

2016 Technology•Media•Telecom Purchase Price Allocation Study

Introduction

Houlihan Lokey Financial Advisory Service's Technology•Media•Telecom (TMT) Group completed its 2016 Purchase Price Allocation Study (2016 Study) by reviewing public filings for 446 completed transactions in 2016 and summarizing the results for certain transactions. The 2016 Study provides statistics, other annual data, and a comparison to certain 2015 results (2015 Study), 2014 results (2014 Study), and 2013 results (2013 Study).

- Of the 446 transactions in our initial screening, 309 transactions were not considered due to one of two reasons: 1) financial statements did not present intangible asset values and/or purchase consideration (PC) information in a clear, reconcilable format, or 2) the general asset and liability segmentation was insufficient for us to determine the nature of the intangible assets acquired.
- The 137 TMT transactions that form the basis of the 2016 Study represent 31% of the total original population.
- The 2016 Study also presents asset allocation information by nine TMT subsectors, including telecommunications and network service carriers; application software; broadcasting, entertainment, and gaming; communications equipment; data processing and outsourced services; electronics; home entertainment software; internet software and others; and semiconductors.

For more information regarding our 2016 Study, please contact your Houlihan Lokey representative or one of the following individuals:





John McIntosh





Kelly Fang

Michael De Simone

Managing Director

404.495.7033

MDeSimone@HL.com

Atlanta

415.273.3644

JMcIntosh@HL.com

San Francisco

Director

Brian Marler

Director

310.712.6548

BMarler@HL.com

Los Angeles

Senior Vice President
415.273.3631
KFang@HL.com
San Francisco

	Page
1. 2016 Study Observations and Results	3
2. About Houlihan Lokey	11
3. Financial Reporting Update	17

Screening Criteria and Methodology

The universe of transactions initially considered in the 2016 Study was obtained from S&P Capital IQ using the following search criteria:

- Transaction closed in 2016
- Acquirer was a U.S. publicly traded company
- Ownership percentage sought by acquirer was 50% or greater
- Base equity purchase price was disclosed

The initial sample consisted of 446 transactions. We reviewed public filings for each company in the initial sample with the objective of finding detailed disclosures regarding PC, identifiable intangible asset fair values, and goodwill. Sufficient disclosures were provided for 137 transactions, which represented approximately 31% of the initial sample.

These 137 transactions formed the basis of the 2016 Study.



TMT Subsector Results

Summary Allocation Percentages

\$ in millions		Purchase Co	nsideration	Intangible Assets, % of PC [1]			[1]	Goodwill, % of PC			
	Count	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean
тмт	137	\$61	\$1,236	2%	81%	37%	37%	5%	86%	47%	45%
Telecommunications and Network Service Carriers	3	18	237	20%	77%	61%	53%	19%	39%	28%	29%
Application Software	20	40	494	15%	63%	41%	40%	10%	73%	47%	46%
Broadcasting, Entertainment, and Gaming	8	35	253	2%	77%	47%	49%	6%	60%	26%	29%
Communications Equipment	7	53	275	28%	52%	29%	35%	14%	63%	32%	34%
Data Processing and Outsourced Services	8	43	1,056	20%	66%	34%	39%	5%	65%	45%	38%
Electronics	15	74	729	11%	67%	41%	40%	11%	84%	36%	38%
Home Entertainment Software	2	43	43	41%	60%	51%	51%	38%	56%	47%	47%
Internet Software and Others [2]	67	76	1,121	8%	81%	32%	34%	7%	86%	53%	52%
Semiconductors	6	2,893	9,956	18%	64%	36%	38%	22%	53%	39%	38%

^[1] PC refers to purchase consideration.

^[2] Others include integrated telecommunications services, internet software and services, IT consulting, systems software, technology hardware, and wireless communications services.

Transaction Size

- Approximately 68% of the TMT transactions in the 2016 Study had PC below \$250 million, and approximately 46% of the transactions had PC below \$50 million.
- From 2015 to 2016, the average transaction size increased from \$582 million to \$1,236 million due to a jump in mega deals. In 2015, there were only three TMT transactions over \$5 billion, but in 2016 there were six TMT transactions over \$5 billion.
- The median transaction size increased from \$37 million in 2015 to \$61 million in 2016, again due to an increase in larger deals.
- From 2015 to 2016, the median goodwill as a percentage of total PC decreased from 65% to 47%. The year-over-year downward trend is consistent across the TMT subsectors.

Summary Allocation Percentages by Size

\$ in millions						Median F	Results					
		P	С	Inta	angible As	sets, % of P	С	Goodwill, % of PC				
-	Count	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	
All Transactions	137	\$61	\$1,236	2%	81%	37%	37%	5%	86%	47%	45%	
PC > \$5,000	6	8,765	18,107	19%	31%	27%	27%	22%	69%	55%	51%	
\$1,000 < PC < \$5,000	18	2,676	2,521	2%	49%	30%	30%	11%	81%	43%	45%	
\$500 < PC < \$1,000	8	740	743	11%	48%	28%	29%	16%	85%	48%	51%	
\$250 < PC < \$500	12	366	366	8%	77%	34%	35%	14%	71%	51%	46%	
\$100 < PC < \$250	15	179	182	14%	45%	38%	35%	7%	86%	50%	51%	
\$50 < PC < \$100	15	70	69	14%	64%	33%	37%	14%	71%	45%	44%	
\$25 < PC < \$50	21	37	37	15%	66%	45%	45%	10%	73%	35%	38%	
\$10 < PC < \$25	19	16	17	19%	67%	36%	42%	5%	76%	41%	42%	
\$5 < PC < \$10	12	7	8	23%	81%	40%	43%	6%	72%	47%	42%	
PC < \$5	11	3	3	9%	77%	39%	40%	19%	86%	49%	50%	

Frequently Identified Intangible Assets

- Developed technology, in-process research and development (IPR&D), customer-related assets, and trademarks and trade names were the most commonly identified intangible assets. Other intangible assets typically included non-compete agreements, licenses, permits, and other contracts or agreements.
- From 2015 to 2016, the median developed technology as a percentage of total PC decreased from 17% to 13% while customer-related assets increased from 15% to 18%. IPR&D and trade names remained flat year-over-year, representing 4% and 2% of total PC, respectively.

Frequently Identified Intangible Assets

	(Count, % o	f Sample			Median	% of PC	
	2016	2015	2014	2013	2016	2015	2014	2013
Developed Technology Change	75% -11%	86% 7%	79% -5%	84%	13% -4%	17% <i>5%</i>	12% <i>-4%</i>	16%
IPR&D	18%	11%	12%	16%	4%	4%	4%	7%
Change	7%	-1%	-4%		0%	0%	-3%	
Customer-Related Assets Change	84%	84%	72%	73%	18%	15%	13%	9%
	<i>0%</i>	12%	-1%		3%	2%	<i>4%</i>	
Trademarks and Trade Names Change	51%	59%	58%	54%	2%	2%	2%	1%
	-8%	1%	<i>4</i> %		0%	0%	1%	

Developed Technology

- Developed technology remains a key intangible asset or strategic rationale for most TMT transactions, especially in the semiconductor and communications equipment sectors.
- In the 2016 Study, 103 transactions (75%) allocated PC to developed technology.
- The mean allocation of PC to developed technology was 16%, while the median was 13%.

Summary of PC Allocated to Developed Technology

\$ in millions		Count		PC	[1]	Devel	oped Tech	nology, % o	f PC		Goodwill,	% of PC	
	Developed	All	%	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean
тмт	103	137	75%	\$61	\$1,236	0%	80%	13%	16%	5%	86%	47%	45%
Telecommunications and Network Service Carriers	1	3	33%	18	237	3%	3%	3%	3%	19%	39%	28%	29%
Application Software	15	20	75%	40	494	3%	46%	12%	17%	10%	73%	47%	46%
Broadcasting, Entertainment, and Gaming	1	8	13%	35	253	19%	19%	19%	19%	6%	60%	26%	29%
Communications Equipment	7	7	100%	53	275	4%	22%	16%	14%	14%	63%	32%	34%
Data Processing and Outsourced Services	8	8	100%	43	1,056	3%	45%	7%	16%	5%	65%	45%	38%
Electronics	11	15	73%	74	729	0%	39%	10%	13%	11%	84%	36%	38%
Home Entertainment Software	1	2	50%	43	43	1%	1%	1%	1%	38%	56%	47%	47%
Internet Software and Others [2]	52	67	78%	76	1,121	0%	80%	13%	17%	7%	86%	53%	52%
Semiconductors	7	7	100%	2,758	8,596	9%	27%	20%	20%	22%	53%	36%	38%

^[1] PC refers to purchase consideration

^[2] Others include integrated telecommunications services, internet software and services, IT consulting, systems software, technology hardware, and wireless communications services.

In-Process Research & Development

- In the 2016 Study, 25 transactions (18%) allocated PC to IPR&D.
- The mean allocation of PC to IPR&D was 13%, while the median was 4%.

Summary of PC Allocated to IPR&D

\$ in millions		Count		PC	[1]		IPR&D,	% of PC			Goodwill, % of PC			
	IPR&D	All	%	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	
TMT	25	137	18%	\$61	\$1,236	0%	67%	4%	13%	5%	86%	47%	45%	
Telecommunications and Network Service Carriers	0	3	0%	18	237	0%	0%			19%	39%	28%	29%	
Application Software	4	20	20%	40	494	2%	42%	13%	17%	10%	73%	47%	46%	
Broadcasting, Entertainment, and Gaming	0	8	0%	35	253	0%	0%			6%	60%	26%	29%	
Communications Equipment	2	7	29%	53	275	2%	3%	2%	2%	14%	63%	32%	34%	
Data Processing and Outsourced Services	0	8	0%	43	1,056	0%	0%			5%	65%	45%	38%	
Electronics	7	15	47%	74	281	0%	67%	2%	16%	11%	84%	36%	38%	
Home Entertainment Software	0	2	0%	43	43	0%	0%			38%	56%	47%	47%	
Internet Software and Others [2]	5	67	7%	76	1,121	0%	54%	2%	17%	7%	86%	53%	52%	
Semiconductors	7	7	100%	2,758	8,596	3%	27%	4%	9%	22%	53%	36%	38%	

^[1] PC refers to purchase consideration

^[2] Others include integrated telecommunications services, internet software and services, IT consulting, systems software, technology hardware, and wireless communications services.

Customer-Related Intangible Assets

- Customer relationships and contracts remain a key intangible asset or strategic rationale for most TMT transactions, especially in the telecommunications and media sectors.
- In the 2016 Study, 115 transactions (84%) allocated PC to customer-related intangibles.
- The mean allocation percentage of PC to customer-related intangibles was 20%, while the median was 18%.

Summary of PC Allocated to Customer-Related Intangible Assets

\$ in millions		Count		PC	[1]	Custom	er-Related	Assets, %	of PC		Goodwill, % of PC		
	Customer- Related Assets	All	%	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean
тмт	115	137	84%	\$61	\$1,236	0%	77%	18%	20%	5%	86%	47%	45%
Telecommunications and Network Service Carriers	3	3	100%	18	237	3%	77%	60%	47%	19%	39%	28%	29%
Application Software	16	20	80%	40	494	7%	52%	18%	22%	10%	73%	47%	46%
Broadcasting, Entertainment, and Gaming	3	8	38%	35	253	21%	71%	35%	42%	6%	60%	26%	29%
Communications Equipment	7	7	100%	53	275	5%	37%	20%	18%	14%	63%	32%	34%
Data Processing and Outsourced Services	8	8	100%	43	1,056	13%	31%	22%	22%	5%	65%	45%	38%
Electronics	12	15	80%	74	729	3%	46%	22%	23%	11%	84%	36%	38%
Home Entertainment Software	1	2	50%	43	43	39%	39%	39%	39%	38%	56%	47%	47%
Internet Software and Others [2]	58	67	87%	76	1,121	0%	58%	17%	17%	7%	86%	53%	52%
Semiconductors	7	7	100%	2,758	8,596	1%	17%	7%	8%	22%	53%	36%	38%

^[1] PC refers to purchase consideration

^[2] Others include integrated telecommunications services, internet software and services, IT consulting, systems software, technology hardware, and wireless communications services.

Trademarks and Trade Names

- In the 2016 Study, 70 transactions (51%) allocated PC to trademarks and trade names.
- The mean allocation percentage of PC to trademarks and trade names was 4%, while the median was 2%.

Summary of PC Allocated to Trademarks and Trade Names

\$ in millions		Count		PC	[1]	Trademar	ks and Tra	ide Names,	% of PC		Goodwill,	% of PC	
	Trademarks and Trade Names	All	%	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean	Low	High	Median	Mean
тмт	70	137	51%	\$61	\$1,236	0%	39%	2%	4%	5%	86%	47%	45%
Telecommunications and Network Service Carriers	2	3	67%	18	237	0%	1%	1%	1%	19%	39%	28%	29%
Application Software	6	20	30%	40	494	1%	8%	4%	4%	10%	73%	47%	46%
Broadcasting, Entertainment, and Gaming	4	8	50%	35	253	1%	39%	2%	11%	6%	60%	26%	29%
Communications Equipment	5	7	71%	53	275	0%	10%	3%	4%	14%	63%	32%	34%
Data Processing and Outsourced Services	5	8	63%	43	1,056	0%	5%	1%	2%	5%	65%	45%	38%
Electronics	11	15	73%	74	729	0%	21%	3%	5%	11%	84%	36%	38%
Home Entertainment Software	1	2	50%	43	43	1%	1%	1%	1%	38%	56%	47%	47%
Internet Software and Others [2]	32	67	48%	76	1,121	0%	18%	2%	4%	7%	86%	53%	52%
Semiconductors	4	7	57%	2,758	8,596	0%	2%	1%	1%	22%	53%	36%	38%

^[1] PC refers to purchase consideration

^[2] Others include integrated telecommunications services, internet software and services, IT consulting, systems software, technology hardware, and wireless communications services.

		Page
1. 2016 Study Obs	servations and Results	3
2. About Houlihan	Lokey	11
3. Financial Repor	ting Update	17

HOULIHAN LOKEY



Houlihan Lokey is the trusted advisor to more top decision makers than any other independent global investment bank.

Corporate Finance

2016 M&A Advisory Rankings All U.S. Transactions								
	Advisor	Deals						
1	Houlihan Lokey	179						
2	JP Morgan	150						
3	Goldman Sachs & Co	142						
4	Morgan Stanley	132						
5	Barclays	105						
Source: Thomson Reuters								

No. 1 U.S. M&A Advisor

Top 10 Global M&A Advisor

Leading Capital Markets Advisor

Financial Restructuring

2016 Global Distressed Debt & Bankruptcy Restructuring Rankings							
	Advisor	Deals					
1	Houlihan Lokey	71					
2	Rothschild & Co.	47					
3	Moelis & Co.	38					
4	Lazard	36					
5	PJT Partners LP	31					
Source: Thomson Reuters							

No. 1 Global Restructuring Advisor

1,000+ Transactions Completed Valued at More Than \$2.5 Trillion Collectively

Financial Advisory

	7 to 2016 Global M&A Fairness visory Rankings Advisor	Deals
1	Houlihan Lokey	996
2	JP Morgan	953
3	Bank of America Merrill Lynch	728
4	Morgan Stanley	665
5	Duff & Phelps	601
	rce: Thomson Reuters. Announced or completed sactions.	

No. 1 Global M&A Fairness Opinion Advisor

1,000+ Annual Valuation Engagements

HOULIHAN LOKEY

Our product knowledge, industry expertise, and global reach deliver superior results.

Product Expertise	Dedicated Industry Groups	Financial Sponsors
Mergers & Acquisitions	Aerospace•Defense•Government Business Services	Active Dialogue With a Diverse Group of More Than 500 Sponsors
Capital Markets	Consumer, Food & Retail	Private Equity Firms
Financial Restructuring	Energy	
	Financial Institutions	Hedge Funds
Financial Advisory	Healthcare	
Titulious Autiony	Industrials	Capital Alliances
Strategic Consulting	Real Estate, Lodging & Leisure	
	Technology•Media•Telecom	
	Transportation & Logistics	

HOULIHAN LOKEY

Our clients benefit from our local presence and global reach.



#1 Position Across Product Categories



Corporate Finance

Mergers & Acquisitions

- Sellside & Buyside Transactions
- Leveraged Transactions
- Minority Equity Transactions
- Activist Shareholder Advisory
- Takeover Defense

Capital Markets

- Debt & Equity Private Placements
- High Yield
- Public Equity Offerings
- PIPEs Financings
- Liabilities Management
- Special Situations Advisory

Illiquid Financial Assets

No. 1 M&A Advisor on U.S.
Transactions in 2016

Financial Advisory

- Tax & Financial Reporting Valuation
- Technology and Intellectual Property Advisory
- Real Estate Valuation & Advisory Services
- Derivatives Valuation & Advisory Services
- Due Diligence Services
- Valuation Opinions
- Portfolio Valuation & Advisory Services
- Fairness Opinions
- Solvency Opinions
- Dispute Resolution & Financial Expert Opinions

Financial Restructuring

- Out-of-Court Transactions
- Restructuring Debt and Equity
- Chapter 11 Planning
- Bulk Sales of Assets
- Sales of Performing & Nonperforming Loans
- Corporate Viability Assessment
- Debtor-in-Possession (DIP) Financing
- Exchange Offers
- Plans of Reorganization
- Distressed Mergers and Acquisitions

Strategic Consulting

Strategy & Execution

- Corporate & Business Unit Strategy
- M&A Support, Due Diligence, and Post-Merger Integration
- New Market Entry

Sales & Marketing Management

- Sales & Marketing Effectiveness
- Product and Solutions Development
- Pricing Strategy

Operations & Performance Improvement

- Organization & Business Model Design
- Supply Chain Optimization
- Strategic Sourcing & Supply Management

No. 1 Global M&A Fairness Opinion
Advisor
Over the Past 20 Years
No. 1 Glo
Re

No. 1 Global Investment Banking Restructuring Advisor Recognized Leader in Management Consulting (Kennedy Research)

Ranking Source: Thomson Reuters.

HOULIHAN LOKEY

Financial Advisory Services Overview

Transaction Opinions

Fairness Opinions

- Public Company
- Special Committee
- Roll-Up/Aggregate
- Indenture
- Equity Allocation

Solvency Opinions

- Leveraged Transactions
- Corporate Spinoffs
- Dividend Recapitalizations
- Retrospective Solvency Analyses

Valuation Opinions

- Distressed Valuation Opinions
- Estate & Gift Tax Valuation Opinions
- ERISA & ESOP Opinions
- Corporate Planning

Transaction Advisory Services

Due Diligence Services

- Buyer Services
- Seller Services
- Lender Services

Tax & Financial Reporting Valuation

- Purchase Price Allocation
- Impairment of Goodwill & Other Assets
- Tangible Asset Valuation
- Tax Valuation
- Equity-Based Compensation
- Fresh-Start Accounting

Portfolio Valuation & Advisory Services

Fair Value Reporting

- Illiquid Securities
- Leveraged Loans
- PIPE Investments
- Real Estate Investments

Derivatives Valuation & Risk Management

- Structured Products
- Complex Derivative Instruments

Real Estate Valuation & Advisory Services

Valuations & Opinions

- Fairness Opinions
- Solvency Opinions
- Corporate Planning
- Expert Witness

Tax & Financial Reporting

- Portfolio Valuations
- Purchase Price Allocations
- Tax Valuations

Financial Consulting

Dispute Resolution & Financial Expert Opinions

- Case Assessment
- Financial Modeling
- Damage Theory Formulation
- Settlement Assistance
- Expert Witness Testimony

INSOURCE Corporate Development Services

- Strategic Alternatives Analysis
- Liquidity Issues
- Unique Valuation Issues

		Page
1.	2016 Study Observations and Results	3
2.	About Houlihan Lokey	11
3.	Financial Reporting Update	17

Financial Reporting Update: Measurement of Minority Equity Investments

The Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) recently issued ASU 2016-01,⁽¹⁾ amending previous guidance in U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) related to the classification and measurement of minority equity investments.

Background

- Under current U.S. GAAP, minority equity securities that are not accounted for under the equity method of accounting (i.e., those for which an investor has less than a 20% equity interest) are currently measured at cost (less any impairment), unless the investor elects to account for them using the fair value option.
- Under the amended guidance outlined in ASU 2016-01, companies will no longer be able to utilize the cost method of accounting when measuring minority equity investments. Minority equity investments must now be measured at <u>fair value</u> through net income (FVTNI).
- Pending a qualitative impairment test by the investor, securities without a readily determinable fair value (RDFV) may be recorded at cost less impairment plus or minus any changes resulting from observable price changes in comparable transactions.
- Securities with a RDFV must now be recorded at FVTNI and may no longer be classified as available for sale securities.

Observations

- As all minority equity investments are now required to be measured at fair value through net income rather than other comprehensive income (OCI), earnings could become more volatile, especially for companies holding significant minority equity interests.
- This new guidance results in an increased need for advisory services related to the identification of potential impairment of investments without a RDFV as well as the valuation of these investments if an impairment were determined to exist.

Important Dates

- For public business entities, the amendments to the accounting guidance in ASU 2016-01 are effective for any fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017, including any interim periods within those fiscal years. For all other entities, the amendments will become effective for fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2018, and all interim periods within fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2019.
- All nonpublic business entities may choose to adopt the amendments of ASU 2016-01 earlier as of the fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2017, including interim periods within those years.

Financial Reporting Update: Measurement of Goodwill Impairment

The FASB recently issued ASU 2017-04,⁽¹⁾ which simplifies the goodwill impairment testing process by eliminating the Step 2 portion of the existing guidance.

Background

- Under the existing guidance, a Step 2 test is performed if a reporting unit fails a Step 1 test.
 - The Step 2 test is similar to the requirements of a purchase price allocation for a business combination, because the fair value of all assets and liabilities of the reporting unit needs to be determined as of the testing date.
- Under the new guidance, companies will measure impairment by determining the amount by which a reporting unit's carrying value exceeds its fair value. (Note, however, that impairment cannot exceed the carrying amount of goodwill allocated to that reporting unit.)
- Nearly all other goodwill impairment guidance remains unchanged. For example, companies can still elect to perform a qualitative assessment (Step 0) to determine whether a Step 1 test is necessary.

Observations

- The new guidance not only simplifies financial reporting but also diminishes the differences between U.S. GAAP and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), as IFRS also has a single-step process for calculating goodwill impairment.
- Under the former standard, failing Step 1 might not result in any goodwill impairment. Under the new guidance, however, failing Step 1 will always result in a goodwill impairment. Therefore, it is likely there will be more impairment charges, all other things being equal, under the new standard than under the old.
- With respect to the amount of the impairment charge under the new standard as compared to the old, this will depend on specific factors (for example, whether reporting units have unrecognized or appreciated assets and whether the fair value of the reporting unit's long-lived assets is below their book value).

Important Dates

■ This accounting update is effective for annual or interim goodwill impairment tests for U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) filers beginning after December 15, 2019. For public entities that are not SEC filers, the guidance is effective beginning after December 15, 2020. For all other entities, the guidance is effective beginning after December 15, 2021. Early adoption is permitted for annual or interim goodwill impairment tests performed on testing dates after January 1, 2017.

Disclaimers

© 2017 Houlihan Lokey. All rights reserved. This material may not be reproduced in any format by any means or redistributed without the prior written consent of Houlihan Lokey.

Houlihan Lokey is a trade name for Houlihan Lokey, Inc., and its subsidiaries and affiliates, which include those in (i) the United States: Houlihan Lokey Capital, Inc., an SEC-registered broker-dealer and member of FINRA (www.finra.org) and SIPC (www.sipc.org) (investment banking services); Houlihan Lokey Financial Advisors, Inc. (financial advisory services); Houlihan Lokey Consulting, Inc. (strategic consulting services); and Houlihan Lokey Real Estate Group, Inc. (real estate advisory services); (ii) Europe: Houlihan Lokey EMEA, LLP, authorized and regulated by the U.K. Financial Conduct Authority; Houlihan Lokey GmbH; Houlihan Lokey (Netherlands) B.V.; and Houlihan Lokey (España), S.A.; (iii) the United Arab Emirates, Dubai International Financial Centre (Dubai): Houlihan Lokey (MEA Financial Advisory) Limited, regulated by the Dubai Financial Services Authority to provide regulated financial services to professional clients only; (iv) Singapore: Houlihan Lokey (Singapore) Private Limited, an "exempt corporate finance adviser" able to provide exempt corporate finance advisory services to accredited investors only; (v) Hong Kong SAR: Houlihan Lokey (China) Limited, licensed in Hong Kong by the Securities and Futures Commission to conduct Type 1, 4, and 6 regulated activities to professional investors only; (vi) China: Houlihan Lokey Howard & Zukin Investment Consulting (Beijing) Co., Limited (financial advisory services); (vii) Japan: Houlihan Lokey K.K. (financial advisory services); and (viii) Australia: Houlihan Lokey (Australia) Pty Limited (ABN 74 601 825 227), a company incorporated in Australia and licensed by the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (AFSL number 474953) in respect of financial services provided to wholesale clients. In the European Economic Area, Dubai, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Australia, this communication is directed to intended recipients, including actual or potential professional clients, accredited investors, and professional investors, respectively, and no other person should act upon it.

Houlihan Lokey gathers its data from sources it considers reliable; however, it does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information provided within this presentation. The material presented reflects information known to the authors at the time this presentation was written, and this information is subject to change. Houlihan Lokey makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, regarding the accuracy of this material. The views expressed in this material accurately reflect the personal views of the authors regarding the subject securities and issuers and do not necessarily coincide with those of Houlihan Lokey. Officers, directors and partners in the Houlihan Lokey group of companies may have positions in the securities of the companies discussed. This presentation does not constitute advice or a recommendation, offer or solicitation with respect to the securities of any company discussed herein, is not intended to provide information upon which to base an investment decision, and should not be construed as such. Houlihan Lokey or its affiliates may from time to time provide investment banking or related services to these companies. Like all Houlihan Lokey employees, the authors of this presentation receive compensation that is affected by overall firm profitability.



CORPORATE FINANCE
FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES
FINANCIAL RESTRUCTURING
STRATEGIC CONSULTING

HL.com