

Information Supplement

Van Kampen Merritt Insured Income Trust

Van Kampen American Capital Insured Income Trust

Van Kampen Focus Portfolios Insured Income Trust

Van Kampen Focus Portfolios, Taxable Income Series

Van Kampen Insured Income Trust

Van Kampen Unit Trusts, Taxable Income Series

Invesco Unit Trusts, Taxable Income Series

This Information Supplement provides additional information concerning the risks and operations of each Trust which is not described in the prospectus for the Trust. This Information Supplement should be read in conjunction with the Trust's prospectus. This Information Supplement is not a prospectus (but is incorporated into the prospectus by reference), does not include all of the information that an investor should consider before investing in a Trust and may not be used to offer or sell Units without the prospectus. Copies of the prospectus can be obtained by contacting the Sponsor at its unit investment trust division located at 3500 Lacey Road, Suite 700, Downers Grove, Illinois 60515-5456, or by contacting your broker. All capitalized terms have been defined in the prospectus.

Table of Contents

	Page
Risk Factors	2
Insurance on the Bonds.....	15
Portfolio Administration	25
Sponsor Information	26
Trustee Information	26
Termination of the Trust Agreement	27
Description of Ratings.....	27



Risk Factors

The Trusts include certain types of bonds described below. Accordingly, an investment in a Trust should be made with an understanding of the characteristics of and risks associated with such bonds. Neither the Sponsor nor the Trustee shall be liable in any way for any default, failure or defect in any of the bonds.

Consumer Discretionary and Consumer Staples Issuers. Certain Trusts may invest significantly in bonds issued by companies that manufacture or sell consumer products. The profitability of these companies will be affected by various factors including the general state of the economy and consumer spending trends. In the past, there have been major changes in the retail environment due to the declaration of bankruptcy by some of the major corporations involved in the retail industry, particularly the department store segment. The continued viability of the retail industry will depend on the industry's ability to adapt and to compete in changing economic and social conditions, to attract and retain capable management, and to finance expansion. Weakness in the banking or real estate industry, a recessionary economic climate with the consequent slowdown in employment growth, less favorable trends in unemployment or a marked deceleration in real disposable personal income growth could result in significant pressure on both consumer wealth and consumer confidence, adversely affecting consumer spending habits. In addition, competitiveness of the retail industry will require large capital outlays for investment in the installation of automated checkout equipment to control inventory, to track the sale of individual items and to gauge the success of sales campaigns. Changes in demographics and consumer tastes can also affect the demand for, and the success of, consumer products and services in the marketplace. Increasing employee and retiree benefit costs may also have an adverse effect on the industry. In many sectors of the retail industry, competition may be fierce due to market saturation, converging consumer tastes and other factors. Because of these factors and the recent increase in trade opportunities with other countries, American retailers are now entering global markets which entail added risks such as sudden weakening of foreign economies, difficulty in adapting to local conditions and constraints and added research costs.

Financial Services Issuers. The Trust may invest significantly in bonds issued by companies within the bank and financial services sector.

The effects of the sub-prime mortgage crisis that began to unfold in 2007 continue to manifest in nearly all the sub-divisions of the financial services industry. Sub-prime mortgage related losses and write downs among investment banks and similar institutions reached significant levels in 2008. The impact of these losses among traditional banks, investment banks, broker/dealers and insurers has forced a number of large such institutions into either liquidation or combination, while drastically increasing the credit risk, and possibility of default, of bonds issued by such institutions faced with these troubles. Many of the institutions are having difficulty in accessing credit markets to finance their operations and in maintaining appropriate levels of equity capital. In some cases, the U.S. government has acted to bail out or provide support to select institutions, however the risk of default by such issuers has nonetheless increased substantially.

While the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Federal Reserve Board and Congress have taken steps to address problems in the financial markets and with financial institutions, there can be no assurance that the risks associated with investment in financial services company issuers will decrease as a result of these steps.

Banks and their holding companies are especially subject to the adverse effects of economic recession, volatile interest rates, portfolio concentrations in geographic markets and in commercial and residential real estate loans, and competition from new entrants in their fields of business. Banks are highly dependent on net interest margin. Bank profitability is largely dependent on the availability and cost of capital funds, and can fluctuate significantly when interest rates change or due to increased competition. As initial home purchasing and refinancing activity subsided as a result of increasing interest rates and other factors, this income diminished. Economic conditions in the real estate markets have deteriorated and have had a substantial negative effect upon banks because they generally have a portion of their assets invested in loans secured by real estate. Banks and their holding companies are subject to extensive federal regulation and, when such institutions are

state-chartered, to state regulation as well. Such regulations impose strict capital requirements and limitations on the nature and extent of business activities that banks may pursue. Furthermore, bank regulators have a wide range of discretion in connection with their supervisory and enforcement authority and may substantially restrict the permissible activities of a particular institution if deemed to pose significant risks to the soundness of such institution or the safety of the federal deposit insurance fund. Regulatory actions, such as increases in the minimum capital requirements applicable to banks and increases in deposit insurance premiums required to be paid by banks and thrifts to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”), can negatively impact earnings and the ability of a company to pay dividends. Neither federal insurance of deposits nor governmental regulations, however, insures the solvency or profitability of banks or their holding companies, or insures against any risk of investment in the securities issued by such institutions.

The statutory requirements applicable to and regulatory supervision of banks and their holding companies have increased significantly and have undergone substantial change in recent years. To a great extent, these changes are embodied in the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act; enacted in August 1989, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991, and the regulations promulgated under these laws. Many of the regulations promulgated pursuant to these laws have only recently been finalized and their impact on the business, financial condition and prospects of the securities in the Trust’s portfolio cannot be predicted with certainty. The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act financial-services overhaul legislation allows banks, securities firms and insurance companies to form one-stop financial conglomerates marketing a wide range of financial service products to investors. This legislation has resulted in increased merger activity and heightened competition among existing and new participants in the field. Legislation to liberalize interstate banking has been signed into law in recent years, allowing banks to be able to purchase or establish subsidiary banks in any state. Since mid-1997, banks have been allowed to turn existing banks into branches. Consolidation is likely to continue. The Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) and the Financial Accounting Standards Board require the expanded use of market value accounting by banks and have imposed rules requiring market accounting for investment securities held in trading accounts or available for sale. Adoption of additional such rules may result in increased volatility in the reported health of the industry, and mandated regulatory intervention to correct such problems. Additional legislative and regulatory changes may be forthcoming. For example, the bank regulatory authorities have proposed substantial changes to the Community Reinvestment Act and fair lending laws, rules and regulations, and there can be no certainty as to the effect, if any, that such changes would have on the bonds in the Trust’s portfolio. In addition, from time to time the deposit insurance system is reviewed by Congress and federal regulators, and proposed reforms of that system could, among other things, further restrict the ways in which deposited moneys can be used by banks or reduce the dollar amount or number of deposits insured for any depositor. Such reforms could reduce profitability, as investment opportunities available to bank institutions become more limited and as consumers look for savings vehicles other than bank deposits. Banks face significant competition from other financial institutions such as mutual funds, credit unions, mortgage banking companies and insurance companies, and increased competition may result from legislative broadening of regional and national interstate banking powers. Among other benefits, such legislation allows banks and bank holding companies to acquire across previously prohibited state lines and to consolidate their various bank subsidiaries into one unit. Neither the Sponsor nor any Underwriter makes any prediction as to what, if any, manner of bank regulatory actions might ultimately be adopted or what ultimate effect such actions might have on the Trust’s portfolio.

The Federal Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 generally prohibits a bank holding company from (1) acquiring, directly or indirectly, more than 5% of the outstanding shares of any class of voting securities of a bank or bank holding company, (2) acquiring control of a bank or another bank holding company, (3) acquiring all or substantially all the assets of a bank, or (4) merging or consolidating with another bank holding company, without first obtaining Federal Reserve Board (“FRB”) approval. In considering an application with respect to any such

transaction, the FRB is required to consider a variety of factors, including the potential anti-competitive effects of the transaction, the financial condition and future prospects of the combining and resulting institutions, the managerial resources of the resulting institution, the convenience and needs of the communities the combined organization would serve, the record of performance of each combining organization under the Community Reinvestment Act and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the prospective availability to the FRB of information appropriate to determine ongoing regulatory compliance with applicable banking laws. In addition, the federal Change In Bank Control Act and various state laws impose limitations on the ability of one or more individuals or other entities to acquire control of banks or bank holding companies.

The FRB has issued a policy statement on the payment of cash dividends by bank holding companies. In the policy statement, the FRB expressed its view that a bank holding company experiencing earnings weaknesses should not pay cash dividends which exceed its net income or which could only be funded in ways that would weaken its financial health, such as by borrowing. The FRB also may impose limitations on the payment of dividends as a condition to its approval of certain applications, including applications for approval of mergers and acquisitions. Neither the Sponsor nor any Underwriter makes any prediction as to the effect, if any, such laws will have on the bonds or whether such approvals, if necessary, will be obtained.

Companies engaged in the investment management industry are subject to the adverse effects of economic recession, volatile interest rates, and competition from new entrants in their fields of business. Adverse changes in the direction of the stock market, investor confidence, equity transaction volume, the level and direction of interest rates and the outlook of emerging markets could adversely affect the financial stability, as well as the prices of the securities, of these companies. Additionally, competitive pressures, including increased competition with new and existing competitors, the ongoing commoditization of traditional businesses and the need for increased capital expenditures on new technology could adversely impact the profit margins of companies in the investment management and brokerage industries. Companies involved in the investment management industry are also subject to extensive regulation by government agencies and self-regulatory organizations, and changes in laws, regulations or rules, or in the interpretation of such laws, regulations and rules could adversely affect such companies.

Companies involved in the insurance, reinsurance and risk management industry underwrite, sell or distribute property, casualty and business insurance. Many factors affect insurance, reinsurance and risk management company profits, including but not limited to interest rate movements, the imposition of premium rate caps, a misapprehension of the risks involved in given underwritings, competition and pressure to compete globally, weather catastrophes or other disasters and the effects of client mergers. Individual companies may be exposed to material risks including reserve inadequacy and the inability to collect from reinsurance carriers. Insurance companies are subject to extensive governmental regulation, including the imposition of maximum rate levels, which may not be adequate for some lines of business. Proposed or potential tax law changes may also adversely affect insurance companies' policy sales, tax obligations and profitability. In addition to the foregoing, profit margins of these companies continue to shrink due to the commoditization of traditional businesses, new competitors, capital expenditures on new technology and the pressure to compete globally.

In addition to the normal risks of business, companies involved in the insurance and risk management industry are subject to significant risk factors, including those applicable to regulated insurance companies, such as:

- the inherent uncertainty in the process of establishing property-liability loss reserves, and the fact that ultimate losses could materially exceed established loss reserves, which could have a material adverse effect on results of operations and financial condition;
- the fact that insurance companies have experienced, and can be expected in the future to experience, catastrophic losses, which could have a material adverse impact on their financial conditions, results of operations and cash flow;

- the inherent uncertainty in the process of establishing property-liability loss reserves due to changes in loss payment patterns caused by new claim settlement practices;
- the need for insurance companies and their subsidiaries to maintain appropriate levels of statutory capital and surplus, particularly in light of continuing scrutiny by rating organizations and state insurance regulatory authorities, and in order to maintain acceptable financial strength or claims-paying ability ratings;
- the extensive regulation and supervision to which insurance companies are subject, and various regulatory and other legal actions;
- the adverse impact that increases in interest rates could have on the value of an insurance company's investment portfolio and on the attractiveness of certain of its products; and
- the uncertainty involved in estimating the availability of reinsurance and the collectability of reinsurance recoverables.

The state insurance regulatory framework has, during recent years, come under increased federal scrutiny, and certain state legislatures have considered or enacted laws that alter and, in many cases, increase state authority to regulate insurance companies and insurance holding company systems. Further, the National Association of Insurance Commissioners ("NAIC") and state insurance regulators are re-examining existing laws and regulations, specifically focusing on insurance companies, interpretations of existing laws and the development of new laws. In addition, Congress and certain federal agencies have investigated the condition of the insurance industry in the United States to determine whether to promulgate additional federal regulation. The Sponsor is unable to predict whether any state or federal legislation will be enacted to change the nature or scope of regulation of the insurance industry, or what effect, if any, such legislation would have on the industry.

All insurance companies are subject to state laws and regulations that require diversification of their investment portfolios and limit the amount of investments in certain investment categories. Failure to comply with these laws and regulations would cause non-conforming investments to be treated as non-admitted assets for purposes of measuring statutory surplus and, in some instances, would require divestiture.

Health Care Issuers. The Trust may invest significantly in bonds issued by companies within the health care sector. Health care companies involved in advanced medical devices and instruments, drugs and biotech, managed care, hospital management/health services and medical supplies have potential risks unique to their sector of the health care field. These companies are subject to governmental regulation of their products and services, a factor which could have a significant and possibly unfavorable effect on the price and availability of such products or services. Furthermore, such companies face the risk of increasing competition from new products or services, generic drug sales, termination of patent protection for drug or medical supply products and the risk that technological advances will render their products obsolete. The research and development costs of bringing a drug to market are substantial, and include lengthy governmental review processes with no guarantee that the product will ever come to market. Many of these companies may have losses and not offer certain products for several years. Such companies may also have persistent losses during a new product's transition from development to production, and revenue patterns may be erratic. The goods and services of health care issuers are also subject to risks of product liability litigation.

Health care facility operators may be affected by events and conditions including, among other things, demand for services, the ability of the facility to provide the services required, physicians' confidence in the facility, management capabilities, competition with other hospitals, efforts by insurers and governmental agencies to limit rates, legislation establishing state rate-setting agencies, expenses, government regulation, the cost and possible unavailability of malpractice insurance and the termination or restriction of governmental financial assistance, including that associated with Medicare, Medicaid and other similar third-party payor programs.

Legislative proposals concerning health care are proposed in Congress from time to time. These proposals span a wide range of topics, including cost and price controls (which might include a freeze on the prices of

prescription drugs), national health insurance, incentives for competition in the provision of health care services, tax incentives and penalties related to health care insurance premiums and promotion of pre-paid health care plans. The government could also reduce funding for health care related research. The Sponsor is unable to predict the effect of any of these proposals, if enacted, on the issuers of Securities in your Trust.

Industrials Issuers. The Trust may invest significantly in bonds issued by industrials companies. General risks of industrials companies include the general state of the economy, intense competition, consolidation, domestic and international politics, excess capacity and consumer spending trends. In addition, capital goods companies may also be significantly affected by overall capital spending levels, economic cycles, technical obsolescence, delays in modernization, limitations on supply of key materials, labor relations, government regulations, government contracts and ecommerce initiatives. Industrials companies may also be affected by factors more specific to their individual industries. Industrial machinery manufacturers may be subject to declines in commercial and consumer demand and the need for modernization. Aerospace and defense companies may be influenced by decreased demand for new equipment, aircraft order cancellations, disputes over or ability to obtain or retain government contracts, labor disputes or changes in government budget priorities, changes in aircraft-leasing contracts and cutbacks in profitable business travel. The number of housing starts, levels of public and non-residential construction including weakening demand for new office and retail space, and overall construction spending may adversely affect construction equipment manufacturers.

Technology Issuers. The Trust may invest significantly in bonds issued by issuers within the technology industry which includes information technology companies. Your Trust, and therefore Unitholders, may be particularly susceptible to a negative impact resulting from adverse market conditions or other factors affecting technology issuers because any negative impact on the technology industry will not be diversified among issuers within other unrelated industries. Accordingly, an investment in Units should be made with an understanding of the characteristics of the information technology industry and the risks which such an investment may entail.

Technology companies generally include companies involved in the development, design, manufacture and sale of computers, computer related equipment, computer networks, communications systems, telecommunications products, electronic products, and other related products, systems and services. The market for technology products and services, especially those specifically related to the Internet, is characterized by rapidly changing technology, rapid product obsolescence, cyclical market patterns, evolving industry standards and frequent new product introductions. The success of the issuers of the Securities depends in substantial part on the timely and successful introduction of new products. An unexpected change in one or more of the technologies affecting an issuer's products or in the market for products based on a particular technology could have a material adverse affect on an issuer's operating results. Furthermore, there can be no assurance that the issuers of the Securities will be able to respond timely to compete in the rapidly developing marketplace.

The market for certain technology products and services may have only recently begun to develop, is rapidly evolving and is characterized by an increasing number of market entrants. Additionally, certain technology companies may have only recently commenced operations or offered securities to the public. Such companies are in the early stage of development and have a limited operating history on which to analyze future operating results. It is important to note that following its initial public offering a security is likely to experience substantial price volatility and speculative trading. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that upon redemption of Units or termination of a Trust a Unitholder will receive an amount greater than or equal to the Unitholder's initial investment.

Based on trading history, factors such as announcements of new products or development of new technologies and general conditions of the industry have caused and are likely to cause the market price of

technology common stocks to fluctuate substantially. Market volatility may adversely affect the market price of the Securities and therefore the ability of a Unitholder to redeem units, or roll over Units into a new trust, at a price equal to or greater than the original price paid for such Units.

Some key components of certain products of technology issuers are currently available only from single sources. There can be no assurance that in the future suppliers will be able to meet the demand for components in a timely and cost effective manner. Accordingly, an issuer's operating results and customer relationships could be adversely affected by either an increase in price for, or and interruption or reduction in supply of, any key components. Additionally, many technology issuers are characterized by a highly concentrated customer base consisting of a limited number of large customers who may require product vendors to comply with rigorous and constantly developing industry standards. Any failure to comply with such standards may result in a significant loss or reduction of sales. Because many products and technologies are incorporated into other related products, certain companies are often highly dependent on the performance of other computer, electronics and communications companies. There can be no assurance that these customers will place additional orders, or that an issuer of Securities will obtain orders of similar magnitude as past orders from other customers. Similarly, the success of certain companies is tied to a relatively small concentration of products or technologies with intense competition between companies. Accordingly, a decline in demand of such products, technologies or from such customers could have a material adverse impact on issuers of the Securities.

Telecommunications Issuers. The Trust may invest significantly in bonds issued by telecommunications companies. The telecommunications industry is subject to governmental regulation, and the products and services of telecommunications companies may be subject to rapid obsolescence. These factors could affect the value of Units. Telephone companies in the United States, for example, are subject to both state and federal regulations affecting permitted rates of returns and the kinds of services that may be offered. Certain types of companies represented in a portfolio are engaged in fierce competition for a share of the market of their products. As a result, competitive pressures are intense and the values of telecommunications company securities are subject to rapid price volatility.

Several high-profile bankruptcies of large telecommunications companies have illustrated the potentially unstable condition of telecommunications companies. High debt loads that were accumulated during the industry growth spurt of the 1990s are catching up to the industry, causing debt and stock prices to trade at distressed levels for many telecommunications companies and increasing the cost of capital for needed additional investment. At the same time, demand for some telecommunications services has fallen sharply, as several key markets have become oversaturated, some local customers have switched to substitute providers and technologies, and corporate profits and the economy generally remain weak. To meet increasing competition, companies may have to commit substantial capital, particularly in the formulation of new products and services using new technologies. As a result, many companies have been compelled to cut costs by reducing their workforce, outsourcing, consolidating and/or closing existing facilities and divesting low selling product lines. Furthermore, certain companies involved in the industry have also faced scrutiny for alleged accounting irregularities that may have led to the overstatement of their financial results, and other companies in the industry may face similar scrutiny. Due to these and other factors, the risk level of owning the securities of telecommunications companies has increased substantially and may continue to rise.

While a portfolio may concentrate on the securities of established suppliers of traditional telecommunication products and services, a Trust may also invest in bonds of smaller telecommunications companies which may benefit from the development of new products and services. These smaller companies may present greater opportunities for capital appreciation, and may also involve greater risk than large, established issuers. Such smaller companies may have limited product lines, market or financial resources, and their securities may trade less frequently and in limited volume than the securities of larger, more established companies. As a result, the prices of the securities of such smaller companies may fluctuate to a greater degree than the prices of securities of other issuers.

In addition, recent federal legislation governing the United States telecommunications industry remains subject to judicial review and additional interpretation, which may adversely affect the companies whose securities are held by a Trust.

Utility and Energy Issuers. Because certain Trusts may invest significantly in bonds issued by public utility and energy companies, an investment in Units of certain Trusts should be made with an understanding of the characteristics of the public utility and energy industries and the risks which such an investment may entail. General problems of the public utility and energy industries include the difficulty in obtaining an adequate return on invested capital despite frequent increases in rates which have been granted by the public service commissions having jurisdiction, the difficulty in financing large construction programs during an inflationary period, the restrictions on operations and increased cost and delays attributable to environmental, nuclear safety and other regulatory considerations, the difficulty of the capital markets absorbing utility debt and equity securities, the difficulty in obtaining fuel for electric generation at reasonable prices, regulatory restrictions on the ability to pass increasing wholesale costs along to the retail and business customer, and the effects of energy conservation. There is no assurance that public service commissions will grant rate increases in the future or that any such increases will be timely or adequate to cover operating and other expenses and debt service requirements. All of the public utilities which are issuers of securities in certain Trusts have been experiencing many of these problems in varying degrees. Furthermore, utility and energy stocks are particularly susceptible to interest rate risk, generally exhibiting an inverse relationship to interest rates. As a result, electric utility stock prices may be adversely affected as interest rates rise. Similarly, the success of certain companies is tied to a relatively small concentration of products or technologies with intense competition between companies. There can be no assurance that these customers will place additional orders, or that an issuer of Securities will obtain orders of similar magnitude as past orders from other customers. Accordingly, a decline in demand of such products, technologies or from such customers could have a material adverse impact on issuers of securities in certain Trusts.

Utilities are generally subject to extensive regulation by state utility commissions which, for example, establish the rates which may be charged and the appropriate rate of return on an approved asset base, which must be approved by the state commissions. Certain utilities have had difficulty from time to time in persuading regulators, who are subject to political pressures, to grant rate increases necessary to maintain an adequate return on investment. Any unexpected limitations could negatively affect the profitability of utilities whose budgets are planned far in advance. In addition, gas pipeline and distribution companies have had difficulties in adjusting to short and surplus energy supplies, enforcing or being required to comply with long-term contracts and avoiding litigation with their customers, on the one hand, or suppliers, on the other.

Certain utility companies have experienced full or partial deregulation in recent years. These utility companies are frequently more similar to industrial companies in that they are subject to greater competition and have been permitted by regulators to diversify outside of their original geographic regions and their traditional lines of business. These opportunities may permit certain utility companies to earn more than their traditional regulated rates of return. Some companies, however, may be forced to defend their core business and may be less profitable.

Certain of the issuers of securities in certain Trusts may own or operate nuclear generating facilities. Governmental authorities may from time to time review existing, and impose additional, requirements governing the licensing, construction and operation of nuclear power plants. Nuclear generating projects in the electric utility industry have experienced substantial cost increases, construction delays and licensing difficulties. These have been caused by various factors, including inflation, high financing costs, required design changes and rework, allegedly faulty construction, objections by groups and governmental officials, limits on the ability to finance, reduced forecasts of energy requirements and economic conditions. This experience indicates that the risk of significant cost increases, delays and licensing difficulties remain present until completion and achievement of commercial operation of any nuclear project. Also, nuclear generating units in service have experienced unplanned outages or extensions of scheduled outages due to equipment problems or new

regulatory requirements sometimes followed by a significant delay in obtaining regulatory approval to return to service. A major accident at a nuclear plant anywhere could cause the imposition of limits or prohibitions on the operation, construction or licensing of nuclear units.

In view of the uncertainties discussed above, there can be no assurance that any utility company's share of the full cost of nuclear units under construction ultimately will be recovered in rates or the extent to which a company could earn an adequate return on its investment in such units. The likelihood of a significantly adverse event occurring in any of the areas of concern described above varies, as does the potential severity of any adverse impact. It should be recognized, however, that one or more of such adverse events could occur and individually or collectively could have a material adverse impact on a company's financial condition, the results of its operations, its ability to make interest and principal payments on its outstanding debt or to pay dividends.

Other general problems of the electric, gas and water utility industries (including state and local joint action power agencies) include rising costs of rail transportation to transport fossil fuels, the uncertainty of transmission service costs for both interstate and intrastate transactions, changes in tax laws which adversely affect a utility's ability to operate profitably, increased competition in service costs, recent reductions in estimates of future demand for electricity and gas in certain areas of the country, restrictions on operations and increased cost and delays attributable to environmental considerations, uncertain availability and increased cost of capital, unavailability of fuel for electric generation at reasonable prices, including the steady rise in fuel costs and the costs associated with conversion to alternate fuel sources such as coal, availability and cost of natural gas for resale, technical and cost factors and other problems associated with construction, licensing, regulation and operation of nuclear facilities for electric generation, including, among other considerations, the problems associated with the use of radioactive materials and the disposal of radioactive wastes, and the effects of energy and environmental conservation efforts. Each of the problems referred to could adversely affect the ability of the issuers of any utility and energy bonds to make dividend payments and the value of such issues on redemption of your Units.

Taxable Municipal Issues. Certain bonds in a Trust may consist of taxable obligations of municipal issuers. Obligations of municipal issuers can be either general obligations of a government entity that are backed by the taxing power of such entity or revenue bonds payable from the income of a specific project or authority and are not supported by the issuer's power to levy taxes.

General obligation bonds are backed by the general taxing power of the issuer. The issuer secures these bonds by pledging its faith, credit and unlimited taxing power for the payment of principal and interest.

Revenue bonds are payable only from the revenue of a specific project or authority. They are not supported by the issuer's general power to levy taxes. The risk of default in payment of interest or principal increases if the income of the related project falters because that income is the only source of payment. All of the following bonds are revenue bonds.

Airport bonds are obligations of issuers that own and operate airports. The ability of the issuer to make payments on these bonds primarily depends on the ability of airlines to meet their obligations under use agreements. Due to increased competition, deregulation, increased fuel costs and other factors, some airlines may have difficulty meeting these obligations.

Bond banks are vehicles that pool various municipal obligations into larger offerings. This reduces the cost of borrowing for the municipalities. The types of financing projects that these obligations support vary.

Build America Bonds were issued pursuant to The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the "Recovery Act"), authorizing states and local governments to issue taxable bonds and to elect to receive a federal subsidy for a portion of their borrowing costs through a refundable tax credit paid by the Treasury Department and

the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) in an amount equal to 35 percent of the total coupon interest payable to investors (45 percent for those Build America Bonds that qualify and are designated as Recovery Zone Economic Development Bonds).

The Recovery Act adds a new section to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, (the “Code”) which authorizes Build America Bonds that meet the definition of “qualified bonds”, as described below, to receive the refundable credit. The Code section defines the term “qualified bond” to mean a Build America Bond (a) issued before January 1, 2011, (b) with 100 percent of the excess of (i) the available project proceeds (as defined to mean sale proceeds of such issue less not more than two percent of such proceeds used to pay issuance costs plus investment proceeds thereon), over (ii) the amounts in a reasonably required reserve fund with respect to such issue, are to be used for capital expenditures, and (c) where the issuer makes an irrevocable election to have this subsection of the Code apply.

Should a Build America Bond issuer fail to continue to meet the applicable requirements as imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, it is possible that such issuer may not receive federal cash subsidy payments, impairing the issuer’s ability to make scheduled interest payments. In addition, Build America Bonds are often subject to extraordinary redemption in the event that changes to Sections 54AA or 6431 of the Code (as added by the Recovery Act) or other federal legislation causes to reduce or eliminate the federal cash subsidy payment for a portion of a Build America Bond issuer’s borrowing costs.

Qualified School Construction Bonds, Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds and Clean Renewable Energy Bonds (collectively, “Qualified Bonds”) are taxable bonds that are similar to certain Build America Bonds, in that state and municipal Qualified Bond issuers may elect to receive direct interest-subsidy payments from the U.S. Treasury if certain conditions are met. The Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act, enacted into federal law on March 18, 2010, permits issuers of Qualified Bonds to seek applicable subsidies on bond interest payments.

Qualified School Construction Bonds, issued pursuant to provisions in the Recovery Act, are issued to finance the construction, rehabilitation, or repair of a public school facility or for the acquisition of land on which such a bond-financed facility will be constructed. Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds and Clean Renewable Energy Bonds are both issued pursuant to the “Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008”, and like Qualified School Construction Bonds, are governed by Section 54A of the Code. Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds are issued for qualified energy conservation purposes, and Clean Renewable Energy Bonds are issued to finance qualified renewable energy facilities that produce electricity. Although the year of issuance is not restricted for Qualified Bonds, federal law provides for limits on the dollar amounts that may be issued for these bond types.

Federal legislation has amended the Code in recent years to provide for certain qualifications and restrictions on the issuance of Qualified Bonds, and to include such bonds under the definition of “qualified tax credit bond” as found in Section 54A of the Code. Eligible issuers of Qualified School Construction Bonds may receive subsidy payments equal to 100% of the lesser of the actual interest rate of the bonds or the tax credit rate for municipal tax-credit bonds, set daily by the U.S. Treasury. Eligible issuers of Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds and Clean Renewable Energy Bonds may receive subsidy payments equal to 70% of the lesser of the actual interest rate of the bonds or the tax credit rate for municipal tax-credit bonds, set daily by the U.S. Treasury.

Should the issuer of a Qualified Bond fail to continue to meet the applicable requirements as imposed on any such bond by the Code or other federal laws, it is possible that such issuer may not receive federal cash subsidy payments, impairing the issuer’s ability to make scheduled interest payments or even causing mandatory redemption of a portion of the bonds. As provided in Section 54A of the Code, Qualified Bonds are also subject to mandatory redemption of any portion of available project proceeds that remain unexpended by the issuer after three years from the date of issuance. This mandatory redemption must be completed within 90 days after such three-year period, unless an extension is granted by the Treasury.

Additionally, Qualified Bonds may be subject to extraordinary redemption in the event that changes to applicable sections of the Code or other federal legislation causes to reduce or eliminate the federal cash subsidy payment for any Qualified Bond issuer's borrowing costs.

Certificates of participation are generally a type of municipal lease obligation. Lease payments of a governmental entity secure payments on these bonds. These payments depend on the governmental entity budgeting appropriations for the lease payments. A governmental body cannot obligate future governments to appropriate for or make lease payments, but governments typically promise to take action necessary to include lease payments in their budgets. If a government fails to budget for or make lease payments, sufficient funds may not exist to pay interest or principal on these bonds.

Health care bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenue from hospitals and hospital systems. The ability of these issuers to make payments on bonds depends on factors such as facility occupancy levels, demand for services, competition resulting from hospital mergers and affiliations, the need to reduce costs, government regulation, costs of malpractice insurance and claims, and government financial assistance (such as Medicare and Medicaid).

Higher education bonds are obligations of issuers that operate universities and colleges. These issuers derive revenues from tuition, dormitories, grants and endowments. These issuers face problems related to declines in the number of college-age individuals, possible inability to raise tuitions and fees, uncertainty of continued federal grants, state funding or donations, and government legislation or regulation.

Industrial revenue bonds finance the cost of acquiring, building or improving industrial projects. Private corporations usually operate these projects. The ability of the issuer to make payments on these bonds depends on factors such as the creditworthiness of the corporation operating the project, revenues generated by the project, expenses of the project and environmental or other regulatory restrictions.

Multi-family housing bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenues from mortgage loans on multiple family residences, retirement housing or housing projects for low to moderate-income families. These bonds are generally pre-payable at any time. It is likely that their life will be less than their stated maturity. The ability of these issuers to make payments on bonds depends on such factors as rental income, occupancy levels, operating expenses, mortgage default rates, taxes, government regulations and appropriation of subsidies.

Other care bonds include obligations of issuers that derive revenue from mental health facilities, nursing homes and intermediate care facilities. These bonds are similar to health care bonds and the issuers face the same general risks.

Public building bonds finance the cost of acquiring, leasing, building or improving public buildings such as offices, recreation facilities, convention centers, police stations, correctional institutions and parking garages. The ability of the issuers to make payments on these bonds depends on factors such as the government budgeting sufficient funds to make lease or mortgage payments on the facility, user fees or rents, costs of maintenance and decreases in use of the facility.

Public education bonds are obligations of issuers that operate primary and secondary schools. The ability of these issuers to make payments on these bonds depends primarily on ad valorem taxes. These issuers may also face problems related to litigation contesting state constitutionality of public education financing.

Retail electric/gas/telephone bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenues from the retail sale of utilities to customers. The ability of these issuers to make payments on these bonds depends on factors such as the rates and demand for these utilities, competition, government regulation and rate approvals, overhead expenses and the cost of fuels.

Single family housing bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenues from mortgage loans on single family residences. Single family residences generally include one to four-family dwellings. These bonds are similar to multi-family housing bonds and the issuers face the same general risks.

Tax district bonds are obligations secured by a pledge of taxing power by a municipality, such as tax increment financing or tax allocation bonds. These bonds are similar to general obligation bonds. Unlike general obligation bonds, however, the municipality does not pledge its unlimited taxing power to pay these bonds. Instead, the municipality pledges revenues from a specific tax to pay these bonds. If the tax cannot support payment of interest and principal, a municipality may need to raise the related tax to pay these bonds. An inability to raise the tax could have an adverse affect on these bonds.

Transportation bonds are obligations of issuers that own and operate public transit systems, ports, highways, turnpikes, bridges and other transportation systems. The ability of these issuers to make payments on these bonds depends on variations in use, the degree of government subsidization, competition from other forms of transportation and increased costs. Port authorities derive revenues primarily from fees imposed on ships using the port facilities. These fees can fluctuate depending on the local economy and competition from air, rail and truck transportation. Increased fuel costs, alternative transportation modes and competition from toll-free bridges and roads will impact revenues of issuers that operate bridges, roads or tunnels.

Waste disposal bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenues from resource recovery facilities. These facilities process solid waste, generate steam and convert steam to electricity. These issuers face problems such as costs and delays due to environmental concerns, effects of conservation and recycling, destruction or condemnation of a project, void or unenforceable contracts, changes in the economic availability of raw materials, operating supplies or facilities, and other unavoidable changes that adversely affect operation of a project.

Water and sewer bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenues from user fees from the sale of water and sewerage services. These issuers face problems such as the ability to obtain rate increases, population declines, difficulties in obtaining new fresh water supplies and “no-growth” zoning ordinances. These issuers also face many of the same problems of waste disposal issuers.

Wholesale electric bonds are obligations of issuers that derive revenues from selling electricity to other utilities. The ability of these issuers to make payments on these bonds depends on factors such as the rates and demand for electric utilities, competition, overhead expenses and government regulation and rate approvals.

Zero Coupon Bonds. Certain of the bonds in a Trust may be “zero coupon” bonds. Zero coupon bonds are purchased at a deep discount because the buyer receives only the right to receive a final payment at the maturity of the bond and does not receive any periodic interest payments. The effect of owning deep discount bonds which do not make current interest payments (such as the zero coupon bonds) is that a fixed yield is earned not only on the original investment but also, in effect, on all discount earned during the life of such income on the bond at a rate as high as the implicit yield on the discount bond, but at the same time eliminates the holder’s ability to reinvest at higher rates in the future. For this reason, zero coupon bonds are subject to substantially greater price fluctuations during periods of changing market interest rates than are securities of comparable quality which pay interest.

Ginnie Mae Securities. The Ginnie Mae securities included in a GNMA Income Portfolio are backed by the indebtedness secured by underlying mortgage pools of up to 30 year mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwellings. The securities are often referred to simply as “Ginnie Maes.” The pool of mortgages which is to underlie a particular new issue of Ginnie Mae securities is assembled by the proposed issuer of such Ginnie Mae securities. The issuer is typically a mortgage banking firm, and in every instance must be a mortgagee approved by and in good

standing with the Federal Housing Administration (“*FHA*”). In addition, Ginnie Mae imposes its own criteria on the eligibility of issuers, including a net worth requirement.

The mortgages which are to comprise a new Ginnie Mae pool may have been originated by the issuer itself in its capacity as a mortgage lender or may be acquired by the issuer from a third party, such as another mortgage banker, a banking institution, the Veterans Administration (“*VA*”) (which in certain instances acts as a direct lender and thus originates its own mortgages) or one of several other governmental agencies. All mortgages in any given pool will be insured under the National Housing Act, as amended (“*FHA-insured*”), or Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (“*FMHA Insured*”) or guaranteed under the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, or Chapter 37 of Title 38, U.S.C. (“*VA-guaranteed*”). Such mortgages will have a date for the first scheduled monthly payment of principal that is not more than one year prior to the date on which Ginnie Mae issues its guaranty commitment as described below, will have comparable interest rates and maturity dates, and will meet additional criteria of Ginnie Mae. All mortgages in the pools backing the Ginnie Mae securities contained in the Trust are mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwellings (having a stated maturity of up to 30 years for securities in the Trust but an estimated average life of considerably less. In general, the mortgages in these pools provide for equal monthly payments over the life of the mortgage (aside from prepayments) designed to repay the principal of the mortgage over such period, together with interest at the fixed rate on the unpaid balance.

To obtain Ginnie Mae approval of a new pool of mortgages, the issuer will file with Ginnie Mae an application containing information concerning itself, describing generally the pooled mortgages, and requesting that Ginnie Mae approve the issue and issue its commitment (subject to Ginnie Mae’s satisfaction with the mortgage documents and other relevant documentation) to guarantee the timely payment of principal of and interest on the Ginnie Mae securities to be issued by the issuer. If the application is in order, Ginnie Mae will issue its commitment and will assign a Ginnie Mae pool number to the pool. Upon completion of the required documentation (including detailed information as to the underlying mortgages, a custodial agreement with a Federal or state regulated financial institution satisfactory to Ginnie Mae pursuant to which the underlying mortgages will be held in safekeeping, and a detailed guaranty agreement between Ginnie Mae and the issuer), the issuance of the Ginnie Mae securities is permitted. When the Ginnie Mae securities are issued, Ginnie Mae will endorse its guarantee thereon. The aggregate principal amount of Ginnie Mae securities issued will be equal to the then aggregate unpaid principal balances of the pooled mortgages. The interest rate borne by the Ginnie Mae securities is currently fixed at 1/2 of 1% below the interest rate of the pooled 1- to 4-family mortgages, the differential being applied to the payment of servicing and custodial charges as well as Ginnie Mae’s guaranty fee.

Ginnie Mae IIs consist of jumbo pools of mortgages from more than one issuer. By allowing pools to consist of multiple issuers, it allows for larger and more geographically diverse pools. Unlike Ginnie Mae Is, which have a minimum pool size of \$1 million, Ginnie Mae IIs have a minimum pool size of \$7 million. In addition, the interest rates on the mortgages within the Ginnie Mae II pools will vary unlike the mortgages within pools in Ginnie Mae Is which all have the same rate. The rates on the mortgages will vary from 1/2 of 1% to 1.50% above the coupon rate on the Ginnie Mae security, which is allowed for servicing and custodial fees as well as the Ginnie Mae’s guaranty fee. The major advantage of Ginnie Mae IIs lies in the fact that a central paying agent sends one check to the holder on the required payment date. This greatly simplifies the current procedure of collecting distributions from each issuer of a Ginnie Mae, since such distributions are often received late.

All of the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust, including the Ginnie Mae IIs, are of the “fully modified pass-through” type, *i.e.*, they provide for timely monthly payments to the registered holders thereof (including the Trust) of their pro rata share of the scheduled principal payments on the underlying mortgages, whether or not collected by the issuers, including, on a pro rata basis, any prepayments of principal of such mortgages received and interest (net of the servicing and other charges described above) on the aggregate unpaid principal balance of such Ginnie Mae securities, whether or not the interest on the underlying mortgages has been collected by the issuers.

The Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust are guaranteed as to timely payment of principal and interest by Ginnie Mae. Funds received by the issuers on account of the mortgages backing the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust are intended to be sufficient to make the required payments of principal of and interest on such Ginnie Mae securities but, if such funds are insufficient for that purpose, the guaranty agreements between the issuers and Ginnie Mae require the issuers to make advances sufficient for such payments. If the issuers fail to make such payments, Ginnie Mae will do so.

Ginnie Mae is authorized by Section 306(g) of Title III of the National Housing Act to guarantee the timely payment of and interest on securities which are based on or backed by a Trust or pool composed of mortgages insured by FHA, the Farmers' Home Administration ("*FMHA*") or guaranteed by the VA. Section 306(g) provides further that the full faith and credit of the United States is pledged to the payment of all amounts which may be required to be paid under any guaranty under such subsection. An opinion of an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, dated December 9, 1969, states that such guaranties "constitute general obligations of the United States backed by its full faith and credit." ***Any statement that a particular security is backed by the full faith and credit of the United States is based upon the opinion of an assistant attorney general of the United States and should be so construed.*** Ginnie Mae is empowered to borrow from the United States Treasury to the extent necessary to make any payments of principal and interest required under such guaranties.

Ginnie Mae securities are backed by the aggregate indebtedness secured by the underlying FHA-insured, FMHA-insured or VA-guaranteed mortgages and, except to the extent of funds received by the issuers on account of such mortgages, Ginnie Mae securities do not constitute a liability of nor evidence any recourse against such issuers, but recourse thereon is solely against Ginnie Mae. Holders of Ginnie Mae securities (such as the Trust) have no security interest in or lien on the underlying mortgages.

The Ginnie Mae guaranties referred to herein relate only to payment of principal of and interest on the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust and not to the Units offered hereby.

Monthly payments of principal will be made, and additional prepayments of principal may be made, to each Trust in respect of the mortgages underlying the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust. All of the mortgages in the pools relating to the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust are subject to prepayment without any significant premium or penalty at the option of the mortgagors. While the mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwellings underlying the Ginnie Mae securities have a stated maturity of up to 30 years for the Trust, it has been the experience of the mortgage industry that the average life of comparable mortgages, owing to prepayments, refinancings and payments from foreclosures, is considerably less.

In the mid-1970's, published yield tables for Ginnie Mae securities utilized a 12- year average life assumption for Ginnie Mae pools of 26-30 year mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwellings. This assumption was derived from the FHA experience relating to prepayments on such mortgages during the period from the mid-1950's to the mid-1970s. This 12-year average life assumption was calculated in respect of a period during which mortgage lending rates were fairly stable. **The assumption is no longer an accurate measure of the average life of Ginnie Mae Securities or their underlying single family mortgage pools. Recently it has been observed that mortgages issued at high interest rates have experienced accelerated prepayment rates which would indicate a significantly shorter average life than 12 years. Today, research analysts use complex formulae to scrutinize the prepayments of mortgage pools in an attempt to predict more accurately the average life of Ginnie Mae Securities.**

A number of factors, including homeowner's mobility, change in family size and mortgage market interest rates will affect the average life of the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust. For example, Ginnie Mae securities issued during a period of high interest rates will be backed by a pool of mortgage loans bearing similarly high rates. In general, during a period of declining interest rates, new mortgage loans with interest rates lower than those charged during periods of high rates will become available. To the extent a homeowner has an outstanding

mortgage with a high rate, he may refinance his mortgage at a lower interest rate or he may rapidly repay his old mortgage. Should this happen, a Ginnie Mae issued with a high interest rate may experience a rapid prepayment of principal as the underlying mortgage loans prepay in whole or in part. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that the prepayment levels which will be actually realized will conform to the estimates or experience of the FHA, other mortgage lenders, dealers or market makers or other Ginnie Mae investors. It is not possible to meaningfully predict prepayment levels regarding the Ginnie Mae securities in the Trust. The termination of the Trust might be accelerated as a result of prepayments made as described herein.

Insurance on the Bonds

Insurance has been obtained by the issuers of certain bonds in the Trusts prior to the deposit of such bonds in a Trust, guaranteeing prompt payment of interest and principal, when due, in respect of such bonds. See “The Trusts--Objective and Bond Selection” in the prospectus. The premium for any insurance policy or policies obtained by an issuer of bonds has been paid by such issuer, and any such policy or policies are non-cancelable and will continue in force so long as the bonds so insured are outstanding and the Preinsured Bond Insurer remains in business. If the provider of an original issuance insurance policy is unable to meet its obligations under such policy or if the rating assigned to the claims-paying ability of any such insurer deteriorates, the Preinsured Bond Insurers have no obligation to insure any issue adversely affected by either of the above described events.

ACA Financial Guaranty Corporation (“ACA Financial Guaranty”). ACA Financial Guaranty is organized and domiciled in the State of Maryland. Since December 2007, ACA Financial Guaranty has not issued any new financial guaranty insurance policies and is currently operating as a runoff insurance company.

On August 8, 2008, ACA Financial Guaranty and counterparties to its structured finance products reached an agreement on a restructuring plan for ACA Financial Guaranty. The plan, approved by the Maryland Insurance Administration, provided for settlement of the structured finance obligations and protection for ACA Financial Guaranty’s municipal policyholders. The settlement required that ACA Financial Guaranty make a \$209 million cash payment and a distribution of surplus notes. The surplus notes provide the former collateralized debt obligation (“CDO”) counterparties and certain other counterparties with approximately a 95% economic interest in ACA Financial Guaranty. ACA Financial Guaranty continues to operate as a runoff insurance company and focus on actively monitoring its remaining insured municipal obligations.

As of September 30, 2012, ACA Financial Guaranty had total admitted assets of \$436.3 million and total liabilities of \$328.7 million, resulting in a surplus as regards policyholders of \$107.6 million.

On December 15, 2008, S&P raised the financial strength, financial enhancement, and issuer credit ratings on ACA Financial Guaranty to B from CCC, with a developing outlook. The upgrade reflected the positive effects of the restructuring transaction completed in August 2008 that settled all outstanding CDO and reinsurance exposures of the company, including the significantly deteriorated CDO of asset-backed securities (“ABS”) transactions, eliminating a requirement to post a significant amount of collateral to the CDO of ABS counterparties. At the same time, S&P also withdrew the ratings at ACA Financial Guaranty’s request.

The information relating to ACA Financial Guaranty contained above has been furnished by ACA Financial Guaranty or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Ambac Assurance Corporation (“Ambac Assurance”). Ambac Financial Group, Inc. (“Ambac”), headquartered in New York City, is a holding company incorporated in the state of Delaware on April 29, 1991. Ambac’s activities are divided into two business segments: (i) financial guarantee and (ii) financial services. Ambac provides financial guarantee insurance for public and structured finance obligations through its principal operating subsidiary, Ambac Assurance. As a holding company, Ambac is largely dependent on dividends from Ambac Assurance to pay principal and interest on its indebtedness and to pay its operating expenses.

On June 5, 2008, S&P downgraded Ambac Assurance's insurance financial strength rating to AA from AAA, with negative implications. On June 19, 2008, Moody's downgraded Ambac Assurance's insurance financial strength rating from Aaa to Aa3, with a negative outlook. Moody's June 19, 2008 downgrade of Ambac Assurance's insurance financial strength rating reflects Ambac Assurance's overall credit profile in the current environment, including its significantly constrained new business prospects, its impaired financial flexibility and increased expected and stress loss projections among its mortgage-related risk exposures relative to previous estimates. On November 5, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Ambac Assurance from Aa3 to Baa1, with a developing outlook, as a result of greater than expected mortgage-related losses in the third quarter. On November 19, 2008, S&P lowered its insurance financial strength rating of Ambac Assurance to A from AA, with a negative outlook. The November 19, 2008 rating action on Ambac Assurance reflects S&P's view that Ambac Assurance's exposures in the U.S. residential mortgage sector and particularly the related collateralized debt obligation structures have been a source of significant and comparatively greater-than-competitor losses and will continue to expose the company to the potential for further adverse loss development. On April 13, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Ambac Assurance from Baa1 to Ba3, with a developing outlook, reflecting Ambac Assurance's weakened business position and very constrained financial flexibility, as well as its weakened risk adjusted capitalization, as Moody's loss estimates on residential mortgage-backed securities ("RMBS") have increased significantly. In Moody's view, these higher loss estimates increase the estimated capital required to support Ambac Assurance's sizable direct RMBS portfolio (including securities owned as well as securities guaranteed) and also the insurer's large portfolio of ABS CDO risks. On June 24, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of Ambac Assurance to BBB from A with negative implications. The June 24, 2009 rating action on Ambac Assurance reflects S&P's view that Ambac Assurance is effectively in runoff and the likelihood of the company continuing as an operating entity capable of writing new business has decreased significantly. On July 28, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of Ambac Assurance to CC from BBB, with a developing outlook. The July 28, 2009 rating action on Ambac Assurance reflects S&P's view of the significant deterioration in the Ambac Assurance's insured portfolio of nonprime RMBS and related CDOs, which has required the company to strengthen reserves to account for higher projected claims. In S&P's view, the additional reserves will have a significant negative effect on operating results, which will likely cause surplus to decline to below regulator required minimums. On July 29, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Ambac Assurance from Ba3 to Caa2, with a developing outlook, reflecting Moody's belief that, as a result of Ambac Assurance's recently announced large loss reserve increase and credit impairment charge estimated for the second quarter of 2009 which would reduce Ambac Assurance's regulatory capital to levels below the required minimum threshold, there will be increased pressure on Ambac Assurance's counterparties to commute outstanding exposures on terms that could imply a distressed exchange. On March 25, 2010, S&P revised the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of Ambac Assurance to R from CC (an issuer rated "R" by S&P is under regulatory supervision because of its financial condition). S&P's March 25, 2010 rating action resulted following a directive by the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin to Ambac Assurance to establish a segregated account for certain insured exposure, primarily policies related to credit derivatives, RMBS, and other structured finance transactions. On March 26, 2010, Moody's placed the Caa2 insurance financial strength rating of Ambac Assurance on review for possible upgrade. On November 23, 2010, Moody's affirmed Ambac's Caa2 insurance financial strength rating, with a developing outlook. On November 30, 2010, S&P withdrew the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of Ambac at the company's request. The November 30, 2010 rating action followed a directive by the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin to Ambac to establish a segregated account for certain insured exposure, primarily policies related to credit derivatives, residential mortgage-backed securities, and other structured finance transactions. On April 7, 2011, Moody's withdrew the insurance financial strength rating of Ambac Assurance.

There have been a number of developments with respect to ratings actions by the rating agencies. As a result of these rating agency actions, as well as investor concern with respect to these actions, Ambac Assurance and its operating subsidiaries have been able to originate only a de minimis amount of new financial guarantee business since November 2007, and no new business in 2009. As a result, Ambac is no longer competing for new business.

On March 25, 2010, Ambac announced that, at the direction of the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Wisconsin (“OCI”), Ambac Assurance had established a segregated account for certain of its liabilities, primarily policies related to credit derivatives, RMBS and other structured finance transactions. This action derives from the OCI’s view that immediate action is necessary to address Ambac Assurance’s financial position. In conjunction with the establishment of the segregated account, the OCI has commenced rehabilitation proceedings with respect to liabilities contained in the segregated account in order to facilitate an orderly run-off and/or settlement of those specific liabilities. On June 7, 2010 Ambac announced that it had commuted all of its remaining CDOs of ABS and that certain other non-CDO of ABS exposures would be commuted within the next twelve months.

On November 8, 2010, Ambac announced that it has filed for a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”) in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the “Bankruptcy Court”). Ambac will continue to operate in the ordinary course of business as “debtor-in-possession” under the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court and in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code and the orders of the Bankruptcy Court. Ambac Assurance is subject to insurance regulatory requirements of the States of Wisconsin and New York, and the other jurisdictions in which it is licensed to conduct business.

Ambac Assurance’s statutory policyholder surplus and qualified statutory capital were \$100.0 million and \$628.3 million at September 30, 2012, respectively as compared to \$495.3 million and \$684.6 million as of December 31, 2011, respectively. As of September 30, 2012, total stockholders’ deficit was \$3.49 billion; at December 31, 2011, total stockholders’ deficit was \$3.15 billion. This increased deficit was primarily caused by the net loss for the nine months ended September 30, 2012, partially offset by unrealized gains on investment securities during the period.

The information relating to Ambac Assurance contained above has been furnished by Ambac Assurance or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Assured Guaranty Corp. (“Assured Guaranty”) and Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. (“Assured Municipal”) (formerly Financial Security Assurance Inc. (“FSA”)). Assured Guaranty, a subsidiary of Assured Guaranty Ltd. (“Assured”), is organized in the State of Maryland and provides financial guaranty insurance to both the municipal and structured finance sectors. Assured Municipal, also a subsidiary of Assured, is a separately capitalized company organized in the State of New York and provides municipal bond insurance.

In January 2009, Assured Guaranty finalized an agreement with CIFG Assurance North America, Inc. to assume a diversified portfolio of financial guaranty contracts totaling approximately \$13.3 billion of net par outstanding. Assured Guaranty received \$75.6 million, which included \$85.7 million of upfront premiums net of ceding commissions and approximately \$12.2 million of future installments related to this transaction.

On July 1, 2009, Assured completed the purchase of Financial Security Assurance Holdings Ltd., the parent of financial guaranty insurance company, FSA, from Dexia Holdings Inc. Effective November 9, 2009, FSA was renamed Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. In certain states, Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. may operate under its prior name, Financial Security Assurance Inc.

On June 24, 2010, S&P published a Full Analysis in which it affirmed its “AAA” financial strength ratings of Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal, reflecting S&P’s view of the companies’ dominant market position in the bond insurance industry and their strong combined capital position. On October 25, 2010, S&P lowered the

counterparty credit and financial strength ratings of both Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal to AA+ from AAA, with a stable outlook. The downgrades reflect S&P's view of a struggling financial guarantee market, each company's weak statutory operating performance, and also the quality of each company's capital within S&P's capital adequacy analysis. On November 30, 2011 S&P lowered the counterparty credit and financial strength ratings of both Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal to AA- from AA+, with a stable outlook. The November 30, 2011 downgrades reflect S&P's view that Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal do not maintain enough capital to mitigate the largest obligor concentrations for a higher rating.

On November 21, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Assured Guaranty from Aaa to Aa2, primarily reflecting Moody's updated view on Assured Guaranty's exposure to weakness inherent in the financial guaranty business model. Also on November 21, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of FSA from Aaa to Aa3, reflecting Moody's view of FSA's diminished business and financial profile resulting from its exposure to losses on U.S. mortgage risks and disruption in the financial guaranty business more broadly. On November 12, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Assured Guaranty from Aa2 to Aa3, with a negative outlook. Moody's November 12, 2009 downgrade results from Moody's review of the performance of Assured's RMBS exposures. Moody's said that adverse trends in RMBS loss estimates have had varying effects on Assured's main insurance subsidiaries. On March 5, 2010, Moody's confirmed the insurance financial strength ratings of both Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal at Aa3, with a negative outlook. On January 17, 2013, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of Assured Guaranty to A3 from Aa3 and of Assured Municipal to A2 from Aa3, both with a stable outlook. The January 17, 2013 downgrade reflects Moody's reassessment of the business franchise, expected future profitability and financial flexibility of Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal.

On April 1, 2015, Assured Guaranty acquired all issued and outstanding shares of Radian Asset Assurance, Inc. All prior obligations of Radian Asset are now obligations of Assured Guaranty.

Assured's third quarter 2012 net income declined to \$142 million from \$761 million in third quarter 2011 due primarily to the effects of changes in credit spreads on the fair value of credit derivatives, offset in part by a decline in loss expense, which was significantly higher in the prior year due mainly to the effects of declining discount rates in the third quarter of 2011. Non-GAAP operating income in third quarter 2012 was \$166 million, an increase from operating income in third quarter 2011, due primarily to higher net earned premiums due to refundings, accelerations and terminations, lower loss expense, and a lower effective tax rate on operating income. As of September 30, 2012, Assured Guaranty had total assets of \$5.28 billion and total liabilities of \$4.13 billion, resulting in total shareholder equity of \$1.15 billion. As of September 30, 2012, Assured Municipal had total assets of \$10.74 billion and total liabilities of \$7.64 billion, resulting in total shareholder equity of \$3.10 billion.

The information contained above relating to Assured Guaranty and Assured Municipal and their parent company, Assured, is based upon publicly available information, or upon information that has been provided by the ratings agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Berkshire Hathaway Assurance Corp ("BHAC"). BHAC is a bond insurance company created by Berkshire Hathaway, Inc. ("Berkshire") in December 2007 and is licensed to write financial guarantee insurance in 49 states.

On April 11, 2008, S&P assigned an initial rating of AAA to BHAC's insurance financial strength, with a stable outlook. On April 25, 2008, Moody's assigned an initial rating of Aaa to BHAC's insurance financial strength, with a stable outlook. On April 8, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of BHAC from Aaa to Aa1, with a stable outlook. This downgrade reflects Moody's view concerning "the impact on Berkshire's key businesses of the severe decline in equity markets over the past year as well as the protracted economic recession." Moody's noted that Berkshire is also exposed to heightened volatility in its earnings and capital base related to market value fluctuations within its large portfolio of equity derivatives. On February 4, 2010, S&P lowered the financial strength rating of BHAC from AAA to AA+, with a stable outlook. The February 4, 2010

rating action was taken in anticipation of Berkshire's acquisition of Northern Santa Fe Corporation reflecting S&P's expectation that a significant part of the internal cash for the acquisition will come from Berkshire's core insurance operations and that Berkshire's overall capital adequacy has weakened to levels no longer consistent with a AAA rating and is not expected to return to extremely strong levels in the near term.

As of September 30, 2012, Berkshire had total assets of \$424.1 billion and total liabilities of \$235.0 billion, resulting in total shareholder equity of \$189.1 billion.

The information relating to BHAC and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by BHAC or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Build America Mutual Assurance Company ("BAM"). BAM is a New York domiciled mutual insurance company owned by the issuers of municipal bonds who use BAM to insure their debt obligations. BAM officially launched on July 23, 2012 and began writing policies in September of 2012.

On July 23, 2012, S&P assigned an initial rating of AA to BAM's financial strength and counterparty credit ratings, with a stable outlook. These ratings are based upon S&P's view that BAM holds a very strong competitive position with low industry risk, along with extremely strong capital adequacy and strong operating performance.

As of September 30, 2012 BAM had total net admitted assets of \$518.9 million and total liabilities of \$27.9 million, resulting in a surplus as regards policyholders of \$491.0 million.

The information relating to BAM contained above has been furnished by BAM or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

CIFG Assurance North America, Inc. ("CIFG"). CIFG Holding, Inc. is the holding company for the CIFG group of financial guaranty insurance and reinsurance companies ("CIFG Group"), including CIFG Assurance North America, Inc., a New York corporation and its subsidiaries. The CIFG Group is actively managing the runoff of a portfolio of insured structured finance, municipal and infrastructure risks. On September 29, 2010, CIFG and CIFG Guaranty entered into a merger agreement which resulted in CIFG Guaranty merging into CIFG (together with related transactions, the "CIFG Merger").

On March 6, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of CIFG from Aaa to A1, with a stable outlook. This rating action reflected Moody's assessment of CIFG's weakened capitalization, impaired business opportunities, and uncertain strategic direction, as a result, in part, of its exposures to the U.S. residential mortgage market. Moody's believed that CIFG's significant exposure to the mortgage sector, especially ABS CDOs is indicative of a risk posture far greater than would be consistent with a Aaa rating going forward. On May 20, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of CIFG to Ba2 from A1, with direction uncertain, reflecting the high likelihood that, absent material developments, the company would fail minimum regulatory capital requirements in New York and Bermuda due to expected significant increases in modeled loss reserves on ABS CDOs. In Moody's view, the breach of such regulatory capital requirements would put the company in a precarious position, especially in light of the solvency provisions embedded in its CDS exposures. On October 28, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of CIFG from Ba2 to B3, with direction uncertain, reflecting Moody's expectation of substantially higher mortgage-related losses arising from CIFG's insured portfolio, as well as the possibility that certain troubled exposures could be commuted. On January 22, 2009, Moody's upgraded the insurance financial strength rating of CIFG from B3 to Ba3, with a developing outlook, reflecting the strengthened capital adequacy profile of CIFG following its restructuring and the commutation of substantially all of its ABS CDO risks. Also on January 22, 2009, S&P raised the insurance financial strength rating of CIFG to BB from B, with a developing outlook. S&P's January 22, 2009 upgrade results from the completion of CIFG's restructuring plan involving key policyholders, creditors, and equity owners (counterparties) who had hedged their ABS CDO and commercial real estate CDO exposures with

CIFG and which were significantly affected by defaults and downgrades of the underlying collateral. On June 15, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of CIFG to CC from BB, with a negative outlook, reflecting S&P's view of the significant deterioration in the company's insured portfolio of nonprime RMBS which has necessitated that CIFG strengthen reserves to account for the higher projected claims. On August 20, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of CIFG from Ba3 to Caa2, resulting from significant deterioration in the company's remaining insured portfolio since January, 2009 when CIFG initiated a broad restructuring. On November 11, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of CIFG from Caa2 to Ca. Also on November 11, 2009, Moody's announced that it will withdraw the insurance financial strength rating of CIFG. The November 11, 2009 rating actions reflect Moody's view that material deterioration in CIFG's insured portfolio adversely affected the guarantor's capital adequacy profile and Moody's believes that CIFG may no longer have sufficient financial resources to pay all insurance claims. On February 16, 2010, S&P withdrew the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of CIFG.

As of September 30, 2012, CIFG had net admitted assets of \$742.3 million and total liabilities of \$385.5 million. CIFG's statutory surplus as of September 30, 2012 is approximately \$356.7 million, a decrease of approximately \$227.8 million from approximately \$584.5 million at December 31, 2011. This decrease is primarily attributable to unpaid losses and loss adjustment expense reserves established for student loans of approximately \$252.3 million, which is partially offset by other income statement balances resulting in a net loss of approximately \$227.0 million and an increase in contingency reserves of approximately \$3.5 million.

The information relating to CIFG and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by CIFG or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Financial Guaranty Insurance Company ("FGIC"). FGIC is a wholly owned subsidiary of FGIC Corporation. The company was engaged in the business of providing financial guaranty insurance and other forms of credit enhancement for public finance and structured finance obligations. In January 2008, FGIC voluntarily ceased writing financial guaranty policies concerning new or additional risks.

The deterioration in the U.S. housing and mortgage markets and the global credit markets, which accelerated in the fourth quarter of 2007 and continued through the fourth quarter of 2009, has adversely affected the company's business, results of operations and financial condition. Specifically, the company incurred significant losses related to its exposure to certain ABS CDOs, which are backed primarily by subprime RMBS, and to certain RMBS, primarily backed by first-lien or second-lien mortgages. These losses have resulted in a substantial reduction of FGIC's statutory policyholders' surplus over time. On November 24, 2009, the New York State Insurance Department, the predecessor to the New York State Department of Financial Services, issued an order pursuant to Section 1310 of the New York Insurance Law requiring FGIC to, among other things, suspend paying any and all claims. FGIC was subsequently unable to eliminate the impairment of its policyholders' surplus through an out-of-court Surplus Restoration Plan. On June 11, 2012, Benjamin M. Lawskey, Superintendent of Financial Services of the State of New York (the "Superintendent") filed a verified petition with the Supreme Court of the State of New York for an order of rehabilitation (i) appointing the Superintendent as rehabilitator ("Rehabilitator") of FGIC, (ii) directing the Rehabilitator to take possession of the property and assets of FGIC and to conduct the business thereof, and (iii) directing the Rehabilitator to take steps towards the removal of the causes and conditions which have made FGIC's rehabilitation proceeding (the "Rehabilitation Proceeding") necessary. FGIC consented to the commencement of the Rehabilitation Proceeding.

Prior to the fourth quarter of 2007, FGIC's financial strength was rated "Aaa" by Moody's "AAA" by S&P, and "AAA" by Fitch Ratings, Inc. ("Fitch"). Moody's, S&P and Fitch have since completed several assessments of FGIC's capital adequacy in relation to the company's exposure to ABS CDOs which are backed primarily by subprime RMBS, and its exposure to first-lien and second-lien RMBS. As a result of these assessments, Moody's,

S&P and Fitch downgraded the financial strength ratings of FGIC. As of March 31, 2008, Fitch had downgraded FGIC from AA to BBB with Rating Watch Negative; Moody's had downgraded FGIC from A3 to Baa3; and S&P had downgraded FGIC from A to BB. On June 20, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of FGIC from Baa3 to B1, reflecting FGIC's severely impaired financial flexibility and proximity to minimum regulatory capital requirements relative to Moody's estimates of expected case losses. On November 24, 2008, S&P lowered its insurance financial strength rating of FGIC to CCC from BB, with a negative outlook. S&P's November 24, 2008 downgrade results from FGIC's exposure to nonprime and second-lien mortgages and related CDO of ABS. On December 19, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of FGIC from B1 to Caa1, with a negative outlook, reflecting Moody's expectation of higher mortgage-related losses arising from FGIC's insured portfolio and the constrained liquidity and financial flexibility of the holding company. On March 24, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of FGIC from Caa1 to Caa3, with a negative outlook, reflecting Moody's expectation of higher mortgage-related losses arising from FGIC's insured portfolio, insufficient claims paying resources to cover Moody's estimate of expected loss, and the constrained liquidity and financial flexibility of FGIC's holding company. Also on March 24, 2009, Moody's withdrew the insurance financial strength rating of FGIC. On April 22, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of FGIC to CC from CCC, with a negative outlook. Also on April 22, 2009, S&P withdrew the ratings on FGIC and the counterparty credit rating on the holding company, FGIC Corporation, because of S&P's expectation that timely and comprehensive financial information will no longer be available.

As of September 30, 2012, FGIC had net admitted assets of approximately \$2.1 billion and total liabilities of approximately \$5.8 billion.

On August 4, 2010, FGIC Corporation announced that it had filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the Southern District of New York. None of FGIC Corporation's subsidiaries or affiliates, including FGIC, are part of the Chapter 11 filing.

The information relating to FGIC and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by FGIC or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Municipal Assurance Corporation ("MAC"). MAC is a New York domiciled corporation providing municipal bond insurance for municipal and infrastructure bonds. MAC currently guarantees only public finance transactions. MAC is an Assured Guaranty company owned jointly by its affiliates Assured Guaranty Municipal Corp. and Assured Guaranty Corp. MAC is part of the Assured Guaranty Group.

On July 17, 2013, S&P assigned MAC a long-term financial strength and counterparty credit rating of AA- to MAC with a stable outlook. On March 18, 2014, S&P raised its financial strength and enhancement rating on MAC from AA- to AA. The rating action reflects S&P's view that MAC's competitive position remains strong relative to its peers' in the bond industry. S&P continues to view MAC as having a stable outlook.

As of June 30, 2014, MAC had a total net admitted assets of \$1,519,869,768 and total liabilities of \$999,277,625 resulting in a surplus as regards policyholders of \$520,592,143.

The information relating to MAC contained above is based upon publicly available information or upon information that has been provided by the ratings agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

National Public Finance Guarantee Corporation ("National Guarantee") (formerly MBIA Insurance Corp. of Illinois ("MBIA Illinois")). MBIA, Inc., a Connecticut corporation, conducts its financial guarantee business through its wholly-owned subsidiaries MBIA Insurance Corporation ("MBIA Corp."), which writes global structured finance and non-U.S. public finance financial guarantee insurance, and National Guarantee, which writes U.S. public finance guarantees.

On February 18, 2009, MBIA, Inc., the parent company of MBIA Corp., announced the restructuring of its financial guaranty insurance operations following the approval of the New York and Illinois insurance regulators. The restructuring involved the segregation of its financial guaranty insurance operations into two separately capitalized sister companies, with National Guarantee assuming the risk associated with its U.S. municipal exposures, and with MBIA Corp. insuring the remainder of the portfolio, including all international and structured finance exposures. Business ceded to MBIA Corp. from FGIC in 2008 has been assigned to National Guarantee. To provide additional protection for its municipal bond policyholders, National Guarantee has also issued second-to-pay policies for the benefit of the policyholders covered by the reinsurance and assignment. The second-to-pay policies, which are a direct obligation of National Guarantee, will be held by The Bank of New York Mellon as insurance trustee. These policies provide that if MBIA Corp. or FGIC, as applicable, do not pay valid claims of their policyholders, the policyholders will then be able to make a claim directly against National Guarantee under the second-to-pay policies. On March 19, 2009, MBIA Illinois formally changed its name to National Public Finance Guarantee Corporation. Effective December 1, 2009, National Guarantee was redomesticated to the State of New York and is subject to insurance regulations and supervision of the State of New York. National Guarantee is a wholly owned subsidiary of MBIA, Inc. and independently capitalized with \$5.6 billion in claims-paying resources as of December 31, 2010. In certain states, National Public Finance Guarantee Corporation may operate under its prior name, MBIA Insurance Corp. of Illinois.

On June 5, 2008, S&P downgraded MBIA Corp.'s insurance financial strength rating to AA from AAA. On June 19, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of MBIA Corp. and its insurance affiliates from Aaa to A2. Moody's June 19, 2008 downgrade of MBIA Corp. and its insurance affiliates reflects MBIA Corp.'s limited financial flexibility and impaired franchise, as well as the substantial risk within its portfolio of insured exposures and a movement toward more aggressive capital management within the group. On November 7, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of MBIA Corp. and its insurance affiliates from A2 to Baa1, with a developing outlook. Moody's November 7, 2008 downgrade of MBIA Corp. and its insurance affiliates reflects MBIA Corp.'s diminished business and financial profile resulting from its exposure to losses from U.S. mortgage risks and disruption in the financial guaranty business more broadly. On February 18, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of MBIA Corp. from Baa1 to B3, with a developing outlook, reflecting MBIA Corp.'s substantial reduction in claims-paying resources relative to the remaining higher-risk exposures in its insured portfolio, given the removal of capital, and the transfer of unearned premium reserves associated with the ceding of its municipal portfolio to MBIA Illinois, as well as the continued deterioration of MBIA Corp.'s insured portfolio of largely structured credits, with stress reaching sectors beyond residential mortgage-related securities. Also on February 18, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of MBIA Corp. to BBB+ from AA, with a negative outlook. The February 18, 2009 rating action on MBIA Corp. reflects S&P's view that MBIA Corp.'s retained insured portfolio lacks sufficient sector diversity and with time could become more concentrated, and that MBIA Corp.'s 2005–2007 vintage direct RMBS, CDO of ABS, and other structured exposures are subject to continued adverse loss development that could erode capital adequacy. At the same time, S&P lowered the counterparty credit and financial strength ratings of MBIA Illinois to AA- from AA, reflecting MBIA Illinois's uncertain business prospects and capital. On June 5, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of MBIA Corp. to BBB from BBB+, with a negative outlook, resulting from MBIA Corp.'s increased loss assumptions on its 2005–2007 vintage direct RMBS and CDO of ABS and a change in the assumed tax benefit of tax-loss carryforwards. Also on June 5, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of National Guarantee to A from AA-, with a negative outlook, reflecting S&P's view of National Guarantee's uncertain business and capital-raising prospects. On September 28, 2009, S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of MBIA Corp. to BB+ from BBB, with a negative outlook, reflecting S&P's view that macroeconomic conditions continue to contribute to losses on the group's structured finance products. On December 22, 2010 S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial

strength, and financial enhancement ratings of MBIA Corp. to B from BB+, with a negative outlook, reflecting increased stress case loss projections. Also on December 22, 2010 S&P lowered the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of National Guarantee to BBB from A, with a developing outlook. On December 19, 2011 Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of National Guarantee from Baa1 to Baa2, with a negative outlook, based upon weakening of the overall MBIA group's market standing as losses grow at National Guarantee's affiliated companies and the risk that resources at National Guarantee could be drawn away to support losses elsewhere within the group. On May 10, 2013 S&P raised the counterparty credit, financial strength, and financial enhancement ratings of National Guarantee to A from BB, with a stable outlook. The May 10, 2013 rating action reflects S&P's view that MBIA Corp. no longer acts as an anchor on the National Guarantee rating following the settlement with Societe Generale that ends litigation challenging National Guarantee's split from MBIA Corp. in 2009. On May 21, 2013 Moody's upgraded the insurance financial strength rating of MBIA Corp. to B3 from Caa2, with a positive outlook, citing MBIA Corp.'s improved capital and liquidity profile following settlements of putback receivables and insured claims with major counterparties. Also on May 21, 2013 Moody's upgraded the insurance financial strength rating of National Guarantee to Baa1 from Baa2, with a positive outlook. The May 21, 2013 rating action reflects National Guarantee's improved credit profile following the repayment of the loan from its weaker affiliate, MBIA Corp., and the termination of the litigation related to the 2009 restructuring.

As of September 30, 2012, National Guarantee had total net admitted assets of \$5.9 billion and total liabilities of \$4.1 billion, resulting in a surplus as regard policyholders of \$1.8 billion.

As of September 30, 2012, MBIA, Inc. and its subsidiaries had total assets of \$22.1 billion and total liabilities of \$19.6 billion. MBIA, Inc.'s total shareholders' equity as of September 30, 2012 was \$2.6 billion, increasing from \$1.7 billion as of December 31, 2011.

The information relating to MBIA and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by MBIA or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

Syncora Guarantee Inc. ("Syncora Guarantee") (formerly XL Capital Assurance Inc. ("XLCA")). Syncora Guarantee, a wholly owned subsidiary of Syncora Holdings Ltd. ("Syncora Holdings"), is a New York domiciled financial guarantee insurance company which provides credit enhancement and protection products to the public finance and structured finance markets throughout the United States and internationally.

In February 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength ratings of XLCA to A3 from Aaa. On June 20, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of XLCA from A3 to B2, reflecting XLCA's severely impaired financial flexibility and proximity to minimum regulatory capital requirements relative to Moody's estimates of expected case losses. On October 24, 2008, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Syncora Guarantee from B2 to Caa1. On November 18, 2008, S&P lowered its insurance financial strength rating of Syncora Guarantee to B from BBB- with developing expectations. S&P's November 18, 2008 downgrade resulted from the Syncora Guarantee's delay in implementing its restructuring plan and slow progress in its negotiations with counterparties of its CDO of ABS exposure. On January 29, 2009, S&P lowered the issuer credit and financial strength ratings of Syncora Guarantee to CC from B, with a negative outlook. S&P's January 29, 2009 downgrade resulted from S&P's recent update to its distressed exchange criteria. On March 9, 2009, Moody's downgraded the insurance financial strength rating of Syncora Guarantee from Caa1 to Ca, with a developing outlook, as a result of the large loss reserve and credit impairment charges taken by Syncora Guarantee on its mortgage-related exposures during the fourth quarter, which have resulted in a \$2.4 billion statutory deficit at Syncora Guarantee as of December 31, 2008. On April 27, 2009, S&P revised the financial strength and financial enhancement ratings of Syncora Guarantee to R from CC (an issuer rated "R" by S&P is under regulatory supervision because of its financial condition). Also on April 27, 2009, S&P revised the counterparty credit rating of Syncora Guarantee to D from CC (an issuer rated "D" by S&P has failed to pay one or more of its financial obligation

when it became due). S&P's April 27, 2009 rating actions resulted from Syncora Guarantee's announcement that pursuant to an order of the New York Insurance Department ("NYID"), the company must suspend any and all claims payments until it has restored its policyholders' surplus to a level greater than or equal to \$65 million, the minimum the state requires. On July 28, 2010, S&P withdrew the D counterparty credit rating and the R financial strength and financial enhancement ratings of Syncora Guarantee. S&P's July 28, 2010 ratings actions resulted from S&P's belief that there is not sufficient information to judge Syncora Guarantee's claims paying ability.

As of September 30, 2012, Syncora Guarantee had total assets of \$1.17 billion and total liabilities of \$639 million, resulting in a policyholders' surplus of \$504.2 million.

On July 20, 2010, Syncora Holdings announced that Syncora Guarantee has completed its remediation plan sufficient to meet its minimum statutory policyholder surplus requirements and address previously announced short and medium term liquidity issues. Also on July 20, 2010, Syncora Holdings announced that the NYID had approved Syncora Guarantee's plan for the payment of accrued and unpaid claims and for the payment of new claims as they become due in the ordinary course of business, resulting in the recommencement of claim payments by Syncora Guaranty on regularly scheduled payment dates occurring on or after July 21, 2010.

The information relating to Syncora Guarantee and its affiliates contained above has been furnished by Syncora Guarantee or the rating agencies. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information, or as to the existence of any adverse changes in such information subsequent to the date hereof.

The public can read and copy any materials the above referenced companies file with the SEC at the SEC's Public Reference in Washington, D.C. You may obtain information about the Public Reference Room by calling 1-202-551-8090. Reports, proxy and information statements, and other information regarding issuers, which may include the companies listed above, that file electronically with the SEC available on the EDGAR Database on the SEC's Internet site at <http://www.sec.gov>.

The extent of state insurance regulation and supervision varies by jurisdiction, but New York and most other jurisdictions have laws and regulations prescribing permitted investments and governing the payment of dividends, transactions with affiliates, mergers, consolidations, acquisitions or sales of assets and incurrence of liabilities for borrowings.

In order to be in an Insured Trust, bonds must be insured by one of the Preinsured Bond Insurers. In determining eligibility for insurance, the Preinsured Bond Insurers have applied their own standards which correspond generally to the standards they normally use in establishing the insurability of new issues of bonds and which are not necessarily the criteria used in the selection of bonds by the Sponsor. To the extent the standards of the Preinsured Bond Insurers are more restrictive than those of the Sponsor, the previously stated Trust investment criteria have been limited with respect to the bonds. This decision is made prior to the Date of Deposit, as debt obligations not eligible for insurance are not deposited in an Insured Trust. Thus, all of the bonds in the portfolios of the Insured Trusts are insured by the issuer of the bonds prior to the deposit of such bonds in a Trust.

Preinsured Bonds in a Trust may or may not have a higher yield than uninsured bonds. In selecting such bonds for an Insured Trust, the Sponsor has applied the applicable criteria.

In the event of nonpayment of interest or principal, when due, in respect of a bond, a Preinsured Bond Insurer shall make such payment after the respective insurer has been notified that such nonpayment has occurred or is threatened (but not earlier than the date such payment is due). The insurer, as regards any payment it may make, will succeed to the rights of the Trustee in respect thereof. All policies issued by the Preinsured Bond Insurers are substantially identical insofar as obligations to an Insured Trust are concerned.

The Internal Revenue Service has issued a letter ruling which holds in effect that insurance proceeds representing maturing interest on defaulted municipal obligations paid to holders of insured bonds, under policy provisions substantially identical to the policies described herein, will be excludable from federal gross income

under Section 103(a)(1) of the Code to the same extent as if such payments were made by the issuer of the municipal obligations. Holders of Units in an Insured Trust should discuss with their tax advisers the degree of reliance which they may place on this letter ruling. However, counsel for the Sponsor at the time of the closing of the Insured Trust, had given an opinion to the effect such payment of proceeds would be excludable from federal gross income to the extent described under “Federal Tax Status” in Prospectus Part II.

Each Preinsured Bond Insurer is subject to regulation by the department of insurance in the state in which it is qualified to do business. Such regulation, however, is no guarantee that each Preinsured Bond Insurer will be able to perform on its contract of insurance in the event a claim should be made thereunder at some time in the future. At the date hereof, it is reported that no claims have been submitted or are expected to be submitted to any of the Bond Insurers which would materially impair the ability of any such company to meet its commitment pursuant to any contract of bond insurance.

The information relating to each Preinsured Bond Insurer has been furnished by such companies. The financial information with respect to each Preinsured Bond Insurer appears in reports filed with state insurance regulatory authorities and is subject to audit and review by such authorities. No representation is made herein as to the accuracy or adequacy of such information or as to the absence of material adverse changes in such information subsequent to the dates thereof.

Portfolio Administration

The Trustee is empowered to sell, for the purpose of redeeming Units tendered by any Unitholder, and for the payment of expenses for which funds may not be available, such of the bonds designated by the Evaluator as the Trustee in its sole discretion may deem necessary. The Evaluator, in designating such bonds, will consider a variety of factors, including (a) interest rates, (b) market value and (c) marketability. To the extent that bonds are sold which are current in payment of principal and interest in order to meet redemption requests and defaulted bonds are retained in the portfolio in order to preserve the related insurance protection applicable to said bonds, the overall quality of the bonds remaining in the Trust’s portfolio will tend to diminish. The Sponsor is empowered, but not obligated, to direct the Trustee to dispose of bonds in the event of an advanced refunding.

The Sponsor is required to instruct the Trustee to reject any offer made by an issuer of any of the bonds to issue new bonds in exchange or substitution for any bond pursuant to a refunding or refinancing plan, except that the Sponsor may instruct the Trustee to accept or reject such an offer or to take any other action with respect thereto as the Sponsor may deem proper if (1) the issuer is in default with respect to such bond or (2) in the written opinion of the Sponsor the issuer will probably default with respect to such bond in the reasonably foreseeable future. Any bond so received in exchange or substitution will be held by the Trustee subject to the terms and conditions of the Trust Agreement to the same extent as bonds originally deposited thereunder. Within five days after the deposit of obligations in exchange or substitution for underlying bonds, the Trustee is required to give notice thereof to each Unitholder, identifying the bonds eliminated and the bonds substituted therefor. Except as stated herein and under “Trust Administration--Replacement Bonds” in Prospectus Part II regarding the substitution of Replacement Bonds for Failed Bonds, the acquisition by the Trust of any bonds other than the bonds initially deposited is not permitted.

With respect to a Preinsured Bond in a Trust, the Trustee shall promptly notify the Preinsured Bond Insurer of any nonpayment of principal or interest on such Preinsured Bond and if the Preinsured Bond Insurer should fail to make payment to the Trustee within thirty days after receipt of such notice, the Trustee shall take all action against the Preinsured Bond Insurer and/or the issuer deemed necessary to collect all amounts of principal and interest at that time due, but not collected.

Sponsor Information

Invesco Capital Markets, Inc. is the Sponsor of your Trust. The Sponsor is a wholly owned subsidiary of Invesco Advisers, Inc. (“Invesco Advisers”). Invesco Advisers is an indirect wholly owned subsidiary of Invesco Ltd., a leading independent global investment manager that provides a wide range of investment strategies and vehicles to its retail, institutional and high net worth clients around the globe. The Sponsor’s principal office is located at 11 Greenway Plaza, Houston, Texas 77046-1173. As of June 30, 2016, the total stockholders’ equity of Invesco Capital Markets, Inc. was \$105,041,393.09 (unaudited). The current assets under management and supervision by Invesco Ltd. and its affiliates were valued at approximately \$779.6 billion as of June 30, 2016. (This paragraph relates only to the Sponsor and not to the Trust or to any other Series thereof. The information is included herein only for the purpose of informing investors as to the financial responsibility of the Sponsor and its ability to carry out its contractual obligations. More detailed financial information will be made available by the Sponsor upon request.)

The Sponsor and your Trust have adopted a code of ethics requiring Invesco Ltd.’s employees who have access to information on Trust transactions to report personal securities transactions. The purpose of the code is to avoid potential conflicts of interest and to prevent fraud, deception or misconduct with respect to your Trust.

If the Sponsor shall fail to perform any of its duties under the Trust Agreement or become incapable of acting or shall become bankrupt or its affairs are taken over by public authorities, then the Trustee may (i) appoint a successor Sponsor at rates of compensation deemed by the Trustee to be reasonable and not exceeding amounts prescribed by the Securities and Exchange Commission, (ii) terminate the Trust Agreement and liquidate the Trusts as provided therein or (iii) continue to act as Trustee without terminating the Trust Agreement.

Trustee Information

The Trustee is The Bank of New York Mellon, a trust company organized under the laws of New York. The Bank of New York Mellon has its principal unit investment trust division offices at 2 Hanson Place, 12th Floor, Brooklyn, New York 11217, telephone (800) 856-8487. The Bank of New York Mellon is subject to supervision and examination by the Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and its deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent permitted by law.

The duties of the Trustee are primarily ministerial in nature. It did not participate in the selection of bonds for the portfolios of any of the Trusts. In accordance with the Trust Agreement, the Trustee shall keep proper books of record and account of all transactions at its office for the Trusts. Such records shall include the name and address of every Unitholder of the Trusts. Such books and records shall be open to inspection by any Unitholder at all reasonable times during the usual business hours. The Trustee shall make such annual or other reports as may from time to time be required under any applicable state or Federal statute, rule or regulation. The Trustee is required to keep a certified copy or duplicate original of the Trust Agreement on file in its office available for inspection at all reasonable times during the usual business hours by any Unitholder, together with a current list of the bonds held in the Trusts.

Under the Trust Agreement, the Trustee or any successor trustee may resign and be discharged of the trusts created by the Trust Agreement by executing an instrument in writing and filing the same with the Sponsor. The Trustee or successor trustee must mail a copy of the notice of resignation to all Unitholders then of record, not less than 60 days before the date specified in such notice when such resignation is to take effect. The Sponsor upon receiving notice of such resignation is obligated to appoint a successor trustee promptly. If, upon such resignation, no successor trustee has been appointed and has accepted the appointment within 30 days after notification, the retiring Trustee may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction for the appointment of a successor. The Sponsor may remove the Trustee and appoint a successor trustee as provided in the Trust Agreement at any time with or without cause. Notice of such removal and appointment shall be mailed to each Unitholder by the Sponsor. Upon execution of a written acceptance of such appointment by such successor trustee, all the rights,

powers, duties and obligations of the original trustee shall vest in the successor. The resignation or removal of a Trustee becomes effective only when the successor trustee accepts its appointment as such or when a court of competent jurisdiction appoints a successor trustee. Any corporation into which a Trustee may be merged or with which it may be consolidated, or any corporation resulting from any merger or consolidation to which a Trustee shall be a party, shall be the successor trustee. The Trustee must be a banking corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any state and having at all times an aggregate capital, surplus and undivided profits of not less than \$5,000,000.

Termination of the Trust Agreement

A Trust may be terminated at any time by consent of Unitholders representing 51% of the Units of the Trust then outstanding (or, with respect to Van Kampen Unit Trusts, Taxable Income Series 119 and subsequent series, by consent of Unitholders representing 75% of the Units of the Trust then outstanding, and with respect to a GNMA Income Portfolio, by consent of Unitholders of 66 2/3% of the Units then outstanding) or by the Trustee when the value of the Trust, as shown by any semi-annual evaluation, is less than 20% (40% in the case of a GNMA Income Portfolio) of the original principal amount of bonds.

A Trust will be liquidated by the Trustee in the event that a sufficient number of Units not yet sold are tendered for redemption by the Underwriters, including the Sponsor, so that the net worth of the Trust would be reduced to less than 40% of the initial principal amount of the Trust. If the Trust is liquidated because of the redemption of unsold Units by the Underwriters, the Sponsor will refund to each purchaser of Units the entire sales charge paid by such purchaser.

The Trust Agreement provides that the Trust shall terminate upon the redemption, sale or other disposition of the last bond held in the Trust, but in no event shall it continue beyond the end of the year preceding the fiftieth anniversary of the Trust Agreement (twentieth anniversary for Intermediate Term Trusts and Variable Rate Trusts). In the event of termination of the Trust, written notice thereof will be sent by the Trustee to each Unitholder of the Trust at his address appearing on the registration books of the Trust maintained by the Trustee. Within a reasonable time thereafter the Trustee shall liquidate any bonds then held in the Trust and shall deduct from the funds of the Trust any accrued costs, expenses or indemnities provided by the Trust Agreement, including estimated compensation of the Trustee and costs of liquidation and any amounts required as a reserve to provide for payment of any applicable taxes or other governmental charges. The sale of bonds in the Trust upon termination may result in a lower amount than might otherwise be realized if such sale were not required at such time. For this reason, among others, the amount realized by a Unitholder upon termination may be less than the principal amount or par amount of bonds represented by the Units held by such Unitholder. The Trustee shall then distribute to each Unitholder his share of the balance of the Interest and Principal Accounts. With such distribution the Unitholders shall be furnished a final distribution statement of the amount distributable. At such time as the Trustee in its sole discretion shall determine that any amounts held in reserve are no longer necessary, it shall make distribution thereof to Unitholders in the same manner.

Description of Ratings

Standard & Poor's, A Division of the McGraw-Hill Companies. A Standard & Poor's long-term debt obligation credit rating is a current opinion of the creditworthiness of an obligor with respect to a specific debt obligation. This opinion of creditworthiness may take into consideration the creditworthiness of guarantors, insurers or other forms of credit enhancement on the obligation.

The long-term debt obligation credit ratings are not a recommendation to purchase, sell or hold the debt obligation, inasmuch as they do not comment as to market price or suitability for a particular investor.

The long-term debt obligation credit ratings are based on current information furnished by the obligor or obtained by Standard & Poor's from other sources it considers reliable. Standard & Poor's does not perform an audit in connection with any credit rating and may, on occasion, rely on unaudited financial information. Credit ratings may be changed, suspended or withdrawn as a result of changes in, or unavailability of, such information, or based on other circumstances.

The long-term debt obligation credit ratings are based, in varying degrees, on the following considerations:

- I. Likelihood of payment--capacity and willingness of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on an obligation in accordance with the terms of the obligation.
- II. Nature of and provisions of the obligation.
- III. Protection afforded by, and relative position of, the obligation in the event of bankruptcy, reorganization or other arrangement under the laws of bankruptcy and other laws affecting creditors' rights.

The credit rating definitions are expressed in terms of default risk. As such, they pertain to senior obligations of an entity. Junior obligations are typically rated lower than senior obligations to reflect the lower priority in bankruptcy, as noted above. (Such differentiation applies when an entity has both senior and subordinate obligations, secured and unsecured obligations or operating company and holding company obligations.) Accordingly, in the case of junior debt, the rating may not conform exactly with the category definition.

AAA--An obligation rated "AAA" has the highest rating assigned by Standard & Poor's. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is extremely strong.

AA--An obligation rated "AA" differs from the highest-rated obligations only in small degree. The obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is very strong.

A--An obligation rated "A" is somewhat more susceptible to adverse effects of changes in circumstances and economic conditions than obligations in higher-rated categories. However, the obligor's capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation is still strong.

BBB--An obligation rated "BBB" exhibits adequate protection parameters. However, adverse economic conditions or changing circumstances are more likely to lead to a weakened capacity of the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

Obligations rated "BB," "B," "CCC," "CC" and "C" are regarded as having significant speculative characteristics. "BB" indicates the least degree of speculation and "C" the highest. While such obligations will likely have some quality and protective characteristics, these may be outweighed by large uncertainties or major exposures to adverse conditions.

BB--An obligation rated 'BB' is less vulnerable to nonpayment than other speculative issues. However, it faces major ongoing uncertainties or exposure to adverse business, financial, or economic conditions which could lead to the obligor's inadequate capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

B--An obligation rated 'B' is more vulnerable to nonpayment than obligations rated 'BB', but the obligor currently has the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. Adverse business, financial, or economic conditions will likely impair the obligor's capacity or willingness to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

CCC--An obligation rated 'CCC' is currently vulnerable to nonpayment, and is dependent upon favorable business, financial, and economic conditions for the obligor to meet its financial commitment on the obligation. In the event of adverse business, financial, or economic conditions, the obligor is not likely to have the capacity to meet its financial commitment on the obligation.

CC--An obligation rated 'CC' is currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment.

C--A 'C' rating is assigned to obligations that are currently highly vulnerable to nonpayment, obligations that have payment arrearages allowed by the terms of the documents, or obligations of an issuer that is the subject of a bankruptcy petition or similar action which have not experienced a payment default. Among others, the 'C' rating may be assigned to subordinated debt, preferred stock or other obligations on which cash payments have been suspended in accordance with the instrument's terms or when preferred stock is the subject of a distressed exchange offer, whereby some or all of the issue is either repurchased for an amount of cash or replaced by other instruments having a total value that is less than par.

Plus (+) or Minus (-): The ratings from "AA" to "CCC" may be modified by the addition of a plus or minus sign to show relative standing within the major rating categories.

r--This symbol is attached to the ratings of instruments with significant non-credit risks. It highlights risks to principal or volatility of expected returns which are not addressed in the credit rating.

NR--This indicates that no rating has been requested, that there is insufficient information on which to base a rating or that Standard & Poor's does not rate a particular obligation as a matter of policy.

Moody's Investors Service. *Municipal long-term rating scale.* Moody's municipal ratings are opinions of the investment quality of issuers and issues in the US municipal and tax-exempt markets. As such, these ratings incorporate Moody's assessment of the default probability and loss severity of these issuers and issues. The default and loss content for Moody's municipal long-term rating scale differs from Moody's general long-term rating scale.

Municipal ratings are based upon the analysis of five primary factors relating to municipal finance: market position, financial position, debt levels, governance, and covenants. Each of the factors is evaluated individually and for its effect on the other factors in the context of the municipality's ability to repay its debt.

Aaa--Issuers or issues rated Aaa demonstrate the strongest creditworthiness relative to other US municipal or tax-exempt issuers or issues.

Aa--Issuers or issues rated Aa demonstrate very strong creditworthiness relative to other US municipal or tax-exempt issuers or issues.

A--Issuers or issues rated A present above-average creditworthiness relative to other US municipal or tax-exempt issuers or issues.

Baa--Issuers or issues rated Baa represent average creditworthiness relative to other US municipal or tax-exempt issuers or issues.

Obligations rated "Ba," "B," "Caa," "Ca" and "C" are regarded as having significant speculative characteristics. "Ba" indicates the least degree of speculation and "C" the highest. While such obligations will likely have some quality and protective characteristics, these may be outweighed by large uncertainties or major exposures to adverse conditions.

Ba--Obligations rated 'Ba' are judged to be speculative and are subject to substantial credit risk.

B--Obligations rated 'B' are considered speculative and are subject to high credit risk.

Caa--Obligations rated 'Caa' are judged to be speculative of poor standing and are subject to very high credit risk.

Ca--Obligations rated 'Ca' are highly speculative and are likely in, or very near, default, with some prospect of recovery of principal and interest.

C--Obligations rated 'C' are the lowest rated class of bonds and are typically in default, with little prospect for recovery of principal or interest.

Note: Moody's appends numerical modifiers 1, 2, and 3 to each generic rating category from Aa through Caa. The modifier 1 indicates that the issuer or obligation ranks in the higher end of its generic rating category; the modifier 2 indicates a mid-range ranking; and the modifier 3 indicates a ranking in the lower end of that generic rating category.

General long-term rating scale. Moody's long-term obligation ratings are opinions of the relative credit risk of fixed-income obligations with an original maturity of one year or more. They address the possibility that a financial obligation will not be honored as promised. Such ratings reflect both the likelihood of default and any financial loss suffered in the event of default.

Aaa--Obligations rated Aaa are judged to be of the highest quality, with minimal credit risk.

Aa--Obligations rated Aa are judged to be of high quality and are subject to very low credit risk.

A--Obligations rated A are considered upper-medium grade and are subject to low credit risk.

Baa--Obligations rated Baa are subject to moderate credit risk. They are considered medium-grade and as such may possess certain speculative characteristics.

Obligations rated "Ba," "B," "Caa," "Ca" and "C" are regarded as having significant speculative characteristics. "Ba" indicates the least degree of speculation and "C" the highest. While such obligations will likely have some quality and protective characteristics, these may be outweighed by large uncertainties or major exposures to adverse conditions.

Note: Moody's appends numerical modifiers 1, 2, and 3 to each generic rating category from Aa through Caa. The modifier 1 indicates that the issuer or obligation ranks in the higher end of its generic rating category; the modifier 2 indicates a mid-range ranking; and the modifier 3 indicates a ranking in the lower end of that generic rating category.

Fitch Ratings. Long-Term Ratings Scales. Fitch rated entities in a number of sectors, including financial and non-financial corporations, sovereigns and insurance companies, are generally assigned Issuer Default Ratings ("IDRs"). IDRs opine on an entity's relative vulnerability to default on financial obligations. The "threshold" default risk addressed by the IDR is generally that of the financial obligations whose non-payment would best reflect the uncured failure of that entity. As such, IDRs also address relative vulnerability to bankruptcy, administrative receivership or similar concepts, although the agency recognizes that issuers may also make pre-emptive and therefore voluntary use of such mechanisms.

In aggregate, IDRs provide an ordinal ranking of issuers based on the agency's view of their relative vulnerability to default, rather than a prediction of a specific percentage likelihood of default. For historical information on the default experience of Fitch-rated issuers, please consult the transition and default performance studies available from the Fitch Ratings website.

- The ratings do not predict a specific percentage of default likelihood over any given time period;
- The ratings do not opine on the market value of any issuer's securities or stock, or the likelihood that this value may change;
- The ratings do not opine on the liquidity of the issuer's securities or stock;
- The ratings do not opine on the possible loss severity on an obligation should an issuer default;
- The ratings do not opine on the suitability of an issuer as a counterparty to trade credit;
- The ratings do not opine on any quality related to an issuer's business, operational or financial profile other than the agency's opinion on its relative vulnerability to default;

AAA--Highest credit quality. 'AAA' ratings denote the lowest expectation of default risk. They are assigned only in cases of exceptionally strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is highly unlikely to be adversely affected by foreseeable events.

AA--Very high credit quality. 'AA' ratings denote expectations of very low default risk. They indicate very strong capacity for payment of financial commitments. This capacity is not significantly vulnerable to foreseeable events.

A--High credit quality. 'A' ratings denote expectations of low default risk. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered strong. This capacity may, nevertheless, be more vulnerable to adverse business or economic conditions than is the case for higher ratings.

BBB--Good credit quality. 'BBB' ratings indicate that expectations of default risk are currently low. The capacity for payment of financial commitments is considered adequate but adverse business or economic conditions are more likely to impair this capacity.

BB--Speculative. 'BB' ratings indicate an elevated vulnerability to default risk, particularly in the event of adverse changes in business or economic conditions over time; however, business or financial flexibility exists which supports the servicing of financial commitments.

B--Highly speculative. 'B' ratings indicate that material default risk is present, but a limited margin of safety remains. Financial commitments are currently being met; however, capacity for continued payment is vulnerable to deterioration in the business and economic environment.

CCC--Substantial credit risk. Default is a real possibility.

CC--Very high levels of credit risk. Default of some kind appears probable.

C--Exceptionally high levels of credit risk. Default is imminent or inevitable, or the issuer is in standstill. Conditions that are indicative of a 'C' category rating for an issuer include:

- a. the issuer has entered into a grace or cure period following non-payment of a material financial obligation;
- b. the issuer has entered into a temporary negotiated waiver or standstill agreement following a payment default on a material financial obligation; or
- c. Fitch Ratings otherwise believes a condition of 'RD' or 'D' to be imminent or inevitable, including through the formal announcement of a coercive debt exchange.

Note: The modifiers "+" or "-" may be appended to a rating to denote relative status within major rating categories. Such suffixes are not added to the 'AAA' Long-Term IDR category, or to Long-Term IDR categories below 'B'.

U-TISSUP0916