William J. Harrington
Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments
[redacted]

November 3, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Secretary
United States Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE
Washington DC 20549-1090

State and District of Columbia Signatories
to the United States Department of Justice Settlement
with Moody's Corp, Moody's Investors Service, and
Moody's Analytics (January 13, 2017)

Re: Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments,
SEC File Number 265-30,
and
Moody's Investors Service Violations of Moody's Compliance Commitments in Settlement with United States Department of Justice and Attorneys General of 21 States and the District of Columbia (January 13, 2017)

Dear All

My name is Bill Harrington. I registered "Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments" with New York County five years ago on November 3, 2014. The second attachment to the delivering email contains the New York County Certification of "Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments."

Per the certification, "Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments" seeks to "assess rating impact of flip clauses and derivative contracts in cash flow asset-backed securities." The type of business is "financial assessment," and emphatically not "an investment advisor or broker." Financial assessment of the rating impact on an entity that is party to a swap contract with a flip clause is critical to the US economy because the flip clause was central to the financial crisis.[1]

[1] I estimate that between 90% -100% of both the asset-backed-security-collateralized-debt-obligations and the underlying structured products such as residential-mortgage-backed-

The absence of financial assessment of the rating impact on an entity that is party to a swap contract with a flip clause badly harms the US economy.

> ***The absence of financial assessment of the rating impact on an entity that is party to a swap contract with a flip clause shows that the United Securities and Exchange Commission must end the Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (NRSRO) regime.***

Perpetuating the NRSRO regime by tinkering with it — whether by introducing "Alternative Compensation Models for Credit Rating Agencies" or making other trivial changes — will do much harm to the US economy and no good.[2]

Any human person (as opposed to corporate person) who reads any NRSRO methodology and the associated rating announcements will conclude as I do.

> ***The NRSRO regime does not work because the NRSRO regime cannot work.***

A *useful* system would produce accurate assessments of "rating impact of flip clauses and derivative contracts in cash flow asset-backed securities (ABS)" with respect to both a given ABS and the derivative contract dealer.

The United States Securities and Exchange Commission designed and operates the NRSRO regime so that it can be gamed by practitioners in most financial sectors. One of the many ways in which the United States Securities and Exchange Commission operates the NRSRO regime so that financial practitioners can game it is to cherry-pick among federal legislation that impact NRSRSOs.

Most notably, the United States Securities and Exchange Commission:

1. scrupulously *observes* law that prevents it from scrutinizing the content of NRSRO "free speech" such as methodologies and rating announcements;
   but
2. *nullifies* an intentionally offsetting Dodd-Frank provision by perpetuating the Response of the Office of the Chief Counsel, Division of Corporation Finance Re: Ford Motor Credit Company LLC and Ford Credit Auto Receivables Two, LLC, Incoming Letter Dated July 22, 2010 (November 23, 2010).

The policy of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission to operate an NRSRO regime that most financial practitioners can game prevents "Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments" from obtaining business. Accordingly, I believe that I have grounds to sue the United States Securities and Exchange Commission to rescind the Response of the Office of the

---

securities that Cordell, Feldberg, and Sass evaluate ("The Role of ABS CDOs in the Financial Crisis," *Journal of Structured Finance*, May 28, 2019) were issued by entities that were parties to one or more swap contracts with a flip clause.

[2] See also Morgenson, Gretchen "Should Free Markets Govern the Bond Rating Agencies?", *New York Times*, May 5, 2017.

Chief Counsel, Division of Corporation Finance Re: Ford Motor Credit Company LLC and Ford Credit Auto Receivables Two, LLC, Incoming Letter Dated July 22, 2010 (November 23, 2010).

Suing the United States Securities and Exchange Commission to rescind the Response of the Office of the Chief Counsel, Division of Corporation Finance Re: Ford Motor Credit Company LLC and Ford Credit Auto Receivables Two, LLC, Incoming Letter Dated July 22, 2010 (November 23, 2010) is an extreme, but necessary, measure. All other avenues that I have pursued full-time since 2011 have proved fruitless. As recent examples:

1. Moody's Corporation will not respond to my complaint to its ombudsman regarding inaccurate ratings of entities that are parties to a swap contract with a flip clause, and also of structured finance operating companies in light of swap margin rules (Report to Moody's Integrity Hotline / 1-866-330-6397 / Report Identifier MDYS-17-08-002, Pin #1741). I learned in my first follow-up call that Moody's Corporation had not responded. I learned in my second follow-up call of today that Moody's Corporation had disbanded the report system as of December 2018;
   and
2. On February 21, 2018, Chief of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission Office of the Whistleblower Office Ms. Jane Norberg responded to my report "TCR Submission number: TCR15191-605-056 (Feb 16, 2018)" *not* by acting on the report, but by instead writing to induce me to take the necessary steps to claim any resultant financial award. Because I have no interest in a financial award, I offered it to the public via an October 2019 LinkedIn post of Ms. Norberg's letter.[3]

Appendix A to this letter contains my "Motion to File a Proposed Amicus Curiae Brief with the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Re: Case No. 18-1079, *Lehman Brothers Special Financing, Inc. against Branch Banking and Trust Company, et al." of* June 25, 2019.

[3] See my LinkedIn profile. https://www.linkedin.com/in/williamjharrington/
"Claim $$$ Credit for My SEC Whistleblowing on Inflated NRSRO Credit Ratings of CLOs & SLABS with Flip Clauses (also, Navient)!
"Cite "TCR Submission number: TCR15191-605-056" (Feb 16, 2018).
"Money is up for grabs, per the Feb 21, 2018 letter from Jane Norberg, Chief, Office of the Whistleblower, 202-551-4790 & F 703-813-9322.
"'It is now required that you submit a signed Form TCR (including the declarations page) in order to be considered for a whisteblower award. You are encouraged to submit the form using our-online questionnaire . . . ' **https://lnkd.in/eAENTTs**
"Me? I want NO money for amping up the SEC echo chamber that I began in 2011. **https://lnkd.in/dE6qXJw**
"The SEC? It thinks I trust them. Enforcement staff 'may contact you for additional assistance or information.'
"Coda: I added to the echo to keep the SEC from burying my info. **https://lnkd.in/d-kGpZG**
"Your info? It might force the SEC to start hearing evil.
"How? 'You just put your lips together, and blow.'"

To aid the reader, Appendix A is shaded in yellow. (Croatan Institute, where I am a senior fellow, posts the motion. http://croataninstitute.org/images/publications/WJH-Motion-to-File-Amicus-Brief.pdf)

The Motion, which is 5,200 words, details my 20-year experience of continually assessing the rating implications for both entities that are party to a swap contract with a flip clause. I am one of the few people globally with such experience and the only person to put all research in the public domain. The fact that most readers of this letter do not know of the flip clause is itself an indictment of the NRSRO regime.

Appendix B to this letter is my "Proposed Amicus Curiae Brief to the US 2nd Circuit Re: Case No. 18-1079 (Lehman vs 250 Financial Entities) - WJH V2.0 - 07-30-19."

To aid the reader, Appendix B is shaded in green. (Croatan Institute posts the proposed amicus curiae brief and an accompanying update letter to the Court. http://croataninstitute.org/images/publications/20190808-Amicus-Curiae-Brief.pdf**)**

The information on the proposed amicus curiae brief and update letter to the Court footnoted here, while contorted, is as accurate and as concise as possible.[4] The contortions are another indication that the NRSRO regime fails with respect to the ratings of the two entities that are party to a swap contract with a flip clause.

The following excerpt from my update letter to the Court of August 8, 2019 (page B) is an indication not only that the NRSRO regime fails with respect to the ratings of the two entities that are party to a swap contract with a flip clause, but also that the NRSRO Moody's Investors Service continues to violate the Compliance Commitments of the 2017 settlement with the state and District of Columbia attorneys general notified herein.

> 'Please see Section V (***Don't Contort 219 Years of US Bankruptcy Law to Legitimize Crisis-Causing, Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract Craze of 2000-to-2007***), Subsection D (***Distinction with a Difference (and Unintended Consequence): Swap Agreement That Incorporates ABS Documents Activates Margin Posting***), pages 51-53.
>
> "Accordingly, I **am** copying staff of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the CFTC, Natixis, and Navient in this letter and delivering email.

[4] "Filed with the US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Re: *Lehman Brothers Special Financing, Inc. against Branch Banking and Trust Company, et al* on June 25, 2019. See pages 1-55, which is a clean-up revision dated July 30, 2019.
In turn, the revision was included in an update letter to the Court of August 8, 2019 (first three pages A-C.) The update letter and the proposed amicus curiae brief were also delivered to the CFTC, the Federal Reserve Bank of NY, the SEC, the US Department of Justice, US Senator Josh Hawley (R-MO), the global financial company Natixis, the largest US student loan company Navient, and the NRSRO credit rating agencies DBRS, Fitch Ratings, Moody's Investors Service, and SP Global."

"Furthermore, the potential Natixis violation of US swap margin rules indicate that NRSRO credit rating agencies maintain inflated ratings of:
(1) Natixis;
(2) other swap dealers that are parties to flip-clause-swap-contracts with US issuers of ABS;
(3) ABS of US issuers that are party to a flip-clause-swap contract with Natixis; and
(4) all other ABS of US issuers that are parties to flip-clause-swap-contracts.

"Accordingly, I **am** copying staff of the SEC Office of Credit Ratings and of the NRSROs DBRS, Fitch Ratings, Moody's, and S&P Global in this letter and delivering email.

"Also, the NRSRO Moody's Investors Service is obligated to enforce the Compliance Commitments that it, along with parent Moody's Corporation and affiliate Moody's Analytics agreed to in the settlement with the US Department of Justice and the attorneys general of 21 states and of Washington, DC on January 13, 2017. Accordingly, I **have** delivered copies of this letter to the US Department of Justice contacts to whom the Moody's entities must report.

"Finally, US Senator Joshua D. Hawley of Missouri was a signatory to the Moody's settlement in his former capacity as Attorney General of Missouri. Accordingly, I **am** copying Senator Hawley's Chief of Staff in this letter and delivering email."[5]

Respectfully,

/s/William J. Harrington

William J. Harrington
Harrington Independent Flip Clause Assessments
Senior Fellow, Croatan Institute
Wikirating.org Experts Board — Structured Finance Topics

CC: United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (***In re Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.*, No. 18-1079**)

Arizona Attorney General's Office

California Department of Justice

Attorney General for the State of Connecticut

Attorney General for the State of Delaware

Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Attorney General for the State of Idaho

[5] Harrington, William J. "Update Letter to the United State Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Re: *In re Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., No. 18-1079*, August 8, 2019," page B.

State of Illinois

Attorney General for the State of Indiana

Attorney General for the State of Iowa

Attorney General of Kansas

Office of the Attorney General of the State of Maine

Office of the Attorney General of Maryland

Office of the Attorney General of Massachusetts

Attorney General for the State of Mississippi

Office of United States Senator Roger Wicker (Mississippi)

Missouri Attorney General

Office of United States Senator Joshua Hawley (Missouri)

New Hampshire Bureau of Securities Regulation

Attorney General of the State of New Jersey

North Carolina Attorney General

Oregon Department of Justice

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General of the State of South Carolina

Attorney General of Washington

Ms. Jane Norberg, Chief of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission Whistleblower Office

Mr. Abraham Putney, New York City Branch Chief, United States Securities and Exchange Commission

Mr. Raymond McDaniel, President and CEO, Moody's Corporation

Mr. Cezary Podkul, Wall Street Journal

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

LEHMAN BROTHERS SPECIAL FINANCING INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

—against—

Case No. 18-1079

BRANCH BANKING AND TRUST COMPANY, et al.

Defendants-Appellees

MOTION BY WILLIAM J. HARRINGTON FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF

William J. Harrington
51 5th Avenue, Apartment 16A
New York, New York 10003
(917-680-1465)
wjharrington@yahoo.com

Private US Citizen

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I, William J. Harrington, am a private US citizen. I self-finance research advocacy to eliminate the type of priority payment provisions at issue in this litigation (the ***flip clause***), to fix Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (***NRSRO***) credit ratings, and to improve the capitalization and regulation of asset-backed securities and other structured finance products (***ABS***) and of derivative contracts.

I have no commercial relationship with any party to the above-captioned case or any affiliate of any such party.

I have no financial or commercial interest in the above-captioned case, its outcome, or any implication thereof.

I am not employed by, or consult on a paid basis for, any entity.

I ***am*** a Key Expert on Structured Finance Topics for the Experts Board of Wikirating.org — a worldwide, independent, transparent, and collaborative organization for credit ratings. The Swiss nonprofit Wikirating Association operates the Wikirating platform.

I ***am*** affiliated as senior fellow with Croatan Institute — an independent, nonprofit, tax exempt **501(c)**(3), research institute.

I have no other professional affiliation.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes **Page(s)**

Financial Regulations

Other Authorities

Denison, Erin, Michael Fleming, Asani Sarkar. "Creditor Recovery in Lehman's Recovery." *Liberty Street Economics* (blog of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.) (January 14, 2019.).....…22 (https://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2019/01/creditor-recovery-in-lehmans-bankruptcy.html)

Dutta, Deboleena, William Harrington, Gus Harris, Gary Witt, William May, and Yuri Yoshizawa. "Capping Hedge Termination Payments in Moody's Rated Structured Notes Following Default of the Underlying Debt Instrument." *Moody's Investors Service Special Report.* (September 17, 2004.)….....31 (https://www.moodys.com/)

Fitch Ratings. "Fitch Takes Rating Actions on EuroSail UK 2007-4BL PC." *Announcement*. (December 17, 2014.).....23 (https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20141217005430/en/Fitch-Takes-Rating-Actions-Eurosail-UK-2007-4BL-PLC)

Gaillard, Norbert J. and William J. Harrington. "Efficient, commonsense actions to foster accurate credit ratings." *Capital Markets Law Journal* 11, No.1 (2016): 38-59. https://doi: 10.1093/cmlj/kmv……..……14 (https://academic.oup.com/cmlj/article-abstract/11/1/38/2366006?redirectedFrom=fulltext)

Harrington, Bill. "Existing ABS swaps also caught in swap margin net." *Debtwire ABS*. (August 12, 2016.).....17, 20 (https://www.debtwire.com/info/existing-abs-swaps-also-caught-swap-margin-net-%E2%80%94-analysis)

Harrington, Bill. "Moody's bets Germany will support Deutsche Bank derivatives above all else." *Debtwire ABS*. (12 October 2016.).....36 (https://www.debtwire.com/info/moody%E2%80%99s-bets-germany-will-support-deutsche-bank-derivatives-above-all-else-%E2%80%94-analysis)

Harrington, Bill et al. "Update on the Lehman Brothers Derivative Product Companies' Bankruptcy (Plan of reorganization by the Lehman bankrupt estate proposes to pay 100% of allowed claims against two Lehman DPCs)." *Moody's Structured Credit Perspectives*.

June 2010, pages 29-31.....26
(https://www.moodys.com/)

Harrington, Bill, Gus Harris, Isaac Efrat, Jerry Gluck, and Bill May. "Moody's Approach for Rating Thresholds of Hedge Counterparties in CDO Transactions." *Moody's Investors Service Special Report.* (October 23, 2002.).....30, 31, 35, 36
(https://www.moodys.com/)

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to Moody's President and Chief Operating Officer Mr. Michel Madelain.
(April 1, 2013.)……27, 28, 35
(HTML pages 16-99 in Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the US Securities and Exchange Commission Re: Rule Comment Number 4-661. (June 3, 2013.)
(https://www.sec.gov/comments/4-661/4661-28.pdf))

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to Moody's President and Chief Operating Officer Mr. Michel Madelain. (June 11, 2012.).....18, 19
(HTML pages 145-152 in Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the US Securities and Exchange Commission Re: Rule Comment Number 4-661. (June 3, 2013.)
(https://www.sec.gov/comments/4-661/4661-28.pdf))

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to Moody's President and Chief Operating Officer Mr. Michel Madelain.
(October 26, 2012.).....33
(Available on request.)

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to US Commodity Futures Trading Commission Secretary Christopher Kirkpatrick Re: CFTC Letter No. 17-52, No-Action, 27 October 2017, Division of Swap Intermediary Oversight (Re: No-Action Position: Variation Margin Requirements Applicable to Swaps with Legacy Special Purpose Vehicles). (February 2, 2018.).....20
(http://www.wikirating.org/data/other/20180203_Harrington_J_William_31_Misrepresentations_in_CFTC%20_Letter_No_17-52.pdf)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's rates the Crown City CDO 2005-1 Limited offering from Lehman Brothers." *Announcement*. (June 30, 2005.).....24 (https://www.moodys.com/research/MOODYS-RATES-THE-CROWN-CITY-CDO-2005-1-LIMITED-OFFERING--PR_98907)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's rates the Crown City CDO 2005-2 Limited offering from Lehman Brothers." *Announcement*. (June 30, 2005.).....24 (https://www.moodys.com/research/MOODYS-RATES-THE-CROWN-CITY-CDO-2005-2-LIMITED-OFFERING--PR_98908)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's rates the Mulberry Street CDO, Ltd offering from UBS." *Announcement*. (December 20, 2002.).....24 (https://www.moodys.com/research/MOODYS-RATES-THE-MULBERRY-STREET-CDO-LTD-OFFERING-FROM-UBS--PR_62979)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's requests comments on proposal for swaps in highly-rated structured finance cashflow transactions." *Announcement*. (December 7, 2005.).....32 (https://www.moodys.com/research/MOODYS-REQUESTS-COMMENTS-ON-PROPOSAL-FOR-SWAPS-IN-HIGHLY-RATED--PR_106039)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's unifies hedge framework for highly rated structured finance cashflow transactions." *Announcement*. (May 25, 2006.).....31 (https://www.moodys.com/research/MOODYS-UNIFIES-HEDGE-FRAMEWORK-FOR-HIGHLY-RATED-STRUCTURED-FINANCE-CASH--PR_114003)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's withdraws ratings of Notes issued by 34 ABS CDOs." *Announcement*. (September 11, 2008.)……....21 (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-withdraws-ratings-of-Notes-issued-by-34-ABS-CDOs--PR_162573)

Moody's Investors Service. "Structured Finance Responds to Issues of Counterparty Risk and Basel II in Calls for Comment." *Inside Credit Policy*. (January 2006.).....34 (https://www.moodys.com/sites/products/AboutMoodysRatingsAttachments/2005200000425263.pdf)

Pauley, Justin and Dave Preston. "Wachovia CDO Research presents our summary of CDO Default Statistics." *Wachovia Structured Product Research*. (December 31, 2007.)…….21 (available on request to amicus.)

Rodriguez, Mayra Valladres. "Non-Banks Are The Largest Holders of Collateralized Loan Obligations." *Forbes*. (June 11, 2019.)……18 (https://www.forbes.com/sites/mayrarodriguezvalladares/2019/06/11/non-banks-are-the-largest-holders-of-collateralized-loan-obligations-globally/#1160a9c6e95e)

S&P Global Ratings. "Global Securitization on Pace for $1 Trillion in 2018." *RatingsDirect*. (July 24, 2018.).....17 (https://www.spratings.com/documents/20184/0/Global+Securitization+On+Pace+For+$1+Trillion+In+2018/8f1dd609-c3e8-469f-8b81-1175a7fe1bdb)

Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (***SIFMA***). "Brief of Amicus Curiae Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association in Support of Appellant and in Favor of Reversal in Lehman Brothers Special Financing, Inc. versus BNY Trustee Corporate Services Limited." (November 1, 2010.).....34 (https://www.sifma.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/lehman-brothers-special-financing-v-bny-corporate-trustee-services.pdf, as of June 21, 2019.)

Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (***SIFMA***) and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association, Inc (***ISDA***). "Proposed Brief of Amicus Curiae SIFMA and ISDA in Support of Defendants-Appellees and Affirmance in Lehman Brothers Special Financing, Inc. versus Bank of America National Association et al." (Case No. 17-cv-1224-LGS, Document 87.) (June 16, 2017.).....31, 34 (https://www.sifma.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/LehmanBrothers061617.pdf, as of June 21, 2019.)

Segoviano, Miguel, Bradley Jones, Peter Lindner, and Johannes Blankenheim. "Securitization: Lessons Learned and the Road Ahead." *International Monetary Fund Working Paper WP/15/2355.*

(November 2013.)……..……...……20
(https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2013/wp13255.pdf)

Story, Louise, Landon Thomas Jr. and Nelson D. Schwartz. "Wall St. Helped to Mask Debt Fueling Europe's Crisis." *New York Times*. (February 13, 2010.)……..23
(https://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/14/business/global/14debt.html?partner=MOREOVERNEWS&ei=5040)

Tempkin, Adam. "Here's Why the Japanese Bid for CLOs Isn't Likely to Slow Soon." *Bloomberg Markets*. (April 2, 2019.)…...……...……...18
(https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-04-02/here-s-why-the-japanese-bid-for-clos-isn-t-likely-to-slow-soon)

US Department of Justice. "Justice Department and State Partners Secure Nearly $864 Million Settlement with Moody's Arising from Conduct in the Lead up to the Financial Crisis." *Announcement*. (January 13, 2017.)……..……13, 27
(https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-and-state-partners-secure-nearly-864-million-settlement-moody-s-arising)

US Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. "Wall Street and the Financial Crisis: Anatomy of A Financial Crisis." *Majority and Minority Staff Report*. (April 13. 2011.).....36
(https://archive.org/stream/283228-sandp0112/283228-sandp0112_djvu.txt)

Wikirating……19
(https://wikirating.org/)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29(b), I, William J. Harrington respectfully move this Court for leave to file the brief attached hereto as Exhibit A (***Proposed Brief***) as amicus curiae in the above-captioned case (***Case***.)

In support of this motion, I state the following:

1. I am a private US citizen.

2. I am not an attorney.[6]

3. I self-finance investigation into the capitalization and regulation of complex finance, publicly report findings, and disseminate them widely.[7]

4. I work to boost the sustainability of our financial system by improving price-making, reducing the likelihood of bailouts, and eliminating the flip clause.

---

[6] I worked fulltime to submit a brief after fruitlessly seeking help from professors at seven law schools and four law clinics, two attorney friends, and several others (who collectively contacted 170-plus attorneys on my behalf) in October-November 2018.

[7] Harrington, William J., "Submission to the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission Re: RIN 3038-AE85 'Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants' (In the Event of No Deal Brexit)," May 31, 2019. (https://comments.cftc.gov/PublicComments/CommentList.aspx?id=2960.)

5. Pursuant to Second Circuit Local Rule 27.1(f)(1), I aver that the collective experience of teaching myself to write and submit an amicus brief is an "extraordinary circumstance."

6. Pursuant to Second Circuit Local Rule 27.1(f)(3), I am filing Exhibit A "as soon as practicable" i.e., ***on the day*** that I completed an amicus brief that is clear, concise, ***and complete***.[8]

7. My lodestar has been that the which United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (the ***District Court***) cited in affirming the decision of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the ***Bankruptcy Court***): To present analysis and "facts of which the court may take judicial notice" (Opinion And Order, Page 7).[9]

8. I have a singular ability to help the Court deliberate the Case because I am among the few to have continually scrutinized global use of the flip clause since June 1999, when I joined the derivatives group of Moody's Investors Service (***Moody's***).

---

[8] US Securities and Exchange Commission (***SEC***), "Capital, Margin, and Segregation Requirements for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants and Capital and Segregation Requirements for Broker-Dealers," *FR Pending*, **June 21, 2019**, (***SEC-Swap-Margin-Rule***.) Footnotes 327, 377, 463, 519, 569, 730, 738, 796, 1052, and 1058. (https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2019/34-86175.pdf.)

[9] (https://dlbjbjzgnk95t.cloudfront.net/1022000/1022435/https-ecf-nysd-uscourts-gov-doc1-127122046923.pdf.)

9. I support my claim with the othe following personal observations.

10. I have scrutinized the flip clause from the following **18** vantages: **1)** academic literature of the financial crisis; **2)** bankruptcy law of the US and other jurisdictions; **3)** byline journalism; **4)** competing exposures of the two parties to a swap contract, including the zero-sum exposure that a flip clause creates; **5)** global market practice since 1999; **6)** investigation by the US Department of Justice and attorneys general of 21 states and District of Columbia that resulted in them obtaining an $864 million settlement, including a Statement of Facts, from Moody's Corporation, Moody's Analytics, and Moody's in 2017;[10] **7)** lead NRSRO credit analyst and team leader who proposed credit ratings, voted in 1500 ABS, banking, derivative, insurance, municipal, and sovereign committees, and co-developed global methodologies for derivative contracts, including both standard swap contracts and ones in which an ABS issuer referred to a flip clause in paying a swap dealer (***flip-clause-swap-contract***); **8)** lead NRSRO analyst for 50 ABS, collateralized loan obligations (***CLOs***), and collateralized debt obligations (***CDOs***),

[10] US Department of Justice, "Justice Department and State Partners Secure Nearly $864 Million Settlement with Moody's Arising from Conduct in the Lead up to the Financial Crisis," *Announcement*, January 13, 2017. (https://www.**justice**.gov/opa/pr/**justice-department-and-state-partners-secure-nearly-864-million-settlement-moody-s-arising**.)

including three that defendants-appellees issued or insured; **9)** lead NRSRO analyst for ten derivative dealers, including two Lehman Brothers affiliates, that provided swap contracts both with and without a flip clause; **10)** lead NRSRO liaison with the swap trading desks at 15 financial institutions, including both the plaintiff-appellant and five defendants-appellees, regarding development and implementation of a global NRSRO methodology for flip-clause-swap-contracts; **11)** legal enforceability opinions with carve-outs; **12)** longitudinal tracking of core components of the flip-clause-swap-contract, including but not limited to the flip clause; **13)** review of NRSRO methodologies for the flip-clause-swap-contract; **14)** self-financed, public-citizen advocate for responsible US finance whose advocacy against the flip-clause-swap-contract US financial regulators both cited and adopted in Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (***Dodd-Frank Act***) rulemaking;[11] **15)** Structured Finance Industry Group (***SFIG***) member from May 13, 2013 to December 31, 2013 and participant on the "Derivatives in Securitization Committee," which champions the flip-clause-swap-contract, from May 15, 2013 to December 31, 2013;[12] **16)** the student loan crisis; **17)** pro-bono "whistleblower" who regularly provides analysis to the SEC and the US Commodity Futures Trading

---

11 (https://www.congress.gov/111/plaws/publ203/PLAW-111publ203.pdf)

12 On January 17, 2014, the SFIG Treasurer informed me that the Membership Committee had decided I would no longer be a member.

Commission (***CFTC***) while explicitly opting **not** to be considered for a financial award; and **18)** the respective regulations and proposals of 14 financial regulators — Australian Prudential Regulation Authority, Bank of England, European Banking Authority, European Central Bank, European Commission, European Securities and Markets Authority, Japanese Financial Services Agency, Board of Governors of the US Federal Reserve Board System (***Federal Reserve***), US Farm Credit Administration, US Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (***FDIC***), US Federal Housing Finance Agency, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (collectively, the preceding five US regulators, the ***prudential regulators***), the CFTC, and the SEC.

11. I am a dispassionate friend of the Court because I am agnostic regarding the correctness of both the Bankruptcy Court decision and its affirmation by the District Court.

12. I ***do*** have a well-founded view that no decision by the Court can fix the flip clause. It cannot be fixed.

13. ***The flip clause is quicksand. No financial sector or market that uses the flip clause can be stabilized because quicksand cannot be stabilized.***

14. Whatever the Court's decision, it will confirm US market and regulatory assessments that the flip clause is inherently and irredeemably defective. Upholding the flip clause will render it unacceptable to swap dealers. Striking down

the flip clause will render it unacceptable to investors. Splitting the difference will exposure future parties to a decade of litigation.

15. Accordingly, the Court must contort neither law nor logic in a futile effort to prop up the flip clause. In particular, the Court must carefully review three distinctions that the Bankruptcy Court made.

Firstly, the Type 1 / Type 2 designation is a distinction without a difference.

Secondly, the inclusion of transaction documents in a swap agreement has unintended consequences because such documents are, along with the rest of a swap contract, subject to US regulations for swap margin.

Thirdly, three prudential regulators enacted rules in 2017 that explicitly make failure of a major financial institution a "singular" event.

16. My 20 years of scrutiny have produced a disquieting finding. ***Every party that agreed to or endorsed a flip clause generated the financial crisis. None was a blindsided casualty.***

17. From 2000 to 2007, US ABS issuers that entered into a swap contract almost uniformly entered into a flip-clause-swap-contract.

18. Few post-crisis issuers have entered into a flip-clause-swap-contract and none have done so since January 2016.[13]

19. ***US ABS are thriving without the flip-clause-swap contract*!**[14]

20. In July 2010, Congress enacted its clear intent to eliminate the flip-clause-swap-contract in multiple sections of the Dodd-Frank Act. It explicitly instructs US financial regulators to establish rules that impose variation margin requirements on a swap dealer for each uncleared swap contract with an end user.

21. ***A variation margin requirement supersedes both the operation and the purpose of a flip clause, thereby rendering it doubly superfluous***.

22. In 2015, the prudential regulators and the CFTC complied with the Dodd-Frank mandate by adopting swap margin rules that intentionally kill the flip-clause-swap-contract by preventing a swap dealer from providing a new contract or amending an existing one.[15] On June 21, 2019, the SEC followed suit.

---

[13] "The good news is that embedded swaps are less prevalent in U.S. deals..." Adelson, Mark and Robbin Conner, "SFIG Vegas 2017 Conference Notes," March 11, 2017, page 20. (http://www.**markadelson.**com/pubs/**SFIG-Vegas-2017-Conference-Notes**.pdf.)

[14] "Global Securitization on Pace for $1 Trillion in 2018," *S&P Global Ratings RatingsDirect*, July 24, 2018. (https://www.**spratings**.com/documents/20184/0/**Global+Securitization+On+Pace+For+$1+Trillion+In+2018**/8f1dd609-c3e8-469f-8b81-1175a7fe1bdb.)

[15] Harrington, Bill, "Existing ABS swaps also caught in swap margin net," *Debtwire ABS*, August 12, 2016. (https://www.**debtwire**.com/info/**existing-abs-swaps-also-caught-swap-margin-net**-%E2%80%94-**analysis**.)

23. In 2017, three prudential regulators cited the Lehman bankruptcy in adopting additional Dodd-Frank rules to prevent the mass termination of derivative contracts in the event that an entity within a systemically important banking organization enters bankruptcy or resolution. ***Notably, the derivative contracts of such entities must "prohibit a counterparty… from exercising cross-default rights."***[16]

24. Issuers have always had better alternatives to a flip-clause-swap-contract. As examples, issuers can accept lower ABS ratings, align the payment characteristics of assets and ABS, buy options, enter into a swap contract with two-way margin posting, increase deal resources, or let non-US investors mitigate exposures outside of a deal.[17] Unsurprisingly, each alternative costs more than a flip-

---

[16] Memo from Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell, August 24, 2017. (https://www.**federalreserve**.gov/aboutthefed/**boardmeetings**/files/**qfc-board-memo-20170901**.pdf.)

[17] Tempkin, Adam, "Here's Why the Japanese Bid for CLOs Isn't Likely to Slow Soon," *Bloomberg Markets*, April 2, 2019. (https://www.**bloomberg**.com/news/articles/2019-04-02/**here-s-why-the-japanese-bid-for-clos-isn-t-likely-to-slow-soon**) Also, Rodriguez, Mayra Valladres, "Non-Banks Are The Largest Holders of Collateralized Loan Obligations," *Forbes*, June 11, 2019. "Japanese banks hold about $108 billion in US CLOs." (https://www.**forbes**.com/sites/**mayrarodriguezvalladares**/2019/06/11/**non-banks-are-the-largest-holders-of-collateralized-loan-obligations-**globally/#1160a9c6e95e.)

clause-swap-contract, verifying that it is an artificial contrivance and not a product of free market forces.

25. I resigned from Moody's in July 2010 largely because the company thwarted an honest post-mortem of its role in the financial crisis, e.g., with respect to ***the failure of all flip-clause-swap-contract components***.[18] In addition to the flip clause, the other failed components include rating agency confirmation (***RAC***), replacement/guarantee, and one-way collateralization.[19]

26. In January 2011, I began a fulltime, self-financed advocacy to eliminate the flip-clause-swap-contract as a financing tool for the US economy, particularly the housing sector.[20] My ongoing advocacy, which has largely succeeded, centers on the 40-plus technical comments that I have submitted to US and EU financial regulators, US and UK legislative inquiries, and NRSROs.[21]

---

[18] Harrington, William J., "Electronic Letter to Moody's President and Chief Operating Officer Mr. Michel Madelain," June 11, 2012, final page. (HTML page 152 of Harrington, William J., "Electronic Letter to the US SEC Re: Rule Comment Number 4-661," June 3, 2013 (***WJH-SEC-Comment-06-03-2013***.) (https://www.sec.gov/comments/4-661/4661-28.pdf.))

[19] Gaillard, Norbert J. and William J. Harrington, "Efficient, commonsense actions to foster accurate credit ratings," *Capital Markets Law Journal* 11, No.1 (2016): 38-59. https://doi: 10.1093/cmlj/kmv064. Regarding the respective provisions' failures, see pages 42-44, including footnotes 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 45, 46, and 47.

[20] Both Wikirating and Croatan Institute post my work. (https://wikirating.org/ and http://www.croataninstitute.org/william-j-harrington, respectively.)

[21] Most recently, SEC-Swap-Margin-Rule, pages 175-6 and 204-5.

27. From October 2015 - November 2016, I worked as a journalist at *Debtwire ABS*, analyzing and reporting on the regulation and use of flip-clause-swap-contracts. Anticipating renewed lobbying to revive the contract after the 2016 elections, I resigned to resume fulltime, self-financed advocacy in December 2016.[22]

28. Mine is the only rigorous analysis of the flip-clause-swap-contract worldwide.[23] Disappointingly, even academics and policy makers who study the financial crisis have not evaluated the contract.[24]

29. When I joined Moody's in 1999, NRSROs routinely predicated the ratings of ABS such as CDOs, CLOs, residential mortgage-backed securities

---

[22] For lobbying and NRSRO materials to preserve flip-clause-swap-contracts, see Harrington, William J. "Electronic Letter to the CFTC 'Re: CFTC Letter No. 17-52, No-Action,'" February 2, 2018, in toto. (https://www.wikirating.org/data/other/20180203_**Harrington_J_William_31_Misrepresentations_in_CFTC**%20_**Letter_No_17-52**.pdf.)

[23] As example, I was the first to publicly correct legal and NRSRO misinformation regarding legacy flip-clause-swap-contracts and the new swap margin rules. Harrington, *Debtwire ABS*, August 12, 2016.

[24] For ***vacuous*** work, see Miguel Segoviano et al. "Securitization: Lessons Learned and the Road Ahead," *International Monetary Fund Working Paper WP/15/2355*, November 2013, pages 38-39. (https://www.**imf**.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2013/**wp13255**.pdf.) Also, Harrington, William J. "Submission to the CFTC Re: RIN 3038-AD54 'Capital Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants,'" May 4, 2017 (***WJH-CFTC-Comment-05-04-2017***), footnote 5. "I apprised Dr. Segoviano and his co-authors of the risk characteristics of an uncleared swap with a flip clause in a teleconference on 16 January 2014." They had been unaware of the flip clause. (https://comments.**cftc.gov/PublicComments**/ViewComment.aspx?id=61196&SearchText=.)

(***RMBS***) on reference to a flip clause when an issuer was party to a swap contract. In doing so, the NRSROs asserted a brazen proposition — namely, a swap contract injected **zero** counterparty exposure into either a deal or a swap dealer.

30. NRSRO endorsement made the flip-clause-swap-contract artificially cheap and pre-crisis ABS issuers used it heavily to offset the potential depreciation of securitized assets viz-a-viz ABS and to create assets.[25] Spectacularly reckless issuers accrued exponential exposure to-flip-clause-swap-contracts by buying ABS from issuers that themselves were parties to a contract.[26]

31. A flip-clause-swap-contract can reference a basis rate, a commodity, a currency, one or more entities, an interest rate, or the payment characteristics of an asset pool. The contract ***always*** exposes both a deal and a swap dealer to outsized losses regardless of which party is in-the-money. The ABS sector

---

[25] WJH-CFTC-Comment-05-04-2017, page 102. Under a flip-clause-swap-contract, an issuer "posted no collateral to a swap dealer and held *no* capital against its insolvency."

[26] Pauley, Justin and Dave Preston, "Wachovia CDO Research presents our summary of CDO Default Statistics," *Wachovia Structured Product Research*, (December 31, 2008.) We "track 283 ABS CDOs with a total aggregate issuance amount of $295 billion that have tripped their EOD triggers between October 2007 and Dec. 31, 2008." Also, Moody's Announcement, September 11, 2008. Moody's withdrew "the ratings of 261 classes of notes issued by 34 CDOs backed primarily by portfolios of RMBS securities" and CDO-squared deals that "completed [post-EOD] liquidation." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-withdraws-ratings-of-Notes-issued-by-34-ABS-CDOs**--PR_162573.)

intentionally concocted the contract so that it could only fail its patently fantastic purpose — namely, ensuring that neither a deal nor a swap dealer incurred ***any*** loss following the latter's bankruptcy.

32. The Bankruptcy Court detailed the 100% loss of contract values that the plaintiff-appellant (***LBSF***) incurred under 100% of a "multitude" of in-the-money, flip-clause-swap-contracts in the decision.

> "***The amount of the proceeds of the liquidation of the Collateral was insufficient to make any payment to LBSF under the Waterfall after proceeds were paid pursuant to Noteholder Priority.***"[27]

(Memorandum Decision, Page 11. Emphasis added.)

Under a separate, very large in-the-money contract, LBSF may have lost 67%.[28] Partly owing to the outsized losses that the LBSF flip-clause-swap-contract portfolio incurred, LBSF creditors received lower recoveries than other Lehman creditors.[29]

---

[27] http://www.nysb.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/opinions/202553_1360_opinion.pdf.)

[28] Moody's Announcement on Ballyrock ABS CDO 2007-1, March 4, 2010. "…the Issuer has just over $137MM in cash while the credit default swap termination payments due to LBSF is approximately $405MM." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-downgrades-the-ratings-of-two-classes-of-Notes-issued**--PR_195797.)

[29] Denison, Erin, Michael Fleming, and Asani Sarkar, "Creditor Recovery in Lehman's Recovery," *Federal Reserve Bank of New York*, January 14, 2019. (https://**libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed**.org/**2019/01/creditor-recovery-in-lehmans-bankruptcy**.html.)

Conversely, one European deal lost 34% under an *in-the-money* flip-clause-swap-contract, i.e., one that was *out-of-the-money* to a Lehman entity.[30] Collectively, European flip-clause-swap-contracts with a variety of swap dealers undermined national economies, most notably Greece.[31]

33. Pre-crisis issuers of CDOs, CLOs, RMBS, and other ABS that entered into a flip-clause-swap-contract knowingly under-capitalized their deals, i.e., intentionally adulterated them. Likewise, the corresponding swap dealers undermined themselves by under-capitalizing the offsetting exposures to the same contracts. Many *deals* failed, including most CDOs that the defendants-appellees issued or insured. Several *dealers* failed, including the plaintiff-appellant. Surviving deals and dealers, including several other defendants-appellees, might otherwise have failed but for direct and indirect government intervention.

Without the flip-clause-swap-contract, pre-crisis issuers would have either better capitalized deals or not issued them in the first place. Lehman and other

---

[30] Fitch Ratings Announcement on Eurosail-UK 2007-4BL: December 17, 2014. "[P]roceeds of USD116m received by the issuer represent approximately 66% of the stipulated claim amount." (https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20141217005430/en/**Fitch-Takes-Rating-Actions-Eurosail-UK-2007-4BL-PLC**.)

[31] Story, Louise, Landon Thomas Jr. and Nelson D. Schwartz, "Wall St. Helped to Mask Debt Fueling Europe's Crisis," *New York Times*, February 13, 2010. (https://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/14/business/global/14debt.html?partner=MOREOVERNEWS&ei=5040.)

swap dealers would have been better capitalized. The financial crisis might never have occurred.

34. Moody's Derivatives Group assigned and monitored ratings of the respective CDOs and ABS of 16 deals that defendants-appellees issued. The group also provided financial institution colleagues with the underlying "shadow" ratings on CDO and ABS that monoline insurers, including at least one defendant-appellee, "wrapped."

I was lead analyst in assigning the initial ratings to three CDOs that defendants-appellees issued or wrapped.[32] In total, I was lead analyst in assigning initial ratings to the respective CDOs, CLOs, and other ABS of 50 deals from June 1999 until assuming new responsibilities in Spring 2006.[33] Moreover, I was a voting member of the rating committees for many more ABS because I was the derivatives go-to person for North American analysts in all sectors.

---

[32] Moody's Announcements: December 20, 2002; and June 30, 2005 (two). (https://www.moodys.com/research/**MOODYS-RATES-THE-MULBERRY-STREET-CDO-LTD-OFFERING-FROM-UBS--**PR_62979) (https://www.moodys.com/research/**MOODYS-RATES-THE-CROWN-CITY-CDO-2005-1-LIMITED-OFFERING**--PR_98907) (https://www.moodys.com/research/**MOODYS-RATES-THE-CROWN-CITY-CDO-2005-2-LIMITED-OFFERING**--PR_98908)

[33] Harrington, William J., "Submission to the US SEC Re: File Number S7-18-11, 'Proposed Rules for Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization,'" August 8, 2011 (***WJH-SEC-Comment-08-08-2011***), pages 3 and 57-58. (https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-18-11/s71811-33.pdf.)

The overwhelming majority of pre-crisis CDO, CLO, RMBS, and other ABS issuers that entered into a swap contract laden it with a flip clause refence to avoid adding resources to the deal. However, a CDO that I rated (and a defendant-appellee wrapped) entered into swaps but paid certain termination amounts from a ringfenced cash reserve.[34] Many CLO issuers bought an option; some but not all also entered into a flip-clause-swap-contract. Issuers in all ABS sectors simply aligned the payment characteristics of assets and liabilities and forewent a derivative contract altogether.

35. Moody's Derivatives Group assigned and monitored ratings for structured finance operating companies that dealt derivative contracts (***SFOCs***). SFOCs included: dealers of uncollateralized credit derivative contracts, although not flip-clause-swap-contracts (credit derivative product companies or ***CDPCs***); dealers of generally uncollateralized currency and interest rate derivative contracts, including flip-clause-swap-contracts (derivative product companies or ***DPCs***); and collateralized swap and repo programs. Upon joining Moody's, I became lead analyst for several DPCs, including Lehman Brothers Derivative Products (***LBDP***), Lehman Brothers Financial Products (***LBFP***), and Merrill Lynch Derivative

[34] Moody's Announcement: March 21, 2001. (https://www.moodys.com/research/**MOODYS-ASSIGNS-RATING-TO-PHOENIX-FUNDING-LIMITED-CDO**--PR_44224.)

Products (***MLDP***). I also assumed the lead in assigning the initial rating to a new DPC (Nomura Derivative Products Inc, or ***NDPI***) in 2000 and to a new collateralized swap program (Enhanced-Rating ISDA Program of JPMorgan Chase Bank) in 2005. I monitored each SFOC until resigning from Moody's in July 2010.

At various times, LBDP, LBFP, MLDP, or NDPI proposed to provide a flip-clause-swap-contract. In each instance, I responded that, in order to do so, the DPC must hold significantly more resources than would be the case for an otherwise identical, and much more standard, swap contract that did not refer to a flip clause. ***After all, almost all of a swap dealer's counterparties, i.e., those that do not reference a flip clause when paying the dealer, face outsized and potentially cascading losses in the event that the dealer fails while exposed to a flip clause.*** To limit the losses from a flip clause, DPCs were to dynamically increase or decrease the additional resources in line with the mark-to-market, i.e., the outsized exposure that the flip clause creates.[35] Largely owing to the projected costs, each DPC provided few-to-no flip-clause-swap-contracts.

36. My monitoring contributed to LBDP and LBFP ***eventually*** paying unsecured creditors in full.[36] In addition to insisting that the Lehman DPCs

---

[35] WJH-CFTC-Comment-05-04-2017, pages 98-107.

[36] Harrington, Bill et al, "Update on the Lehman Brothers Derivative Product Companies' Bankruptcy (Plan of reorganization by the Lehman bankrupt

fully capitalize the respective exposures under new flip-clause-swap-contracts, I also obligated the DPCS to hold "capital and collateral resources in cash and highly liquid U.S. government securities…[and]…refused a request by the DPCs to credit a new monoline guarantee to capital resources upon expiry of a prior guarantee that had been in place since formation."[37]

37. More generally, all DPCs under my purview had more capital and collateral resources than otherwise because I ***did not enact*** Moody's global practice of diluting relevant benchmarks for Aaa-ratings.[38]

38. I was Team Co-Leader of SFOCs beginning in 2005, which enabled me to monitor additional SFOCs.[39] One legacy DPC that I began monitoring — Bear Stearns Financial Products (***BSFP***) — was an established provider of flip-

---

estate proposes to pay 100% of allowed claims against two Lehman DPCs)," *Moody's Structured Credit Perspectives*, June 2010, pages 29-31.

[37] Harrington, William J., "Electronic Letter to Moody's President and Chief Operating Officer Mr. Michel Madelain," April 1, 2013 (***WJH-Letter-Moody's-Madelain-04-01-2013***), pages 9-10 (HTML pages 24-25 in WJH-SEC-Comment-06-03-2013)

[38] US Department of Justice. *Announcement*, January 13, 2017. (https://www.**justice**.gov/opa/pr/**justice-department-and-state-partners-secure-nearly-864-million-settlement-moody-s-arising**.) "Starting in 2004, Moody's did not follow its published idealized expected loss standards in rating certain Aaa CDO securities…In 2005, Moody's authorized the expanded use of this practice to all Aaa CDO securities."

[39] WJH-Letter-Moody's-Madelain-04-01-2013, pages 15-18, 23-30, and 33-54 (HTML pages 30-33, 38-45, and 48-69 in WJH-SEC-Comment-06-03-2013).

clause-swap-contracts to RMBS issuers.[40] I also led colleagues in stemming CDPC trading with CDOs, RMBS, and other ABS sectors.

39. As the financial crisis unfolded, I led colleagues in directing four global financial institutions to add tangible resources to the respective portfolios of flip-clause-swap-contracts.

BSFP added capital to track ***in-the-money*** flip-clause-swap-contracts.

In March 2008, JPMorgan Chase amended a guarantee of selected obligations of multiple Bear Stearns entities to add performance obligations that Moody's Derivative Group had identified as critical to protecting BSFP counterparties.[41]

In Summer 2008, the then independent Merrill Lynch agreed to fully implement my colleagues' proposals in a credit support annex with the PARCS / PYXIS programs that secured the latter's swap claims of USD 8 billion.[42]

---

[40] Ibid., pages 10-14 (HTML pages 25-29.)

[41] Moody's Announcements: March 25, 2008 and June 4, 2008. (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-continues-Bear-Stearns-review-assigns-JPM-backed-issuer-ratings**--PR_151714.) (https://www.**moodys.com/research/Moodys-issues-rating-confirmation-for-Bear-Stearns-affiliate**--PR_156804.)

[42] WJH-SEC-Comment-08-08-2011, pages 4, 21-24, 68, and 76.

In 2009-2010, Bank of America agreed to finance a proposal by its new subsidiary MLDP to guarantee the performance of third-party AIG under flip-clause-swap-contracts with 50 CDO and ABS issuers. The contracts were deeply in-the-money to AIG (i.e., the flip clauses exposed the tottering insurance company to significant exposure to its own credit deterioration) in part because many deals were repaying loans that AIG had made upfront when entering the respective contracts.[43]

Finally, I led SFOC colleagues in overhauling a DPC methodology and in downgrading DPCs to address deficiencies that BSFP and the Lehman DPCs revealed in 2008. The update produced a key insight: A DPC effectively holds a "walkaway" provision, which is akin to a flip clause, in the master swap with the parent institution.[44]

40. I enjoyed evaluating the exposure of a DPC under a flip-clause-swap-contract because the work informed my other major responsibility from the outset of joining Moody's — namely, evaluating the exactly opposite exposure of an ABS issuer. My interest in articulating the zero-sum nature of the flip clause flowed from two pre-Moody's jobs. I structured derivative contracts that referenced interest rates, currencies, and sovereign entities at Merrill Lynch (1992-1998) and

---

[43] Ibid., pages 4, 27-29 (including footnote 7), 36, 40, 62-68, 70-71, and 73-74.

[44] Ibid. pages 68-70. Also, WJH-CFTC-Comment-05-04-2017, footnote 87, page 99.

was an international economist for the interest rate and currency service of The WEFA Group (1987-1990.)

41. At Moody's, I co-developed three guides for an issuer that entered into a derivative contract. The guides were published in 2002, 2004, and 2006, respectively. Each specified certain parameters of a derivative contract to align it with the same aggressive numerical input that Moody's had long used to support its ABS franchise; namely that a derivative contract injected **zero** counterparty exposure into a deal.

42. The 2002 guide applied to US issuers of cashflow CDOs and described one half of the flip clause, i.e., waterfall seniority (***Moody's-2002-CDO-Framework***.)[45] "The guidelines are being published as senior noteholders and hedge counterparties in the banking industry compete increasingly for seniority." II "Hedge Counterparties Are Climbing the Waterfall."[46] Other ABS teams piggybacked on the guide to address the (with hindsight) impossible-to-reconcile clash between ABS and swap dealer.

---

[45] "Moody's Approach for Rating Thresholds of Hedge Counterparties in CDO Transactions," *Moody's Investors Service Special Report*, October 23, 2002 (with Gus Harris, Isaac Efrat, Jerry Gluck, and Bill May).

[46] Moody's Announcement: November 4, 2002. (https://www.moodys.com/research/**MOODYS-PUBLISHES-GUIDELINES-FOR-CDO-HEDGE-COUNTERPARTIES--**PR_61233.)

43. The 2004 guide capped the rating for a structured note in line with certain senior termination amounts payable to a swap dealer. As example, a structured note would be rated Aa1 — i.e., only one notch below Aaa — when an issuer capped certain senior termination amounts at **45% of contract notional** (**NB**, not the much smaller 45% of mark-to-market.)[47] Even so, both issuers and Moody's shunned the approach.

44. The 2006 publication applied to issuers of cashflow (as opposed to synthetic) ABS worldwide and was operational until November 11, 2013 (***Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework***).[48] The methodology, which ostensibly supplanted existing ones, improved on them by comprehensively articulating and

---

[47] Dutta, Deboleena and Bill Harrington, "Capping Hedge Termination Payments in Moody's Rated Structured Notes Following Default of the Underlying Debt Instrument," *Moody's Investors Service Special Report*, September 17, 2004.

[48] Manchester, Edward, Bill Harrington, and Nicholas Lindstrom, "Framework for De-Linking Hedge Counterparty Risks from Global Structured Finance Cashflow Transactions," *Moody's Investors Service Rating Methodology,* May 25, 2006.

standardizing many flip-clause-swap-contract provisions.[49] The 2006 framework also provided a pro-forma template for incorporation boilerplate ISDA documents.[50]

45. One Moody's legal colleague in London crafted the flip clause provisions. A second legal colleague in London drafted the ISDA template. No US legal analyst developed or drafted even a small part of Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework. The absence is notable because Moody's Derivatives managers assigned a legal analyst to virtually every CDO, CLO, and SFOC.

46. ***To repeat, Moody's assigned NO US legal analyst who was well-versed in the flip-clause-swap-contract to develop Moodys-2006-Hedge-Framework***.

47. My London colleague cited first in the preceding paragraph kicked-off the project by proposing the flip clause articulation. I, not knowing that the flip clause had a stronger grounding under UK law than US law, endorsed the

---

[49] Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (***SIFMA***) and International Swaps and Derivatives Association (***ISDA***), "Proposed Brief of Amicus Curiae in Support of Defendants-Appellees and Affirmance in Lehman Brothers Special Financing, Inc. versus Bank of America National Association et al. (Case No. 17-cv-1224-LGS (Document 87)," June 16, 2017. Appendix A contains Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework. (https://www.**sifma**.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/**LehmanBrothers**061617.pdf.)

[50] Moody's Announcement: May 25, 2006. (https://www.moodys.com/research/**MOODYS-UNIFIES-HEDGE-FRAMEWORK-FOR-HIGHLY-RATED-STRUCTURED-FINANCE-CASH**--PR_114003.)

articulation wholeheartedly. In our shared view, we were to develop an airtight framework so that Moody's nonnegotiable rating assumption — namely, that a flip-clause-swap-contract injected ***zero*** counterparty exposure into a deal — became a reality in each contract.[51]

We spoke to teams that provided flip-clause-swap-contracts at US and EU financial institutions. Furthermore, we published two detailed comment requests that featured the flip clause articulation in 2005.[52]

I discussed the framework with New York-based swaps teams at: Bank of America; Bank of New York; Bear Stearns; BSFP; CIBC, Credit Suisse; Deutsche Bank; Goldman Sachs; JPMorgan Chase; Lehman Brothers; Merrill Lynch (the corporation); MLDP; Swiss Re; UBS; and Wachovia. I also discussed the framework with deal counsel for US RMBS deals and with then Bank of England Deputy Governor Mr. Paul Tucker.[53]

---

[51] WJH-SEC-Comment-08-08-2011, page 58.

[52] Moody's Announcement: December 7, 2005. (**https://www.moodys.com/research/MOODYS-REQUESTS-COMMENTS-ON-PROPOSAL-FOR-SWAPS-IN-HIGHLY-RATED--**PR_106039.)

[53] Moody's Announcement: August 28, 2006. (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-framework-for-de-linking-hedge-counterparty-risks-from-global**--PR_118610.)

48. The swap teams challenged many obligations such as posting collateral, replacement/guarantee, and the respective rating triggers. ***However, no swap team disputed the flip clause, let alone challenged its enforceability.***

49. Similarly, no issuer, investor, trustee, or vendor to an ABS deal or SFOC had disputed the flip clause or challenged its enforcement with me.[54] Nor, with one exception, did a US Moody's legal colleague.[55]

50. From early 2004 to December 2006, my London colleagues and I regularly updated a global team of senior Moody's management, who approved each stage of the framework-in-progress.[56]

51. Citations, and even wholesale inclusion, of Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework in amicus briefs that SIFMA and ISDA proposed for a slew of cases corroborate that ABS practitioners — e.g., auditors, bankers, counsel, credit analysts, industry groups, insurers, issuers, swap providers, trustees, underwriters,

---

[54] William J. Harrington, Letter to Moody's President and COO Mr. Michel Madelain, October 26, 2012 (***WJH-Letter-Moody's-Madelain-10-26-2012***), pages 1-5.

[55] In 2014, a former Moody's legal colleague stated that no counsel for a US deal had ever delivered a clean opinion with respect to the enforceability of the flip clause.

[56] Moody's Investors Service, "Structured Finance Responds to Issues of Counterparty Risk and Basel II in Calls for Comment," *Inside Credit Policy*, January 2006, pages 4-5. (https://www.moodys.com/sites/products/AboutMoodysRatingsAttachments/2005200000425263.pdf.)

and warehousers — contemporaneously examined the flip clause treatment therein. Additionally, a Moody's colleague who had previously worked at S&P offered that its analysts had also used Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework.

52. The widespread reliance on the flip clause nagged at me out of simple common sense. Wouldn't the FDIC simply repudiate the flip clauses of a bank in receivership to preserve both it and taxpayer money? After all, a failed bank that had agreed to a flip clause knowingly hastened its own insolvency — i.e., was "willfully negligent." I shared the concern with Moody's Executive Vice President and Co-Chief Operating Office Mr. Brian Clarkson. He hesitated before replying that the regulators were "aware of the issue."[57]

Mr. Clarkson's evasion was standard Moody's practice. The ABS and banking franchises maximized revenues by minimizing the respective capital implications for both deal and dealer that were party to a flip-clause-swap-contract. No Moody's financial analyst pro-actively measured issuers' derivative exposures, let alone tracked the walk-away provisions in master swaps with DPCs or the flip clause exposure to ABS deals.[58]

---

[57] WJH-Letter-Moody's-Madelain-10-26-2012, page 5.

[58] As example, "Moody's Announcement: March 29, 2007." "The rating does not address any payments that may be due to the Class Al Swap Counterparty upon the early termination of the Class Al Swap."

53. My managers in the US Derivatives Group set the example.[59] ***Firstly***, the Derivatives Group did *not* abide by Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework in ratings *cashflow* CDOs and *cashflow* CLOs from 2006 to 2013. Instead, managers allowed issuers to cherry pick the most lenient parameters from Moody's-2002-CDO-Framework and Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework. Accordingly, issuers such as Lancer Funding II, Ltd jerry rigged flip-clause-swap-contracts that required less capitalization than a contract that fully adhered to either the 2002 or the 2006 framework.[60]

Secondly, Moody's managers allowed issuers of *synthetic* ABS to use Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework in the first place. The 2006 framework excluded "synthetic transactions, such as credit default swaps and synthetic CDOs."[61]

(https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-rates-the-Class-V-Funding-III-Ltd-offering-from**--PR_126229.)

[59] Moody's Derivatives managers regularly helped Goldman Sachs Mitsui Marine Derivative Products misrepresent the outsize exposures being accumulated under flip-clause-swap-contracts. WJH-Letter-Moody's-Madelain-04-01-2013, pages 10-11 (HTML pages 25-26 in WJH-SEC-Comment-06-03-2013.) "Managers provided letters upon request from GSMMDP as a 'business accommodation' stating that the senior-most debt of CDO issuers that were counterparty to GSMMDP was rated Aaa."

[60] Emails of Moody's analysts, manager Yvonne Fu, and UBS banker, May 22-23, 2007, US Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, *"Wall Street and the Financial Crisis: Anatomy of A Financial Crisis,"* footnote 1084 and pages 0626-0629. (https://archive.org/stream/283228-sandp0112/283228-sandp0112_djvu.txt.)

[61] Moody's-2006-Hedge-Framework, footnote 2.

54. Moody's still ignores issuer exposure to derivative contracts, including from flip clauses and walkway provisions, in maintaining ***ALL*** ratings (e.g., ABS, corporate, financial, municipal, and sovereign.) Ditto DBRS, Fitch Ratings and S&P Global.[62]

55. Accordingly, I respectfully request permission to file the Proposed Brief.

Dated: New York, New York

June 25, 2019

By: /s/

William J. Harrington
51 5th Avenue, Apartment 16A
New York, New York 10003
(917) 680-1465
wjharrington@yahoo.com

[62] Harrington, Bill, "Moody's bets Germany will support Deutsche Bank derivatives above all else," *Debtwire ABS*, 12 October 2016. (https://www.debtwire.com/info/**moody**%E2%80%99s-**bets-germany-will-support-deutsche-bank-derivatives-above-all-else**-%E2%80%94-analysis.)

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE FORM 6
CERTIFICATE OF COMPL IANCE WITH TYPE- VOLUME LIMIT

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 3(g), the undersigned, who is "an unrepresented party," hereby certifies that, based on the word counting device used in my computer program:

1. This brief complies with type-volume limitation of Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2)(A) because this document contains 5,194 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f).

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because the brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2013 in 14-point font size, Times New Roman type style.

Dated: New York, New York
June 25, 2019

By: /s/

William J. Harrington
51 5th Avenue, Apartment 16A
New York, New York 10003
(917) 680-1465
wjharrington@yahoo.com

Appendix B

William J. Harrington
51 5Th Avenue
Apartment 16A
New York, NY 10003
917-680-1465
wjharrington@yahoo.com

August 8, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe
Clerk of Court
United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007

Re: *In re Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.*, No. 18-1079

Dear Ms. Wolfe:

I am a pro-se movant in the above-referenced matter and am providing a final contribution to it in this letter.

I am very proud that the Case docket properly memorializes my highly useful work of the last ten months. I am also very heartened for the sake of our Country that the Case docket will continue to memorialize my highly useful contributions in perpetuity.

Today's letter includes an edited version of the amicus curiae brief that I proposed on June 25, 2019 and re-proposed on July 15, 2019. Please see pages i and 1-55 herein. Capitalized terms and acronyms have the same respective meanings in these pages A-C as in the proposed amicus curiae brief.

The edits to the proposed amicus curiae brief improve its clarity but do not alter content. I finalized the edits on July 30, 2019 as part of the required preparation to file the brief in the hoped-for event that the Court would accept it. Disappointingly, the Court denied my second motion to file the brief on August 6, 2019.

To be very clear: I am ***not*** asking the Court to consider my brief for a third time. Similarly, I am ***not*** using my status as a pro se movant to introduce additional material to the Court docket.

To be just as clear: I ***am*** reminding the Court that the proposed amicus curiae brief has from the outset contained analyses of the Bankruptcy's Court findings and decision which indicate that defendant-appellee Natixis may be in violation of one or more provisions of the US swap margin rules (the Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule and the CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule,

respectively.) The potential violations pertain to the failure of Natixis to either: initiate daily, two-way exchange of variation margin with an amended Navient student loan ABS deal; or fully capitalize self-exposure under the associated flip-clause-swap-contract.

Please see Section V (***Don't Contort 219 Years of US Bankruptcy Law to Legitimize Crisis-Causing, Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract Craze of 2000-to-2007***), Subsection D (***Distinction with a Difference (and Unintended Consequence): Swap Agreement That Incorporates ABS Documents Activates Margin Posting***), pages 51-53.

Accordingly, I **am** copying staff of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the CFTC, Natixis, and Navient in this letter and delivering email.

Furthermore, the potential Natixis violation of US swap margin rules indicate that NRSRO credit rating agencies maintain inflated ratings of:

(1) Natixis;
(2) other swap dealers that are parties to flip-clause-swap-contracts with US issuers of ABS;
(3) ABS of US issuers that are party to a flip-clause-swap contract with Natixis; and
(4) all other ABS of US issuers that are parties to flip-clause-swap-contracts.

Accordingly, I **am** copying staff of the SEC Office of Credit Ratings and of the NRSROs DBRS, Fitch Ratings, Moody's, and S&P Global in this letter and delivering email.

Also, the NRSRO Moody's Investors Service is obligated to enforce the Compliance Commitments that it, along with parent Moody's Corporation and affiliate Moody's Analytics agreed to in the settlement with the US Department of Justice and the attorneys general of 21 states and of Washington, DC on January 13, 2017. Accordingly, I **have** delivered copies of this letter to the US Department of Justice contacts to whom the Moody's entities must report.

Finally, US Senator Joshua D. Hawley of Missouri was a signatory to the Moody's settlement in his former capacity as Attorney General of Missouri. Accordingly, I **am** copying Senator Hawley's Chief of Staff in this letter and delivering email.

Respectfully,

/s/William J. Harrington

William J. Harrington
Senior Fellow, Croatan Institute
Wikirating.org Experts Board — Structured Finance Topics

CC: Office of Inspector General, Federal Reserve Bank of New York
Office of Inspector General, US Commodity Futures Trading Commission

Press Relations, Natixis

Paul Hartwick, Vice President Communications, Navient

Jessica Kane, Director of Office of Credit Ratings, US Securities and Exchange Commission

Jon Riber, Senior Vice-President, DBRS

Mark Risi, Lead Analytical Manager, S&P Global

Kevin Duignan, Global Head of Financial Institutions, Fitch Ratings

Raymond McDaniel, Chief Operating Officer, Moody's Corporation

United State Attorney for the District of New Jersey, United States Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey,
970 Broad Street, 7th Floor Newark, NJ 07102

Director, Consumer Protection Branch, U.S. Department of Justice
450 5th Street NW Washington, DC 20530

Kyle Plotkin, Chief of Staff for US Senator Joshua D. Hawley

PROPOSED BRIEF V2.0

(WJH Clean-Up Edits of July 30, 2019)

D

18-1079-bk

IN THE

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

IN RE: LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.

Debtor.

LEHMAN BROTHERS SPECIAL FINANCING INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

(Caption continued on following pages)

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

AMICUS CURIAE WILLIAM J. HARRINGTON'S BRIEF

William J. Harrington
51 5th Avenue, Apartment 16A
New York, New York 10003
(917-680-1465)
wjharrington@yahoo.com

—v.—

BRANCH BANKING & TRUST COMPANY, BANK OF AMERICA N.A., U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, 801 GRAND CDO SERIES 2006-1 LLC, AS COISUER, 801 GRAND CDO SPC f/a/o THE SERIES, 2006-2, AS ISUER, 801 GRAND CDO SERIES 2006-2 LLC, AS COISUER, 801 GRAND CDO SPC f/a/o THE SERIES, 2006-1, AS ISSUER, ALTA CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES, 2007-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, ALTA CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES, 2007-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, ALTA CDO LLC, FOR SERIES 2007-1, AS CO ISSUER, ALTA CDO LLC, FOR SERIES 2007-2, AS COISSUER, BARTON SPRINGS CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2005-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, BARTON SPRINGS CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2005-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, BARTON SPRINGS CDO SERIES 2005-1 LLC, AS CO ISSUER, BARTON SPRINGS CDO SERIES 2005-2 LLC, AIG TAIWAN INSURANCE CO. LTD., AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP, INC., ANZ INVESTMENT BANK, ANZ NOMINEES LIMITED, ATLANTIC CENTRAL BANKERS BANK, BALMORAL AUSTRALIA PTY LTD., BANCO DE CREDITO DEL PERU, BASIS CAPITAL PTY LIMITED, BASIS PAC-RIM OPPORTUNITY FUND, BELMONT PARK INVESTMENTS PTY LTD, BIG HORN CDO 2007-1 COLLATERAL, BLUE MOUNTAINS CITY COUNCIL, BLUE POINT CDO SERIES 2005-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, BLUE POINT CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2005-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, BNY MELLON CORPORATE TRUSTEE SERVICES LTD., BRODERICK CDO 3, LTD., CARROLL 2 CC/CARROLL HOLDINGS COMPANY AND/OR THE HOLDERS OF AN ACCOUNT IN THAT NAME, CATHOLIC DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF BATHURST, CHERRY HILL CDO LLC FOR SERIES 2007-1, AS COISSUER, CHERRY HILL CDO LLC FOR SERIES 2007-2, AS COISSUER, CHERRY HILL CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, CHERRY HILL CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, CHEYNE CLO INVESTMENTS I LTD., CITICORP NOMINEES PTY LTD., CITIGROUP GLOBAL MARKETS INC., CITY OF ALBANY, CITY OF SWAN, CLASS V FUNDING III, CORP., CLASS V FUNDING III, LTD., CONTINENTAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF BRENTWOOD TENNESSEE, COPPER CREEK CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, COPPER CREEK CDO SPC, f/a/o SERIES 2007-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, COUNTRY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, CROWN CITY CDO 2005-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, CROWN CITY CDO 2005 2 LIMITED, AS ISSUER, CROWN CITY CDO 2005-2 LLC, AS COISSUER, DEUTSCHE BANK TRUST COMPANY AMERICAS, DIVERSEY

HARBOR ABS CDO, INC., DIVERSEY HARBOR ABS CDO, LTD., EASTERN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL COUNCIL, ELLIOTT INTERNATIONAL, L.P., EUROAMERICA ASESORIAS S.A., EUROCLEAR BANK SA/NV, FIRST NORTHERN BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, FREEDOM PARK CDO SERIES 2005-1 LIMITED, AS ISSUER, FULLERTON DRIVE CDO LIMITED, AS ISSUER, FULLERTON DRIVE CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, FULTON STREET CDO CORP., FREEDOM PARK CDO SERIES 2005-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, G & F YUKICH SUPERANNUATION PTY LTD, GARADEX INC., GATEX PROPERTIES INC., GENERAL SECURITY NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY, GENWORTH LIFE AND ANNUITY INSURANCE COMPANY, GEOMETRIC ASSET FUNDING LTD., GOLDMAN SACHS INTERNATIONAL, GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO. LLC, GOSFORD CITY COUNCIL, GREYSTONE CDO SERIES 2006-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, GREYSTONE CDO SERIES2006-2 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, GREYSTONE CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES2006-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, GREYSTONE CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2006-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, GUOHUA LIFE INSURANCE CO. LTD., HAVENROCK II LIMITED, HHE PARTNERSHIPLP, JEFFERSON VALLEYCDO SERIES 2006-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, JEFFERSON V ALLEY CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2006-1 SEGREGATED P ORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., JP MORGAN SECURITIES, PLC, KINGS RIVER LIMITED, AS ISSUER, KINGS RIVER LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, KLIO II FUNDING CORP., KLIO II FUNDING LTD., KLIO III FUNDING CORP., KLIO III F UNDING LTD., KMCL CARROLL AND/OR THE HOLDERS OF AN ACCOUNT IN THAT NAME, LAKEVIEW CDO LLC SERIES 2007-1, AS COISSUER, LAKEVIEW CDO LLC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS CO-ISSUER, LAKEVIEW CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-3 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, LAKEVIEW CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, LAKEVIEW CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-2 S EGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, LANCER FUNDING II LTD., LANCER FUNDING II, LLC, LEETON SHIRE COUNCIL, LEITHNER & COMPANY PTY LTD, LGT BANK IN LIECHTENSTEIN LTD., LIFEPLAN AUSTRALIA FRIENDLY SOCIETY LTD., LORELEY FINANCING (JERSEY) NO. 15 LIMITED, LOWER MURRAY WATER, LYNDOCH LIVING INC., MAGNETAR CONSTELLATION FUND II LTD., MAGNETAR CONSTELLATION MASTER FUND III LTD., MAGNETAR CONSTELLATION MASTER FUND LTD., MANLY COUNCIL, MARINER LDC, MARSH & MCLENNAN COMPANIES, INC., STOCK INVESTMENT PLAN, MARSH & MCLENNAN MASTER RETIREMENT TRUST, MBIA INC., MONEY GRAMS ECURITIES LLC, MORGAN STANLEY& CO. LLC,

MORGANS FINANCIAL LIMITED, MULBERRY STREET CDO, LTD., NATIONAL NOMINEES LIMITED, NATIONWIDE HYBRID MAND/NATIONWIDE SF HYBRID AND/OR THE HOLDERS OF AN ACCOUNT IN THAT NAME, NATIONWIDE SUPERANNUATION AND/OR THE HOLDERS OF AN ACCOUNT IN THAT NAME, NATIXIS FINANCIAL PRODUCTS LLC, NEWCASTLE CITY COUNCIL, OHIO PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM, OSDF, LTD., OVERSEAS PROPERTY INVESTMENT CORPORATION, PANORAMA RIDGE PTY LTD, PANTERA VIVE CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, PANTERA VIVE CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1, AS ISSUER, PARKES SHIRE COUNCIL, PCA LIFE ASSURANCE CO. LTD., PEBBLE CREEK LCDO 2007-2, LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, PEBBLE CREEK LCDO 2007-2, LTD., AS ISSUER, PENN'S LANDING CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, MODERN WOODMEN OF AMERICA, PENN'S LANDINGCDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, PHL VARIABLE INSURANCE COMPANY, PHOENIX LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, PINNACLE POINT FUNDING CORP., PINNACLE POINT FUNDING LTD., PUTNAM DYNAMIC ASSET ALLOCATION FUNDS-GROWTH PORTFOLIO, PUTNAM INTERMEDIATE DOMESTIC INVESTMENT GRADE TRUST, PUTNAM STABLE VALUE FUND, PYXIS ABS CDO 2007-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, PYXIS ABS CDO 2007-1 LTD., AS ISSUER, QUARTZ FINANCE PLC, SERIES 2004-1, RESTRUCTURED ASSET CERTIFICATES WITH ENHANCED RETURNS, SERIES 2005-21-C TRUST, RESTRUCTURED ASSET CERTIFICATES WITH ENHANCED RETURNS, SERIES 2006-1-C TRUST, RESTRUCTURED ASSET CERTIFICATES WITH ENHANCED RETURNS, SERIES 2007-4-C TRUST, RGA REINSURANCE CO., RUBYFINANCE PLC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2005-1, CLASS A2A9, AS ISSUER, SBSI, INC., SCOR REINSURANCE COMPANY, SECURITIZED PRODUCT OF RESTRUCTURED COLLATERAL LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 FEDERATION A-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SECURITIZED PRODUCT OF RESTRUCTURED COLLATERAL LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 FEDERATION A-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SECURITIZED PRODUCT OF RESTRUCTURED COLLATERAL LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 TABXSPOKE (07-140-100) SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, SECURITY BENEFIT LIFE INSURANCE CO., SENTINEL MANAGEMENT GROUP INC., SERIES 2007-1 TABXSPOKE (07-140-100) LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, SHENANDOAH LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, SHINHAN BANK, SMH CAPITAL ADVISORS, INC., SOLAR V CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, SOLARV CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2007-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL SOCIETY QUEENSLAND, STABFUND SUB CA AG, STANDARD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF INDIANA,

STANTON ABS I P.L.C., STARLING STRATEGIES LTD., STAT E STREET BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, STATE STREET GLOBAL ADVISORS, STATE STREET INTERNATIONAL IRELAND LIMITED, STICHTING SHELL PENSIOENFONDS, STOWE CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, STOWE CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2006-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, STOWE CDO SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2008-2-A SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, STRATEGIC GLOBAL (PUTNAM) MANAGED TRUST, STRUCTURED CREDIT OPPORTUNITIES FUND II, LP, SUNSET PARK CDO LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2004-1 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2004-2 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2004-4 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO LIMITED SPC, f/a/o THE SERIES 2005-5 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO SERIES 2005-5 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO SERIES 2005-6 LIMITED, AS ISSUER ,SUNSET PARK CDO SERIES 2005-6 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO-M LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, SUNSET PARK CDO-M LIMITED SPC f/a/o THE SERIES 2005-3 SEGREGATED PORTFOLIO, AS ISSUER, SUSQUEHANNA BANK, TAVARES SQUARE CDO LIMITED, TAVARES SQUARE CDO LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, TERWIN CAPITAL, LLC, BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, N.A., BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUST COMPANY, N.A., BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON, LONDON BRANCH, STOWE CDO SERIES 2006-1 LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, THE LIVERPOOL LIMITED PARTERNSHIP, THE WINTER GROUP, TIERRA ALTA FUNDING I LTD., TIERRA ALTA FUNDING I, CORP., TOPDANMARK EDB A/S, TRICADIA CREDIT STRATEGIES MASTER FUND, LTD., TRUSTEE U.S. BANK TRUST NATIONALASSOCIATION, UNICREDIT BANK AG, LONDON BRANCH, UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA PROPERTY TRUST (SA), VOX PLACE CDO LLC, VOX PLACE CDO LIMITED, WHITEHAWKCDO F UNDING, LLC, WHITEHAWK CDO FUNDING, LTD., ZAIS INVESTMENT GRADE LIMITED II, ZAIS INVESTMENT GRADE LIMITED V, GOLDMAN SACHS & CO., VALEO INVESTMENT GRADE CDO LTD., SUNSET PARK CDO-M LLC, AS CO-ISSUER, ZAIS INVESTMENT GRADE LIMITED X,

Defendants-Appellees,

CITIBANK, N.A., P RINCIPAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I, William J. Harrington, am a private US citizen. I self-finance research advocacy to eliminate the type of priority payment provisions at issue in this litigation (the ***flip clause***), to fix Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (***NRSRO***) credit ratings, and to improve the capitalization and regulation of asset-backed securities and other structured finance debt (***ABS***) and derivative contracts.

I do this work fulltime without compensation.[1]

I have no commercial relationship with any party to the above-captioned case or any affiliate of any such party.

I have no financial or commercial interest in the above-captioned case, its outcome, or any implication thereof.

I am not employed by, or consult on a paid basis for, any entity.

I ***am*** a Key Expert on Structured Finance Topics for the Experts Board of Wikirating.org — a worldwide, independent, transparent, and collaborative

[1] No person contributed money or help to produce this brief.

organization for credit ratings. The Swiss nonprofit Wikirating Association operates the Wikirating platform.

I ***am*** affiliated as senior fellow with Croatan Institute — an independent, nonprofit, tax exempt **501(c)**(3), research institute.[2]

I have no other professional affiliation.

[2] Wikirating and Croatan Institute both post my work. (https://wikirating.org/ and http://www.croataninstitute.org/william-j-harrington, respectively.) For citations and excerpts, Harrington, William J., "Submission to the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission Re: RIN 3038-AE85 'Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants' (In the Event of No-Deal Brexit)," May 31, 2019. (https://comments.cftc.gov/PublicComments/CommentList.aspx?id=2960.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases **Page(s)**

Statutes

Bills not Enacted into Law

Financial Regulations

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System,
Office of the Comptroller of the Currency,
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation,
Farm Credit Administration, and
Federal Housing Finance Agency
"Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities."
80 FR 74840. (November 30, 2015.).....29-36, 52-23
(https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2015-11-30/pdf/2015-28671.pdf)

US Commodity Futures Trading Commission.
"Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers
and Major Swap Participants." 81 FR 636. (January 6, 2016.)....29-35, 51-53
(https://www.cftc.gov/sites/default/files/idc/groups/public/@lrfederalregister/documents/file/2015-32320-1a.pdf)

US Securities and Exchange Commission.
"Capital, Margin, and Segregation Requirements for
Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based
Swap Participants and Capital and Segregation Requirements
for Broker-Dealers." *FR Publication Pending*. (June 21, 2019.).…….29-35
(https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2019/34-86175.pdf)

Other Authorities

Adelson, Mark and Robbin Conner. "SFIG Vegas 2017 Conference
Notes." (March 11, 2017.)…….23, 35
(http://www.markadelson.com/pubs/SFIG-Vegas-2017-Conference-Notes.pdf)

Collins, Sean F. "Rights, Duties and Obligations of Counter-Parties
Following Default Under Derivative Contracts."
Alberta Law Review 42:1 (2004): 153-166.
https://doi.org/10.29173/alr487.....54
(https://www.albertalawreview.com/index.php/ALR/article/view/487)

Croatan Institute. "People."……..8
(http://www.croataninstitute.org/people)

Durden, Tyler and Marla Singer. "Is Titlos PLC (Special Purpose Vehicle) the Downgrade Catalyst Trigger Which Will Destroy Greece?" *Zero Hedge*. (February 15, 2010.)……...38 (https://www.zerohedge.com/article/titlos-llc-special-purpose-vehicle-downgrade-catalyst-trigger-which-will-destroy-greece)

Federal Reserve Board. "Conference Call Between Staff of the Prudential Regulators (Farm Credit Administration, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Housing Finance Agency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency) and the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, William Harrington and Richard Michalek." *Announcement*. (May 12, 2015.).....32-33 (https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/rr-commpublic/harrington-michalek-call-20150512.pdf)

Fitch Ratings. "Fitch: No Rating Impact for 4 SF Deals with Bank of America Merrill Lynch Counterparty Exposure." *Announcement*. (March 12, 2015.).....47 (https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20150312006588/en/Fitch-Rating-Impact-4-SF-Deals-Bank)

Fleming, Michael J. and Asani Sarkar. "The Failure Resolution of Lehman Brothers." *FRBNY Economic Policy Review 185.* Pages 175-206. (December 2014.).....46 (https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/research/epr/2014/1412flem.pdf)

Gaillard, Norbert J. and William J. Harrington. "Efficient, commonsense actions to foster accurate credit ratings." *Capital Markets Law Journal* 11, No.1 (2016): 38-59. https://doi: 10.1093/cmlj/kmv……..22, 25, 45, 46 (https://academic.oup.com/cmlj/article-abstract/11/1/38/2366006?redirectedFrom=fulltext)

Giancarlo, J. Christopher and Bruce Tuckman. "Swaps Regulation Version 2.0." *CFTC White Paper*. (April 26, 2018.).....43 (https://www.cftc.gov/sites/default/files/2018-05/oce_chairman_swapregversion2whitepaper_042618.pdf)

Harrington, Bill. "Existing ABS swaps also caught in swap margin net." *Debtwire ABS*. (August 12, 2016.).....30 (https://www.debtwire.com/info/existing-abs-swaps-also-caught-swap-margin-net-%E2%80%94-analysis)

Harrington, Bill. "Moody's bets Germany will support Deutsche Bank derivatives above all else." *Debtwire ABS*. (12 October 2016.).....26-27 (https://www.debtwire.com/info/moody%E2%80%99s-bets-germany-will-support-deutsche-bank-derivatives-above-all-else-%E2%80%94-analysis)

Harrington, Bill. "Moody's DOJ Settlement Won't Stop Fake Rating Analysis & Derivatives Denial." *LinkedIn.com*. (January 14, 2017.)……..…..22 (https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/moodys-doj-settlement-wont-stop-fake-rating-analysis-bill-harrington)

Harrington, William J. "Can Green Bonds Flourish in a Complex-Finance Brownfield?" *Croatan Institute Working Paper*. (July 2018.)…..…..26, 38 (http://www.croataninstitute.org/publications/publication/can-green-bonds-flourish-in-a-complex-finance-brownfield)

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission Secretary Christopher Kirkpatrick Re: CFTC Letter No. 17-52, No-Action, 27 October 2017, Division of Swap Intermediary Oversight (Re: No-Action Position: Variation Margin Requirements Applicable to Swaps with Legacy Special Purpose Vehicles). (February 2, 2018.).....22, 36, 44 (http://www.wikirating.org/data/other/20180203_Harrington_J_William_31_Misrepresentations_in_CFTC%20_Letter_No_17-52.pdf)

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the US Securities and Exchange Commission. (February 2, 2014.)…..33-34 (https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-10/s70810-256.pdf)

Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the US Securities and Exchange Commission. (September 11, 2013.)…..54 (https://wikirating.org/data/other/20130911_Harrington_J_William_ABS_Losses_Attributable_to_Securitization_Swaps.pdf)

Harrington, William J. Submission to the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission Re: RIN 3038-AE85 "'Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants' (In the Event of No-Deal Brexit)." (May 31, 2019.).....8 (https://comments.cftc.gov/PublicComments/CommentList.aspx?id=2960)

Harrington, William J. Submission to the US Securities and Exchange Commission Re: File Number S7-18-11 "Comment on SEC Proposed Rules for Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations." (August 8, 2011.).....46 (https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-18-11/s71811-33.pdf)

Haunss, Kristen. "US CLO issuance sets new record with more than US$124 billion of volume." *Reuters*. (December 12, 2018.).....36 (https://www.reuters.com/article/clo-record/refile-us-clo-issuance-sets-new-record-with-more-than-us124bn-of-volume-idUSL1N1YH1S5)

Marchetti, Peter. "Amending the Flaws in the Safe Harbors of the Bankruptcy Code: Guarding Against Systemic Risk in the Financial Markets and Adding Stability to the System." *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal* 31, No. 2 (2015.)…….....53 (http://law.emory.edu/ebdj/content/volume-31/issue-2/articles/amending-flaws-safe-harbors-guarding-systemic-markets-stability.html#section-6f8b794f3246b0c1e1780bb4d4d5dc53)

Moody's Investors Service. "ACE Securities Corp. Home Equity Loan Trust, Series 2006-NC3." (April 14, 2010 and November 29, 2010.)……..…….....45 (https://www.moodys.com/credit-ratings/ACE-Securities-Corp-Home-Equity-Loan-Trust-Series-2006-NC3-credit-rating-715036579)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's Determines No Negative Rating Impact Due to Amendment to and New Guaranty for Swaps on Sorin Real Estate CDO III." *Announcement*. (April 3, 2012.).....47 (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-Determines-No-Negative-Rating-Impact-Due-to-Amendment-to--PR_241278)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's Determines No Negative Rating Impact Due to New Guaranty for Swap on Alesco Preferred

Funding V, Ltd.” *Announcement*. (December 14, 2011.) 47
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-Determines-No-Negative-Rating-Impact-Due-to-New-Guaranty--PR_233539)

Moody’s Investor Service. “Moody’s downgrades one class of notes in SLM Student Loan Trust 2003-7.” *Announcement*. (January 15, 2019.).....52
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-downgrades-one-class-of-notes-in-SLM-Student-Loan--PR_393791)

Moody’s Investors Service. “Moody's downgrades the ratings of two classes of Notes issued by Ballyrock ABS CDO 2007-1 Limited, an ABS CDO.” *Announcement*. (March 4, 2010.).....44
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-downgrades-the-ratings-of-two-classes-of-Notes-issued--PR_195797)

Moody’s Investors Service. “Moody's downgrades SF CDO notes issued by Cheyne CLO Investments I.” *Announcement*. (August 11, 2009.).....44
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-downgrades-SF-CDO-notes-issued-by-Cheyne-CLO-Investments--PR_184715)

Moody’s Investors Service. “Moody's: No Negative Rating impact on 11 SF CDOs following Swap Counterparty's Rating Downgrade.” *Announcement*. (July 20, 2012.).....47
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-No-Negative-Rating-impact-on-11-SF-CDOs-following--PR_251415)

Moody’s Investors Service. “Moody's reviews for downgrade three classes of notes from two SLM student loan ABS securitizations.” *Announcement*. (March 28, 2018.)…….....52
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-reviews-for-downgrade-three-classes-of-notes-from-two--PR_381201)

Moody’s Investors Service. “Moody's takes action on 37 swaps in thirty one RMBS transactions issued between 2006 and 2007.” *Announcement*. (October 17, 2011.).....45
(https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-takes-action-on-37-swaps-in-thirty-one-RMBS--PR_228507)

Moody’s Investors Service. “Moody’s upgrades six tranches in four Navient FFELP securitizations.” *Announcement*.

(October 20, 2017.).....37 (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-upgrades-six-tranches-in-four-Navient-FFELP-securitizations--PR_374267)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's upgrades three classes of notes in SLM Student Loan Trust 2005-9." *Announcement*. (February 2, 2018.).....37 (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-upgrades-three-classes-of-notes-in-SLM-Student-Loan--PR_378819)

Moody's Investors Service. "Moody's upgrades two classes of notes in SLM Student Loan Trust 2006-4." *Announcement*. (February 23, 2018.).....37 (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-upgrades-two-classes-of-notes-in-SLM-Student-Loan--PR_379894)

Moody's Investors Service. "No rating impact on PELICAN MORTGAGES No. 3 following the Royal Bank of Scotland plc's downgrade." *Announcement*. (May 1, 2018.).....34 (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-No-Rating-impact-on-PELICAN-MORTGAGES-NO-3-following--PR_383075)

Pauley, Justin and Dave Preston. "Wachovia CDO Research presents our summary of CDO Default Statistics." *Wachovia Structured Product Research*. (December 31, 2007.)……..……27-28 (available on request.)

S&P Global Ratings. "Special-Purpose Vehicle Margin Requirements for Swaps--Methodologies and Assumptions." *Criteria*. (October 7, 2017.)……..……...29 (https://www.standardandpoors.com/ja_JP/delegate/getPDF;jsessionid=21CC87997D0D3192366EE23481A9C4D1?articleId=1930885&type=COMMENTS&subType=CRITERIA)

Shearman and Sterling. "First Major Dodd-Frank Reform Bill Signed Into Law." *Perspectives*. (May 25, 2018.)……...42 (https://www.shearman.com/perspectives/2018/05/first-major-dodd-frank-reform-bill.)

Smith, Corinne. "Counterparty conundrums: Issuers, investors adapting to swap dilemmas." *Structured Credit Investor*.

(2 August 2013.).....33-34
(https://www.structuredcreditinvestor.com/
and, by publisher permission, in
Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the US
Securities and Exchange Commission. (February 2, 2014.)
Pages 17-19.
https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-10/s70810-256.pdf)

Structured Finance Industry Group. "Amicus Curiae Structured Finance
Industry Group's Brief in Support of Defendants-Appellees
and Affirmance."
United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Case No-18-1079. (November 1, 2018.)……..23

Structured Finance Industry Group. "Motion for Structured Finance
Industry Group for Leave to File Amicus Brief."
United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Case No-18-1079. (November 1, 2018.)…….22-23

Structured Finance Industry Group. "Reply Brief in Support of Motion
for Structured Finance Industry Group for Leave to File
Amicus Brief." *United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.*
Case No-18-1079. (November 20, 2018.)……..23

Tempkin, Adam. "Here's Why the Japanese Bid for CLOs Isn't Likely
to Slow Soon." *Bloomberg Markets*. (April 2, 2019.)…..……..……..38
(https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-04-02/here-s-why-the-
japanese-bid-for-clos-isn-t-likely-to-slow-soon)

Timsit, Annabelle. "The euro-zone economy is back on familiar
ground—slow, grinding growth." *Quartz*. (February 7, 2019.).....38
(https://qz.com/1544961/the-euro-zone-economy-is-back-on-familiar-
ground-slow-grinding-growth/)

US Commodity Futures Trading Commission. "External Meetings:
Conference Call with Mr. William Harrington
and Mr. Rick Michalek." (May 12, 2015.)……..……..……33
(https://www.cftc.gov/node/157371)

US Department of Justice. "Justice Department and State Partners
Secure Nearly $864 Million Settlement with Moody's

Arising from Conduct in the Lead up to the Financial Crisis." *Announcement*. (January 13, 2017.)…….....26 (https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-and-state-partners-secure-nearly-864-million-settlement-moody-s-arising)

US Department of the Treasury. "A Financial System That Creates Economic Opportunities—Capital Markets, Report to President Donald J. Trump, Executive Order 13772 on Core Principles for Regulating the United States Financial System." (October 2017.)…….....25 (https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Documents/A-Financial-System-Capital-Markets-FINAL-FINAL.pdf)

US Securities and Exchange Commission. "Citigroup to Pay $285 Million to Settle SEC Charges for Misleading Investors About CDO Tied to Housing Market." *Announcement*. (October 19, 2011.).....27 (https://www.sec.gov/news/press/2011/2011-214.htm)

US Securities and Exchange Commission. "Paul A. Gumagay, Office of Commissioner Louis A. Aguilar, Teleconference with William J. Harrington." *Memorandum*. (June 30, 2014.)…….....47 (https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-10/s70810-304.pdf)

US Securities and Exchange Commission. "SEC Charges Moody's With Internal Controls Failures and Rating Symbols Deficiencies." *Announcement*. (August 28, 2018).....26, 36 (https://www.sec.gov/news/press-release/2018-169)

Wikirating……..8 (https://wikirating.org/)

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

I, William J. Harrington, investigate the capitalization and regulation of complex finance, publicly report findings, and disseminate them widely. My aim is to boost the sustainability of our financial system by improving price-making, reducing the likelihood of bailouts, and eliminating the flip clause.

The flip clause is the global ABS sector's:

1. best practice;
2. black hole;
3. Escher-staircase-to-nowhere;
4. foundation;
5. nifty lawyering;
6. original sin; and
7. quicksand.

Parties that refer to a flip clause in making payments under a swap contract (***flip-clause-swap-contract***) knowingly drafted it to fail. The plaintiff-appellant, defendants-appellees, and other ***crisis-causing entities*** routinely embedded ABS deals with flip-clause-swap-contracts, thereby wrecking our economy and undermining our Country.

Our Country, including the Court, needs disinterested, rigorous, and timely analyses of the crisis-causing flip-clause-swap-contract. I am the only person, human or corporate, who provides such analyses. No one else even tracks flip-clause-swap-contracts, whereas I have done so continuously since 1999.

No issuer establishes that a flip-clause-swap-contract protects ABS investors one tenth as effectively as a swap contract with daily, two-way exchange of variation margin.

No swap dealer such as defendant-appellee Natixis demonstrates that it robustly capitalizes the outsized exposure to its own credit profile in (fortunately, for our Country) shriveling portfolios of legacy flip-clause-swap-contracts. Nor does a swap dealer validate flip-clause-swap-contract capitalization against that of swap contracts that do not incorporate flip clauses.

No law firm produces an ironclad template for an enforceable flip-clause-swap-contract.

No auditor produces a protocol for valuing ABS of issuers that, respectively, are and are not parties to a flip-clause-swap-contract.

No NRSRO publishes a cogent flip-clause-swap-contract methodology or apportions the zero-sum exposures of a flip clause to the respective ABS and swap dealer ratings.[3]

No academician documents the extent to which flip-clause-swap-contracts and walkaway provisions stripped assets from the Lehman Brothers estate immediately after the bankruptcy filing.

Lastly, no industry group discusses the flip-clause-swap-contract without lying, parroting irrelevancies, or presenting "market information" that is alarmist, fatuous, and outdated.[4]

---

[3] Gaillard, Norbert J. and William J. Harrington, "Efficient, commonsense actions to foster accurate credit ratings," *Capital Markets Law Journal* 11, No.1 (2016): 38-59. https://doi: 10.1093/cmlj/kmv064. Pages 38, 41-44, and 54-59. (https://academic.oup.com/cmlj/article-abstract/11/1/38/2366006?redirectedFrom=fulltext.) Also, Harrington, Bill, "Moody's DOJ Settlement Won't Stop Fake Rating Analysis & Derivatives Denial," *LinkedIn.com*, January 14, 2017. "**The 800-page gorilla – rating methodologies are protected speech.**" (https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/moodys-doj-settlement-wont-stop-fake-rating-analysis-bill-harrington.)

[4] Harrington, William J. Electronic Letter to the CFTC "Re: Letter No. 17-52, No-Action," February 2, 2018 (***WJH-Corrections-to-CFTC-Letter-No-17-52***), pages 4, 5, 15, 23-26, 68, 94-110, and 114-116. (https://www.wikirating.org/data/other/20180203_**Harrington_J_William_31_Misrepresentations_in_CFTC**%20_**Letter_No_17-52**.pdf.) Structured Finance Industry Group **(*SFIG*), "Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief Re: Case 18-1079**," November 1, 2018. Page 1: "[T]he priority payment provisions . . . are central to the functioning of the securitization and swap markets." Page 2: "[T]his Court's decision will affect hundreds, if not thousands of derivatives transactions . . . at the heart

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

US Congress, markets, and regulators have consigned the flip-clause-swap-contract to the garbage heap of history. There, the contract rots away with aerosol sprays, trans-fats, asbestos tiles, and other toxic synthetics that poisoned users, producers, and our Country.[5]

---

of the structured finance industry." **"Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief Re: Case 18-1079**," November 20, 2018. Page 5: "[T]his Court's decision may affect the broader securitization industry, which accounts for trillions of dollars of transactions." **"Amicus Curiae SFIG's Brief in Support of Defendants-Appellees and Affirmance Re: Case 18-1079**," November 1, 2018. Page 1: Flip clause issues "are critical to the efficient functioning of securitization and swap markets." Page 10: "[A] CDO transaction, which has at its heart a swap transaction." Page 11: "[W]hen entering into CDO transactions, market participants . . . rightly expect that the swap agreement . . . (2nd Cir. 1998)." Page 15: A "narrow reading . . . would throw into doubt the viability of thousands of structured finance transactions . . . posing a systemic risk to the securitization markets." Pages 18-19: "[E]vents such as the UK Brexit vote . . . or the S&P downgrade of the US . . . resulted in substantial currency movements." Page 24: "Such provisions . . . facilitate liquidity in structured finance markets." Page 24: "[M]arket participants may become unwilling to participate in the structured finance market altogether. Striking the Priority Provisions would unravel thousands of transactions . . . and thereby undermine the stable operation of the structured finance markets, potentially triggering far broader repercussions to the economy . . . (2010)." Page 30: "[I]f the Bankruptcy Code were construed to invalidate ipso facto clauses . . . the impact on derivatives markets would be significant."

[5] "The good news is that embedded swaps are less prevalent in U.S. deals." Adelson, Mark and Robbin Conner, "SFIG Vegas 2017 Conference Notes," March 11, 2017, (***Adelson-Conner-SFIG-2017***), page 20. (http://www.markadelson.com/pubs/SFIG-Vegas-2017-Conference-Notes.pdf.)

ARGUMENT

I. 2010: Congress Clearly Stated Its Intent to Fix ABS in Multiple Sections of the Dodd-Frank Act.

A. Financial Regulators *WILL* Impose Rigorous Margin Requirements on *ALL* Uncleared Swap Contracts (Sections 731 and 764).

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (***Dodd-Frank Act***) unequivocally directs seven financial regulators to adopt capital and margin rules for dealers of swap contracts.[6] Collectively, the regulators' rules must impose "capital requirements" and "initial and variation margin requirements on all swaps" and "all security-based swaps that are not cleared by a registered derivatives clearing organization." See Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. No. 111-203, § 731(e)(2), 124 Stat. 1704-5 and § 764 (e)(2), 124 Stat. 1786-87.[7]

Note the ***all*** in "***all*** swaps" and "***all*** security-based swaps." Congress expressed its clear and unambiguous intent in enacting § 731 and § 764. ***All*** regulators would formulate rigorous margin rules that would encompass ***all*** swap

---

[6] The seven regulators, respectively: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board System (***Federal Reserve***); Farm Credit Administration; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (***FDIC***), Federal Housing Finance Agency (***FHFA***), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (***OCC***, and, the five regulators collectively, the ***prudential regulators***); US Commodity Futures Trading Commission (***CFTC***); and US Securities and Exchange Commission (**SEC**).

[7] (https://www.congress.gov/111/plaws/publ203/PLAW-111publ203.pdf.)

contracts, ***no exceptions!*** To ensure CFTC and SEC compliance, Congress curbed the agencies' "exemptive authority with respect to the swaps requirements of Dodd-Frank."[8]

B. NRSROs *WILL* Maintain Accurate Credit Ratings (Title IX, Subtitle C—Improvements to the Regulation of Credit Rating Agencies).

Congress plainly and clearly intended to end the ubiquitous NRSRO practice of inflating ABS credit ratings. See Dodd-Frank Act, Title IX, Subtitle C—Improvements to the Regulation of Credit Rating Agencies, 124 Stat. 1872-1890.[9]

The Congressional Finding on inflated ABS ratings and global chaos:

> The "ratings on structured financial products have proven to be inaccurate. This inaccuracy contributed significantly to the mismanagement of risks by financial institutions and investors, which

---

[8] US Department of the Treasury, "A Financial System That Creates Economic Opportunities—Capital Markets, Report to President Donald J. Trump, Executive Order 13772 on Core Principles for Regulating the United States Financial System," October 2017, page 179. "Dodd-Frank amended CEA Section 4(c)(1) and Exchange Act Section 36(c) to limit the agencies' ability to exempt many of the activities covered under Title VII. Limitations on the exemptive authority with respect to the swaps requirements of Dodd-Frank was perhaps a measure to ensure that the agencies, while writing rules and implementing the new regulatory framework, did not unduly grant exemptions." (**https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Documents/A-Financial-System-Capital-Markets-FINAL-FINAL**.pdf.)

[9] Gaillard and Harrington, pages 46-48 describe Subtitle C provisions and SEC rule-making and exemption-issuing.

> in turn adversely impacted the health of the economy in the United States and around the world."

(Dodd-Frank Act, § 931, 124 Stat. 1872.)

Moody's corroborated the Congressional Finding when it settled with the US Department of Justice and the attorneys general of 21 states and Washington, D.C. on January 13, 2017. In the Statement of Facts, Moody's acknowledged having compromised pre-crisis ratings of collateralized debt obligations (***CDOs***) and residential-mortgage-backed securities (***RMBS***).[10]

Unfortunately for our country, the SEC has nullified a core provision — Dodd-Frank Section 939G, which imposed expert liability on NRSROs — since July 2010.[11] As a result, NRSROs continue to maintain wildly inflated ratings on ABS and on swap dealers that are party to a flip-clause-swap-contract.[12]

---

[10] US Department of Justice, "Justice Department and State Partners Secure Nearly $864 Million Settlement with Moody's Arising from Conduct in the Lead up to the Financial Crisis," *Announcement*, January 13, 2017. (https://www.**justice.gov**/opa/pr/j**ustice-department-and-state-partners-secure-nearly-864-million-settlement-moody-s-arising**.)

[11] Harrington, William J., "Can Green Bonds Flourish in a Complex-Finance Brownfield?", *Croatan Institute Working Paper*, July 2018, (***Harrington-Croatan-Institute-Working-Paper-2018***), pages 9-12. (http://www.croataninstitute.org/publications/publication/can-green-bonds-flourish-in-a-complex-finance-brownfield.)

[12] "SEC Charges Moody's With Internal Control Failures and Ratings Symbols Deficiencies," *Announcement*, August 28, 2018 (***SEC-Charges-Moody's-Re-675-RMBS&CLO-Rating-Errors-2018***). (https://www.**sec.gov**/news/press-release/2018-169.) Also, Harrington, Bill, "Moody's bets Germany will support Deutsche Bank derivatives above all

C. Issuers *WILL* Capitalize ABS as Advertised (Title IX, Subtitle D—Improvements to the Asset-Backed Securitization Process).

Congress plainly and clearly intended to end pre-crisis practices for assembling ABS. See the Dodd-Frank Act, Title IX, Subtitle D—Improvements to the Asset-Backed Securitization Process, 124 Stat. 1890-1898.

Congress could hardly have done otherwise, given that pre-crisis issuers were so adept at structuring blatantly undercapitalized ABS.[13] Many CDOs, including Big Horn Structured Funding CDO 2007-1, Broderick CDO III, Class V Funding III, and Lancer Funding II, incurred an event of default within a year of issuance.

Entering into a flip-clause-swap-contract was a main way that ABS issuers undercapitalized deals. The CDO of ABS model — buy ABS from issuers that likewise enter into flip-clause-swap-contracts — leveraged the undercapitalization game exponentially.[14]

---

else," *Debtwire ABS*, 12 October 2016. (https://www.**debtwire.com**/info/**moody**%E2%80%99s-**bets-germany-will-support-deutsche-bank-derivatives-above-all-else**-%E2%80%94-analysis.)

[13] SEC, "Citigroup to Pay $285 Million to Settle SEC Charges for Misleading Investors about CDO Tied to Housing Market," *Announcement*, October 19, 2011. (https://www.**sec.gov**/news/press/2011/2011-214.htm.)

[14] Pauley, Justin and Dave Preston, "Wachovia CDO Research presents our summary of CDO Default Statistics," *Wachovia Structured Product Research*, December 31, 2008. "283 ABS CDOs [including nine that defendants-appellees issued] with a total aggregate issuance amount of

D. Walkaway Clauses Are *NOT* Enforceable Against FDIC or FHFA (Section 210).

"[N]o walkway clause shall be enforceable in a qualified financial contract of a covered financial company in default." (Dodd-Frank Act, § 210, 124 Stat. 1488.) ***The flip clause is a type of walkaway clause.***

> "WALKAWAY CLAUSE DEFINED . . . any provision in a qualified financial contract that suspends, conditions, or extinguishes a payment obligation of a party, in whole or in part, or does not create a payment obligation of a party that would otherwise exist, solely because of the status of such party as a nondefaulting party in connection with the insolvency of a covered financial company that is a party to the contract or the appointment of or the exercise of rights or powers by the Corporation as receiver for such covered financial company."

(Dodd-Frank Act, § 210, 124 Stat. 1488.)

Congress was crystal clear in enacting § 210(c)(6)(F) ***Walkaway Clauses Not Effective***. A counterparty cannot exercise an option to "walkaway" from a "covered financial company" such as a government-sponsored entity (***GSE***) or insured depository institution when the company is in FDIC or FHFA receivership or conservatorship. ***In short, counterparties beware! An entity with a taxpayer backstop cannot barter it away via a walkaway clause.***

The non-enforceability of walkaway clauses advances the dual purposes of receivership / conservatorship — namely, preserving the assets of a

---

> $295 billion . . . tripped their EOD triggers between October 2007 and Dec. 31, 2008.

covered financial company in default and limiting taxpayer losses. If walkaway clauses *were* enforceable, counterparties would immediately and simultaneously activate them and strip an already defaulted company of still more assets.

II. 2015 and 2019: Regulators Intentionally Kill the Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract in Implementing Dodd-Frank Mandate to Fix ABS.

A. Prudential Regulators, CFTC, and SEC Specify Daily, Two-Way Exchange of Variation Margin for Flip-Clause-Swap-Contracts.

> "Under regulatory margin requirements . . . subordination provisions may no longer be available to the SPV . . . The liquidity impact of the termination payment, if owed by the SPV to the counterparty upon termination of the swap, is mitigated by the posting of collateral by the SPV up to the termination date."[15]

In 2015, the prudential regulators and the CFTC implemented the clear Congressional intent for "initial and variation margin requirements," citing Dodd-Frank § 731 as impetus. In 2019, the SEC followed suit. The prudential regulators jointly adopted a capital and margin rule in October 2015.[16] The CFTC

---

[15] S&P Global Ratings, "Special-Purpose Vehicle Margin Requirements for Swaps-Methodologies and Assumptions," *Criteria*, October 7, 2017, paragraphs 34-35. (https://www.**standardandpoors**.com/ja_JP/delegate/getPDF;jsessionid=21CC87997D0D3192366EE23481A9C4D1?articleId=1930885&type=COMMENTS&subType=**CRITERIA**.)

[16] Prudential Regulators, "Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities," 80 FR 74840, November 30, 2015 (***Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule***). (https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2015-11-30/pdf/2015-28671.pdf.)

adopted a margin rule in December 2015.[17] The SEC adopted a capital and margin rule on June 21, 2019.[18]

The three rules obligate a dealer to include daily, two-way exchange of variation margin in a new swap contract with a "financial end user."[19]

> "Because financial counterparties are more likely to default during a period of financial stress, they pose greater systemic risk and risk to the safety and soundness of the covered swap entity."[20]

The three rules each reiterate that "financial end user" includes ABS issuers and that industry lobbying for an exemption was rejected.[21]

---

[17] CFTC. "Margin Requirements for Uncleared Swaps for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants," 81 FR 636, January 6, 2016 (***CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule***.) (https://www.cftc.gov/sites/default/files/idc/groups/public/@lrfederalregister/documents/file/2015-32320-1a.pdf.)

[18] SEC, "Capital, Margin, and Segregation Requirements for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants and Capital and Segregation Requirements for Broker-Dealers," *FR Publication Pending*, June 21, 2019 (***SEC-Swap-Margin-Rule***.) (https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2019/34-86175.pdf.)

[19] Under the Prudential-Regulator-Swap-Rule and the CFTC-Swap-Margin Rule, a "new" swap is one entered into or amended starting March 1, 2017. Harrington, Bill, "Existing ABS swaps also caught in swap margin net. *Debtwire ABS*. (August 12, 2016.) (https://www.**debtwire**.com/info/**existing-abs-swaps-also-caught-swap-margin-net**-%E2%80%94-analysis.)

[20] Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74853.

[21] For example, SEC-Swap-Margin-Rule, pages 204-205.

"The list also includes . . . securitization entities."[22]

"[S]tructured finance vehicles . . . are financial end users for purposes of the final rule."[23]

"The [Agencies / Commission] have not modified the definition of financial end user to exclude" structured finance vehicles.[24]

"The Commission is not excluding, as commenters urged . . . structured finance vehicles."[25]

> "[C]ommenters also requested that the [Agencies / Commission] exclude from the financial end user definition structured finance vehicles, including securitization" vehicles."[26]
>
> "[C]ommenters argued that covered swap entities . . . that enter a swap may be protected by other means—e.g., a security interest granted in the assets of a securitization SPV."[27]
>
> "These commenters urged the [Commission / Agencies] to follow . . . proposed European rules under which securitization vehicles would be

---

[22] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 640 and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74853.

[23] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 643 and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74856.

[24] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 643 and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74857.

[25] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 683.

[26] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 640 and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74856.

[27] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 640. **NB, *the facts in this Case obliterate the argument that the "security interest granted in the assets of a securitization" protects a dealer. A "security interest" in an asset that a flip clause has instantaneously reduced to $0.00 is meaningless.***

defined as non-financial entities and . . . not be required to exchange initial or variation margin."[28]

B. Former Moody's Derivatives Analysts Crack ABS Hall-of-Mirrors.

1. Two-Way Exchange of Variation Margin "*Defuses*" Flip Clause.

On May 12, 2015, a former Moody's colleague who practices US law and I led an hour teleconference on ABS and the flip-clause-swap-contract with the six respective prudential regulator and CFTC teams that were writing swap margin rules.

"Mr. Harrington and Mr. Michalek expressed approval of the proposal's inclusion of ABS issuers as financial end-users and asserted that ABS issuers in all sectors should post full margin against their swap contracts" and with "the Agencies also discussed potential sources of systemic instability from ABS issuances and discussed whether margin requirements for ABS issuers would mitigate systemic risk."[29]

"Commenters argue against an exemption from margin requirements for issuers of ABS. Commenters believe ABS issuers current practice

---

[28] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 640 and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74857.

[29] Federal Reserve, "Conference Call Between Staff of the Prudential Regulators and the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, William Harrington and Richard Michalek," *Announcement*, May 12, 2015 (***Former-Moodys-Derivatives-Analysts-Flip-Clause-Presentation-to-Prudential-Regulators-and-CFTC-2015***), Cover. (https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/rr-commpublic/harrington-michalek-call-20150512.pdf.)

> for dealing with counterparty credit risk is inadequate by construction and presents a systemic risk."[30]

The CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule memorialized the argument that my colleague and I successfully made.

> Commenters argued that obligating "ABS issuers to post full margin against all swap contracts would defuse commonly used 'flip clauses' and decrease the loss exposure of investors in ABS."[31]

Likewise, the SEC-Swap-Margin Rule also memorialized the argument that my colleague and I made. "A commenter specifically opposed exceptions for asset-backed security issuers."[32]

The daily, two-way exchange of variation margin ***"defuses"*** the flip clause by enabling both a swap dealer and an ABS issuer to terminate a swap contract without referencing the deal's priorities of payments. Moreover, the reason for termination becomes largely irrelevant because the party that is owed payment will hold collateral with market value that is at least equal to the previous day's swap valuation.[33] Crucially, both parties will have agreed all prior daily valuations since

---

[30] CFTC, "External Meetings: Conference Call with Mr. William Harrington and Mr. Rick Michalek," May 12, 2015. (https://www.cftc.gov/node/157371.)

[31] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 640. Also, Former-Moodys-Derivatives-Analysts-Flip-Clause-Presentation-to-Prudential-Regulators-and-CFTC-2015, page 7 (HTML page 8.)

[32] SEC-Swap-Margin-Rule, page 204, footnote 569.

[33] As an additional boon for financial stability, the daily, two-way exchange of variation margin also prevents a swap dealer from unilaterally depriving a

having entered the swap, i.e., they will have established a track record of mutually accepting both the termination valuation and the means of monetizing it.

2. ABS are *Non-Eligible Collateral*, Partly Because of the Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract.

"ABS issuers should not be permitted to post ABS as Margin."[34]

The Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule and the CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule are more stringent than my colleague and I proposed. Both rules assign ***zero*** credit to private-label ABS and other non-eligible collateral in ***all*** instances.[35]

> The "final rule generally does not include ABS, including mortgage-backed securities, within the permissible category of publicly traded debt securities."[36]

---

deal of collateral simply by paying an NRSRO to issue a no-downgrade letter. Smith, Corinne, "Counterparty conundrums: Issuers and investors adapting to swap dilemmas." *Structured Credit Investor*, April 13, 2013. (https://www.structuredcreditinvestor.com/ and, by permission, in Harrington, William J., "Electronic Letter to US Securities and Exchange Commission," February 2, 2014, pages 17-19, https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-08-10/s70810-256.pdf.) In 177 instances, a dealer "successfully petitioned Moody's to be allowed to amend an existing derivative contract with an ABS transaction so as to avoid posting collateral." Also, Moody's Announcement, May 1, 2018 (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-No-Rating-impact-on-PELICAN-MORTGAGES-NO-3-following**--PR_383075.) "RBS will not take further action following the trigger breach, which constitutes 'other action' as remedial action under the swap documentation."

[34] Former-Moodys-Derivatives-Analysts-Flip-Clause-Presentation-to-Prudential-Regulators-and-CFTC-2015, Cover.

[35] Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74872.

[36] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 666 and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74871.

The only eligible ABS collateral is that issued or fully guaranteed by the US government or certain GSEs, i.e., entities that do not enter into flip-clause-swap-contracts. [37]

The proposal by my former colleague and me also induced the SEC to institute a "ready market" test for complex finance debt posted as collateral.

> A "commenter recommended that the Commission [SEC] apply a 100% haircut to a structured product, asset-backed security, re-packaged note, combination security, and any other complex instrument. In response, the final margin rule requires margin collateral to have a ready market. This is designed to exclude collateral that cannot be promptly liquidated.[38]

III. US Issuers Shunned the Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract After 2008; Quit Cold Turkey in 2016; Issued Record Amounts in 2018!

"The good news is that embedded swaps are less prevalent in U.S. deals than . . . in European deals."[39]

Actually, the news is great! No US issuer of ABS has entered into any swap contract, neither one with daily, two-way exchange of variation margin nor a flip-clause-swap-contract, since January 2016. Nor is any US ABS issuer likely to

---

[37] Ibid. Also, CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 701-702 §23.156 Forms of margin, and Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule, 80 FR, 74870-2.

[38] SEC-Swap-Margin-Rule, page 175-176, including footnotes 463 and 464.

[39] Adelson-Conner-SFIG-2017, page 20.

enter into a swap in the foreseeable future, given that none has made the "significant structural change . . . to post and collect variation margin."[40]

The result? The ABS sector is thriving![41]

With respect to legacy US ABS deals, only 54 deals *with investment grade debt* are party to a flip-clause-swap-contract.[42] Moreover, a single company, the student loan company Navient, sponsors 34 of the 54 legacy deals. To the extent additional US deals are parties to a contract, they are most likely *pre-crisis, zombie* CDO and RMBS deals with debt that incurred downgrades to "C" or lower years ago.[43]

All 54 legacy deals with investment grade debt and a flip-clause-swap-contract are "private-label." ***GSEs that issue ABS such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac don't use the flip-clause-swap-contract.***

---

[40] CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule, 81 FR, No. 3, 640.

[41] Haunss, Kristen, "US CLO issuance sets new record with more than US$124 billion of volume," *Reuters*, December 12, 2018. (https://www.**reuters**.com/article/clo-record/refile-**us-clo-issuance-sets-new-record-with-more-than-us124bn-of-volume**-idUSL1N1YH1S5.)

[42] WJH-Corrections-to-CFTC-Letter-No-17-52, pages 2-4. At least six of the 60 deals have terminated or run-off the respective flip-clause-swap-contracts.

[43] For example, the 650 RMBS deals with USD 49 BN par cited in SEC-Charges-Moody's-Re-675-RMBS&CLO-Rating-Errors-2018.

Thirty-two of the 54 legacy deals closed in 2003–2008. Only 22 deals, including 14 Navient-sponsored deals, closed in January 2010–January 2016. Each of the 14 Navient-sponsored deals has a flip-clause-swap contract that is denominated in US dollars.

Of the remaining 20 Navient-sponsored deals that closed in 2003–2008, some have contracts that exchange US dollars for euros. ***Apart from Navient predecessor Sallie Mae, few sponsors used contracts that referenced currencies because they are exceptionally volatile.*** Since 2017, even Navient has gone to great lengths to retire currency contracts and liabilities. For three deals, the company simultaneously terminated the currency contract, called the euro-denominated tranche, and issued a US dollar tranche without a swap contract.[44]

Many US issuers of collateralized loan obligations (***CLOs***) ***do*** place a flip clause in the priority of payments ***without*** providing the capital, legal, and operational resources for the respective deals to exchange variation margin daily, i.e., to comply with the US swap margin rules. To-date, the CLOs have not entered

[44] Moody's Announcements: October 20, 2017; February 2, 2018; and February 23, 2018. (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-upgrades-six-tranches-in-four-Navient-FFELP-securitizations**--PR_374267.) (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-upgrades-three-classes-of-notes-in-SLM-Student-Loan**--PR_378819.) (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-upgrades-two-classes-of-notes-in-SLM-Student-Loan--PR**_379894.)

swap contracts.[45] Instead, CLO investors such as Japanese banks mitigate exposures themselves.[46]

In short, US markets have consigned the flip-clause-swap-contract to the garbage heap of history. There, the contract rots away with aerosol sprays, trans-fats, asbestos tiles, and other harmful synthetics that poisoned users, producers, and our Country.

The flip-clause-swap-contract was central to the EU financial crisis.[47] Even so, EU issuers of RMBS and other ABS use the flip-clause-swap-contact under policy that the US has prudently rejected.[48] As evidence, the US economy habitually outperforms the EU.[49] Also, our social compact rejects bailing out financial companies again, whereas the EU tolerates public support for private entities.

---

[45] Harrington-Croatan-Institute-Working-Paper-2018, pages 25-27.

[46] Tempkin, Adam, "Here's Why the Japanese Bid for CLOs Isn't Likely to Slow Soon," *Bloomberg Markets*, April 2, 2019. (https://www.**bloomberg.**com/news/articles/2019-04-02/**here-s-why-the-japanese-bid-for-clos-isn-t-likely-to-slow-soon**.)

[47] Durden, Tyler and Marla Singer, "Is Titlos PLC (SPV) the Downgrade Catalyst Trigger Which Will Destroy Greece?" *Zero Hedge*, February 15, 2010. (https://www.**zerohedge.com**/article/**titlos-llc-special-purpose-vehicle-downgrade-catalyst-trigger-which-will-destroy-greece**.)

[48] Harrington-Croatan-Institute-Working-Paper-2018, pages 18-21 and 35.

[49] Timsit, Annabelle, "The euro-zone economy is back on familiar ground—slow, grinding growth," *Quartz*, February 7, 2019. (https://qz.com/1544961/**the-euro-zone-economy-is-back-on-familiar-ground-slow-grinding-growth/**.)

IV. 2017-2019: Congress and Regulators Hasten Dodd-Frank Demise of the Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract.

A. 2017: Regulators Prescribe "Singular" Event Against Lehman Repeat.

A "primary goal of the final rule—to avoid the disorderly termination of QFCs in response to the failure of an affiliate."[50]

> "The final rule facilitates the resolution of a large financial entity under the US Bankruptcy Code and other resolution frameworks by ensuring that the counterparties of solvent affiliates of the failed entity cannot unravel their contracts with the solvent affiliate solely based on the failed entity's resolution."[51]

In 2017, the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the OCC adopted respective rules that operate to prevent mass terminations of swaps and other "qualified financial contracts" (***QFCs***) with affiliates of a systemically important institution in receivership. Rule commentary repeatedly cites the Lehman bankruptcy as cautionary tale. *In-the-money counterparties activated terminations with LBHI or cross-default terminations with solvent Lehman affiliates. Out-of-the-money swap counterparties* ***with flip clauses*** *activated them. Out-of-the-money*

---

[50] Federal Reserve, "Restrictions on Qualified Financial Contracts of Systemically Important US Banking Organizations and the US Operations of Systemically Important Foreign Banking Organizations; Revisions to the Definition of Qualifying Master Netting Agreement," 82 FR 42882, September 12, 2017, page 42907. (https://www.**federalregister**.gov/documents/2017/09/12/2017-19053/**restrictions-on-qualified-financial-contracts-of-systemically-important-us-banking-organizations-and**.)

[51] Ibid., page 42883.

*counterparties **without flip clauses** suspended payments rather than terminating swaps, "reducing the liquidity available to the bankruptcy estate."*[52]

> Commenter: "[L]osses in the Lehman bankruptcy alone due to the ability of counterparties to close out QFCs and seize collateral destroyed millions if not billions of dollar . . . the exemption of QFCs from the automatic stay of the US Bankruptcy Code has effectively subsidized the cost of credit extended among QFC participants."[53]
>
> "This final rule is meant to help avoid a repeat of the systemic disruptions caused by the Lehman failure by preventing the exercise of default rights in financial contracts from leading to such disorderly and destabilizing severe distress or failures."[54]

The fix? No cross-default provisions in swap contracts!

> A "covered entity is prohibited from entering into covered QFCs that would allow the exercise of cross-default rights—that is, default rights related, directly or indirectly, to the entry into resolution of an affiliate of the direct party—against it."[55]

The QFC rules pave the way for at least a temporary "singular" event to benefit Country, institution in receivership, and non-terminating counterparties.

> "Title II of the Dodd-Frank Act's stay-and-transfer provisions would address both direct default rights and cross-default rights. But . . . no similar statutory provisions would apply to a resolution under the US Bankruptcy Code. The final rule attempts to address these obstacles to

---

52 Ibid.
53 Ibid., page 42914.
54 Ibid., page 42883.
55 Ibid., page 42890.

> orderly resolution by extending the stay-and-transfer provisions to any type of resolution of a covered entity."[56]
>
> "The final rule is intended to yield substantial net benefits for the financial stability of the United States."[57]
>
> "The final rule should also benefit the counterparties of a subsidiary of a failed GSIB by preventing the severe distress or disorderly failure of the subsidiary and allowing it to continue to meet its obligations."[58]

Had the QFC rules been in place in 2008, no CDO could have terminated a flip-clause-swap-contract until the plaintiff-appellant (LBSF) entered bankruptcy. The "singular" event would have been a legal, market, and practical reality.

> "[T]o ensure that the proposed prohibitions would apply only to cross-default rights . . . the final rule provides that a covered QFC may permit the exercise of default rights based on the direct party's entry into a resolution proceeding.[59]

B. 2018: Congress Keeps *ALL* ABS Fixes; Reverses Other Dodd-Frank Provisions.

The 115th Congress (2017-2018) intentionally preserved ***all*** Dodd-Frank provisions that fix ABS, including those that kill the flip-clause-swap-

---

[56] Ibid., page 42903.
[57] Ibid., page 42914.
[58] Ibid., page 42904.
[59] Ibid.

contract. In 2018, Congress enacted one bill that tweaked the Dodd-Frank Act and let a second bill, a wholesale reversal of the Dodd-Frank Act, die.[60]

President Trump signed into law the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act (Pub. L. No. 115-174, S.2155) on May 24, 2018.[61] The act primarily eases Dodd-Frank restrictions on community and regional banks.

Had Congress intended to protect the flip-clause-swap-contract under US bankruptcy law, Congress would have passed the Financial Choice Act of 2017.[62] The bill would have eased the CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule by exempting many swap contracts from margin posting.[63] The bill also would have amended US Bankruptcy Law so that Chapter 11 proceedings covered large financial institutions.[64]

---

[60] Shearman and Sterling, "First Major Dodd-Frank Reform Bill Signed Into Law," *Perspective*, May 25, 2018. (https://www.shearman.com/perspectives/2018/05/first-major-dodd-frank-reform-bill.)

[61] (https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/2155.)

[62] H.R. 10 - Financial Choice Act of 2017, 115th Congress. (https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/10.)

[63] Ibid., "Title VIII-Capital Markets Improvements, Subtitle C--Harmonization of Derivatives Rules."

[64] Ibid., "Title I--Ending 'Too Big to Fail' and Bank Bailouts, Subtitle B--Financial Institution Bankruptcy."

C. 2019: CFTC Chairperson Gives Up on Exempting Flip-Clause-Swap-Contracts from Margin Posting.

On April 26, 2018, CFTC Chair Giancarlo co-published a White Paper that proposed to reverse many Dodd-Frank rules.[65] Giancarlo *did* make good on many proposals by ushering the respective rule reversals to adoption. However, a backdoor protection of the flip-clause-swap-contract that SFIG had long sought, a reinterpretation of "financial entity in the Commodity Exchange Act" to exempt "a variety of end users, including . . . special purpose vehicles," never materialized.[66] The reinterpretation would have exempted flip-clause-swap-contracts from the CFTC-Swap-Margin-Rule.[67]

V. Don't Contort 219 Years of US Bankruptcy Law to Legitimize Crisis-Causing, Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract Craze of 2000-to-2007.

A. Waterfall Seniority is Exceedingly Valuable to Swap Dealers Because It Ensures Even Zombies Pony Up.

With a flip clause, a swap dealer and an ABS issuer each pay a steep price (waterfall subordination) for a high value good (waterfall seniority).

---

[65] Giancarlo, J. Christopher and Bruce Tuckman, "Swaps Regulation Version 2.0," *CFTC White Paper*, April 24, 2018. (https://www.cftc.gov/sites/default/files/2018-05/oce_chairman_swapregversion2whitepaper_042618.pdf.)

[66] Ibid., page 80.

[67] CFTC staff discussed an exemption with SFIG many times in 2017. "WJH-Corrections-to-CFTC-Letter-No-17-52, pages 78-79 and 113-114.

The benefit to a swap dealer from waterfall seniority is immense because it protects swap assets in many circumstances, including when an ABS deal is in default. Conversely, the cost to ABS investors is also immense because senior payments to the dealer deplete cash that might otherwise repay interest or principal.

As examples, ***two crisis-era, defaulted deals stopped repaying respective ABS after having ringfenced cash for senior termination payments***.

(1) By February 2009, ***Ballyrock CDO ABS 2007-1 Limited*** had not paid "any classes of notes" since November 2008 because the deal was husbanding cash against a possible termination obligation to ***LBSF***.[68]

(2) After incurring an event of default on March 31, 2009, ***Cheyne CLO Investments I*** paid a large swap termination to ***Credit Suisse***. "Today's rating downgrades reflect the increased expected loss associated with each tranche due to the termination of T[otal]R[eturn]S[wap] transactions" with Credit Suisse.[69]

---

[68] "Moody's Announcement: March 4, 2010." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-downgrades-the-ratings-of-two-classes-of-Notes-issued**--PR_195797.)

[69] "Moody's Announcement: August 11, 2009." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-downgrades-SF-CDO-notes-issued-by-Cheyne-CLO-Investments**--PR_184715.)

Similarly, ***waterfall seniority protects in-the-money flip-clause-swap-contracts that a dealer retains rather than terminates with a zombie deal***.

Indeed, dealers such as AIG, Bank of America, Barclays Bank, Bear Stearns Financial Products, Deutsche Bank, Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan, and Merrill Lynch preserved assets under most flip-clause-swap-contracts with zombie CDO and RMBS deals.[70] Each dealer maximized the value of a given flip-clause-swap-contract by allowing the deal to continue paying according to schedule rather than by terminating the contract and risking a fire-sale shortfall.[71]

In fact, waterfall seniority in even a zombie deal can determine whether a credit-impaired, flip-clause-swap-contract dealer remains solvent. LBSF shows how the flip to subordination can spur dealer insolvency and cut estate

---

[70] As examples, Barclays Bank and Deutsche Bank collectively had 37 high value, deeply in-the-money flip-clause-swap-contracts with 31 zombie RMBS deals. "Moody's Announcement: October 17, 2011." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-takes-action-on-37-swaps-in-thirty-one-RMBS**--PR_228507.) (**NB,** Moody's "counterparty instrument rating" **minimizes** the potential that a swap dealer will incur waterfall subordination. Like the flip clause, the rating is circular and self-referencing. Gaillard and Harrington, footnote 23.)

[71] Ibid. Regarding one of the 37 high-value, deeply in-the-money flip-clause-swap-contracts with a zombie RMBS deal, Moody's assigned the contract a counterparty instrument rating of Aa3 on November 29, 2010, five months after having downgraded a formerly Aaa-rated RMBS tranche to Ca on April 14, 2010. (https://www.**moodys.com/credit-ratings/ACE-Securities-Corp-Home-Equity-Loan-Trust-Series-2006-NC3-credit-rating-**715036579.)

assets.[72] Conversely, two other credit-impaired dealers, AIG and Merrill Lynch, remained solvent in part by taking extraordinary actions to preserve seniority (i.e., avoiding subordination) of deep-in-the-money contracts with distressed CDO and RMBS deals. Some actions — e.g., executing a credit support annex or paying a higher rated entity to guarantee performance viz-a-viz deals — appeared reasonable but were in fact entirely gratuitous because the contracts were so deeply-in-the-money to the respective dealers. The credit support annexes were gratuitous because the respective dealers could not possibly owe money to the respective deals. The performance guarantees by higher-rated entities were gratuitous because the dealers had no payment or performance obligations to guarantee viz-a-viz the deals.[73]

NRSROs issued the rating agency conditions (***RACs***) that effectuated each gratuitous dealer action.[74] In a particularly egregious instance, Fitch and Moody's each greenlighted an entirely circular scheme in which Merrill Lynch

---

[72] Fleming, Michael J. and Asani Sarkar, "The Failure Resolution of Lehman Brothers," *FRBNY Economic Policy Review 185*, December 2014, in toto, e.g., pages 179, 185, 186, and 188. (https://www.**newyorkfed**.org/medialibrary/media/**research**/epr/2014/1412flem.pdf)

[73] Harrington, William J., "Submission to the US SEC Re: File Number S7-18-11, 'Proposed Rules for Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization,'" August 8, 2011, pages 4, 27-29 (including footnote 7), 36, 40, 62-68, 70-71, and 73-74. (https://www.sec.gov/comments/s7-18-11/s71811-33.pdf.)

[74] Gaillard and Harrington, Regarding RAC generally, pages 42-44, especially footnotes 40-43.

Derivative Products guaranteed the performance obligations of its Merrill Lynch guarantor.[75]

With other equally egregious RACs, *swap dealers took the action of "taking no action"* to remediate the credit impact on deals.[76]

B. Flip Clauses Are *Ipso-Facto* Provisions.

The decision by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the ***Bankruptcy Court***) plainly shows that 100% of the flip clauses in 100% of the 44 CDOs *ipso facto* modified LBSF's rights by 100%.

> "***The amount of the proceeds of the liquidation of the Collateral was insufficient to make any payment to LBSF under the Waterfall after proceeds were paid pursuant to Noteholder Priority***."

(Memorandum Decision, Page 11. Emphasis added.)

---

[75] "Moody's Announcement: December 14, 2011." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-Determines-No-Negative-Rating-Impact-Due-to-New-Guaranty**--PR_233539.)
Also, "Fitch Announcement: March 12, 2015." (**https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20150312006588/en/Fitch-Rating-Impact-4-SF-Deals-Bank**.)
Also, "Moody's Announcement: April 3, 2012." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-Determines-No-Negative-Rating-Impact-Due-to-Amendment-to**--PR_241278.)
Also, SEC, "Paul A. Gumagay, Office of Commissioner Louis A. Aguilar, Teleconference with William J. Harrington," *Memorandum*, June 30, 2014, page 1. (https://www.**sec.gov**/comments/s7-08-10/s70810-304.pdf.)

[76] "Moody's Announcement: July 20, 2012." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-No-Negative-Rating-impact-on-11-SF-CDOs-following**--PR_251415.)

In a cavalier aside, the Bankruptcy Court mulled an alternative reality in which flip clause activation might have benefited both CDOs and LBSF.

> Had "the proceeds of the sale of the Collateral been much greater than they were, LBSF may have even received a payment in connection with its purported 'in-the-money' position in the Swaps."

(Memorandum Decision, Page 26, Footnote 83.)

Indeed! Also, "money might grow on trees" if only "pigs had wings!"

The unfounded fantasy of greater proceeds is pie-in-the-sky musing that misses not only the forest for the trees, but also the whole eco-system! The instance in which a flip clause is activated — namely, the bankruptcy of a flip-clause-swap-contract dealer — is the same instance in which many financial markets, including seemingly unrelated ones, falter. Moreover, the larger the failed swap dealer and flip-clause-swap-contract portfolio, the larger the negative impact on markets.

The scale of the Lehman bankruptcy, compounded by the scale of the Lehman flip-clause-swap-contract portfolio, ensured that asset prices worldwide would plummet. There was no scenario, save a US government bail-out of Lehman Brothers, in which "the proceeds of the sale of the Collateral" would have "been much greater than they were."

C. Type 1 / Type 2: A Distinction *Without* a Difference.

Given the zero-sum stakes, the conditions for waterfall seniority must be construed as operational from the outset rather than as materializing only upon activation of a flip clause. LBSF drafted every flip-clause-swap-contract to enjoy the significant benefit of waterfall seniority from the outset and to permanently relinquish the seniority for a deeply subordinate position upon certain instances of its own credit impairment. Likewise, each ABS issuer knowingly agreed to the conditions that permanently relegated LBSF waterfall priority to a very subordinate place from a very senior one.

The same has always been the case for all flip-clause-swap-contract dealers globally. At the outset of each contract, a dealer drafts and agrees the potential for a flip to waterfall subordination from seniority.

The Bankruptcy Court formulated an entirely artificial, wholly contrived protocol in categorizing each of the 44 CDOs as either a Type 1 Transaction or a Type 2 Transaction.

Neither type contains "materially distinct types of language" (Memorandum Decision, Page 20.) Both types modified "LBSF's rights because of its default" (Memorandum Decision, Page 23.) Specifically, all 44 CDOs gave LBSF:

> "right to payment priority of a Swap termination payment (if it was 'in-the-money') that was fixed at the outset of the Transaction as the default option — meaning, LBSF had an automatic right to payment priority ahead of the Noteholders unless the conditions for an alternative priority was established."

(Memorandum Decision, Pages 20-21.)

Accordingly, the flip clauses in each Type 2 Transaction are *ipso facto* provisions just as the flip clauses in each Type 1 Transaction are *ipso facto* provisions. The flip clauses of each of the 44 CDOs, i.e., of both "Types," operated identically to those of the other 43 CDOs. To the extent that the "enforcement of the Priority Provisions in Type 1 Transactions effected an *ipso facto* modification of LBSF's rights," the enforcement of the Priority Provisions of the Type 2 Transactions did so, as well. (Memorandum Decision, Page 23).

There is no practical or theoretical instance in which a flip clause of any Type 1 Transaction would operate differently from a flip clause of any Type 2 Transaction. No flip clause in a Type 1 Transaction would activate without the flip clauses in all Type 2 Transactions also activating, and vice-versa.

Regulators and investors assessed the respective flip clauses of the 44 CDOs identically. Underwriters and issuers, including the plaintiff-appellant and most defendants-appellees, marketed the respective flip clauses of the 44 CDOs identically. NRSROs modeled the flip clauses of the 44 CDOs identically. NRSRO

methodologies neither specified, nor now recognize, a "toggle between two potential Waterfalls" that becomes "applicable upon Early Termination" (Memorandum Decision, Page 22).

Likewise, NRSROs that assigned a "counterparty instrument rating" to flip-clause-swap-contracts (apart from the respective ABS ratings) would have maintained identical ratings for the respective contracts in any Type 1 Transaction and any Type 2 Transaction, other contract provisions being similar.

D. Distinction *With* a Difference (and Unintended Consequence): Swap Agreement That Incorporates ABS Documents Activates Margin Posting.

> "Judge Peck's determination in BNY that section 560 did not apply relied in no small measure on a ruling that the priority provisions at issue in that case 'did not comprise part of the swap agreement,' and thus the provisions governing the liquidation were not a part of the swap agreement. The facts here are different . . . the Priority Provisions are either explicitly set forth in the schedules to the ISDA Master Agreements or are incorporated into such schedules from the Indentures."

(Memorandum Decision, Page 40.)

A flip-clause-swap-contract is irredeemably deficient irrespective of whether or not it incorporates ABS documents.

SLM Student Loan Trust 2003-7, a Navient-sponsored deal, demonstrates why. The deal exchanges dollars for euros under a flip-clause-swap-

contract with Natixis, which is subject to the Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule.[77] SLM 2003-7 amended governing documents in January 2019.[78]

If the flip-clause-swap-contract incorporates the amended documents, the flip clause may be binding, but so too is the Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule because it covers swaps that were amended on or after March 1, 2017. ***Accordingly, Natixis has continuously violated the Prudential-Regulators-Swap-Margin-Rule unless it and the deal have been exchanging variation margin daily contemporaneously since the amendment effective date.***

Conversely, if the flip-clause-swap-contract do not incorporate the SLM 2003-7 governing documents, the flip clause may be void per "Judge Peck's determination in BNY." A swap amendment could repair the flip clause, but that would also immediately activate the daily, two-way exchange of variation margin. Accordingly, Navient must write-off the deal's residual value. NRSROs must

---

[77] Moody's Announcement on SLM Trusts with CDC Ixis / Natixis as Flip-Clause-Swap-Contract Dealer: March 28, 2018. (https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-reviews-for-downgrade-three-classes-of-notes-from-two--PR_381201.)

[78] Moody's Announcement: January 15, 2019. Navient amended SLM 2003-7 to "add the ability to purchase an additional 10% of the initial pool balance" and "establish a revolving credit facility that enables the trust to borrow money from Navient Corporation on a subordinated basis." (https://www.moodys.com/research/**Moodys-downgrades-one-class-of-notes-in-SLM-Student-Loan**--PR_393791.)

downgrade not only the deal's ABS, but ABS of every issuer that has not incorporated the relevant deal documents into a flip-clause-swap-contract.

E. Scrap 1992 Precedent: Swap Asset is *NOT* Mere "Unrealized Investment Gain."

> "A swap agreement provision denying an in-the-money defaulting party recovery is 'neither a penalty, a forfeiture, nor an unjust enrichment' because it merely requires a party to 'forego an unrealized investment gain.' *Drexel Burnham Lambert Prod. Corp. v. Midland Bank PLC*, No. 92 Civ. 3098, 1992 WL 12633422, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 10, 1992)."

(United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Opinion and Order, Page 16.)

The 1992 holding is bad precedent.[79] Simply put, an in-the-money swap contract ***is a real-world, real-time, real asset***. A swap dealer manages an in-the-money contract as a ***real asset*** in accounting, cashflow, and risk management. The global swap market operates with the understanding that a contract is always a real-world asset for one party and a corresponding real-world liability for the other

[79] Marchetti, Peter, "Amending the Flaws in the Safe Harbors of the Bankruptcy Code: Guarding Against Systemic Risk in the Financial Markets and Adding Stability to the System," *Emory Bankruptcy Developments Journal* 31, No. 2 (2015). Footnote 217: The "*Drexel* decision did not cite any supporting precedent, did not contain an extensive analysis of the conclusion it reached, and is of 'dubious precedential value.'" (http://law.emory.edu/ebdj/content/volume-31/issue-2/articles/amending-flaws-safe-harbors-guarding-systemic-markets-stability.html#section-6f8b794f3246b0c1e1780bb4d4d5dc53.)

party. No dealer would operate if in-the-money contracts were merely "unrealized investment gains" because all swap assets would be exposed to 100% write-down.

Eliminating an early termination payment due a defaulting party penalizes it 100% and, commensurately, gifts its counterparty a 100% windfall, i.e., 100% write-off of a real liability.[80]

Even NRSROs, which otherwise inflate ABS cashflows, debit them according to original swap schedule in simulations of dealer default.[81]

---

[80] Collins, Sean F., "Rights, Duties and Obligations of Counter-Parties Following Default Under Derivative Contracts," *Alberta Law Review* 42:1 (2004): 153-166, https://doi.org/10.29173/alr487. Page 165: "If the benefit derived from the non-defaulting party is grossly disproportionate to the damages suffered . . . the provision . . . can be construed as a penalty." (https://www.albertalawreview.com/index.php/ALR/article/view/487.)

[81] Harrington, William J., Electronic Letter to the SEC, September 11, 2013, page 6. Dealer simulation is merely "a generic placeholder that exchanges payments with an ABS issuer" per original swap schedule. (https://wikirating.org/data/other/20130911_Harrington_J_William_ABS_Losses_Attributable_to_Securitization_Swaps.pdf.)

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE FORM 6

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 32(g), I, the undersigned and "an unrepresented party," hereby certifies that, based on the word counting device used in my computer program:

1. This brief complies with type-volume limitation of Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5) and Second Circuit Local Rule 29.1(c) because this document contains 6,987 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f), which is less than one-half of the length of the principal brief as authorized in Local Rules 29.1 and 32.1.

2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because the brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2013 in 14-point font size, Times New Roman type style.

Dated: New York, New York
July 30, 2019

By: /s/

William J. Harrington
51 5th Avenue, Apartment 16A
New York, New York 10003
(917) 680-1465
wjharrington@yahoo.com

No. 47976

Certification

STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF NEW YORK, SS:

I, Norman Goodman, County Clerk and Clerk of Supreme Court New York County,

do hereby certify that on November 3, 2014 I have compared

the document attached hereto,

BUSINESS CERTIFICATE FOR: HARRINGTON INDEPENDENT FLIP CLAUSE ASSESSMENTS page(s) 1

with the originals filed in my office and the same is a correct transcript

therefrom and of the whole of such original in witness

whereto I have affixed my signature and seal.

NORMAN GOODMAN
NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK

Business Certificate

I HEREBY CERTIFY *that I am conducting or transacting business under the name or designation*

of HARRINGTON INDEPENDENT FLIP CLAUSE ASSESSMENTS

at 51 FIFTH AVE, APT 16A

City or Town of NY *County of* NY *State of New York.*

My full name is WILLIAM J HARRINGTON

Print or type name. If under 21 years of age, state "I am ..... years of age".

and I reside at 51 FIFTH AVE, APT 16A NY NY 10003

I FURTHER CERTIFY *that I am the successor in interest to* _____

the person or persons heretofore using such name or names to carry on or conduct or transact business.

Type of business FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT *(see next page)*

ASSESS RATING IMPACT OF FLIP CLAUSES AND DERIVATIVE CONTRACTS IN CASH FLOW ASSET-BACKED SECURITIES WATERFALLS (NOT AN INVESTMENT ADVISOR OR BROKER)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, *I have signed this certificate on* NOV - 3 2014 *20*

William J. Harrington

STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF New York ss.: WILLIAM J HARRINGTON

On NOV - 3 2014 before me, the undersigned, personally appeared

personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the individual(s) whose name(s) is (are) subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument, the individual(s), or the person upon behalf of which the individual(s) acted, executed the instrument.

Richard B. Minor

(signature and office of person taking acknowledgment)

Notary Stamp

RICHARD B. MINOR
Notary Public, State of New York
Reg. No. 04MI6147382
Qualified in New York County
Commission Expires June 5, 2018

State of New York
County of **ss.:**

On before me, the undersigned,
personally appeared

personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the individual(s) whose name(s) is (are) subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument, the individual(s), or the person upon behalf of which the individual(s) acted, executed the instrument.

(signature and office of individual taking acknowledgment)

State of
County of **ss.:**

On before me, the undersigned,
personally appeared

personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the individual(s) whose name(s) is (are) subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument, the individual(s), or the person upon behalf of which the individual(s) acted, executed the instrument.

(signature and office of individual taking acknowledgment)

FILED
001788 NOV -3
COUNTY CLERK N.Y.C.
RETURN FILE TO CLERK

INDEX No. 1788/14B

Certificate

of

WILLIAM J HARRINGTON

CONDUCTING BUSINESS UNDER
THE NAME OF

HARRINGTON INDEPENTENT FLIP CLAUSE ASSESSMENTS

GBL §130.4. A certified copy of the original certificate, or if an amended certificate has been filed, then of the most recent amended certificate filed shall be conspicuously displayed on the premises at each place in which the business for which the same was filed is conducted.

Some counties request the type of business.

- Consultant Services
- Educational Services
- Entertainment–Recreation
- Finance–Insurance Services
- Home Improvement Services
- Medical—Home Care Services
- Professional—Technical Services
- Real Estate Services
- Retail Trade
- Wholesale Trade
- Other (state type)

PRINT YOUR NAME WILLIAM J HARRINGTON

PRINT YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS [redacted]

PRINT YOUR BUSINESS TELEPHONE NUMBER [redacted]