

Ratings

| Category | Moody's Rating |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| Outlook | Stable |
| Bank Deposits | Baa1/P-2 |
| Bank Financial Strength | E+ |
| Senior Unsecured | Baa1 |
| Subordinate -Dom Curr | Baa2 |
| Other Short Term -Dom Curr | (P)P-2 |

Contacts

| Analyst | Phone |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Katharina Barten/Frankfurt am Main | 49.69.707.30.700 |
| Swen Metzler/Frankfurt am Main | |
| Carola Schuler/Frankfurt am Main | |
| Mira Kirschner/Frankfurt am Main | |

Key Indicators

Kommunalkredit Austria AG (Consolidated Financials) [1]

| | [2]6-10 | [2]12-09 | Avg. |
|---|----------|----------|----------|
| Total Assets (EUR million) | 17,606.7 | 18,283.2 | [3]-3.7 |
| Total Assets (USD million) | 21,566.5 | 26,231.6 | [3]-17.8 |
| Tangible Common Equity (EUR million) | 315.8 | 314.0 | [3]0.5 |
| Tangible Common Equity (USD million) | 386.8 | 450.6 | [3]-14.2 |
| PPI / Avg RWA (%) | 0.1 | 0.1 | [4]0.1 |
| Net Income / Avg RWA (%) | 0.1 | 0.1 | [4]0.1 |
| (Market Funds - Liquid Assets) / Total Assets (%) | 71.4 | 64.2 | [5]67.8 |
| Core Deposits / Average Gross Loans (%) | -- | 13.6 | [5]13.6 |
| Tier 1 Ratio (%) | 15.6 | 14.3 | [4]15.0 |
| Tangible Common Equity / RWA (%) | 12.2 | 11.0 | [4]11.6 |
| Cost / Income Ratio (%) | 91.6 | 59.5 | [5]75.6 |
| Problem Loans / Gross Loans (%) | -- | 0.0 | [5]0.0 |
| Problem Loans / (Equity + Loan Loss Reserves) (%) | -- | 0.0 | [5]0.0 |

Source: Moody's

[1] All ratios are adjusted using Moody's standard adjustments [2] Basel II; IFRS [3] Compound Annual Growth Rate based on IFRS reporting periods [4] Basel II & IFRS reporting periods have been used for average calculation [5] IFRS reporting periods have been used for average calculation

Opinion

RECENT CREDIT DEVELOPMENTS

Kommunalkredit Austria AG (KA; Baa1, E+/B2 stable) is the surviving core bank that emerged from a rescue in late 2008 and the subsequent breakup of the former Kommunalkredit Austria AG ("KA Old") in November 2009, that was orchestrated by the Austrian government (Aaa, stable). The break-up (or, legally, demerger) resulted in two independent entities: KA and KA Finanz AG (KF, not rated except for government-guaranteed, Aaa-rated bond issues).

Both banks have received government support which has allowed them to meet their financial obligations until today. However, as KF serves as a wind-down vehicle for non-core assets, only KA is a going concern. It aims at fully restoring its franchise, but currently remains vulnerable given the bank's weak albeit increasingly focused business profile that is marked by high leverage, high dependence on market funds and low - albeit improving - profitability. This is somewhat mitigated by KA's strong ownership - being 99.78% owned by the Republic of Austria - and the proven government support since late 2008. As KA may suffer set-backs yet on its road to recovery, its operations remain, in our view, dependent on the implicit support indicated by the bank's government background.

APPROVAL FOR STATE AID OBTAINED

On 31 March 2011, KA obtained approval from the European Commission for the state aid it had received during the crisis. With the approval, the bank's previously submitted restructuring plan was also approved, reflecting an endorsement by the Commission of the bank's new strategy and business model of focussing on public sector and infrastructure finance. However, the compensation measures include not only the expected limitation of annual balance sheet growth to 2%, but also unspecified compensation payments to the government of Austria.

While we expect that the bank should maintain some leeway to build reserves, we understand that this compensation measure represents a limitation of KA's internal capital generation. We further understand that a change of ownership is to be achieved in the medium term whereby the time horizon remains unspecified. We caution that this implies a level of continued uncertainty for the bank's risk profile.

SUMMARY RATING RATIONALE

On 2 December 2009 we assigned a bank financial strength rating (BFSR) of E+ to KA, which translates into a Baseline Risk Assessment (BCA) of B2. We further assigned Baa1 ratings to the bank's long-term senior debt and deposits and a rating of Baa2 to its senior subordinated debt. All of these ratings carry a stable outlook. The rating for short-term liabilities is Prime-2.

The E+ BFSR is constrained by KA's evolving franchise as a provider of public finance lending and services, developing risk management and anticipated weak profitability. At the same time, the E+ BFSR takes into account the sound quality of the bank's assets and adequate capitalisation.

KA's long-term global local currency (GLC) debt and deposit ratings are at the Baa1 level, based on our assumption of a very high probability of systemic support from the bank's 99.78% shareholder, the Republic of Austria, resulting in a seven-notch uplift from the B2 BCA.

Credit Strengths

- 99.78% Government of Austria ownership with a demonstrated willingness and ability to support the bank
- adequate regulatory capitalization with a Tier I ratio of 15.6% as of 30 June 2010
- sound asset quality of the public sector finance lending book, with 70% in the Aaa and Aa rating categories, albeit also with 3% in non-investment grade

Credit Challenges

- low-risk / low-return public sector lending franchise, dependent on market funds and principally vulnerable to unexpected losses and distortions in financial markets
- Potential medium-term pressure from the increased capital requirements under Basel III, in particular with regard to leverage
- restoring a sustainable level of profitability against the headwinds of increasing competition in municipal project finance lending in Austria
- restoring a credible risk management track record, while we recognise that progress has been made

Rating Outlook

The outlook on all ratings is stable.

The stable outlook on the E+ BFSR reflects our view that KA should be able to gradually stabilise its business, although set-backs cannot be ruled out. While the bank may be able to re-establish an independent funding franchise over time, the stable outlook on the Baa1 long-term debt ratings reflects our view that KA will likely continue to receive government support in case of need. That said, a degree of rating transition risk remains, especially in the medium term, given that the financial markets remain challenging for public sector finance franchises, and because the bank has yet to prove that it can achieve appropriate levels of sustainable profitability.

While we acknowledge that the Republic of Austria may seek to exit from its ownership at some point in the future, we believe that such a sale will only be possible in the medium-to-long term and only once KA has established a track record of delivering sustainable returns and having regular access to (unsecured) funding. Depending on the degree of financial stability achieved, a divestment by the government could exert adverse pressure on the unsecured ratings, as we would need to reassess our assumption for the probability of systemic support post-divestment.

What Could Change the Rating - Up

We see little upside potential for the BFSR at this stage and expect that stabilisation of the business will take several years. Positive pressure on the BFSR would require a track record of sustainable profits and sound risk liquidity and risk management.

An upgrade of the Baa1 long-term senior debt and deposit ratings could be triggered by a stronger commitment by the Austrian government, in particular an explicit guarantee for the bank's obligations.

What Could Change the Rating - Down

A downgrade of the BFSR could be triggered if losses exceed those expected under Moody's baseline stress scenario, exerting pressure on the bank's capital ratios and undermining its strategy and longer-term viability.

A downgrade of the Baa1 long-term senior debt and deposit ratings could be triggered by a reassessment of the probability of future support for the bank.

Recent financial development

For the first six months to June 2010, the bank reported a modest pre-tax income of EUR 2.2 million on EUR 23.9 million in revenues which were negatively impacted by a negative EUR 13.2 million trading and valuation result which was solely driven by adverse valuation charges on

the bank's public sector bond portfolio.

Total assets as of June 2010 were EUR 17.6 billion, based on IFSR accounting. The Tier 1 ratio improved to 15.6%, up from 14.3% six months earlier, driven by lower risk weighted assets (-5%).

DETAILED RATING CONSIDERATIONS

Detailed considerations for KA's currently assigned ratings are as follows:

Bank Financial Strength Rating

Moody's assigns an E+ BFSR to KA. The rating is constrained by KA's evolving franchise as a provider of public finance lending and services, developing risk management and anticipated weak profitability. The E+ BFSR also takes into account the sound quality of the bank's assets and acceptable capitalisation.

The assigned BFSR is three notches below the calculated outcome of Moody's bank financial strengths scorecard which results in a D+. Nonetheless, the E+ is considered the appropriate rating level, given several negative factors that are not fully captured by the scorecard, including the low predictability of whether KA will be able to rebuild a sustainable franchise with a different business focus.

Qualitative Factors (50%)

Factor 1: Franchise Value

Trend: Neutral

The fragility of the highly leveraged public sector finance business model, that relies on short-term market borrowings to fund long-term loans to (or bond investments in) the public sector, came under intense pressure during the financial crisis and, in KA's case, proved unsustainable. Nonetheless, equipped with more appropriate capital levels by the government, KA remains in business as a specialist lender to public-sector authorities and related entities in Austria, Switzerland and Germany.

Following the break up in late 2009, KA has been aiming to build a franchise focusing on higher-margin municipal project finance business in Austria as well as in neighbouring EU new member countries. However, the chosen strategy remains challenging, as the competition in these markets is high. Moreover, KA has still a large legacy, low-margin public sector lending book of roughly EUR 10 billion, representing the lion's share of total assets (of around EUR 18 billion). KA's public sector loan book will be wound down only slowly over time and, according to the strategy of the bank, replaced by higher-margin municipal project finance business.

While we consider it yet uncertain as to whether KA will be able to demonstrate a full restoration of its franchise, its business will face additional hurdles when the higher requirements for capital and liquidity under Basel III will be phased in, starting from 2013. We are also concerned that lending margins may remain too low to allow for sufficient returns on the higher capital levels.

As a specialised service provider for public sector clients, the bank offers the full product range in public sector finance including lending, infrastructure and project finance, leasing, private placements as well as advisory service including debt restructuring and asset management. KA has been mandated by the Republic of Austria to manage several environmental and infrastructure development programs. If sufficient returns can be derived from such services, this could help to improve the franchise over time. Based on the results during the 6 months to June 2010, however, KA fully depends on interest income, with other income being immaterial in the context of its total earnings and cost position.

The overall score for franchise value is E+.

Factor 2: Risk Positioning

Trend: Neutral

Given that the lion's share of KA's assets is represented by its public sector finance book, the credit risk of KA's business is relatively low. However, according to the bank's plans, the low-margin, low risk assets will be replaced with higher margin assets over time - which we expect will translate into gradually increasing credit risk over time. In the initial period of building a targeted lending business, we caution that it may be difficult to accurately price the risk as well as monitor risk adjusted performance, partly as the bank's risk management capabilities are still evolving. We will closely monitor the bank's progress in establishing an appropriate risk management system for the new business and in building a credible track record of a sound risk culture.

KA's business model includes considerable concentration risk in terms of both, borrower and industry concentrations. Although the exposures are predominantly towards highly rated public sector entities, i.e. governments and sub-sovereign borrowers, they also include risk exposure international credit institutions. Given that (i) banks across Europe may henceforth enjoy less support than they did during the crisis, and (ii) the combination of risk concentrations and the leveraged nature of KA's business, the bank is principally vulnerable to unexpected losses than cannot be ruled out. This demands conservative underwriting standards, which the bank has meanwhile implemented, complemented by the building of undisclosed reserves.

KA is heavily reliant on capital market funds and thus dependent on regular access to debt capital markets. Since its establishment in late 2009, KA has had limited access to debt capital markets for unsecured funds (initially only with the support from the Austrian government), which is one of the main constraining factors for the E+ BFSR.

The overall score for risk positioning is D-.

Factor 3: Regulatory Environment

Trend: Neutral

All Austrian banks are subject to the same score for the regulatory environment. This factor does not address bank-specific issues; instead, it evaluates whether regulatory bodies are independent and credible, demonstrate enforcement powers and adhere to global standards of best practices for risk control.

Factor 4: Operating Environment

Trend: Neutral

In general, this factor is also common to all Austrian banks. Moody's assigns an A- score for the overall operating environment. However, in the case of KA, an adjustment of this factor to B+ better reflects the bank's geographical diversification with operations in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).

Quantitative Factors (50%)

Factor 5: Profitability

Trend: Improving

The bank's earnings profile is mostly driven by its low-margin public sector loan book, allowing for only weak returns from net interest income. Fee and commission income was also weak during the first quarters of KA's establishment. We are also concerned about the relatively high degree of earnings volatility, given the EUR 1.8 million negative trading and valuation result in 2009 - driven by valuation losses - that was followed by a EUR 13.2 million loss in H1 2010. We therefore take a cautious view on KA's future profitability, even though it was allowed to part with its major loss-driving activities (i.e. the CDS portfolio and the largest part of its securities portfolio) in 2009. This transaction, which in effect was an offloading of assets to KF, resulted in a funding benefit for KA, albeit only indirectly, as funding was supported with EUR 5.0 billion in state guarantees to KF, which also has to bear the costs for these guarantees. This continues to benefit KA's earnings power until today.

While we believe that the demand for municipal project financing will increase, especially in KA's targeted CEE markets, given expected continued investments in infrastructure, we also observe increasing competition from larger institutions that have more diversified franchises and financial flexibility. That being said, we expect considerably higher earnings year-on-year for the whole financial year 2010, and thus some recovery of KA's intrinsic earnings power.

The score for profitability is E.

Factor 6: Liquidity

Trend: Neutral

KA is fully dependent on wholesale funds and therefore on regular access to debt capital markets. Issuing senior unsecured debt at viable pricing levels has remained challenging during the first few quarters since KA's establishment, although the bank has resumed issuing small senior unsecured tranches under its new EUR 2.0 billion debt issuance program. The weak independent funding franchise of KA currently remains one of the main rating constraints.

Notwithstanding the above mentioned shortcomings, we nevertheless recognise that KA was successful in tapping the markets with a 5-year EUR 500 million public sector covered bond issue in February 2011, which the bank reported was oversubscribed and could be placed with investors in various European countries. That being said, KA has committed to maintaining 28% of over-collateralisation which requires substantial portions of unsecured debt (or deposits) for the funding of its core business.

As mentioned under Profitability above, the bank's break up in 2009 had an indirect, positive effect on KA's funding profile, because some long-term assets were left behind in KF for unwinding, for which alternative funding was provided, while KA still has the long-term debt of KA Old on its balance sheet. We understand that this resulted in a somewhat better-matched profile of assets and liabilities, which continues to be beneficial for the bank.

Apart from EUR 12.5 billion of secured and unsecured market funds and EUR 1.6 billion interbank borrowings (which reduced by 30% in the 6 months to June 2010), KA currently holds EUR 1.5 billion in (institutional) client deposits which, at +44%, showed a strong increase during H1 2010. This deposit growth could largely off-set the reduction in interbank funds in the same period. We also note that KA remains a net lender in the interbank market.

We believe that, under the current market conditions, KA strongly benefits from its public ownership background and the implicit support from the Austrian government. Judging from recent market volatility and concerns over public sector credit quality, however, the funding situation remains potentially fragile and government ownership and commitment critically important for several years yet.

The score for liquidity is E.

Factor 7: Capital Adequacy

Trend: Neutral

In spite of the improved risk profile of KA following the demerger in late 2009, and notwithstanding satisfactory regulatory capitalisation, we consider the economic capital levels of the bank to be only acceptable. This is because of (i) the limited absolute cushion for unexpected losses of roughly EUR 200 million, (ii) the borrower concentrations in the loan book and (iii) the risk of potential stress to the income statement - and thus capital erosion - that may not stem from credit risk but, e.g., rising funding costs.

The Tier 1 ratio stood at 14.3% at year end 2009 and improved to a more satisfactory 15.6% in the six months to June 2010 owing to a 5% decline in risk weighted assets (while total assets decreased 3.7%). We do not rule out, however, that the Tier 1 ratio will decline over time as KA, trying to rebuild its core franchise, takes on new lending business that will redeploy recently freed-up capital.

With a pro-forma Basel III leverage ratio of 2.3% (i.e., Tier 1 capital in % of total assets as of June 2010), KA displayed considerable leverage and may struggle to meet the higher capital requirements under Basel III which will be phased-in starting from 2013. However, we note that the build-up of reserves coupled with progress in total asset reduction suggests a positive trend in leverage.

The score for capital adequacy is A.

Factor 8: Efficiency

Trend: Neutral

Given the loss of economies of scale following the break-up, we consider KA's efficiency as one of the challenges for the stand-alone bank. KA Old had a pre-crisis history of strong efficiency ratios benefitting from the high operational integration of its subsidiaries Dexia-Kommunalkredit (now 100% owned by Dexia Group and not individually rated) and Kommunalkredit International (now merged with KF), which brought about considerable synergy potential through the sharing of personnel and equipment. Progress on the efficiency of KA will partly depend on the execution of its planned re-focusing and a recovery in core revenues. However, we caution that the potential for improving efficiencies is limited for the small bank.

The score for efficiency is C.

Factor 9: Asset Quality

Trend: Neutral

As a specialised public sector lender, KA's asset quality is fairly sound. The bank's assets are dominated by public sector loans and bonds, complemented by inter-bank loans. The level of problem loans is very low. Maintaining a high asset quality and, as a natural consequence, a low level of risk provisions is a key element in the overall low risk profile of the bank, which is reflected in the score of A for asset quality.

Global Local Currency Deposit Rating (Joint Default Analysis)

Moody's assigns a global local currency (GLC) deposit rating of Baa1 to KA. The rating is based on KA's BCA of B2, as well as by the Aaa local currency deposit ceiling (LCDC) of its underlying support provider and main shareholder, the Republic of Austria. The bank thus receives a seven-notch uplift from its BCA, bringing the long-term debt and deposit ratings to Baa1.

Moody's views the probability of systemic support by the Republic of Austria, to be very high based on (1) the Republic of Austria's 99.78% ownership in KA, and (2) Austria's demonstrated willingness to support KA in the course of the break up.

Notching Considerations

In line with Moody's notching guidelines published in November 2009, KA's subordinated debt is rated at Baa2, i.e. one notch below the bank's senior debt rating.

Foreign Currency Deposit Rating

Moody's foreign currency deposit ratings for KA are Baa1/Prime-2.

Foreign Currency Debt Rating

Moody's foreign currency debt ratings for KA are Baa1/Prime-2.

ABOUT MOODY'S BANK RATINGS

Bank Financial Strength Rating

Moody's Bank Financial Strength Ratings (BFSRs) represent Moody's opinion of a bank's intrinsic safety and soundness and, as such, exclude certain external credit risks and credit support elements that are addressed by Moody's Bank Deposit Ratings. BFSRs do not take into account the probability that the bank will receive such external support, nor do they address risks arising from sovereign actions that may interfere with a bank's ability to honour its domestic or foreign currency obligations. Factors considered in the assignment of BFSRs include bank-specific elements such as financial fundamentals, franchise value, and business and asset diversification. Although BFSRs exclude the external factors specified above, they do take into account other risk factors in the bank's operating environment, including the strength and prospective performance of the economy, as well as the structure and relative fragility of the financial system, and the quality of banking regulation and supervision.

Global Local Currency Deposit Rating

A deposit rating, as an opinion of relative credit risk, incorporates the BFSR as well as Moody's opinion of any external support. Specifically, Moody's Bank Deposit Ratings are opinions of a bank's ability to repay punctually its deposit obligations. As such, they are intended to incorporate those aspects of credit risk relevant to the prospective payment performance of rated banks with respect to deposit obligations, which includes: intrinsic financial strength, sovereign transfer risk (in the case of foreign currency deposit ratings), and both implicit and explicit external support elements. Moody's Bank Deposit Ratings do not take into account the benefit of deposit insurance schemes which make payments to depositors, but they do recognize the potential support from schemes that may provide assistance to banks directly.

According to Moody's joint default analysis (JDA) methodology, the global local currency deposit rating of a bank is determined by the incorporation of external elements of support into the bank's baseline credit assessment. In calculating the Global Local Currency Deposit rating for a bank, the JDA methodology also factors in the rating of the support provider, in the form of the local currency deposit ceiling for a country, Moody's assessment of the probability of systemic support for the bank in the event of a stress situation and the degree of dependence between the issuer rating and the Local Currency Deposit Ceiling.

National Scale Rating

National scale ratings are intended primarily for use by domestic investors and are not comparable to Moody's globally applicable ratings; rather they address relative credit risk within a given country. AAaa rating on Moody's National Scale indicates an issuer or issue with the strongest creditworthiness and the lowest likelihood of credit loss relative to other domestic issuers. National Scale Ratings, therefore, rank domestic issuers relative to each other and not relative to absolute default risks. National ratings isolate systemic risks; they do not address loss expectation associated with systemic events that could affect all issuers, even those that receive the highest ratings on the National Scale.

Foreign Currency Deposit Rating

Moody's ratings on foreign currency bank obligations derive from the bank's local currency rating for the same class of obligation. The implementation of JDA for banks can lead to high local currency ratings for certain banks, which could also produce high foreign currency ratings. Nevertheless, it should be noted that foreign currency deposit ratings are in all cases constrained by the country ceiling for foreign currency bank deposits. This may result in the assignment of a different, and typically lower, rating for the foreign currency deposits relative to the bank's rating for local currency obligations.

Foreign Currency Debt Rating

Foreign currency debt ratings are derived from the bank's local currency debt rating. In a similar way to foreign currency deposit ratings, foreign currency debt ratings may also be constrained by the country ceiling for foreign currency bonds and notes; however, in some cases the ratings on foreign currency debt obligations may be allowed to pierce the foreign currency ceiling. A particular mix of rating factors are taken into consideration in order to assess whether a foreign currency bond rating pierces the country ceiling. They include the issuer's global local currency rating, the foreign currency government bond rating, the country ceiling for bonds and the debt's eligibility to pierce that ceiling.

About Moody's Bank Financial Strength Scorecard

Moody's bank financial strength model (see scorecard below) is a strategic input in the assessment of the financial strength of a bank, used as a key tool by Moody's analysts to ensure consistency of approach across banks and regions. The model output and the individual scores are discussed in rating committees and may be adjusted up or down to reflect conditions specific to each rated entity.

Rating Factors

Kommunalkredit Austria AG

| Rating Factors [1] | A | B | C | D | E | Total Score | Trend |
|---|--------|---|---|---|--------|-------------|------------------|
| Qualitative Factors (50%) | | | | | | D | |
| Factor: Franchise Value | | | | | | E+ | Neutral |
| Market Share and Sustainability | | | | | x | | |
| Geographical Diversification | | | x | | | | |
| Earnings Stability | | | | | x | | |
| Earnings Diversification [2] | | | | | x | | |
| Factor: Risk Positioning | | | | | | D- | Neutral |
| Corporate Governance [2] | | | | x | | | |
| - Ownership and Organizational Complexity | | | | | | | |
| - Key Man Risk | | | | | | | |
| - Insider and Related-Party Risks | | | | x | | | |
| Controls and Risk Management | | | | x | | | |
| - Risk Management | | | | | x | | |
| - Controls | | | x | | | | |
| Financial Reporting Transparency | | x | | | | | |
| - Global Comparability | x | | | | | | |
| - Frequency and Timeliness | | | | x | | | |
| - Quality of Financial Information | | x | | | | | |
| Credit Risk Concentration | | | | | x | | |
| - Borrower Concentration | | | | | x | | |
| - Industry Concentration | | | | | x | | |
| Liquidity Management | | | | | x | | |
| Market Risk Appetite | | | | | x | | |
| Factor: Operating Environment | | | | | | A- | Neutral |
| Economic Stability | x | | | | | | |
| Integrity and Corruption | | x | | | | | |
| Legal System | x | | | | | | |
| Financial Factors (50%) | | | | | | D+ | |
| Factor: Profitability | | | | | | E | Improving |
| PPI / Average RWA - Basel II | | | | | 0.09% | | |
| Net Income / Average RWA - Basel II | | | | | 0.10% | | |
| Factor: Liquidity | | | | | | E | Neutral |
| (Mkt funds-Liquid Assets) / Total Assets | | | | | 64.21% | | |
| Liquidity Management | | | | | x | | |
| Factor: Capital Adequacy | | | | | | A | Neutral |
| Tier 1 Ratio - Basel II | 14.30% | | | | | | |
| Tangible Common Equity / RWA - Basel II | 10.96% | | | | | | |
| Factor: Efficiency | | | | | | C | Neutral |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--|--------|--|--|----------------|----------------|
| Cost / Income Ratio | | | 59.55% | | | | |
| Factor: Asset Quality | | | | | | A | Neutral |
| Problem Loans / Gross Loans | 0.00% | | | | | | |
| Problem Loans / (Equity + LLR) | 0.03% | | | | | | |
| Lowest Combined Score (15%) | | | | | | E | |
| Economic Insolvency Override | | | | | | Neutral | |
| Aggregate Score | | | | | | D+ | |
| Assigned BFSR | | | | | | E+ | |

[1] - Where dashes are shown for a particular factor (or sub-factor), the score is based on non public information [2] - A blank score under Earnings diversification or Corporate Governance indicates the risk is neutral



© 2011 Moody's Investors Service, Inc. and/or its licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ARE MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC.'S ("MIS") CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MIS 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 ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT CONSTITUTE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS ARE NOT RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MIS ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources Moody's considers to be reliable, including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process. Under no circumstances shall MOODY'S have any liability to any person or entity for (a) any loss or damage in whole or in part caused by, resulting from, or relating to, any error (negligent or otherwise) or other circumstance or contingency within or outside the control of MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees or agents in connection with the procurement, collection, compilation, analysis, interpretation, communication, publication or delivery of any such information, or (b) any direct, indirect, special, consequential, compensatory or incidental damages whatsoever (including without limitation, lost profits), even if MOODY'S is advised in advance of the possibility of such damages, resulting from the use of or inability to use, any such information. The ratings, financial reporting analysis, projections, and other observations, if any, constituting part of the information contained herein are, and must be construed solely as, statements of opinion and not statements of fact or recommendations to purchase, sell or hold any securities. Each user of the information contained herein must make its own study and evaluation of each security it may consider purchasing, holding or selling. NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moody's.com under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Any publication into Australia of this document is by MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657, which holds Australian Financial Services License no. 336969. This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, credit ratings assigned on and after October 1, 2010 by Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJKK") are MJKK's current opinions of the relative future credit risk of entities, credit commitments, or debt or debt-like securities. In such a case, "MIS" in the foregoing statements shall be deemed to be replaced with "MJKK". MJKK is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO.

This credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness or a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be dangerous for retail investors to make any investment decision based on this credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.