

Daiwa's View

Things to watch for in FY20 third extra budget, FY21 initial budget

- Size of COVID-19 pandemic response measures and budget allocation, as well as scale of economic measures and estimated tax revenue

FICC Research Dept.

Senior Fiscal Policy and
Credit Analyst
Kouji Hamada
(81) 3 5555-8791
kouji.hamada@daiwa.co.jp



Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd.

Size of COVID-19 pandemic response measures and budget allocation, as well as scale of economic measures and estimated tax revenue

Things to watch for in FY20 third extra budget, FY21 initial budget

The third supplementary budget in FY20 and initial budget in FY21 still contain many uncertain factors. Noteworthy points are (1) the size of measures to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic and budget allocation, (2) the scale of economic measures, and (3) the outlook for tax revenues. We first describe the conclusion on the JGB issuance amount—new JGBs worth Y15tn are expected to be issued for the third supplementary budget, but calendar-base issuance may remain roughly flat given FILP bonds that are not issued according to the initial plan. We forecast that the aggregate JGB issuance amount in the FY21 initial budget (newly issued JGBs + FILP bonds + refunding bonds) will decline by around Y30tn vs. the figure in FY20 after the second supplementary budget. We do not think that our figures are a major surprise, but there are many trillion yen-basis assumptions and we have rounded off figures. Accordingly, we ask readers to interpret the figures with latitude.

In particular, it is difficult to forecast the first item of budget allocation. Regarding economic measures (such as public works) included in the FY20 third extra budget, the implementation can be carried forward to FY21 if a concrete construction plan is set by the end of FY20. This enables the booking of a large amount in the third extra budget. As for measures to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic, there are many programs whose feasibility is uncertain despite securing budgets in both the general account and FILP plan. As these programs cannot be carried forward, there is no point in booking a large amount in the FY20 third extra budget. Therefore, a certain amount of budget needs to be secured again in FY21.

We also look at the methods to secure the budget in FY21. In general, temporary programs, such as disaster restoration and economic packages, are funded by supplementary budgets, instead of booking in the general account's initial budget or the initial FILP plan. Therefore, another focus of attention is whether a large amount of pandemic response measures (see explanation later in this report) will be booked in the FY21 general account's initial budget or the initial FILP plan. If (1) the amount of pandemic response measures is small and (2) the size of the initial budget or the initial FILP plan change little vs. past figures, we need to assume that a first supplementary budget will be compiled at the beginning of FY21.

In any case, we think that the pandemic-related budget will be included in the FY20 third extra budget, the FY21 initial budget, or the FY21 first extra budget. Note that our estimate for the JGB issuance amount is based on this assumption. We then consider the project size.

First, we look at the budget for pandemic response measures. The chart on the next page shows the breakdown of Y57.6tn in the budget included in the first and second extra budgets in the FY20 general account, including contingency funds that have already been used. We think that the following items will continue to be needed—expenses to prevent the spread of COVID-19 infections, support for testing/medical treatment providers, the development of therapeutic agents, local revitalization grants, an employment adjustment subsidy, a subsidy for business continuation, and Go To campaigns. The addition of even a slight amount on

each item becomes a rather large Y15tn. However, as mentioned above, the project expenses in FY20 cannot be basically carried forward to FY21. We thus assume that Y5tn and Y10tn will be allocated in the FY20 extra budgets and the FY21 initial budget, respectively. Moreover, we think that around Y5tn in contingency funds for the COVID-19 pandemic is also necessary in FY21.

COVID-19 Pandemic Response Measures in General Account (actual and estimate)

(Y tn)		FY20 first/second extra budgets	Contingency funds for COVID-19 pandemic	Total	FY20 third extra budget (estimate)	FY21 initial budget (estimate)
Expenses to prevent spread of COVID-19 infections, support for testing/medical treatment providers, development of therapeutic agents		1.4	2.2	3.6	1.0	2.0
For local gov't	Emergency comprehensive support grant	2.4		2.4		
	Local revitalization subsidy	3.0		3.0		2.0
For business operators	Employment adjustment subsidy	0.3		0.3	1.0	1.0
	Financing measures (capital injection to policy-based financial institutions)	11.2		11.2		
	Financing measures (subsidies, grants, etc.)	4.3		4.3		
	Subsidy for business continuation	4.3	0.9	5.2	2.0	2.0
	Rent support subsidy	2.0		2.0		
	Go To campaigns	1.7		1.7	1.0	1.0
	Other	1.5		1.5		1.0
For households	Special cash payment	12.9		12.9		
	Others	0.8	0.6	1.4		1.0
Contingency funds for COVID-19 pandemic		11.5	-3.7	7.8		5.0
Others		0.3		0.3		
Total		57.6	0.0	57.6	5.0	15.0

Source: MOF; compiled by Daiwa Securities.

Next, we look at the FY20 third extra budget (chart below). The meaning is now uncertain regarding the figures of "Y10-15tn" or "Y15-20tn" in remarks by executive members of the ruling parties, but we assume that these figures are major expenditures in the general account. The total of post-disaster restoration of Y0.7tn, the disaster prevention/mitigation project of Y2tn (higher than FY18 and FY19 extra budgets), economic measures/other policy costs of Y10tn (much higher than FY19), and the above-mentioned pandemic response measures of Y5tn is Y17.7tn. Tax revenues were revised downward by Y7.1tn in FY08 and Y9.2tn in FY09 after the global financial crisis. However, the progress of FY20 tax revenues has not been so bad up to September, and we thus estimate a downward revision of Y6tn. All in all, the issuance amount of new JGBs is calculated at around Y15tn.

Year-end Extra Budget in General Account (actual and estimate)

(Y bn)	2017		2018		2019	2020 (estimate)
	First Dec	First Oct	Second Dec	First Dec	Third Dec	
Expenditures	1,654.7	935.6	2,709.7	3,194.5	9,900.0	
Restoration from natural disasters, etc.	343.6	727.5	213.6	690.7	700.0	
Disaster prevention/mitigation project	913.1		1,072.3	855.7	2,000.0	
Transfer to Government Debt Consolidation Fund	189.1		454.7			
Local allocation tax grants			510.8	-734.9	-1,700.0	
Compensation for local allocation tax grants				748.1	1,700.0	
Reduction in stipulated expenses	-1,191.6		-1,290.9	-1,290.8	-1,300.0	
Contingency reserves	-50.0	100.0			-6,500.0	
Economic measures/other policy costs	1,450.5	108.1	1,749.2	2,925.7	10,000.0	
COVID-19 pandemic response measures					5,000.0	
Revenues	1,654.8	935.6	2,709.6	3,194.6	9,900.0	
Tax revenues			849.0	-2,315.0	-6,000.0	
Other revenues	95.7	4.2	139.3	188.1	200.0	
Transfer from surplus in previous fiscal year	374.3	236.4	713.1	900.1	700.0	
Government bond issuance	1,184.8	695.0	1,008.2	4,421.4	15,000.0	
				①+②+③+④	17,700.0	

Source: MOF; compiled by Daiwa Securities.

What should be noted in the FY20 third extra budget is the FILP. The initial plan of Y13.2tn was increased to Y63.7tn due to the addition of Y50.5tn via the first/second extra budgets and an elastic clause. Most of the addition was allocated to the Japan Finance Corporation. The FY20 plan for fiscal loans, which entail the issuance of FILP bonds, is Y44.1tn. However, the actual results show that such loans surged only in May and June, and the total up to September is Y12.5tn (chart below). If fiscal loans are used on the pace of Y0.8tn/month during the remaining six months, the amount unused is calculated at around Y27tn. Even if the pace increases to Y5tn/month during the three months, the amount unused is calculated at around Y14tn. Even in the case that the progress of FILP projects is slow, the FILP plan is rarely reduced in the supplementary budgets. However, the actual issuance amount of FILP bonds is adjusted in line with the progress. Accordingly, if the issuance of new JGBs by legal grounds is increased by around Y15tn in the FY20 third extra budget, the total of JGB issuance on a calendar basis may be unchanged because the amount of unissued FILP bonds is estimated at Y15tn.

FY20 FILP Plan at Japan Finance Corporation and Actual Results up to Sep 2020

(Y bn)	FY20 plan	Apr (actual)	May (actual)	Jun (actual)	Jul (actual)	Aug (actual)	Sep (actual)	Total (actual)
Fiscal loans	44,098.0	861.9	4,051.2	5,722.3	534.4	705.4	579.2	12,454.3
Industrial investment	21.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Government guarantee	6,500.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	50,619.4	861.9	4,051.2	5,722.3	534.4	705.4	579.2	12,454.3

Source: MOF; compiled by Daiwa Securities.

Next, we check the initial budget of the general account in FY21 (chart below). As mentioned, temporal expenditures (such as economic measures, disaster restoration) are generally booked in supplementary budgets, while changes in the initial budget are kept at a minimum level. We would not be surprised if FY21 pandemic response measures are included in the first extra budget at the beginning of the fiscal year. However, there were some additions to expenditures for temporal and special measures (such as public works) in FY19 and FY20, and we assume that the above-mentioned pandemic response measures of Y10tn and the related contingency cost of Y5tn will be included in the initial budget, although this is quite extraordinary. On the premise of the ongoing uptrend of social security expenditures and tax revenues of Y58tn (expected to hit bottom from estimated Y57.5tn after FY20 third extra budget), the issuance amount of new JGBs is estimated at around Y55tn. This can be calculated at around Y40tn if the pandemic-related Y15tn is excluded.

Initial Budget in General Account (actual and estimate)

(Y bn)	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021 (estimate)
Expenditures	97,454.7	97,712.8	101,457.1	102,658.0	119,500.0
Social security expenditure	32,473.5	32,973.2	34,059.3	35,860.8	37,000.0
Public works	5,976.3	5,978.9	6,909.9	6,857.1	7,000.0
Other general expenditures	19,559.2	19,593.5	20,494.6	20,279.4	20,500.0
COVID-19 pandemic response measures	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10,000.0
National debt service	23,528.5	23,302.0	23,508.2	23,351.5	23,500.0
Local allocation tax grants, etc.	15,567.1	15,515.0	15,985.0	15,809.3	16,000.0
Contingency funds for COVID-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5,000.0
Contingency reserves	350.0	350.0	500.0	500.0	500.0
Revenues	97,454.7	97,712.8	101,457.1	102,658.0	119,500.0
Tax and stamp revenues	57,712.0	59,079.0	62,495.0	63,513.0	58,000.0
Other revenues	5,372.9	4,941.6	6,301.6	6,588.8	6,500.0
Government bond issuance	34,369.8	33,692.2	32,660.5	32,556.2	55,000.0

Source: MOF; compiled by Daiwa Securities.

Then, we look at the FILP plan in FY21. The budgetary request stands at Y13.9tn, up Y0.7tn vs. the FY20 initial plan. However, the amount of loans unused in FY20 at the Japan Finance Corporation and other agencies cannot be carried forward to the next fiscal year, as mentioned above. Accordingly, rebooking is necessary in FY21 if needed. We think that the addition of about Y20tn to the budgetary request is necessary to prepare for contingencies, although this does not reach Y50.5tn in the additional amount in FY20. Thus far, temporary FILP plans have been generally funded by extra budgets, but this time we assume that the FILP plan in the FY21 initial budget will be Y33.9tn (Y20tn addition to budgetary request), of which around Y30tn is expected to be funded by FILP bonds.

Given the aforementioned factors, as well as the amount of refunding bonds of Y136.5tn shown in the materials at the Advisory Council on Government Debt Management held on 4 November, we have estimated the JGB issuance amount by legal grounds (chart below). Compared to the amounts after the FY20 second extra budget, the total issuance amount after the FY20 third extra budget is expected to increase by around Y15tn (unchanged if we consider unissued FILP bonds), and the figure in the FY21 initial budget is expected to decline by around Y30tn. Our estimate for newly issued JGBs in FY21 is around “Y15tn in pandemic-related measures plus something extra,” larger than the figure in the material at the Advisory Council on Government Debt Management. The size of pandemic response measures is thus one of the things to watch for.

JGB Issuance Plan by Legal Grounds (actual and estimate)

(Y tn)	FY20								FY21		
	Initial		After first extra budget		After second extra budget		After third extra budget (estimate)		Initial (estimate)		
	Amount	Amount	Initial → First	Amount	First → Second	Amount	Second → Third	Amount	Second → Initial	Third → Initial	
Newly-issued bonds	32.6	58.2	25.7	90.2	31.9	105.2	15.0	55.0	-35.2	-50.2	
Reconstruction bonds	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	-0.9	-0.9	
FILP bonds	12.0	21.4	9.4	54.2	32.8	54.2	0.0	30.0	-24.2	-24.2	
Refunding bonds	108.0	108.0	0.0	108.0	0.0	108.0	0.0	136.5	28.5	28.5	
Total	153.5	188.5	35.1	253.3	64.7	268.3	15.0	221.5	-31.8	-46.8	

Actual issuance amount in line with progress is minus Y15tn from here

Source: MOF; compiled by Daiwa Securities.

Explanatory Document of Unregistered Credit Ratings

In order to ensure the fairness and transparency in the markets, Credit Rating Agencies became subject to the Credit Rating Agencies' registration system based on the Financial Instruments and Exchange Act. In accordance with this Act, in soliciting customers, Financial Instruments Business Operators, etc. shall not use the credit ratings provided by unregistered Credit Rating Agencies without informing customers of the fact that those Credit Rating Agencies are not registered, and shall also inform customers of the significance and limitations of credit ratings, etc.

■ The Significance of Registration

Registered Credit Rating Agencies are subject to the following regulations:

- 1) Duty of good faith.
- 2) Establishment of control systems (fairness of the rating process, and prevention of conflicts of interest, etc.).
- 3) Prohibition of the ratings in cases where Credit Rating Agencies have a close relationship with the issuers of the financial instruments to be rated, etc.
- 4) Duty to disclose information (preparation and publication of rating policies, etc. and public disclosure of explanatory documents).

In addition to the above, Registered Credit Rating Agencies are subject to the supervision of the Financial Services Agency ("FSA"), and as such may be ordered to produce reports, be subject to on-site inspection, and be ordered to improve business operations, whereas unregistered Credit Rating Agencies are free from such regulations and supervision.

■ Credit Rating Agencies

[Standard & Poor's]

The Name of the Credit Rating Agencies group, etc

The name of the Credit Rating Agencies group: S&P Global Ratings ("Standard & Poor's")

The name and registration number of the Registered Credit Rating Agency in the group: S&P Global Ratings Japan Inc. (FSA commissioner (Rating) No.5)

How to acquire information related to an outline of the rating policies and methods adopted by the person who determines Credit Ratings

The information is posted under "Unregistered Rating Information" (<http://www.standardandpoors.co.jp/unregistered>) in the "Library and Regulations" section on the website of S&P Global Ratings Japan Inc. (<http://www.standardandpoors.co.jp>)

Assumptions, Significance and Limitations of Credit Ratings

Credit ratings assigned by Standard & Poor's are statements of opinion on the future credit quality of specific issuers or issues as of the date they are expressed and they are not indexes which show the probability of the occurrence of the failure to pay by the issuer or a specific debt and do not guarantee creditworthiness. Credit ratings are not a recommendation to purchase, sell or hold any securities, or a statement of market liquidity or prices in the secondary market of any issues.

Credit ratings may change depending on various factors, including issuers' performance, changes in external environment, performance of underlying assets, creditworthiness of counterparties and others. Standard & Poor's conducts rating analysis based on information it believes to be provided by the reliable source and assigns credit ratings only when it believes there is enough information in terms of quality and quantity to make a conclusion. However, Standard & Poor's does not perform an audit, due diligence or independent verification of any information it receives from the issuer or a third party, or guarantee its accuracy, completeness or timeliness of the results by using the information. Moreover, it needs to be noted that it may incur a potential risk due to the limitation of the historical data that are available for use depending on the rating.

This information is based on information Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. has received from sources it believes to be reliable as of March 7th, 2017, but it does not guarantee accuracy or completeness of this information. For details, please refer to the website of S&P Global Ratings Japan Inc. (<http://www.standardandpoors.co.jp>)

[Moody's]

The Name of the Credit Rating Agencies Group, etc

The name of the Credit Rating Agencies group: Moody's Investors Service ("MIS")

The name and registration number of the Registered Credit Rating Agency in the group: Moody's Japan K.K. (FSA commissioner (Rating) No.2)

How to acquire information related to an outline of the rating policies and methods adopted by the person who determines Credit Ratings

The information is posted under "Unregistered Rating explanation" in the section on "The use of Ratings of Unregistered Agencies" on the website of Moody's Japan K.K. (The website can be viewed after clicking on "Credit Rating Business" on the Japanese version of Moody's website (https://www.moody.com/pages/default_ja.aspx))

Assumptions, Significance and Limitations of Credit Ratings

Credit ratings are Moody's Investors Service's ("MIS") current opinions of the relative future credit risk of entities, credit commitments, or debt or debt-like securities. MIS defines credit risk as the risk that an entity may not meet its contractual, financial obligations as they come due and any estimated financial loss in the event of default. Credit ratings do not address any other risk, including but not limited to: liquidity risk, market value risk, or price volatility. Credit ratings do not constitute investment or financial advice, and credit ratings are not recommendations to purchase, sell, or hold particular securities. No warranty, express or implied, as to the accuracy, timeliness, completeness, merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose of any such rating or other opinion or information, is given or made by MIS in any form or manner whatsoever.

Based on the information received from issuers or from public sources, the credit risks of the issuers or obligations are assessed. MIS adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MIS considers to be reliable. However, MIS is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process.

This information is based on information Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. has received from sources it believes to be reliable as of April 16th, 2018, but it does not guarantee accuracy or completeness of this information. For details, please refer to the website of Moody's Japan K.K. (https://www.moody.com/pages/default_ja.aspx)

[Fitch]

The Name of the Credit Rating Agencies group, etc

The name of the Credit Rating Agencies group: Fitch Ratings ("Fitch")

The name and registration number of the Registered Credit Rating Agency in the group: Fitch Ratings Japan Limited (FSA commissioner (Rating) No.7)

How to acquire information related to an outline of the rating policies and methods adopted by the person who determines Credit Ratings

The information is posted under "Outline of Rating Policies" in the section of "Regulatory Affairs" on the website of Fitch Ratings Japan Limited (<https://www.fitchratings.com/site/japan>)

Assumptions, Significance and Limitations of Credit Ratings

Ratings assigned by Fitch are opinions based on established criteria and methodologies. Ratings are not facts, and therefore cannot be described as being "accurate" or "inaccurate". Credit ratings do not directly address any risk other than credit risk. Credit ratings do not comment on the adequacy of market price or market liquidity for rated instruments. Ratings are relative measures of risk; as a result, the assignment of ratings in the same category to entities and obligations may not fully reflect small differences in the degrees of risk. Credit ratings, as opinions on relative ranking of vulnerability to default, do not imply or convey a specific statistical probability of default.

In issuing and maintaining its ratings, Fitch relies on factual information it receives from issuers and underwriters and from other sources Fitch believes to be credible. Fitch conducts a reasonable investigation of the factual information relied upon by it in accordance with its ratings methodology, and obtains reasonable verification of that information from independent sources, to the extent such sources are available for a given security or in a given jurisdiction. The assignment of a rating to any issuer or any security should not be viewed as a guarantee of the accuracy, completeness, or timeliness of the information relied on in connection with the rating or the results obtained from the use of such information. If any such information should turn out to contain misrepresentations or to be otherwise misleading, the rating associated with that information may not be appropriate. Despite any verification of current facts, ratings can be affected by future events or conditions that were not anticipated at the time a rating was issued or affirmed.

For the details of assumption, purpose and restriction of credit ratings, please refer to "Definitions of ratings and other forms of opinion" on the website of Fitch Rating Japan Limited.

This information is based on information Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. has received from sources it believes to be reliable as of September 27th, 2019, but it does not guarantee accuracy or completeness of this information. For details, please refer to the website of Fitch Rating Japan Limited (<https://www.fitchratings.com/site/japan>)

IMPORTANT

This report is provided as a reference for making investment decisions and is not intended to be a solicitation for investment. Investment decisions should be made at your own discretion and risk. Content herein is based on information available at the time the report was prepared and may be amended or otherwise changed in the future without notice. We make no representations as to the accuracy or completeness. Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. retains all rights related to the content of this report, which may not be redistributed or otherwise transmitted without prior consent.

Conflicts of Interest: Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. may currently provide or may intend to provide investment banking services or other services to the company referred to in this report. In such cases, said services could give rise to conflicts of interest for Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd.

Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. and Daiwa Securities Group Inc.: Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd. is a subsidiary of Daiwa Securities Group Inc.

Other Disclosures Concerning Individual Issues:

- 1) As of 26 April 2016, Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd., its parent company Daiwa Securities Group Inc., GMO Financial Holdings, Inc., and its subsidiary GMO CLICK Securities, Inc. concluded a basic agreement for the establishment of a business alliance between the four companies. As of end-December 2017, Daiwa Securities Group Inc. owned shares in GMO Financial Holdings, Inc. equivalent to approximately 9.3% of the latter's outstanding shares. Given future developments in and benefits from the prospective business alliance, Daiwa Securities Group Inc. could boost its stake in GMO Financial Holdings, Inc. to up to 20% of outstanding shares.
- 2) Daiwa Real Estate Asset Management is a subsidiary of Daiwa Securities Group Inc. and serves as the asset management company for the following J-REITs: Daiwa Office Investment Corporation (8976), Daiwa Securities Living Investment Corporation (8986).
- 3) Samty Residential Investment became a consolidated subsidiary of Daiwa Securities Group Inc. effective 10 September 2019.
- 4) On 30 May 2019, Daiwa Securities Group Inc. formalized an equity/business alliance with Samty, and as of 14 June 2019 it owned 16.95% of shares outstanding in Samty along with convertible bonds with a par value of ¥10bn. Conversion of all of said convertible bonds into common shares would bring the stake of Daiwa Securities Group Inc. in Samty to 27.28%.
- 5) Daiwa Securities Group Inc. and Credit Saison Co., Ltd. entered into a capital and business alliance, effective 5 September 2019. In line with this alliance, Daiwa Securities Group Inc. is to acquire up to 5.01% of Credit Saison's total common shares outstanding (excl. treasury shares; as of 31 Jul 2019).

Notification items pursuant to Article 37 of the Financial Instruments and Exchange Law

(This Notification is only applicable to where report is distributed by Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd.)

If you decide to enter into a business arrangement with our company based on the information described in this report, we ask you to pay close attention to the following items.

- In addition to the purchase price of a financial instrument, our company will collect a trading commission* for each transaction as agreed beforehand with you. Since commissions may be included in the purchase price or may not be charged for certain transactions, we recommend that you confirm the commission for each transaction. In some cases, our company also may charge a maximum of ¥2 million per year as a standing proxy fee for our deposit of your securities, if you are a non-resident.
- For derivative and margin transactions etc., our company may require collateral or margin requirements in accordance with an agreement made beforehand with you. Ordinarily in such cases, the amount of the transaction will be in excess of the required collateral or margin requirements**.
- There is a risk that you will incur losses on your transactions due to changes in the market price of financial instruments based on fluctuations in interest rates, exchange rates, stock prices, real estate prices, commodity prices, and others. In addition, depending on the content of the transaction, the loss could exceed the amount of the collateral or margin requirements.
- There may be a difference between bid price etc. and ask price etc. of OTC derivatives handled by our company.
- Before engaging in any trading, please thoroughly confirm accounting and tax treatments regarding your trading in financial instruments with such experts as certified public accountants.

* The amount of the trading commission cannot be stated here in advance because it will be determined between our company and you based on current market conditions and the content of each transaction etc.

** The ratio of margin requirements etc. to the amount of the transaction cannot be stated here in advance because it will be determined between our company and you based on current market conditions and the content of each transaction etc.

When making an actual transaction, please be sure to carefully read the materials presented to you prior to the execution of agreement, and to take responsibility for your own decisions regarding the signing of the agreement with our company.

Corporate Name: Daiwa Securities Co. Ltd.

Registered: Financial Instruments Business Operator, Chief of Kanto Local Finance Bureau (Kin-sho) No.108

Memberships: Japan Securities Dealers Association, The Financial Futures Association of Japan, Japan Investment Advisers Association, Type II Financial Instruments Firms Association