

On November 23, 2011, the NCRC was dissolved and the Ukrainian government created the NCCIR. As a result of the NCRC dissolution, the State Inspection of Communications has similarly been dissolved and there are currently no provisions in the legislation that would provide for a similar regulatory body or for its authority. The authority granted to the NCCIR is largely similar to the authority that was afforded to the NCRC.

In addition, the Ukrainian Law on Telecommunications may require, among other things, companies declared to have dominant position or SMP on the telecommunications market to develop public telecommunications services if directed to do so by the regulatory authorities. On June 24, 2010, MTS Ukraine (among other mobile operators) was found to have a dominant position on the interconnect market by the AMC. In 2012, there have been changes in legislation affecting telecommunications providers including: the Rules on Telecommunication Services making the operators responsible for the actions of content-providers, a law on state lotteries prohibiting all lotteries in Ukraine excluding those of state status and a law on telecommunications prohibiting serving new subscribers unless they provide a passport as identity confirmation.

In November 2012, NCCIR issued the statements regarding MNP, which enables the subscribers to retain their telephone number after switching from one operator of mobile communications to another. MNP law came into legal force on July 5, 2013 with the beginning of switching to other operators from December 20, 2013. On December 30, 2013 a resolution that postponed the beginning of service provision to July 2014 came into legal force, however, implementation of MNP service was cancelled later on by a court decision. On July 31, 2015, NCCIR approved the procedure for MNP service rendering and introduced amendments to the basic requirements of agreements for the provision of telecommunication services. The decision entered into force on September 8, 2015. The terms of MNP service launch will be set by the special decision of NCCIR which has not been passed yet.

According to the Law of Ukraine No. 1166 "On prevention of financial disaster and creation of preconditions for the economic growth in Ukraine," the fee for use of radio frequency resource was doubled since April 1, 2014. Over the period of 2016, the fee has raised by 13.35%. The increase in fee for the use of radio frequency resource and similar legislative changes regulating telecommunications industry may materially adversely affect our business, financial condition and results of operations. See "Item 4. Information on Our Company—B. Business Overview—Regulation of Telecommunications in the Russian Federation and Ukraine—Regulation in Ukraine—Legislation."

The Russian taxation system is underdeveloped and any imposition of significant additional tax liabilities could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition or results of operations.

The discussion below provides general information regarding Russian taxes and is not intended to be inclusive of all issues. Investors should seek advice from their own tax advisors as to these tax matters before investing in our shares and ADSs. See also "Item 10. Additional Information—E. Taxation."

In general, taxes payable by Russian companies are substantial and numerous. These taxes include, among others, corporate income tax, value added tax, property taxes, excise duties, payroll-related taxes and other taxes.

Russian tax laws, regulations and court practice are subject to frequent change, varying interpretation and inconsistent and selective enforcement. In some instances, although it may be viewed as contrary to Russian constitutional law, the Russian tax authorities have applied certain new tax laws retroactively, issued tax claims for periods for which the statute of limitations had expired and reviewed the same tax period multiple times.

On October 12, 2006, the Plenum of the High Arbitrazh Court of the Russian Federation issued Resolution No. 53 formulating the concept of "unjustified tax benefit," which is described in the

Resolution by reference to circumstances, such as absence of business purpose or transactions where the form does not match the substance, and which could lead to the disallowance of tax benefits resulting from the transaction or the recharacterization of the transaction. There has been very little further guidance on the interpretation of this concept by the tax authorities or courts, but it is likely that the tax authorities will actively seek to apply this concept when challenging tax positions taken by taxpayers in Russian courts. While the intention of this Resolution might have been to combat abuse of tax laws, in practice, there is no assurance that the tax authorities will not seek to apply this concept in a broader sense.

Generally, tax returns in Russia remain open and subject to tax audit by the tax authorities for a period of three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which the decision to conduct a tax audit is taken. The fact that a year has been reviewed by the tax authorities does not prevent further review of that year, or any tax return applicable to that year, during the eligible three-year period by a superior tax authority or, in certain limited instances, by a tax authority which conducted an initial review.

On July 14, 2005, the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation issued a decision that allows the statute of limitations for tax penalties to be extended beyond the three-year term set forth in the tax laws if a court determines that the taxpayer has obstructed or hindered a tax audit. Additionally, according to amendments to the Tax Code of the Russian Federation, effective January 1, 2007, the three-year statute of limitations may be extended if the actions of the taxpayer created insurmountable obstacles for the tax audit. Because none of the relevant terms is defined, tax authorities may have broad discretion to argue that a taxpayer has "obstructed" or "hindered" or "created insurmountable obstacles" in respect of a tax audit and to ultimately seek review and possibly apply penalties beyond the three-year terms. According to Presidium of High Arbitrazh Court Resolution No. 4134/11 of September 27, 2011, the statute of limitations for tax penalties is calculated starting from the day immediately following the expiration of the tax period when the violation was committed.

On March 17, 2009, the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation issued a decision preventing the Russian tax authorities from carrying out a subsequent tax audit of a tax period if, following the initial audit of such tax period, a court decision was made concerning a tax dispute between the relevant taxpayer and the relevant tax authority arising out of such tax period, and such decision has not been revised or discharged. The Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation then issued Decision No. 138-O-P on January 28, 2010, which confirmed the above approach. Subsequently, the Presidium of High Arbitrazh Court held in several cases that under certain circumstances (in particular, when the case has not been considered in substance) a superior tax body is still entitled to conduct a tax audit with respect to re-opened tax periods and taxes already reviewed during the initial tax audit; however, the circumstances under which the audit is conducted should differ from the initial ones (No. 14585/09 of March 16, 2010, No. 17099/09 of May 25, 2010, No. 7278/10 of October 20, 2010).

There is no guarantee that the tax authorities will not review our compliance with applicable tax law beyond the three-year limitation period. Any such review could, if it concluded that we had significant unpaid taxes relating to such periods, have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and prospects.

As of January 1, 2012, changes to the Tax Code of the Russian Federation enable Russian taxpayers which are part of a group to consolidate their financial results for profit tax purposes. It is yet unclear how the new legislative provisions will be applied by the tax authorities as currently only limited regulatory guidance is available on this matter. In addition to imposing certain criteria that must be met in order to create a consolidated tax paying group, the law also limits certain transactions within the group (e.g. corporate restructurings). In 2014, we concluded an agreement with tax authorities, according to which the consolidated taxpaying group had to start functioning since 2016.

However, pursuant to the law adopted in November 2015, the contracts on the set up of the consolidated taxpaying group are not subject to registration during 2016 - 2017 and the contracts registered during 2014 - 2015 are considered by tax authorities as not registered. In the absence of any official interpretation, it is currently difficult to estimate the implementation of new law on the agreements already registered by tax authorities.

In addition, intercompany dividends are subject to a withholding tax of 0% or 13% (depending on whether the recipient of dividends qualifies for Russian participation exemption rules), if being distributed to Russian companies, and 15% (or lower, subject to benefits provided by relevant double tax treaties), if being distributed to foreign companies.

The Russian tax authorities may take a more assertive position in their interpretation of the legislation and assessments, and it is possible that transactions and activities that have not been challenged in the past may nonetheless be subject to challenges in the future. The foregoing factors raise the risk of the imposition of arbitrary or onerous taxes on us, which could adversely affect the value of our shares and ADSs.

Current Russian tax legislation is, in general, based upon the formal manner in which transactions are documented, looking to form rather than substance. However, the Russian tax authorities are increasingly taking a "substance and form" approach, which may cause additional tax exposures to arise in the future. Additional tax exposures could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and prospects.

It is expected that Russian tax legislation will become more sophisticated, which may result in the introduction of additional revenue raising measures. Although it is unclear how any new measures would operate, any such introduction may affect our overall tax efficiency and may result in significant additional taxes becoming payable. Additional tax exposures could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and prospects.

In addition to the usual tax burden imposed on Russian taxpayers, these conditions complicate tax planning and related business decisions. For example, tax laws are unclear with respect to deductibility of certain expenses. This uncertainty could possibly expose us to significant fines and penalties and to enforcement measures, despite our best efforts at compliance, and could result in a greater than expected tax burden.

See also "Item 8. Financial Information—A. Consolidated Statements and Other Financial Information—7. Litigation—Tax Audits and Claims."

Lack of law enforcement practice of the Russian anti-offshore policy may have adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

In the past few years, the Russian Federation like a number of other countries in the world has been actively involved in a discussion of measures against tax evasion by the use of low tax jurisdictions as well as aggressive tax planning structures.

The rules of controlled foreign companies (CFC) came into force on January 1, 2015. The rules oblige Russian taxpayers being controlling persons of a foreign company to submit to the tax authorities both standard notifications on participation in CFC and tax declarations. Profit generated commencing in 2015, including retained earnings, is subject to taxation in the Russian Federation. The innovations could impose additional tax on the undistributed profits of any foreign entity controlled by us (in proportion to such controlling stake) at the rate of 20%. These innovations caused amendments to the Tax Code providing for liability in case of non-disclosure or incomplete disclosure of information on CFCs and the non-payment or underpayment of relevant tax.

In addition, implementation of new concept of beneficial ownership, with regard to taxation of payment of passive income (dividends, royalty, income), may negatively affect possibility to apply benefits set by the double tax treaties, in case such payments pass through intermediary entities. This may potentially lead to increase of tax burden with regard to such payments.

On November 4, 2014, the President of the Russian Federation signed the Federal law No. 325 "On ratification of the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters."

Ratification of this Convention will enable the Russian Federation to receive tax information from all participating countries which include, among others, a number of offshore jurisdictions.

Lack of law enforcement practice may cause difficulties in interpreting the above-mentioned laws by the Russian tax authorities. It is also currently unclear how the enacted laws could affect our counterparties, which may be registered in off shore jurisdictions.

In case the impact of legislative initiatives is significant for some of our counterparties it may lead to potential influence on our results of operations.

The tax system in Ukraine is undergoing a reform and various tax laws are subject to different interpretations.

Besides the new Tax Code, which came into force on January 1, 2011, Ukraine currently has a number of laws related to various taxes imposed by both central and regional authorities. Applicable taxes include value added tax ("VAT"), corporate income tax (profits tax), customs duties, payroll (social) taxes and other taxes. These tax laws have not been in force for significant periods of time compared to more developed market economies and are constantly changed and amended. Accordingly, few precedents regarding tax issues are available.

Although the Ukrainian Constitution prohibits retroactive enforcement of any newly enacted tax laws and the Law on Taxation System specifically requires legislation to adopt new tax laws at least six months prior to them becoming effective, such rules have largely been ignored. In addition, tax laws are often vaguely drafted, making it difficult for us to determine what actions are required for compliance.

Furthermore, with the entry into force of the new Tax Code of Ukraine (the "TCU"), there is uncertainty in regards to tax accounting of payments for the use of computer software. As part of its business, MTS Ukraine purchases limited end-user rights for the use of computer software. Currently, there are no clear rules for the classification of the payments made by MTS Ukraine for these purchases. Under the TCU, these payments may be treated as payments for intangible assets or as payments for fixed assets. Tax authorities of different levels have provided inconsistent tax clarifications on this matter. The tax rate applicable to these payments will vary according to their classification.

Also, rules established by the TCU for recalculation of the input tax credit for non-current assets are unclear. Uncertain transfer pricing rules and their inconsistent application by the Ukrainian tax authorities and courts may also adversely affect MTS Ukraine's operations. MTS Ukraine's transactions with its related parties as well as certain transactions with non-Ukrainian entities that are not MTS Ukraine's related parties may be affected by the application of the transfer pricing rules. No "safe harbor" margin is provided under Ukrainian legislation if the sale price deviates from the arm's length price.

On December 28, 2014, the Act on Improvement of Tax Control on Transfer Pricing was approved. From January 1, 2015, business transactions that have an impact on taxable profits with related parties non-Ukrainian entities or non-related entities of states, where the Corporate Profits Tax rate is less than 13%, are controlled if the value of all transactions with the same counterparty exceeds 1 million hryvnias (net of VAT).

Due to the poor quality of the applicable tax legislation and its inconsistent interpretation, it is possible that MTS Ukraine's prices could be subject to challenge and adjustment for corporate income tax or VAT purposes. Profit repatriation arrangements, such as the level of royalties for trademarks or loan interest paid by MTS Ukraine from Ukraine abroad, may also be challenged for the same reasons. If such price adjustments are implemented, MTS Ukraine's effective tax rate may increase and its financial results may be adversely affected.

Differing opinions regarding the legal interpretation of tax laws often exist both among and within governmental ministries and organizations, including the tax administration, creating uncertainties and areas of conflict for taxpayers and investors.

Tax declarations/returns, together with other legal compliance areas (e.g., customs and currency control matters), may be subject to review and investigation by various administrative divisions of the tax authorities, which are authorized by law to impose severe fines, penalties and interest charges. These circumstances create tax risks in Ukraine substantially more significant than typically found in countries with more developed tax systems. Generally, tax declarations/returns in Ukraine remain open and subject to inspection for a three-year period. However, this term may not be observed or may be extended under certain circumstances, including in the context of a criminal investigation.

The changes introduced into the Tax Code of the Ukraine during 2012 created a duty to pay advance installments on tax on profits on a monthly basis and retained the duty to pay advance installments on dividend payments. Before 2013, tax on profits charged for the accounting period was reduced by the amount of advance installments made on dividend payments. In 2013, such reductions were not taken into account and we were obliged to pay the new monthly advance installment on the tax on profits as well as the advance installments on the dividend payments, which increased our tax expenses. However, following a new law issued on July 31, 2013 it became possible to reduce the tax on profits by the amount of advance installments on dividend payments but commencing March 1, 2014 when the 2013 and 2014 tax return is filed. But the form of tax return applied for 2013, 2014 and 2015 does not provide for such reduction. The State Fiscal Service provided similar clarifications on the possibility to reduce the tax on profits in tax report for 2015 by the amount of advance installments made on dividend payments in previous years.

The approach to the calculation of the profits tax has changed recently. The tax is currently calculated based on financial results declared in the financial statements, i.e. according to the accounting principles. There were temporary tax differences for specific operations until January 1, 2015, i.e. the revenues reflected in the financial statements for 2015 were also reflected in tax accountings until January 1, 2015, which could lead to double taxation. MTS Ukraine is working with the relevant state authorities to avoid double taxation.

On March 27, 2014, the Act on Finance Crisis Prevention was passed in Ukraine. Several provisions in the Tax Code have been changed by the act which may affect our business in Ukraine, in particular, doubling of the fees for frequency usage.

On December 28, 2014, the Act on tax reform was passed, that changes TCU by introducing the new VAT base and the electronic VAT administration system. From January 1, 2015 the VAT base for taxable supplies cannot be lower than the purchase price for purchased goods/services and/or the cost for produced services (cannot be lower than the normal price from January 1, 2016); and/or the net balance value of non-current assets. From February 1, 2015 till October 1, 2015 the electronic VAT administration system operated in a test regime: all VAT invoices were issued in electronic form and registered in the unified register. Failure to register a VAT invoice issued since October 1, 2015 on time is subject to 20-50% fines depending on the overdue period. Since July 1, 2015, the registration of VAT invoices is available if the supplier has sufficient input VAT and/or has a sufficient balance in its State Treasury electronic VAT account accumulated with cash from supplier's bank account. In addition, starting from January 1, 2016 10-100% fines for errors on VAT invoices were introduced.

While we believe that we are currently materially in compliance with the tax laws affecting our operations in Ukraine, it is possible that relevant authorities may take differing positions with regard to interpretative issues, which may result in a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

Vaguely drafted Russian transfer pricing rules, and lack of reliable pricing information may impact our business and results of operations.

Russian transfer pricing legislation became effective in the Russian Federation on January 1, 1999. This legislation allowed the tax authorities to make transfer pricing adjustments and impose additional tax liabilities with respect to all "controlled" transactions, provided that the transaction price differed from the market price by more than 20%. "Controlled" transactions included transactions with related parties, barter transactions, foreign trade transactions and transactions with significant price fluctuations (i.e., if the price with respect to such transactions differs from the prices on similar transactions conducted within a short period of time by more than 20%). Special transfer pricing provisions were established for operations with securities and derivatives. Russian transfer pricing rules were vaguely drafted, generally leaving wide scope for interpretation by Russian tax authorities and courts. There has been very little guidance (although some court practice is available) as to how these rules should be applied. These transfer pricing rules apply with respect to transactions that occurred before January 1, 2012.

New transfer pricing rules became effective on January 1, 2012. The implementation of these new rules should help to align domestic rules with OECD principles. The new rules are expected to considerably toughen the previously effective law by, among other things, effectively shifting the burden of proving market prices from the tax authorities to the taxpayer and obliging the taxpayer to keep in certain cases specific documentation. In addition, the amendments:

- introduce the possibility for major taxpayers to enter into an advance pricing agreement with the tax authorities;
- introduce the 'arm's length' principle as a fundamental principle of the Russian transfer pricing rules;
- establish a new list of controlled transactions (which would cover cross-border transactions with certain commodities, cross-border transactions with related parties and tax haven residents, and certain intra-Russian transactions with related parties);
- extend the list of related parties;
- extend the list of transfer pricing methods (including the Transactional Net Margin Method and the Profit Split method) with the choice of method depending on the allocation of functions performed, risks assumed and assets used by the parties to a transaction (instead of a rigid priority of methods under prior legislation);
- replace the existing permitted deviation threshold with the 'arm's length' range of market prices (profitability);
- introduce double-side adjustments in relation to domestic transactions; and
- introduce special transfer pricing audits by federal tax authorities and specific transfer pricing penalties (more severe than in case of other, non-transfer pricing related, tax assessments).

If the Russian tax authorities were to impose significant additional tax liabilities through the introduction of transfer pricing adjustments, they could have a material adverse impact on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Adoption of the new transfer pricing rules may increase the risk of transfer pricing adjustments being made by the tax authorities. In addition to the usual tax

risks and tax burden imposed on Russian taxpayers, the uncertainties of the new transfer pricing rules complicate tax planning and related business decisions. It will also require us to ensure compliance with the new transfer pricing documentation requirements proposed in such rules. Uncertainty of the new rules may also require us to expend significant additional time and material resources for implementation of our internal compliance procedures. Tax authorities could impose additional tax liability as well as 20% penalties on the underpaid tax in case the prices or profitability are outside the market range and if the required transfer pricing documentation has not been prepared, which could have a material adverse effect on our results of operations and financial condition.

The regulatory environment for telecommunications in Russia, Ukraine and other countries where we operate or may operate in the future is uncertain and subject to political influence or manipulation, which may result in negative and arbitrary regulatory and other decisions against us on the basis of other than legal considerations and in preferential treatment for our competitors.

We operate in an uncertain regulatory environment. The legal framework with respect to the provision of telecommunications services in Russia and Ukraine and the other countries where we operate or may operate in the future is not well developed, and a number of conflicting laws, decrees and regulations apply to the telecommunications sector.

Moreover, regulation is conducted largely through the issuance of licenses and instructions, and governmental officials have a high degree of discretion. In this environment, political influence or manipulation could be used to affect regulatory, tax and other decisions against us on the basis of other than legal considerations. For example, Russian government authorities investigated VimpelCom in late 2003 on grounds that it was illegally operating in Moscow pursuant to a license issued to its wholly owned subsidiary rather than to VimpelCom itself. In addition, some of our competitors may receive preferential treatment from the government, potentially giving them a substantial advantage over us.

An adverse change in the infrastructure regulation in Russia could result in additional costs on us.

From January 1, 2013, telecommunications operators are required to enter into agreements with owners of roads whose public access areas host telecommunication equipment. These agreements have to contain certain provisions prescribed by the Russian Ministry for Transportation and the Russian Ministry for Economic Development and Trade. To date, no list of such provisions has been adopted. There is a risk of imbalance in the commercial interests of the operators and road owners in case such list is adopted.

Consequently, any adverse changes in legislation relating to the regulation of interaction between the owners of roads and telecommunications companies could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operations and prospects.

Telecom operators will be obliged to sign agreements with both, owners of the roads and with owners of land located within road areas where telecommunication equipment is installed. On September 5, 2014, the Ministry of Transport adopted Order No. 240 "On approval of the procedure for determination of fees for public easements in respect of land plots within the boundaries of road rights-of-way (except for private roads) for laying, moving, conversion and operations of utility lines." The Order establishes annual payment in the amount of 0.12% of the cadastral cost of the land plot.

After the Ministry of Transport of the Russian Federation in coordination with the Ministry of Economic Development adopts the Order setting out key terms of agreements between telecommunications operators and owners of the roads, telecommunications operators will be obliged to enter into these agreements. Federal public bodies are currently considering a draft of the Order.

Risks Relating to the Shares and ADSs and the Trading Market

Government regulations may limit the ability of investors to deposit shares into our ADS facility.

The ability of investors to deposit shares into our ADS facility may be affected by current or future governmental regulations. For example, under Russian securities regulations, no more than 25% of a Russian company's shares may be circulated abroad through sponsored depositary receipt programs. Prior to December 31, 2005, and at the time of our initial public offering, this threshold was 40%. Although we believe that the new lower threshold does not apply to our ADSs, in the future, we may be required to reduce the size of our ADS program or amend the depositary agreement for the ADSs.

Because our ADS program is regularly at or near capacity, purchasers of our shares may not be able to deposit these shares into our ADS facility, and ADS holders who withdraw the underlying shares from the facility may not be able to re-deposit their shares in the future. As a result, effective arbitrage between our ADSs and our shares may not always be possible. Our shares are listed and traded on the Moscow Interbank Currency Exchange. Due to the limited public free float of our common stock, the public market for our shares is significantly less active and liquid than for our ADSs. The cumulative effect of these factors is that our shares may from time to time, and for extended periods of time, trade at a significant discount to our ADSs.

Recent Russian legislation changed the approach towards disclosure of information about ownership of the ADSs, including in some cases beneficial ownership of the ADSs, and a failure to provide such disclosure may restrict your ability to vote.

Pursuant to recently changed legislation, depositaries, and as a result, ADS holders, are not able to vote in connection with the shares underlying ADSs on behalf of the ADS holders unless they provide certain information to the issuer. At a minimum, this information includes the identity of the holder of the ADSs, registration details including a state registration number (for legal entities), and the number of shares attributable to each ADS holder.

Nevertheless the legislation stipulates that the issuer, CBR, Russian courts and pretrial investigation agencies may request such lists of depositary receipt holders from the holder of depositary program depo account. The holder of depositary program depo account shall take all reasonable measures in order to provide such information. In case of non-compliance with the above requirements, the CBR may suspend, or impose limitations on, transactions with securities held in the relevant accounts of Russian custodians for a period of up to six months. As a result, the shares underlying the ADSs may be blocked and it may be impossible to deposit or withdraw the shares into or from the depositary program. Overall, there is lack of practice and official interpretation in relation to the new rules related to shares underlying ADSs as well as uncertainties with respect to exercise of certain rights attaching to shares underlying ADS holders in view of the new rules which could complicate the exercise of right to, and the ability to derive benefits from, the shares represented by ADSs.

The market price of our ADSs has been and may continue to be volatile.

The market price of our ADSs experienced, and may continue to experience, significant volatility. For information on the closing price of our ADSs on the New York Stock Exchange, see "Item 9. Offer and Listing Details—A.4. Market Price Information."

Numerous factors, including many over which we have no control, may have a significant impact on the market price of our ADSs, including, among other things:

- periods of regional or global macroeconomic instability;
- announcements of technological or competitive developments;

- regulatory developments in our target markets affecting us, our customers or our competitors;
- actual or anticipated fluctuations in our quarterly operating results;
- changes in financial estimates or other material comments by securities analysts relating to us, our competitors or our industry in general;
- announcements by other companies in our industry relating to their operations, strategic initiatives, financial condition or financial performance or to our industry in general;
- announcements of acquisitions or consolidations involving industry competitors or industry suppliers;
- sales or perceived sales of additional ordinary shares or ADSs by us or our significant shareholders; and
- impact and development of any investigation or lawsuit, currently pending or threatened, or that may be instituted in the future.

For example, market price of our ADSs experienced significant volatility during 2014 due to an economic downturn coupled with legal proceedings relating to our beneficial owner, as disclosed in more detail by Sistema.

In addition, the stock market in recent years has experienced extreme price and trading volume fluctuations that often have been unrelated or disproportionate to the operating performance of individual companies. These broad market fluctuations may adversely affect the price of our ADSs, regardless of our operating performance.

Voting rights with respect to the shares represented by our ADSs are limited by the terms of the deposit agreement for our ADSs and relevant requirements of Russian law.

ADS holders will have no direct voting rights with respect to the shares represented by the ADSs. They are able to exercise voting rights with respect to the shares represented by ADSs only in accordance with the provisions of the deposit agreement relating to the ADSs and relevant requirements of Russian law. Therefore, there are practical limitations upon the ability of ADS holders to exercise their voting rights due to the additional procedural steps involved in communicating with them. For example, the Joint Stock Companies Law and our charter require us to notify shareholders no less than 30 days prior to the date of any meeting and at least 70 days prior to the date of an extraordinary meeting to elect our Board of Directors. Our ordinary shareholders will receive notice directly from us and will be able to exercise their voting rights by either attending the meeting in person or voting by power of attorney.

ADS holders by comparison, will not receive notice directly from us. Rather, in accordance with the deposit agreement, we will provide the notice to the depository. The depository has undertaken, in turn, as soon as practicable thereafter, to mail to ADS holders the notice of such meeting, voting instruction forms and a statement as to the manner in which instructions may be given by ADS holders. To exercise their voting rights, ADS holders must then instruct the depository how to vote the shares represented by the ADSs they hold. Because of this additional procedural step involving the depository, the process for exercising voting rights may take longer for ADS holders than for holders of the shares and we cannot assure ADS holders that they will receive voting materials in time to enable them to return voting instructions to the depository in a timely manner. ADSs for which the depository does not receive timely voting instructions will not be voted.

Given the above, we cannot provide any assurance that holders and beneficial owners of ADSs will (i) receive notice of shareholder meetings to enable the timely return of voting instructions to the depository, (ii) receive notice to enable the timely cancellation of ADSs in respect of shareholder

actions or (iii) be given the benefit of dissenting or minority shareholders' rights in respect of an event or action in which the holder or beneficial owner has voted against, abstained from voting or not given voting instructions.

See also "Recent Russian legislation changed the approach towards disclosure of information about ownership of the ADSs, including in some cases beneficial ownership of the ADSs, and a failure to provide such disclosure may restrict your ability to vote."

ADS holders may be unable to repatriate distributions made on the shares and ADSs.

We anticipate that any dividends we may pay in the future on the shares represented by the ADSs will be declared and paid to the depositary in rubles and will be converted into U.S. dollars by the depositary and distributed to holders of ADSs, net of the depositary's fees and expenses. The ability to convert rubles into U.S. dollars is subject to the availability of U.S. dollars in Russia's currency markets. Although there is an existing, albeit limited by size, market within Russia for the conversion of rubles into U.S. dollars, including the interbank currency exchange and over-the-counter and currency futures markets, the further development of this market is uncertain. At present, there is a limited market for the conversion of rubles into foreign currencies outside of Russia and limited market in which to hedge ruble and ruble-denominated investments.

ADS holders may be subject to Russian regulatory restrictions.

Prior to the amendments to the Russian securities laws introduced in 2011, a depositary bank could be considered the owner of the shares underlying the ADS, and as such could be subject to the mandatory public tender offer rules, anti-monopoly clearance rules, governmental consents or reporting requirements in respect of acquisition of shares and other limitations contemplated by Russian law. The amendments to the Russian securities laws introduced in 2011 provide that a depositary bank is not an owner of underlying shares, and as such, these requirements should apply to ADS holders.

ADS holders may be unable to benefit from the United States–Russia income tax treaty.

Under Russian law, dividends paid to a non-resident holder of the shares generally will be subject to Russian withholding tax at a rate of 15%. The tax burden may be reduced to 5% or 10% under the United States–Russia income tax treaty for eligible U.S. holders; a 5% rate may potentially apply for U.S. holders who are legal entities owning 10% or more of the company's voting shares, and a 10% rate applies to dividends paid to eligible U.S. holders in other cases, including dividend payments to individuals and legal entities owning less than 10% of the company's voting shares. However, according to the recent amendments to the Tax Code, U.S. holders will only be able to utilize the 5% reduced rate through tax reimbursement procedures, as the tax agent is required to use the baseline tax rate established by the code or the applicable tax treaty, whichever is appropriate. See also "Item 10. Additional Information–E. Taxation–United States–Russia Income Tax Treaty Procedures."

The Russian tax rules in relation to ADS holders (that would affect U.S. holders) are characterized by significant uncertainties and limited interpretive guidance. Recent amendments to the tax rules have clarified the status of the ADS holders as beneficial owners of the income from the underlying shares by establishing that the custodian holding the depo account with the shares underlying the ADSs acting as the tax agent and determines amounts of the withholding tax based on the information about the ADS holders and their tax residency status as provided by the program depositary. However, the application of the baseline tax rate for ADS holders and any double tax treaty relief is available only if the tax treaty residence of the holder is provided to the custodian along with the other information prescribed by the Tax code. In relation to ADS holders such information is to be provided by the ADS holders to the depositary, who relays it to the custodian, who acts as the tax agent and withholds the taxes when making transferring the dividends to the depositary. It is currently unclear how the

depository will collect the necessary information from ADS holders. Thus, while a U.S. holder may technically be entitled to benefit from the provisions of the United States–Russia income tax treaty, in practice such relief may be difficult or impossible to obtain. See also "Item 10. Additional Information–E. Taxation" for additional information.

Capital gain from the sale of shares and ADSs may be subject to Russian income tax.

Income received by a foreign company from the sale, exchange or other disposal (assuming that such income is not related to a permanent establishment of a foreign company in Russia) of shares (participation interest) in an organization in which over 50% of the assets consist of immovable property located in Russia, as well as financial instruments derived from such shares, is treated as income derived from a source in the Russian Federation and is subject to withholding tax at a rate of 20%. However, gains arising from the disposition of the securities which are traded on an organized stock exchange are not treated as Russian-source income, and should not be subject to taxation in Russia.

The amount of such income is typically determined as the sales price of shares (participation interest). However, if documentary support for the acquisition cost of the shares (participation interest) is available, the tax may instead be assessed on the basis of the difference between the sales price and the acquisition cost (including other related costs) if documentary evidence of such costs is submitted to the tax agent. The Russian Tax Code also establishes special rules for calculating the tax base for the purposes of transactions with securities. However, an exemption applies if immovable property located in Russia constitutes more than 50% of a company's assets and the securities are traded on a foreign stock exchange. The determination of whether more than 50% of our assets consist of immovable property located in Russia is inherently factual and is made on an on-going basis and the relevant Russian legislation and regulations in this respect are not entirely clear. Hence, there can be no assurance that immovable property owned by us and located in Russia does not currently and will not constitute more than 50% of our assets as at the date of the sale of ADSs by non-residents.

Where the ADSs are sold by legal entities or organizations to persons other than a Russian company or a foreign company or an organization with a registered permanent establishment in Russia, even if the resulting capital gain is considered taxable in Russia, there is currently no mechanism under which the purchaser will be able to withhold the tax and remit it to the Russian budget.

Under the United States–Russia income tax treaty, capital gains from the sale of shares and/or ADSs by eligible U.S. holders should be relieved from taxation in Russia, unless 50% or more of our assets (the term "fixed assets" is used in the Russian version of the treaty) were to consist of immovable property located in Russia.

The taxation of income of non-resident individuals depends on whether this income is received from Russian or non-Russian sources. Russian tax law does not give a definition of how the "source of income" should be determined with respect to the sale of securities, other than that income from the sale of securities which takes place "in Russia" should be considered as Russian source income. As there is no further definition of what should be considered to be a sale "in Russia," the Russian tax authorities have a certain amount of freedom to conclude what transactions take place in or outside Russia, including looking at the place of the transaction, the place of the issuer of the shares, the location of the registrar recording the transfer of legal title to the relevant securities or other similar criteria.

Non-residents who are individuals are taxable on Russian-source income. Provided that gains arising from the disposition of the foregoing types of securities and derivatives outside of Russia by U.S. holders who are individuals not resident in Russia for tax purposes will not be considered Russian source income, then such income should not be taxable in Russia. However, gains arising from the disposition of the same securities and derivatives "in Russia" by U.S. holders who are individuals not

resident in Russia for tax purposes may be subject to tax either at the source in Russia or based on an annual tax return, which they may be required to submit with the Russian tax authorities. See also "Item 10. Additional Information—E. Taxation."

The lack of a developed practice relating to share registration system in Russia and other countries where we operate may result in improper record ownership of our shares, including the shares underlying the ADSs, and other problems connected with the rights attributed to the relevant shares such as dividend payments.

Ownership of Russian joint stock company shares (or, if the shares are held through a nominee or custodian, then the holding of such nominee or custodian) is determined by entries in a share register and is evidenced by extracts from that register. Currently, the central registration system in Russia is under development. Since October 1, 2014, share registers of all joint stock companies are maintained by licensed registrars. Regulations were issued regarding the licensing conditions for such registrars, as well as the procedures to be followed by both companies maintaining their own registers and licensed registrars when performing the functions of registrar, however companies are no longer able to maintain the registers themselves. Nevertheless, in practice registrars tend to have relatively low levels of capitalization and insufficient insurance coverage.

On December 7, 2011 amendments to the relevant legislation were adopted, substantially reforming the registration system by introducing the CSD. In the course of this reform of the share keeping system, numerous different depositaries with accounts in the registers of companies were replaced by a single central depositary, whose primary function is the custody of shares in all major companies. These changes became effective on January 1, 2012 and are still being implemented. On November 6, 2012, FSFM officially appointed the National Settlement Depositary as the central depositary. Since the central depositary opened its account in MTS' register in March 2013, all the other custodians are restricted from opening their accounts in the register. Currently the central depositary is the only custodian with an account in MTS' register and other custodians hold custodial accounts with the central depositary.

In addition, certain amendments to the Civil Code of the Russian Federation entered into force on October 1, 2013 regarding the transfer and restitution of securities that are aimed at protection of rights of security holders and on September 1, 2014 regarding the regulation of legal entities and their corporate governance. However, a centralized share registration system is currently undergoing a reform in Russia, therefore transactions in respect of a company's shares could be improperly or inaccurately recorded, and share registration could be lost through fraud, negligence, official and unofficial governmental actions or oversight by registrars incapable of compensating shareholders for their misconduct. This creates risks of loss not normally associated with investments in other securities markets.

In addition, on July 6, 2012 a central depositary was introduced in Ukraine. Such central depositary is to hold the shares of all joint stock companies in Ukraine. The methods of dividend payments was also changed: according to the new rules the joint-stock company transfers dividends to the CSD through the operating account at the special processing center in order to enable the central depositary make the onward transfer to the parties eligible to receive dividends. The changes came into force on October 12, 2013 and could affect the timing of dividend payouts.

The Regulation No. 591 of the National Bank of Ukraine "On amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the National Bank of Ukraine" that entered into force on September 23, 2014 and expired on December 2, 2014 set the restriction on a number of operations in foreign currency, including repatriation of dividends to the foreign investor. On December 1, 2014, the National Bank of Ukraine adopted a new regulation (Resolution No. 758) with effect from December 3, 2014, which extended the application of certain currency control restrictions, including the above-mentioned repatriation of dividends (except for the dividends on securities traded on stock exchange) till March 3, 2015. During

the course of 2015 and the first quarter of 2016, the restriction terms have been prolonged several times, with the expiration on June 8, 2016, which may adversely affect our cash flow and results of operations.

See also "—Recent Russian legislation changed the approach towards disclosure of information about ownership of the ADSs, including in some cases beneficial ownership of the ADSs, and a failure to provide such disclosure may restrict your ability to vote."

Foreign judgments may not be enforceable against us.

Our presence outside the United States may limit your legal recourse against us. We are incorporated under the laws of the Russian Federation. Substantially all of our directors and executive officers named in this document reside outside the United States. All or a substantial portion of our assets and the assets of our officers and directors are located outside the United States. As a result, you may not be able to effect service of process within the United States on us or on our officers and directors. Similarly, you may not be able to obtain or enforce U.S. court judgments against us, our officers and directors, including actions based on the civil liability provisions of the U.S. securities laws. In addition, it may be difficult for you to enforce, in original actions brought in courts in jurisdictions outside the United States, liabilities predicated upon U.S. securities laws.

There is no treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation providing for reciprocal recognition and enforcement of foreign court judgments in civil and commercial matters. These limitations may deprive you of effective legal recourse for claims related to your investment in our shares and ADSs. The deposit agreement provides for actions brought by any party thereto against us to be settled by arbitration in accordance with the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the American Arbitration Association, provided that any action under the U.S. federal securities laws or the rules or regulations promulgated thereunder may, but need not, be submitted to arbitration. The Russian Federation is a party to the United Nations (New York) Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, but it may be difficult to enforce arbitral awards in the Russian Federation due to a number of factors, including the inexperience of Russian courts in international commercial transactions, official and unofficial political resistance to enforcement of awards against Russian companies in favor of foreign investors and Russian courts' inability to enforce such orders and corruption.

Other Risks

We have not independently verified information we have sourced from third parties.

We have sourced certain information contained in this document from third parties, including private companies and Russian government agencies, and we have relied on the accuracy of this information without independent verification. The official data published by Russian federal, regional and local governments may be substantially less complete or researched than those of more developed countries. Official statistics may also be produced on different bases than those used in Western countries. Any discussion of matters relating to Russia in this document must, therefore, be subject to uncertainty due to concerns about the completeness or reliability of available official and public information. In addition, the veracity of some official data released by the Russian government may be questionable. In 1998, the Director of the Russian State Committee on Statistics and a number of his subordinates were arrested and subsequently sentenced by a court in 2004 in connection with their misuse of economic data.