking qualitative assessment of the sustainability in revenue growth and the ability to maintain margins on a sustained basis. Hence, our assessment considers both the level and trajectory of margins and revenues but also their respective sustainability. Typical considerations to assess the sustainability of margin or revenue growth include, among other things, the composition or quality of the margin (for example the degree of the company's operational flexibility and its capacity and willingness to take the necessary steps to maintain or support margin level) as well as the drivers behind revenue growth (market dynamics, organic growth vs M&A, etc.) and the risks attached to those.

FACTOR 3

Profitability and Efficiency (10%)

Sub-Factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Revenue Trend and Margin Sustainability	10%	On a sustainable basis: Strong revenue growth AND Exceptional margin levels.	On a sustainable basis: Moderate revenue growth AND Very high margin levels.	On a sustainable basis: Slight revenue growth AND High margin levels.	On a sustainable basis: Stable revenues AND Good margin levels.	Expectation of: Slight, sustained decline in revenues OR Sustained moderate margin levels.	Expectation of: Moderate, sustained decline in revenues OR Sustained modest margin levels.	Expectation of: Strong decline in revenues OR Sustained weak margin levels.	Expectation of: Steep decline in revenues OR Sustained very weak or extremely unpredictable margin levels.

Factor 4: Leverage and Coverage (35% Weight)

Why it Matters

Leverage and coverage measures are key indicators for a company's financial flexibility and long term viability. Financial flexibility is critical to respond to changing consumer preferences, regulatory changes, competitive challenges, and unexpected events.

Debt to earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA) is an indicator of debt serviceability and leverage and is commonly used in this sector as a proxy for comparative financial strength. Retained cash flow to debt is a useful metric in the telecommunications industry, which is typically characterized by intense shareholder pressure; thus, dividend payments may be a rather inflexible component of cash outlays. Similarly, capital investment spending in evolving and existing telecommunication technology may be required or strategically necessary, and it is useful to incorporate these expenditures when assessing an operator's ability to cover ongoing interest payments.

The three sub-factors related to leverage and coverage that we consider in our rating assessments are:

A. Debt / EBITDA

B. RCF / DEBT

C. (EBITDA-Capex) / Interest Expense

How We Assess It For The Scorecard

4.A Debt / EBITDA:

The numerator is total debt and the denominator is earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA).

For carriers who offer device leasing,[6] the accounting rules may allow the carrier to capitalize the device cost and recognize the expense as depreciation over the life of the device lease term. In such instances, we would typically reverse this capitalization as a non-standard adjustment to show the impact of the device cost within EBITDA and preserve comparability across the rated universe.

4.B RCF / Debt:

The numerator is retained cash flow (RCF) and the denominator is total debt.

4.C (EBITDA-Capex) / Interest Expense

The numerator is EBITDA minus capital expenditures (Capex) and the denominator is interest expense.

Moody's Basic Definitions for Credit Statistics defines capital expenditures as gross expenditures for plant and equipment and intangible assets, per the investing activities section of the cash flow statement. There is some divergence in reporting practices for spectrum license payments. Some companies classify such spending as plant and equipment and intangible assets; others classify it within acquisitions and investments; while others may display the payment as a separate line-item. Where there is sufficient information available to identify these payments, we typically reclassify them (as a non-standard adjustment) into other investing cash flows. This allocation, still within the investing activities section of the cash flow statement, would remove the expenditure from Capex.

[6] For instance, wireless operators may offer financing options that allow subscribers to buy or lease new smartphones with zero down and installment payments.

FACTOR 4

Leverage and Coverage (35%)

Sub-Factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Debt / EBITDA (x)*	15%	≤ 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-2.75	2.75-3.75	3.75-5.5	5.5-8	> 8
RCF / Debt (%)**	10%	≥ 60	45-60	35-45	25-35	20-25	10-20	5-10	< 5
(EBITDA-CAPEX)/ Interest Expense (x)***	10%	≥ 8	6.5-8	5-6.5	3.5-5	2-3.5	1-2	0.5-1	< 0.5

* For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is 0.0x. A value of 0.0x or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is 12.0x. A value of 12.0x or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5, as does negative EBITDA.

** For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is 100%. A value of 100% or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is 0%. A value of 0% or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5.

*** For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is 20.0x. A value of 20.0x or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is -0.50x. A value of -0.50x or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5.

Factor 5: Financial Policy (15% Weight)

Why it Matters

Management and board tolerance for financial risk is an important rating determinant, because it directly affects debt levels, credit quality, and the risk of adverse changes in financing and capital structure.

Our assessment of financial policies includes the perceived tolerance of a company's governing board and management for financial risk and the future direction for the company's capital structure. Considerations include a company's public commitments in this area, its track record for adhering to commitments, and our views on the ability for the company to achieve its targets. Financial risk tolerance serves as a guidepost to investment and capital allocation. An expectation that management will be committed to sustaining an improved credit profile is often necessary to support an upgrade. For example, we may not upgrade a company that has built flexibility within its rating category if we believe the company will use that flexibility to fund a strategic acquisition, cash distribution to shareholders, spin-off or other leveraging transaction. Conversely, a company's credit rating may be better able to withstand a moderate leveraging event if management places a high priority on returning credit metrics to pre-transaction levels and has consistently demonstrated the commitment to do so through prior actions. Liquidity management[7] is an important aspect of overall risk management and can provide insight into risk tolerance.

Financial policies are very important in the telecommunication sector, which is characterized by frequent merger and acquisition (M&A) activity. While in-market consolidation can allow market players to extract value from scale benefits, achieve substantial synergies, improve margins and increase cash flows, debt-financed acquisition activity may heighten credit risk, especially when the acquisition increases the company's business risk profile or distract management from the core businesses.

Shareholder pressure is also prevalent in some segments of the telecommunication industry, because established telecommunications companies often have the capacity to generate significant cash flow, even in the face of declining access lines and challenges to growing revenue. Shareholder activism to direct a good portion of the available cash to the equity side can weaken a company's credit profile in an environment of increasing competitive challenges and high capital intensity. This can take the form of dividends, equity recapitalizations, or buybacks that diminish financial flexibility.

7 Liquidity management is distinct from the level of liquidity, which is discussed in the Other Rating Considerations section of this report.

How We Assess it For The Scorecard

Financial Policy

The scoring of this sub-factor is based on a qualitative assessment of the issuer's desired capital structure or targeted credit profile as well as adherence to its commitments and ability to achieve its targets. Considerations typically include the management's historical operating performance, management of liquidity, exposure to derivatives or variable rate instruments and hedging strategies as well as use of cash flow through different phases of economic and industry cycles, its response to key events, such as changes in the credit markets and liquidity environment, legal actions, competitive challenges, and regulatory pressures.

Management's appetite for M&A activity is also an important consideration when assessing financial policy. In particular, when considering a company's track record, we would typically review the type of transactions (i.e. core competency or new business) and funding decisions but also their frequency and materiality. For example, a history of debt-financed or credit-transforming acquisitions would likely result in a low score under this factor.

Other considerations include a company and its owners' past record of balancing shareholder returns and debt holders' interests. A track record of favoring shareholder returns at the expense of debt holders is likely to be viewed negatively in scoring this factor.

FACTOR 5

Financial Policy (15%)

Sub-Factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Financial Policy	15%	Expected to have extremely conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); very stable metrics; public commitment to very strong credit profile over the long term	Expected to have very stable and conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); stable metrics; minimal event risk that would cause a rating transition; public commitment to strong credit profile over the long term	Expected to have predictable financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that preserve creditor interests. Although modest event risk exists, the effect on leverage is likely to be small and temporary; strong commitment to a solid credit profile	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that balance the interest of creditors and shareholders; some risk that debt funded acquisitions or shareholder distributions could lead to a weaker credit profile	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that tend to favor shareholders over creditors; above average financial risk resulting from shareholder distributions, acquisitions or other significant capital structure changes	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that favor shareholders over creditors; high financial risk resulting from shareholder distributions, acquisitions or other significant capital structure changes	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that create a material risk of debt restructuring in varied economic environments	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that create elevated risk of debt restructuring even in healthy economic environments

Assumptions, Limitations and Rating Considerations That Are Not Covered in the Scorecard

The scorecard in this rating methodology represents a decision to favor simplicity that enhances transparency and to avoid greater complexity that might enable the scorecard to map more closely to actual ratings. Accordingly, the rating factors in the scorecard do not constitute an exhaustive treatment of all of the considerations that may be important for ratings of companies in this sector. In addition, our ratings incorporate expectations for future performance. In some cases, our expectations for future performance may be informed by confidential information that we can't disclose. In other cases, we estimate future results based upon past performance, industry trends, competitor actions or other factors. In any case, predicting the future is subject to the risk of substantial inaccuracy.

While Moody's ratings reflect both the likelihood of a default on contractually promised payments and the expected financial loss suffered in the event of default, the scorecard in this rating methodology is principally intended to capture fundamental characteristics that drive going-concern credit risk. As a debt instrument becomes impaired or defaults, or is very likely to become impaired or to default, ratings typically include additional considerations not captured within the scorecard that reflect our expectations for recovery of principal and interest, as well as the uncertainty around that expectation.

Assumptions that may cause our forward-looking expectations to be incorrect include unanticipated changes in any of the following factors: the macroeconomic environment and general financial market conditions, industry competition, disruptive technology, regulatory and legal actions.

Key rating assumptions that apply in this sector include our view that sovereign credit risk is strongly correlated with that of other domestic issuers, that legal priority of claim affects average recovery on

different classes of debt sufficiently to generally warrant differences in ratings for different debt classes of the same issuer, and the assumption that access to liquidity is a strong driver of credit risk.

In choosing factors and metrics for this rating methodology scorecard, we did not explicitly include certain important factors that are common to all companies in any industry such as the quality and experience of management, assessments of corporate governance and the quality of financial reporting and information disclosure. Ranking these factors by rating category in a scorecard would in some cases suggest too much precision in the relative ranking of particular issuers against all other issuers that are rated in various industry sectors.

Ratings may include additional factors that are difficult to quantify or that have a meaningful effect in differentiating credit quality only in some cases, but not all. Such factors include financial controls, exposure to uncertain licensing regimes and possible government interference in some countries. Regulatory, litigation, liquidity, disruptive technology and reputational risk as well as changes to consumer and business spending patterns, competitor strategies and macroeconomic trends also affect ratings. While these are important considerations, it is not possible to precisely express these in the rating methodology scorecard without making the scorecard excessively complex and significantly less transparent. Ratings may also reflect circumstances in which the weighting of a particular factor will be substantially different from the weighting suggested by the scorecard.

This variation in weighting rating considerations can also apply to factors that we choose not to represent in the scorecard. For example, liquidity is a consideration frequently critical to ratings and which may not, in other circumstances, have a substantial impact in discriminating between two issuers with a similar credit profile. As an example of the limitations, ratings can be heavily affected by extremely weak liquidity that magnifies default risk. However, two identical companies might be rated the same if their only differentiating feature is that one has a good liquidity position while the other has an extremely good liquidity position, unless these are low rated companies for which liquidity can be a substantial differentiator for relative default risk.

Other Rating Considerations

Ratings reflect a number of additional considerations. These include but are not limited to: our assessment of the quality of management, corporate governance, financial controls, liquidity, non-wholly owned subsidiaries, excess cash balances, event risk, and parental and institutional support.

Management Strategy

The quality of management is an important factor supporting a company's credit strength. Assessing the execution of business plans over time can be helpful in assessing management's business strategies, policies, and philosophies and in evaluating management performance relative to performance of competitors and our projections. A record of consistency provides Moody's with insight into management's likely future performance in stressed situations and can be an indicator of management's tendency to depart significantly from its stated plans and guidelines.

Corporate Governance

Among the areas of focus in corporate governance are audit committee financial expertise, the incentives created by executive compensation packages, related party transactions, interactions with outside auditors, and ownership structure.

Financial Controls

We rely on the accuracy of audited financial statements to assign and monitor ratings in this sector. The quality of financial statements may be influenced by internal controls, including centralized operations and the proper tone at the top and consistency in accounting policies and procedures. Auditors comments in financial reports and unusual financial statement restatements or delays in regulatory filings may indicate weaknesses in internal controls.

Liquidity

Liquidity is an important rating consideration for all telecommunications companies. Liquidity can be particularly important for companies in highly seasonal operating environments where working capital needs must be considered. We form an opinion on likely near-term liquidity requirements from the perspective of both sources and uses of cash. For more details on our approach, please see our liquidity cross-sector methodology[8].

Excess Cash Balances

Some companies in this sector maintain cash balances (meaning liquid short term investments as well as cash) that are far in excess of their operating needs. Excess cash can be in important credit consideration; however, the underlying policy and motivations of the issuer in holding high cash balances are often as or more important in our analysis than the level of cash held. We have observed significant variation in company behavior based on differences in financial philosophy, investment opportunities, and shareholder pressures.

Most companies need to retain some level of cash in their business for operational purposes. The level of cash required to run a business can vary based on the region(s) of operation and the specific sub-sectors in which the issuer operates. Some issues have very predictable cash needs and others may have much broader intra-periods swings, for instance related to mark-to-market collateral requirements under hedging instruments. Some companies may hold large levels of cash at times because they operate without committed, long-term bank borrowing facilities. Some companies may hold cash on the balance sheet to meet long-term contractual liabilities, whereas other companies with the same types of liabilities have deposited cash into trust accounts that are off balance sheet. The level of cash that issuers are willing to hold can also vary over time based on the cost of borrowing, and macro-economic conditions. The same issuer may place a high value on cash holdings in a major recession or financial crisis but seek to pare cash when inflation is high. As a result, cash on the balance sheet is most often considered qualitatively, by assessing the track-record and the financial and liquidity policy rather than measuring how a point-in-time cash balance would affect a specific metric.

Across all corporate sectors, the primary motivation for holding large cash balances is in many cases to minimize tax payments. Many US companies have funded share repurchases with debt while simultaneously building cash holdings that are offshore for tax purposes. Given shareholder pressures to return excess cash holdings, we generally expect that elimination of the tax motivation would result in a large portion of offshore cash being used for dividends and share repurchases. Another shareholder-focused motivation for cash holdings, sometimes over a very long periods, is cash for acquisitions. In these cases, we do not typically consider that netting cash against the issuer's current level of debt is analytically meaningful; however, the cash may be a material mitigant in our scenario analyses of potential acquisitions, share buybacks or special dividends.

[8] A link to our cross-sector methodologies can be found in the Moody's Related Research section of this report.

By contrast, some companies maintain large cash holdings for long periods of time in excess of their operating and liquidity needs solely due to conservative financial policies, which provides a stronger indication for an enduring approach that will benefit creditors. For instance, some companies have a policy to routinely pre-fund upcoming required debt payments well in advance of the stated maturity. Such companies may also have clearly stated financial targets based on net debt metrics and a track record of maintaining their financial profile within those targets.

While the scorecard in this methodology uses leverage and coverage ratios with total (gross) debt rather than net debt, we do consider excess cash holdings in our rating analysis, including in our assessment of the financial and liquidity policy. For issuers where we have clarity into the extent to which cash will remain on the balance sheet and/or be used for creditor-friendly purposes, excess cash may be considered in a more quantitative manner. While we consider excess cash in our credit assessment for ratings, we do not typically adjust the balance sheet debt for any specific amount because this implies greater precision than we think is appropriate for the uncertain future uses of cash. However, when cash holdings are unusually large relative to debt we may refer to debt net of cash, or net of a portion of cash, in our credit analysis and research in order to provide additional insight into our qualitative assessment of the credit benefit. We may also cite rating threshold levels for certain issuers based on net debt ratios in particular when these issuers have publically stated financial targets based on net debt metrics.

Even when the eventual use for excess cash is likely to be for purposes that don't benefit debt holders, large holdings provide some beneficial cushion against credit deterioration, and cash balances are often considered in our analysis of near-term liquidity sources and uses. Such downside protection is usually more important for low rated companies than for highly rated companies due to differences in credit stability and the typically shorter distance from potential default for issuers at the lower end of the ratings spectrum.

Non-Wholly Owned Subsidiaries

Some companies in the telecommunications sector have policies that include diluting a company's equity stake in subsidiaries, for example through an initial public offering, which may in some cases negatively impact future financial flexibility. While improving cash holdings on a one-off basis, selling minority interests in subsidiaries may have a negative impact on cash flows available to the parent company that may not be fully reflected in consolidated financial statements[9]. The parent's share of dividend flows from a non-wholly owned subsidiary are reduced, and minority stakes can increase structural subordination, since dividend flows to minority interest holders are made before the cash flows are available to service debt at the parent company. While less frequent, sale of a minority stake may be accompanied by policies protective of the subsidiary, for instance restrictions on cash pooling with other member of the corporate family, limitations on dividends and distributions, or arms-length business requirements. Minority stakeholders may have seats on the board of the subsidiary. In many cases, we consider the impact of non-wholly owned subsidiaries qualitatively. However, in some cases we may find that an additional view of financial results, for instance analyzing financial results on a proportional consolidation basis, may be very useful to augment our analysis based on consolidated financial statements. When the impact of equity dilution arising from non-wholly owned subsidiaries is material and negative, actual ratings may be lower than the scorecard indicated outcome.

For companies that hold material minority interest stakes, consolidated funds from operations typically includes the dividends received from the minority subsidiary, while none of its debt is consolidated. When such dividends are material to the company's cash flows, these cash flows may be subject to interruption if they are required for the minority subsidiary's debt service, capital expenditures or other cash needs. When

[9] For example, in case of an equity stake reduction in a subsidiary down to 75%, in the parent's financial statements, all revenues and EBITDA of the subsidiary would typically still be consolidated at the group level.

minority interest dividends are material, we may also find that proportional consolidation or another additional view of financial results is useful to augment our analysis of consolidated financials. We would generally also consider structural subordination in these cases.[10] When the impact of these considerations is material and negative, actual ratings may be lower than the scorecard indicated outcome.

Event Risk

We also recognize the possibility that an unexpected event could cause a sudden and sharp decline in an issuer's fundamental creditworthiness, which may cause actual ratings to be lower than the scorecard-indicated outcome. Typical special events include mergers and acquisitions, asset sales, spin-offs, capital restructuring programs, litigation and shareholder distributions.

Parental and Institutional Support

PARENTAL SUPPORT

Ownership can provide ratings lift for a particular telecom company if it is owned by a highly rated owner(s) and is viewed to be of strategic importance to those owners. In our analysis of parental support, we typically consider whether the parent has the financial capacity and strategic incentives to provide support to the telecom company in times of stress or financial need (e.g., a major capital investment), or has already done so in the past. Conversely, if the parent puts a high dividend burden on the issuer which in turn, reduces its flexibility, the ratings would reflect this risk.

A number of issuers in the telecommunications industry are government-related issuers that get uplift in their ratings due to expected government support (please see our cross-sector methodology on government related issuers). However, for certain issuers, government ownership can have a negative impact on the underlying baseline credit assessment. This can happen when the government pressures the telecom company to further the government's own policies, for instance providing services at a reduced rate without offsetting government subsidies.

OTHER INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

In some countries, some large corporate issuers are likely to receive government or banking support in the event of financial difficulties because of their overall importance to the functioning of the economy. In Japan, Moody's corporate ratings consider the unique system of support that operates there for large and systemically important organizations. Over the years, this has resulted in lower levels of default that might otherwise have occurred. Our approach considers the presence of strong group and banking system relationships that may provide support when companies encounter significant financial stress.

[10] Proportional consolidation brings a portion of the minority subsidiary's debt onto the balance sheet, but this debt is structurally senior to debt at the parent company, because it is closer to the assets and cash flows of the minority subsidiary.

Appendix A: Telecommunications Service Providers Methodology Scorecard

	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Factor 1 Scale (12.5%)									
Revenue (USD Billion)*[1]	12.5%	≥100	50-100	25-50	12.5-25	5-12.5	2-5	0.5-2	<0.5
Factor 2 Business Profile (27.5%)									
Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning - Diversified Carriers	12.5%	Strong geographically diversified incumbent national provider of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base with wireline and wireless segments exposed to very limited competitive challenges; and very successful international expansion; and very low technology risk.	National incumbent provider of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base with wireline and wireless segments exposed to limited competitive challenges; and successful international expansion; and low technology risk.	National incumbent provider of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base wireline and wireless segments exposed to increasing competitive challenges; and. moderate international expansion; and low to moderate technology risk. OR Regional provider*[2] of full suite of integrated services to a broad customer base with wireline and wireless segments exposed to moderate competitive challenges; and moderate expansion outside of home market with typically about 50% to 60% of sales in one market, country or region; and low to moderate technology risk.	National provider of full suite of integrated services to a fairly broad customer base and substantial competitive challenges; and moderate technology risk. OR Regional provider of full suite of integrated services to a fairly broad customer base and increasing competitive challenges and limited expansion outside of home market with typically about 60% to 80% of sales in one market, country or region; and moderate technology risk.	Regional provider of full suite of integrated services to a narrow customer base with increasing competitive challenges; or typically about 80% to 90% of sales in one market, country or region; or moderate to high technology risk.	Regional provider of full suite of integrated services to a narrow customer base with increasing competitive challenges; or typically more than 90% of sales in one market, country or region; or high technology risk.	Provider of full suite of integrated services highly dependent on access to incumbent's network; or very high technology risk.	Provider of full suite of integrated services with very limited access to incumbent's network; or extremely high technology risk; or high probability of disruption in service because of the poor quality of network.

	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning - Wireless Carriers		N.A.	N.A.	Multi-national operator with successful expansion outside its area, with stable business; and low to moderate technology risk. OR Firmly established national or super-regional operator with stable business; and low to moderate technology risk. OR Emerging operator in developing markets with high growth potential and very low existing competition with less than 50% of sales to one market, country or region; and low to moderate technology risk.	Multi-national operator expanding in emerging markets with existing competition with less than 70% of sales to one market, country or region and moderate technology risk. OR National operator with strong business; and moderate technology risk. OR Emerging operator in developing markets with high growth potential and low existing competition; and moderate technology risk.	National operator with stabilizing business OR Established regional operator with stable business and minimal dependence on roaming or subsidy revenues. OR Emerging operator in developing markets with moderate growth potential or stable performance and moderate existing competition; or typically around 85% of sales to one market, country or region; OR Moderate to high technology risk.	National operator with below industry-average performance OR Established regional operator with below average performance. OR Emerging regional operator or established regional operator with deteriorating performance on a sustained basis or typically around 90% of sales to one market, country or region; OR High technology risk.	National operator with very poor performance compared to industry average OR Established regional operator with very poor performance. OR Emerging regional operator or established regional operator with meaningful deterioration in performance and no prospects of recovery in the short-term or typically almost 100% of sales to one market, country or region; OR Very high technology risk.	Mobile Virtual Network Operator or affiliate without spectrum. OR Extremely high technology risk.
Business Model, Competitive Environment and Technical Positioning - Wireline-only Carriers		N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Incumbent exposed to moderate to low competitive challenges; and moderate to low technology risk.	Incumbent with steadily increasing competitive challenges OR Non-incumbent provider with significant end-to-end network infrastructure. Company dependent on access to incumbents' network. OR	Incumbent with rapidly declining business (i.e. revenues declining by about 10% per year) OR Non-incumbent based operator with significant core network infrastructure with high dependence on access to incumbents' network. OR High technology risk.	Incumbent with extremely rapidly declining business and margins OR Non-incumbent based operator with poor core network infrastructure With very high dependence on access to incumbents' network. OR Very high technology risk.	Competitive entrant reliant on other providers for significant portion of termination OR Reseller. OR Extremely high technology risk.

	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
						Moderate to high technology risk.			
Regulatory Environment	7.5%	Regulatory framework is fully developed, has a very long-track record of being extremely predictable and stable, and is extremely supportive of Return on Investment (ROI) for incumbent telecom providers and is very unlikely to change; and regulatory body is located in a highly rated sovereign with very strong institutional framework and effectiveness or strong independent regulator with unquestioned authority over telecom regulation that is national in scope; and very unlikely awards of new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is fully developed, has a long track record of being very predictable and stable, and is highly supportive of ROI for incumbent telecom providers and is unlikely to change; and regulatory body is typically located in a high to moderate rated sovereign with strong institutional framework and effectiveness or strong independent regulator with authority over most telecom regulation that is national in scope; and unlikely awards of new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is fully developed, is very predictable and stable in balancing the interests of the incumbent telecom providers and the new comers but with less track-record and is highly supportive of ROI for incumbent telecom providers; and regulatory body is a sovereign, sovereign agency or independent regulator with authority over most telecom regulation that is national in scope; and unlikely awards of new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is fully developed, has a short track-record of being predictable and stable in overall supporting the interests of the incumbent telecom providers while being somewhat more supportive to new entrants, still allowing an adequate ROI for incumbent telecom providers; and regulatory body is a sovereign, sovereign agency or independent regulator with authority over most telecom regulation that is national in scope with change in administration having some potential to alter outlook; and potential awards of limited new operating concessions.	Regulatory framework is a) well-developed, with evidence of some inconsistency or unpredictability in the way framework has been applied, or framework is new and untested, but based on well-developed and established precedents, or b) jurisdiction has history of independent and transparent regulation in other sectors; or regulatory environment may sometimes be challenging and politically charged; or regulatory support for increased facilities and non-facilities based competition. OR Regulation generally favors new market entrants. OR Likely awards of new operating concessions. OR Regulatory bodies in active deliberations to negatively alter the regulatory framework.	Regulatory framework is developed, but there is a high degree of inconsistency or unpredictability in the way the framework has been applied; or regulatory environment is consistently challenging and politically charged; or there is no consistent track record of independent and transparent regulation. Jurisdiction has a history of difficult or less supportive regulatory decisions, or regulatory authority has been or may be challenged or eroded by political or legislative action.; or regulatory support for non-facilities based competition. OR Regulation strongly favors new market entrants. OR Regulatory change to have strong negative impact on the regulatory framework.	Regulatory framework is not developed, is unclear, is undergoing substantial change or has a history of being unpredictable or adverse to telecom operators; or regulatory body lacks a consistent track record or appears unsupportive, uncertain, or highly unpredictable; or may face high risk of significant government intervention in operations or markets; or strong regulatory support for non-facilities based competition. OR Regulation is highly unbalanced towards favoring new market entrants.	Regulatory framework or regulatory body carry extremely high risk for the business continuity of telecom operators.

	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Market Share	7.5%	Company is the principal player in the local market and in most of the regions where it operates. OR Company has monopoly-type presence in its local region.	Company is a clear market leader in the local market and holds competitive positions in all regions where it operates. OR Company is the principal player and very strong market leader in its local region.	Company is a very solid competitor in the local market and holds competitive positions in most of the regions where it operates. OR Company is a clear market leader in its local region.	Company is a well-positioned competitor in its local market and holds competitive positions in many regions where it operates. OR Company is a very solid competitor in its local region.	Company is a mid to lower-tier competitor in its local market and holds competitive positions in some of the markets where it operates. OR Company is a well-positioned competitor in its local region.	Company is a small competitor in its local market and holds minor competitive positions in other markets. OR Company is a mid to lower-tier competitor in its local region.	Company is a small competitor in its local market.	Company is a start-up with no track record.
Factor 3: Profitability and Efficiency (10%)									
Revenue Trend and Margin Sustainability	10%	On a sustainable basis: Strong revenue growth AND Exceptional margin levels.	On a sustainable basis: Moderate revenue growth AND Very high margin levels.	On a sustainable basis: Slight revenue growth AND High margin levels.	On a sustainable basis: Stable revenues AND Good margin levels.	Expectation of: Slight, sustained decline in revenues OR Sustained moderate margin levels.	Expectation of: Moderate, sustained decline in revenues OR Sustained modest margin levels.	Expectation of: Strong decline in revenues OR Sustained weak margin levels.	Expectation of: Steep decline in revenues OR Sustained very weak or extremely unpredictable margin levels.
Factor 4: Leverage and Coverage (35%)									
Debt / EBITDA (x)*[3]	15%	≤ 0.5	0.5-1	1-2	2-2.75	2.75-3.75	3.75-5.5	5.5-8	> 8
RCF / Debt (%)*[4]	10%	≥ 60	45-60	35-45	25-35	20-25	10-20	5-10	< 5
(EBITDA-CAPEX)/ Interest Expense (x)*[5]	10%	≥ 8	6.5-8	5-6.5	3.5-5	2-3.5	1-2	0.5-1	< 0.5

	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca
Factor 5: Financial Policy	**(15%)**								
Financial Policy	15%	Expected to have extremely conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); very stable metrics; public commitment to very strong credit profile over the long term	Expected to have very stable and conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); stable metrics; minimal event risk that would cause a rating transition; public commitment to strong credit profile over the long term	Expected to have predictable financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that preserve creditor interests. Although modest event risk exists, the effect on leverage is likely to be small and temporary; strong commitment to a solid credit profile	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that balance the interest of creditors and shareholders; some risk that debt funded acquisitions or shareholder distributions could lead to a weaker credit profile	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that tend to favor shareholders over creditors; above average financial risk resulting from shareholder distributions, acquisitions or other significant capital structure changes	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that favor shareholders over creditors; high financial risk resulting from shareholder distributions, acquisitions or other significant capital structure changes	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that create a material risk of debt restructuring in varied economic environments	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that create elevated risk of debt restructuring even in healthy economic environments

*1 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is $300 billion. A value of $300 billion or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is $0.05 billion. A value of $0.05 billion or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5.

*2 Regional dimension makes reference to geographical footprint in large countries such as the US.

*3 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is 0x and equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is 12x. A value of 12x or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5, as does negative EBITDA.

*4 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is 100%. A value of 100% or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is 0%. A value of 0% or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5.

*5 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa end point value is 20.0x. A value of 20.0x or better equates to a numerical score of 0.5. The Ca end point value is -0.50x. A value of -0.50x or worse equates to a numerical score of 20.5.

Moody's Related Research

The credit ratings assigned in this sector are primarily determined by this credit rating methodology. Certain broad methodological considerations (described in one or more secondary or cross-sector credit rating methodologies) may also be relevant to the determination of credit ratings of issuers and instruments in this sector. Potentially related secondary and cross-sector credit rating methodologies can be found here.

The above link can be also be used to access any Moody's rating methodology referenced in this report.

Moody's Basic Definitions for Credit Statistics (User's Guide) can be found here.

For data summarizing the historical robustness and predictive power of credit ratings assigned using this credit rating methodology, see link.

Please refer to Moody's Rating Symbols & Definitions, which is available here, for further information.

Report Number: 1055812

Authors
Daniel Marty
Carlos Winzer
Iván Palacios

Production Specialist
Santhosh V

© 2017 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 ITS RATINGS AFFILIATES ("MIS") ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND 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. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. 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, 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 AND MOODY'S 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 OR MOODY'S 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.

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 the Moody's 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 SUCH RATING OR 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 rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. 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 "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 383569 (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. It would be reckless and inappropriate for retail investors to use MOODY'S credit ratings or publications when making an investment decision. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

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 rating, agreed to pay to MJKK or MSFJ (as applicable) for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY200,000 to approximately JPY350,000,000.

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

MOODY'S
INVESTORS SERVICE