

MOODY'S

INVESTORS SERVICE

RATING METHODOLOGY Mining

Table of Contents:

INTRODUCTION	1
SCOPE OF THIS METHODOLOGY	2
SECTOR OVERVIEW	2
THE SCORECARD FRAMEWORK	3
DISCUSSION OF THE SCORECARD FACTORS	3
OTHER RATING CONSIDERATIONS	12
ASSIGNING ISSUER-LEVEL AND INSTRUMENT-LEVEL RATINGS	17
ASSUMPTIONS	17
LIMITATIONS	17
APPENDICES	19
MOODY'S RELATED PUBLICATIONS	23

This rating methodology replaces the Mining Industry methodology published in April 2018. This update incorporates refinements to the scorecard, including an expansion of the scoring scale to the C category and some small changes in weights and thresholds. In addition, financial ratios are now typically calculated based on an annual or 12-month period, as opposed to a three-year period. This updated document also provides more detail regarding other rating considerations that may be important for companies in this sector.

Introduction

In this rating methodology, we explain our general approach to assessing credit risk for companies in the mining industry globally, including the qualitative and quantitative factors that are likely to affect rating outcomes in this sector.

We discuss the scorecard used for this sector. The scorecard¹ is a relatively simple reference tool that can be used in most cases to approximate credit profiles in this sector and to explain, in summary form, many of the factors that are generally most important in assigning ratings to companies in this sector. The scorecard factors may be evaluated using historical or forward-looking data or both.

We also discuss other rating considerations, which are factors that may be important for ratings but are not included in the scorecard, usually because they can be meaningful for differentiating credit profiles, but only in some cases. In addition, some of the methodological considerations described in one or more cross-sector rating methodologies may be relevant to ratings in this sector.² Furthermore, since ratings are forward-looking, we often incorporate directional views of risks and mitigants in a qualitative way.

As a result, the scorecard-indicated outcome is not expected to match the actual rating for each company.

Our presentation of this rating methodology proceeds with (i) the scope of this methodology; (ii) the scorecard framework; (iii) a discussion of the scorecard factors; (iv) other rating considerations not reflected in the scorecard; (v) the assignment of issuer-level and instrument-level ratings; (vi) methodology assumptions; and (vii) limitations. In Appendix A, we describe how we use the scorecard to arrive at a scorecard-indicated outcome. Appendix B shows the full view of the scorecard factors, sub-factors, weights and thresholds.

THIS METHODOLOGY WAS UPDATED ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2018. WE HAVE CORRECTED A TYPO IN APPENDIX B.

Analyst Contacts:

NEW YORK +1.212.553.1653

Carol Cowan +1.212.553.4999
Senior Vice President
carol.cowan@moodyys.com

Brian Oak +1.212.553.2946
Managing Director - Corporate Finance
brian.oak@moodyys.com

Benjamin Nelson +1.212.553.2981
Vice President - Senior Credit Officer
benjamin.nelson@moodyys.com

SAO PAULO +55.11.3043.7300

Barbara Mattos, CFA +55.11.3043.7357
Senior Vice President
barbara.mattos@moodyys.com

Marianna Waltz +55.11.3043.7309
Managing Director - Corporate Finance
marianna.waltz@moodyys.com

TORONTO +1.416.214.1635

Jamie Koutsoukis +1.416.214.3845
Vice President - Senior Analyst
jamie.koutsoukis@moodyys.com

Donald Carter +1.416.214.3851
Managing Director - Corporate Finance
donald.carter@moodyys.com

» contacts continued on page 24..

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

² A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Scope of This Methodology

This methodology applies to companies globally that are primarily engaged³ in the extraction or mining of ore, coal or other minerals, and the subsequent smelting and refining of minerals and ore. For example, an aluminum company that mines bauxite, refines it into alumina and then smelts into aluminum would be rated under this methodology. Some mining companies also have downstream activities, such as packaging and manufacturing.

Companies that are primarily engaged in purchasing metal as a raw material for rolling and further value-added processing (rather than extracting metals from the ground as part of their own operations) and that derive revenue and earnings from a margin-on-metal construct⁴ are rated under our methodology for the steel industry.⁵

Sector Overview

Mining companies are a diverse group of issuers. Scale and cost-competitiveness, diversity of commodity exposure and geographic breadth are differentiating qualities. They principally produce base metals, such as copper, nickel, aluminum and zinc; precious metals, such as gold and silver; thermal and metallurgical coal; and other extractive minerals, such as iron ore, uranium, cobalt and tin.

The mining industry is characterized by cyclicalities and high earnings volatility. Supply and demand for specific commodities, global economic growth levels and expectations — particularly for China, which generally accounts for at least half of the global production and consumption of a number of base and precious metals — and industrial production levels drive cyclical demand and price volatility. Trading activity also has a meaningful impact on price volatility.

The mining industry is also capital-intensive. The depletion of ore bodies and changes in ore grades over the life of a mine require fairly steady reinvestment in mine development and expansion for companies to sustain and increase production.

These challenges are common across the industry; however, earnings performance can vary widely among companies. Prices for base metals, precious metals, coal, iron ore and other metals move independently, reflecting different fundamental drivers. For example, gold prices are typically influenced by geopolitical risk, investment demand and sentiment toward inflation and other economic factors, whereas industrial production is generally a more significant driver for prices of base metals and other minerals and metals.

Credit ratings in the industry have generally spanned from low speculative grade through investment grade, with a large portion in speculative grade.

This publication does not announce a credit rating action. For any credit ratings referenced in this publication, please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on www.moodys.com for the most updated credit rating action information and rating history.

³ The determination of a company's primary business is generally based on the preponderance of the company's business risks, which are usually proportionate to the company's revenues, earnings and cash flows.

⁴ In a margin-on-metal construct, a company converts a metal into a higher-margin product.

⁵ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

The Scorecard Framework

The scorecard in this rating methodology is composed of five factors. Some of the five factors comprise a number of sub-factors.

EXHIBIT 1

Mining Industry Scorecard

Factors	Factor Weighting	Sub-factors	Sub-factor Weighting
Scale	20%	Revenue	20%
Business Profile	25%	--*	25%
Profitability and Efficiency	10%	EBIT Margin	10%
Leverage and Coverage	30%	EBIT / Interest Expense	10%
		Debt / EBITDA	10%
		Debt / Total Capitalization	5%
		(CFO – Dividends) / Debt	5%
Financial Policy	15%	--*	15%
Total	100%	Total	100%

* This factor has no sub-factors.

Please see Appendix A for general information relating to how we use the scorecard and for a discussion of scorecard mechanics. The scorecard does not include every rating consideration.⁶

Discussion of the Scorecard Factors

In this section, we explain our general approach for scoring each scorecard sub-factor or factor, and we describe why they are meaningful as credit indicators.

Factor 1: Scale (20% Weight)

Why It Matters

Scale provides important indications of a company's revenue-generating capability, its overall market strength and importance to the markets it serves, and its resilience to changes in commodity prices and demand.

Companies with larger scale generally have greater flexibility to manage their businesses under different price and demand scenarios, which is important in an industry that is cyclical. A large revenue base can also lead to economies of scale that lower overall costs for raw materials and to efficiencies for corporate administration of the business, in areas such as finance, legal, tax and accounting. Larger companies also tend to generate higher cash flow for capital reinvestment and debt reduction and have greater access to the capital markets, which can reduce the cost of capital.

⁶ Please see the "Other Rating Considerations" and "Limitations" sections.

How We Assess It for the Scorecard

REVENUE:

Scale is measured (estimated in the case of forward-looking expectations) using total reported revenue in billions of US dollars.

FACTOR 1

Scale (20%)

Sub-factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
Revenue (USD Billion)*	20%	≥ \$100	\$50-\$100	\$25-\$50	\$15-\$25	\$5-\$15	\$2-\$5	\$1-\$2	\$0.5-\$1	< \$0.5

* For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is \$150 billion. A value of \$150 billion or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is zero. A value of zero equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

Factor 2: Business Profile (25% Weight)

Why It Matters

A mining company's business profile is an indicator of its ability to generate earnings and cash flow and the relative stability and sustainability of that cash flow, which are important considerations in an industry characterized by cyclicalities and high price volatility. The business profile also provides an indication of the levers available to a company's management to adjust mining operations when product prices are low or are declining.

Core aspects of a mining company's business profile include the types of commodities it sells and markets it sells into, its competitive position (primarily driven by the company's cost-effectiveness), the locations of its operations, and market demand. Susceptibility to environmental, regulatory and political risk is another important aspect of a company's business profile.

Pricing trends for different metals can vary, so a company concentrated in a single metal is generally more vulnerable to price volatility than one that sells multiple metals. The combination of significant top-line volatility and a limited ability to pass on costs to customers make the quality of a mining company's ore bodies and its cost efficiency essential in order to maintain its competitive position and to better withstand downward price movements.

The location and number of a company's mines is also important because having multiple, discrete assets in different regions typically lessens the impact of strikes, equipment failures, operational event risks, or other events that could curtail production. Geographic diversity also helps mining companies mitigate the impact of trade barriers and tariffs on exports.

Environmental requirements, political concerns and industry regulations are important considerations because they can affect costs and demand. For example, environmental requirements could constrain the production of a domestic mining company to the benefit of a foreign producer. The development of mines in countries lacking a strong rule of law and sufficient infrastructure can result in increased costs and production delays. Also, governments in some regions are more likely to require a greater proportion of local ownership in domestic mines (including a share of the earnings from these resources), which can reduce a mining company's profitability and cash flow and can cause operational disruptions while disputes are resolved. Regulations concerning labor relations, land use, native title, pollution, water scarcity and water quality can all contribute to greater uncertainty and higher costs.

How We Assess It for the Scorecard

Scoring for this qualitative factor is primarily based on our expectations for earnings and cash flow volatility, which is influenced by the diversity of a company's commodity exposure and operations, its competitive position and its geographic diversity.

In assessing a company's competitive position, which is driven primarily by its mining costs and ability to control other costs, we typically consider the grade, or quality, of its deposits, mineral recovery rates, raw material procurement policies, inventory management and relationships with suppliers. We also may consider any technological advantages that contribute to effective cost-control.

We assess geographic diversity by considering the number and location of a company's mines. Companies with three or fewer mines generally score lower for this factor than companies with a larger number of mines, especially if operations are concentrated in one country or in a limited number of countries. We typically also consider the diversity of the types of mines and the commodities produced.

We consider the environmental and regulatory environment in a given country in both our assessment of geographic concentration and our overall scoring for this factor. We typically assess risks that emanate from regulation, government actions and major events in any jurisdiction that could negatively affect the commercial activities of a mining company, including geopolitical risks that could impede trade or disrupt commodity markets. Such risks include tightening environmental regulations, policies to reduce excess capacity, tariffs or other restrictions on imports or exports, and royalty or tax agreements or carried interest requirements.

Generally, we do not expect a given company's business profile to exactly match the attributes listed for a given rating category. We typically assign the factor score to the alpha category for which the issuer has the greatest number of characteristics. However, there may be cases in which one characteristic is sufficiently important to a particular issuer that it has a large influence on the factor score. For example, reliance on three or fewer mines is likely to limit the score for this factor to the B or Caa category, because the operating risk in these cases is typically very high.

FACTOR 2

BUSINESS PROFILE (25%)

Sub-Factor	Sub-Factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
Business Profile	25%	Expected volatility in results is almost non-existent, supported by a commanding market position, entrenched cost-effectiveness, technological leadership and a well-balanced global reach; and essentially no environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Very low expected volatility in results, supported by a deeply entrenched and leading market position that is highly defensible through cost-effectiveness and technological leadership and global exposure; and low environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Low expected volatility in results, supported by a very strong market position in its relevant market, demonstrated and sustainable competitive advantages, insulation from raw material cost fluctuations and solid diversity characteristics; and limited environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Moderate expected volatility in results, supported by a strong market position in its most important geographic or product markets; vertically integrated with advantageous cost profile; good diversity characteristics provide a buffer against sudden/unexpected shifts in demand; modest but manageable environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Products are largely undifferentiated and the marketplace is highly competitive, exposing the company to periods of heightened volatility; established market position, favorable cost profile and fair diversity characteristics, including moderate operational concentration; moderate environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Products are undifferentiated, competition is intense and customers are price-sensitive, making results highly volatile; company does not have an advantageous cost profile or other mitigating competitive advantage; high operational concentration; or operations are primarily in countries or sectors with high environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Results are expected to be extremely volatile; company has a modest market presence, few competitive advantages, may have higher costs than competitors; high operational concentration (three mines); operations are primarily in countries or sectors with very high environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Near-term results are very difficult to predict and expected to be extremely volatile; no material competitive advantage; very high operational concentration (fewer than three mines); operations are concentrated in countries or sectors with a very high level of environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Near-term results are expected to be extremely negative with no expectation of recovery; or no material competitive advantage.

Factor 3: Profitability and Efficiency (10% Weight)

Why It Matters

Profits matter because they are needed to generate sustainable cash flow through different economic environments, reinvest in strategic growth projects and service debt and other obligations, which are especially important for an industry as capital-intensive as mining.

How well a company can control its costs is an important consideration because of the industry's price volatility, limited pricing power and vulnerability to fluctuations in input costs. A strong cost position is an important indicator of a company's ability to maintain profitability during a downturn.

How We Assess It for the Scorecard

EBIT MARGIN:

The numerator is earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT), and the denominator is revenue.

We use EBIT margin, rather than earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA) margin, as an indicator of profitability to take into account the ongoing need of mining companies to reinvest in property, plant and equipment (depreciation is a proxy for maintenance capital spending) in order to maintain their production profiles and competitiveness.

FACTOR 3

EBIT MARGIN (10%)

Sub-factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
EBIT Margin* (EBIT / Revenue)	10%	≥ 50%	35%-50%	20%-35%	15%-20%	10%-15%	6%-10%	2%-6%	(5)%-2%	< (5)%

* For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is 60%. A value of 60% or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is -15%. A value of -15% or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

Factor 4: Leverage and Coverage (30% Weight)

Why It Matters

Leverage and cash flow coverage measures provide important indications of how much financial risk a mining company is willing to undertake. These metrics are also important indications of the company's ability to sustain its competitive position, invest in growth opportunities and service debt.

Mining companies are generally less tolerant of a high degree of financial leverage than companies in industries with lower price volatility and more-stable cash flow generation. Mining companies that maintain lower leverage typically have greater operational flexibility to manage changes in competitive and economic conditions and to invest in their businesses, either through organic growth or acquisitions.

This factor comprises four quantitative sub-factors:

EBIT / Interest Expense

The ratio of EBIT to interest expense is an indicator of a company's ability to pay interest and other fixed charges from its earnings, measured or estimated by EBIT. Given a mining company's typical need to roughly match or exceed depreciation expenses over time with outlays on maintenance and development capital expenditures, EBIT is generally a reasonable proxy for its ability to cover interest expense over time.

Debt / EBITDA

The ratio of total debt to EBITDA is an indicator of debt serviceability and leverage. The ratio is commonly used in this sector as a proxy for comparative financial strength.

Debt / Total Capitalization

The ratio of total debt to book capitalization (debt/book capitalization) is a measure of balance sheet leverage that indicates how much of the company's capital structure is composed of debt and debt-like obligations. Companies frequently use this ratio to set the range of leverage in which they choose to operate, so this ratio also provides an indication of management's risk tolerance and a reference point for comparing the capital structures of companies within the industry.

(CFO – Dividends) / Debt

The ratio of cash flow from operations minus dividends to debt (CFO – Dividends/Debt) is an indicator for a company's ability to repay its debt. It is a measure or estimate of cash flow generation after working capital movements and dividends in relation to total debt.

How We Assess It for the Scorecard

EBIT / Interest Expense:

The numerator is EBIT, and the denominator is interest expense.

Debt / EBITDA:

The numerator is total debt, and the denominator is EBITDA.

Debt / Total Capitalization:

The numerator is total debt, and the denominator is book capitalization.

(CFO – Dividends) / Debt:

The numerator is cash flow from operations minus dividends, and the denominator is total debt.

FACTOR 4

Leverage and Coverage (30%)

Sub-factor	Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
EBIT/Interest Expense*	10%	≥ 20x	15x-20x	7x-15x	4.5x-7x	3x-4.5x	1.5x-3x	1x-1.5x	0.5x-1x	< 0.5x
Debt / EBITDA**	10%	≤0.5x	0.5x-1x	1x-1.5x	1.5x-2.75x	2.75x-3.5x	3.5x-4.5x	4.5x-7x	7x-9x	> 9x
Debt / Total Capitalization ***	5%	≤20%	20%-30%	30%-40%	40%-50%	50%-70%	70%-80%	80%-90%	90%-110%	>110%
(CFO-Dividends) / Debt****	5%	≥ 70%	55%-70%	45%-55%	35%-45%	20%-35%	10%-20%	5%-10%	0%-5%	< 0%

* For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is 30x. A value of 30x or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is -1x. A value of -1x or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

** For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is zero. A value of zero equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is 13x. A value of 13x or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

*** For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is zero. A value of zero equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is 140%. A value of 140% or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

**** For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is 90%. A value of 90% or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is -5%. A value of -5% or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

Factor 5: Financial Policy (15% Weight)**Why It Matters**

Financial policy encompasses management and board tolerance for financial risk and commitment to a strong credit profile. It is an important rating determinant, because it directly affects debt levels, credit quality, the future direction for the company and the risk of adverse changes in financing and capital structure.

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 the ratings of 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 management⁷ is an important aspect of overall risk management and can provide insight into risk tolerance.

How We Assess It for the Scorecard

We assess the issuer's desired capital structure or targeted credit profile, its history of prior actions, including its track record of risk and liquidity management, and its adherence to its commitments. Attention is paid to management's operating performance and use of cash flow through different phases of economic and industry cycles. Also of interest is the way in which management responds to key events, such as changes in the credit markets and liquidity environment, legal actions, competitive challenges or regulatory pressures. Considerations include a company's public commitments in this area, its track record for adhering to commitments and our views on the company's ability to achieve its targets.

When considering event risks in the context of scoring financial policy, we assess the likelihood and potential negative impact of M&A or other types of balance-sheet-transforming events. We assess management's appetite for M&A activity, with a focus on the type of transactions (i.e., core competency or

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

new business) and funding decisions. We also evaluate frequency and materiality of acquisitions and previous financing choices. A history of debt-financed or credit-transforming acquisitions will generally result in a lower score for this factor. We may also consider negative repercussions caused by shareholders' willingness to sell the company.

We also consider a company's and its owners' past record of balancing shareholder returns and debtholders' interests. A track record of favoring shareholder returns at the expense of debtholders is likely to be viewed negatively in scoring this factor.

FACTOR 5

Financial Policy (15%)

Factor	Factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
Financial Policy	15%	Expected to have extremely conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); very stable metrics; essentially no event risk that would cause a rating transition; and public commitment to a very strong credit profile over the long term.	Expected to have very conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); stable metrics; minimal event risk that would cause a rating transition; and public commitment to a 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 interests 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 elevated 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.	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that create imminent risk of debt restructuring.

Other Rating Considerations

Ratings may include additional factors that are not in the scorecard, usually because they may have a meaningful effect in differentiating credit quality, but only in some cases. Such factors include financial controls and the quality of financial reporting; corporate legal structure; the quality and experience of management; assessments of corporate governance as well as environmental and social considerations; exposure to uncertain licensing regimes; and possible government interference in some countries. Regulatory, litigation, liquidity, technology and reputational risk as well as changes to consumer and business spending patterns, competitor strategies and macroeconomic trends also affect ratings.

Following are some examples of additional considerations that may be reflected in our ratings and that may cause ratings to be different from scorecard-indicated outcomes.

Environmental, Regulatory and Other Considerations

The mining industry faces numerous environmental risks across a broad array of its operations. Regulations are becoming increasingly complex and stringent, and can include environmental stewardship and reclamation requirements, air and water quality and emissions standards, as well as native title issues, which can restrict land use and have other impacts. Changes in regulations can increase costs, extend project timelines and add uncertainty to the level of reserves that can be economically mined. All operations, including changes to existing operations, require numerous permits and licenses. Additional environmental considerations include litigation, reputational risks, product replacement risks and competitor strategies.

Environmental and regulatory risks that we may assess include the following:

- » Reclamation and remediation requirements, which are typically spread out over many years. Various jurisdictions may require letters of credit or surety bonds, or may set financial performance metrics for self-bonding.
- » Air pollution requirements, relating to emissions from mining equipment, smelting operations, or in the end-use of the commodity, for example.
- » Soil, water and waste management requirements (for building tailings dams or disposing of hazardous or toxic substances, for example).
- » Limits on carbon dioxide emissions. The aluminum smelting industry, for example, is highly energy-intensive, and the aluminum production process also has fairly high greenhouse gas emissions. The ability to reduce energy intensity can lower costs as well as carbon dioxide emissions, which can improve a company's competitive position.
- » Increasing competition with local communities and agriculture for limited water resources. Smaller, less-diversified companies are the most vulnerable to competition for water because they lack the resources available to larger, lower-cost producers. Additionally, the use of water by mining companies is increasingly subject to objections from local communities.
- » Natural and man-made disasters such as tailings dam and pit wall collapses, seismic activity and structural risks in deep underground mining activity.

Resource nationalism and the value of natural resources to the countries in which they are located increase the likelihood of government interference or unfavorable changes in taxes, royalties, mining regulations, or agreements.

Other considerations may include safety records and a mining company's focus on safety, which also can boost productivity. The mining industry presents a number of operating risks, particularly in underground mines but also in surface mines and processing facilities. Companies with the financial capacity to invest in

and use more advanced technology, such as autonomous haul trucks and haulage systems, are likely to see improvement in safety records and productivity.

Environmental risks are considered in our scoring of the Business Profile factor. In addition, our view of existing regulations and the potential for further regulatory changes relating to the environment, ownership, new mine development and mine operating environment as well as safety and health also play an important role in our expectations of future financial metrics as well as our confidence level in the ability of an issuer to generate sufficient cash flows relative to its debt burden over the medium and longer term. In some circumstances, environmental considerations may also be a rating factor outside the scorecard, for instance when regulatory change is swift, or when a material breach of regulations is disclosed by the issuer, alleged by a regulator or the subject of litigation. In addition, where these risks are very long-term in nature, they may be considered qualitatively outside of the scorecard.

Social Issues

For issuers in this sector, we also consider social issues that could materially affect the likelihood of default and severity of loss, for example through adverse impacts on business reputation and government and employee relations.

Corporate Governance

Audit committee financial expertise, the incentives created by executive compensation packages, related party transactions, interactions with outside auditors, and ownership structure are among the areas we may consider in our assessment of how corporate governance affects the issuer's credit profile.

Reserves

The level of proven and probable reserves⁸ is an estimate of the amount of ore that can be economically and legally extracted. It therefore gives a sense of the likely longevity of the production profile, which can be an important credit consideration, especially for lower speculative-grade companies (typically single B or below) with few operating mines. Key characteristics affecting reserve quality include ore grade and recovery rates, metal price assumptions, geological data obtained and whether the reserves are associated with existing mining operations or require greenfield development. The underlying geology of a deposit is also important because it significantly affects mineral recovery rates and grades as well as development and operating costs. The location of reserves, including whether the deposit is a surface or underground mine, as well as altitude and proximity to existing infrastructure and end-markets may also be considered.

However, given the number of assumptions involved, the varying time requirements for permitting and development and the potential for changing permit requirements, the level of reserves is not necessarily a good predictor of future cash flow. Also, the levels of proven and probable reserves, grades, recovery rates and reserve life vary greatly among base metals, precious metals, iron ore, coal and other minerals. In addition, various reserve-testing requirements apply to the industry depending on the country of domicile. Consequently, we typically consider reserve quality within the context of a specific mineral, the company's reporting requirements and peer comparisons.

Although the scorecard does not have a factor that directly assesses proven and probable reserves, a company's ability to develop reserves into mineral production and to maintain or grow production levels ultimately affects its earnings performance and cash flow generation and can therefore have an impact on scorecard metrics such as EBIT margin and (cash flow from operations less dividends)/debt. Reserve levels in themselves do not generally differentiate credit profiles, but they can be a more important consideration for companies with few operating mines or if reserve life is limited for the key producing mines. In these cases,

⁸ We generally focus on proven and probable reserves rather than possible or inferred reserves given the greater uncertainty around possible or inferred reserves.

weakness in reserve levels may be considered outside the scorecard and can potentially limit a rating's upward movement.

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 the performance of competitors and our projections. A record of consistency provides 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.

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 the proper tone at the top, centralized operations, and consistency in accounting policies and procedures. Auditors' reports on the effectiveness of internal controls, 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 mining companies, although it may not have a substantial impact in discriminating between two issuers with a similar credit profile. Liquidity can be particularly important for companies in highly seasonal operating environments where working capital needs must be considered, and ratings can be heavily affected by extremely weak liquidity. 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.⁹

Excess Cash Balances

Some companies in this sector may 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 an 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, availability of committed revolving credit facilities, and shareholder pressures.

Most issuers 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 issuers have very predictable cash needs and others have much broader intra-period 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 macroeconomic 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 issuer's track record and financial and liquidity policies rather than by measuring how a point-in-time cash balance would affect a specific metric.

⁹ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Across all corporate sectors, an important shareholder-focused motivation for cash holdings, sometimes over 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. Tax minimization strategies have at times been another primary motivation for holding large cash balances. Given shareholder pressures to return excess cash holdings, when these motivations for holding excess cash are eliminated, we generally expect that a large portion of excess cash will be used for dividends and share repurchases.

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 of 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 press releases in order to provide additional insight into our qualitative assessment of the credit benefit. Alternatively, creditor-friendly use of the cash may be factored into our forward view of metrics, for instance when the cash is expected to be used for debt repayment. We may also cite rating threshold levels for certain issuers based on net debt ratios, particularly when these issuers have publicly stated financial targets based on net debt metrics.

Even when the eventual use for excess cash is likely to be for purposes that do not benefit debtholders, 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.

Additional Metrics

The metrics included in the scorecard are those that are generally most important in assigning ratings to companies in this industry; however, we may use additional metrics to inform our analysis of specific companies. These additional metrics may be important to our forward view of metrics that are in the scorecard or other rating factors.

For example, free cash flow is not always an important differentiator of credit profiles. Strong companies with excellent investment opportunities may demonstrate multiyear periods of negative free cash flow while retaining solid access to capital and credit, because these investments will yield stable cash flows in future years. Weaker companies with limited access to credit may have positive free cash flow for a period of time because they have curtailed the investments necessary to maintain their assets and future cash-generating prospects. However, in some cases, free cash flow can be an important driver of the future liquidity profile of an issuer, which, as noted above, can have a meaningful impact on ratings.

Non-Wholly Owned Subsidiaries

Some companies in the mining 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. 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 that further limit the parent's financial flexibility; for instance, restrictions on cash pooling with other members 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, such as analyzing cash flows on a proportional consolidation basis, may be very useful to augment our analysis based on consolidated financial statements. When equity dilution or structural subordination arising from non-wholly owned subsidiaries is material and negative, the credit impact is captured in ratings but may not be fully reflected in scorecard-indicated outcomes.

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 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. When these credit considerations are material, their impact is captured in ratings but may not be fully reflected in scorecard-indicated outcomes.

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. Event risks — which are varied and can range from leveraged recapitalizations to sudden regulatory changes or liabilities — can overwhelm even a stable, well-capitalized firm. Some other types of event risks include operational disasters such as a pit wall collapse or tailings dam collapse, as well as M&A, asset sales, spin-offs, litigation, significant cyber-crime events and shareholder distributions.

Parental Support

Ownership can provide ratings lift for a particular company in the mining sector 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 consider whether the parent has the financial capacity and strategic incentives to provide support to the issuer in times of stress or financial need (e.g., a major capital investment or advantaged supply agreement), 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 mining sector are government-related issuers that may get uplift in their ratings due to expected government support. However, for certain issuers, government ownership can have a negative impact on the underlying baseline credit assessment. For example, price controls, onerous taxation and high distributions can have a negative effect on an issuer's underlying credit profile.

Other Institutional Support

In some countries, 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, our 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 than 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.

Assigning Issuer-Level and Instrument-Level Ratings

After considering the scorecard-indicated outcome, other rating considerations and relevant cross-sector methodologies, we typically assign a corporate family rating (CFR) to speculative-grade issuers or a senior unsecured rating for investment-grade issuers. For issuers that benefit from rating uplift from parental support, government ownership or other institutional support, we may assign a baseline credit assessment.¹⁰

Individual debt instrument ratings may be notched up or down from the CFR or the senior unsecured rating to reflect our assessment of differences in expected loss related to an instrument's 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, the methodology for notching corporate instrument ratings based on differences in security and priority of claim, and the methodology for assigning short-term ratings.¹¹

Assumptions

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.

Our forward-looking opinions are based on assumptions that may prove, in hindsight, to have been incorrect. Reasons for this could include unanticipated changes in any of the following: the macroeconomic environment, general financial market conditions, industry competition, disruptive technology, or regulatory and legal actions.

Limitations

In the preceding sections, we have discussed the scorecard factors, many of the other rating considerations that may be important in assigning ratings, and certain key assumptions. In this section, we discuss limitations that pertain to the scorecard and to the overall rating methodology.

Limitations of the Scorecard

There are various reasons why scorecard-indicated outcomes may not map closely to actual ratings.

¹⁰ For an explanation of the baseline credit assessment, please refer to *Rating Symbols and Definitions* and to our cross-sector methodology for government-related issuers. A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies and a link to *Rating Symbols and Definitions* can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

¹¹ A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector rating methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

The scorecard in this rating methodology is a relatively simple tool focused on indicators for relative credit strength. Credit loss and recovery considerations, which are typically more important as an issuer gets closer to default, may not be fully captured in the scorecard. The scorecard is also limited by its upper and lower bounds, causing scorecard-indicated outcomes to be less likely to align with ratings for issuers at the upper and lower ends of the rating scale.

The weights for each sub-factor and factor in the scorecard represent an approximation of their importance for rating decisions across the sector, but the actual importance of a particular factor may vary substantially based on an individual company's circumstances.

Factors that are outside the scorecard, including those discussed above in the "Other Rating Considerations" section, may be important for ratings, and their relative importance may also vary from company to company. In addition, certain broad methodological considerations described in one or more cross-sector rating methodologies may be relevant to ratings in this sector.¹² Examples of such considerations include the following: how sovereign credit quality affects non-sovereign issuers, the assessment of credit support from other entities, the relative ranking of different classes of debt and hybrid securities, and the assignment of short-term ratings.

We may use the scorecard over various historical or forward-looking time periods. Furthermore, in our ratings we often incorporate directional views of risks and mitigants in a qualitative way.

General Limitations of the Methodology

This methodology document does not include an exhaustive description of all factors that we may consider in assigning ratings in this sector. Companies in the sector may face new risks or new combinations of risks, and they may develop new strategies to mitigate risk. We seek to incorporate all material credit considerations in ratings and to take the most forward-looking perspective that visibility into these risks and mitigants permits.

Ratings reflect our expectations for an issuer's future performance; however, as the forward horizon lengthens, uncertainty increases and the utility of precise estimates, as scorecard inputs or in other rating considerations, typically diminishes. In any case, predicting the future is subject to substantial uncertainty.

¹² A link to an index of our sector and cross-sector methodologies can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Appendix A: Using the Scorecard to Arrive at a Scorecard-Indicated Outcome

1. Measurement or Estimation of Factors in the Scorecard

In the "Discussion of the Scorecard Factors" section, we explain our analytical approach for scoring each scorecard sub-factor or factor,¹³ and we describe why they are meaningful as credit indicators.

The information used in assessing the sub-factors is generally found in or calculated from information in the company's financial statements or regulatory filings, derived from other observations or estimated by Moody's analysts. We may also incorporate non-public information.

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,¹⁴ unless otherwise indicated, are typically calculated based on an 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 historical and expected future performance for periods of several years or more.

All of the quantitative credit metrics incorporate our standard adjustments to income statement, cash flow statement and balance sheet amounts for items such as underfunded pension obligations and operating leases. We may also make other analytical adjustments that are specific to a particular company.

2. Mapping Scorecard Factors to a Numeric 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 numeric 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 on the scale below.

Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
1	3	6	9	12	15	18	20	21

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. As a purely theoretical example, if there were a ratio of revenue to interest for which the Baa range was 50x to 100x, then the numeric score for an issuer with revenue/interest of 99x, relatively strong within this range, would score closer to 7.5, and an issuer with revenue/interest of 51x, relatively weak within this range, would score closer to 10.5. In the text or table footnotes, we define the endpoints 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).

¹³ When a factor comprises sub-factors, we score at the sub-factor level. Some factors do not have sub-factors, in which case we score at the factor level.

¹⁴ For definitions of our most common ratio terms, please see *Moody's Basic Definitions for Credit Statistics (User's Guide)*. A link can be found in the "Moody's Related Publications" section.

Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
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	20.5-21.5

1. 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 a scorecard-indicated outcome based on the ranges in the table below.

EXHIBIT 2

Scorecard-Indicated Outcome

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

For example, an issuer with an aggregate numeric score of 11.7 would have a Ba2 scorecard-indicated outcome.

Appendix B: Mining Industry Scorecard

	Factor or Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
Factor 1: Scale (20%)										
Revenue (USD Billion) ^{*1}	20%	≥ \$100	\$50-\$100	\$25-\$50	\$15-\$25	\$5-\$15	\$2-\$5	\$1-\$2	\$0.5-\$1	< \$0.5
Factor 2: Business Profile (25%)										
Business Profile	25%	Expected volatility in results is almost non-existent, supported by a commanding market position, entrenched cost-effectiveness, technological leadership and a well-balanced global reach; and essentially no environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Very low expected volatility in results, supported by a deeply entrenched and leading market position that is highly defensible through cost-effectiveness and technological leadership and global exposure; and low environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Low expected volatility in results, supported by a very strong market position in its relevant market, demonstrated and sustainable competitive advantages, insulation from raw material cost fluctuations and solid diversity characteristics; and limited environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Moderate expected volatility in results, supported by a strong market position in its most important geographic or product markets; vertically integrated with advantageous cost profile; good diversity characteristics provide a buffer against sudden/unexpected shifts in demand; modest but manageable environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Products are largely undifferentiated and the marketplace is highly competitive, exposing the company to periods of heightened volatility; established market position, favorable cost profile and fair diversity characteristics, including moderate operational concentration; moderate environmental, regulatory and geopolitical risk.	Products are undifferentiated, competition is intense and customers are price-sensitive, making results highly volatile; company does not have an advantageous cost profile or other mitigating competitive advantage; high operational concentration; or operations are primarily in countries or sectors with high environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Results are expected to be extremely volatile; company has a modest market presence, few competitive advantages, may have higher costs than competitors; high operational concentration (three mines); operations are primarily in countries or sectors with very high environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Near-term results are very difficult to predict and expected to be extremely volatile; no material competitive advantage; very high operational concentration (fewer than three mines); operations are concentrated in countries or sectors with a very high level of environmental, regulatory or geopolitical risk.	Near-term results are expected to be extremely negative with no expectation of recovery; or no material competitive advantage.
Factor 3: Profitability and Efficiency (10%)										
EBIT Margin ^{*2} (EBIT / Revenue)	10%	≥ 50%	35%-50%	20%-35%	15%-20%	10%-15%	6%-10%	2%-6%	-5%-2%	< -5%
Factor 4: Leverage and Coverage (30%)										
EBIT / Interest Expense ^{*3}	10%	≥ 20x	15x-20x	7x-15x	4.5x-7x	3x-4.5x	1.5x-3x	1x-1.5x	0.5x-1x	< 0.5x
Debt / EBITDA ^{*4}	10%	≤ 0.5x	0.5x-1x	1x-1.5x	1.5x-2.75x	2.75x-3.5x	3.5x-4.5x	4.5x-7x	7x-9x	> 9x

	Factor or Sub-factor Weight	Aaa	Aa	A	Baa	Ba	B	Caa	Ca	C
Debt / Total Capitalization ^{*5}	5%	≤20%	20%-30%	30%-40%	40%-50%	50%-70%	70%-80%	80%-90%	90%-110%	>110%
(CFO - Dividends) / Debt ^{*6}	5%	≥ 70%	55%-70%	45%-55%	35%-45%	20%-35%	10%-20%	5%-10%	0%-5%	< 0%

Factor 5: Financial Policy (15%)

Financial Policy	15%	Expected to have extremely conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); very stable metrics; essentially no event risk that would cause a rating transition; and public commitment to a very strong credit profile over the long term.	Expected to have very conservative financial policies (including risk and liquidity management); stable metrics; minimal event risk that would cause a rating transition; and public commitment to a 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 interests 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 elevated 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.	Expected to have financial policies (including risk and liquidity management) that create imminent risk of debt restructuring.
------------------	-----	--	--	---	---	---	--	--	--	--

*1 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is \$150 billion. A value of \$150 billion or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is zero. A value of zero equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

*2 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is 60%. A value of 60% or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is -15%. A value of -15% or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

*3 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is 30x. A value of 30x or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is -1x. A value of -1x or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

*4 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is zero. A value of zero equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is 13x. A value of 13x or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

*5 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is zero. A value of zero equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is 140%. A value of 140% or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

*6 For the linear scoring scale, the Aaa endpoint value is 90%. A value of 90% or better equates to a numeric score of 0.5. The C endpoint value is -5%. A value of -5% or worse equates to a numeric score of 21.5.

Moody's Related Publications

Credit ratings are primarily determined by sector credit rating methodologies. Certain broad methodological considerations (described in one or more cross-sector rating methodologies) may also be relevant to the determination of credit ratings of issuers and instruments. An index of sector and cross-sector credit rating methodologies can be found [here](#).

For data summarizing the historical robustness and predictive power of credit ratings, please click [here](#).

For further information, please refer to *Rating Symbols and Definitions*, which is available [here](#).

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

» contacts continued from page 1

Analyst Contacts:

SYDNEY +612.9270.8199

Matthew Moore +612.9270.8108
Vice President - Senior Credit Officer
 matthew.moore@moodys.com

Patrick Winsbury +612.9270.8183
Associate Managing Director
 patrick.winsbury@moodys.com

MOSCOW +7.495.228.6060

Artem Frolov +7.495.228.6110
Vice President - Senior Credit Officer
 artem.frolov@moodys.com

Victoria Maisuradze +7.495.228.6067
Associate Managing Director
 victoria.maisuradze@moodys.com

MEXICO CITY +52.55.1253.5700

Marie Fischer-Sabatie +52.55.1555.5312
Senior Vice President
 marie.fischer-sabatie@moodys.com

SINGAPORE +65.6398.8300

Kaustubh Chaubal +65.6398.8332
Vice President - Senior Credit Officer
 kaustubh.chaubal@moodys.com

LONDON +44.207.772.1000

Sven Reinke +44.207.772.1057
Senior Vice President
 sven.reinke@moodys.com

Anke Richter +44.207.772.1433
Associate Managing Director
 anke.richter@moodys.com

DUBAI +971.4.237.9500

Douglas Rowlings +971.4.237.9543
Vice President - Senior Analyst
 douglas.rowlings@moodys.com

HONG KONG +852.3551.3077

Gerwin Ho +852.3758.1566
Vice President - Senior Analyst
 gerwin.ho@moodys.com

Report Number: 1089739

Author(s)Karen Berckmann
Carol Cowan

© 2018 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.

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

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing 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 of rating services. 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.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 61 003 399 657 AFSL 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.