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| 1 | appearances: | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FINANCIAL CRISIS INQUIRY COMMISSION | 2 | A Charles Prince, P-R-I-N-C-E. |
| 3 | 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 800 | 3 | Q Are you currently provide, Mr. |
| 4 | Washington, DC 20006 | 4 | Prince? |
|  | BY: Bradley J. bondi, Assistant Director | 5 | A I am not. |
| 5 | and Deputy General Counsel KAREN DUBAS, paralegal | 6 | Q Do you have a consulting role |
| ${ }_{7}$ |  | 7 | anywhere? |
| 7 | PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON \& GARRISON, | 8 | A I do. |
| 8 | ${ }_{\text {LLP }}^{\text {PAUL, }}$, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON \& GARRISON, | 9 | Q Where is that? |
|  | On behalf of the Witness | 10 | A With a firm called Albright |
|  | 1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10019 | 11 | Stonebridge Group. |
| 10 |  | 12 | Q Where are you based? |
| 11 | BY: BRUCE BIRENBOIM, ESQ. BRAD S. KARP, ESQ. | 13 | A They are based in Washington, |
| 11 | SUSANNA BUERGEL, ESQ. | 14 | D.C. I am not based there. I consult with |
| 12 | JANE O'BRIEN, ESQ. | 15 | them as needed. |
| 13 | SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER \& FLOM, LLP | 16 | Q And, Mr. Prince, I understand you |
| 14 | On behalf of the Witness | 17 | were CEO of course of Citigroup. |
| 15 | New York, New York 10036 | 18 | Could you briefly describe the |
| 16 | BY: JONATHAN J. LERNER, ESQ | 19 | positions you held at Citigroup or any of |
| 17 |  | 20 | its predecessors and the years that you held |
| 19 |  | 21 | them? |
| 20 |  | 22 | A Sure. And should I go all the |
| 22 |  | 23 | way back to when I started, or as much as |
| 23 |  | 24 | you want or -- |
| 25 |  | 25 | Q If you don't mind briefly just |
|  | 2 |  |  |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | BY MR. BONDI: | 2 | identify the position, the company and the |
| 3 | Q Good morning, Mr. Prince. How | 3 | years, if you wouldn't mind, if you recall. |
| 4 | are you? | 4 | A Sure. |
| 5 | A Good morning. Well, thank you. | 5 | I started with -- for these |
| 6 | Q My name is a Brad Bondi. I am | 6 | purposes, I started with a company called |
| 7 | with the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission | 7 | Commercial Credit Company in Baltimore, |
| 8 | in Washington. We were formed by Congress | 8 | Maryland, on January 15, 1979. And |
| 9 | to investigate the causes of the financial | 9 | commercial credit was a predecessor company |
| 10 | crisis, both domestic and globally, and to | 10 | of what became Citigroup. |
| 11 | report on those causes in a report due | 11 | First let me tell you how it |
| 12 | December 15, 2010, this year. | 12 | became a predecessor company, than I'll give |
| 13 | This interview is being | 13 | you my tenure and so forth. |
| 14 | transcribed. Because we are members of the | 14 | Commercial Credit was a |
| 15 | government, I am obligated to tell you that | 15 | subsidiary of another company at that point |
| 16 | the typical rules of 18 USC 1001 apply. And | 16 | in time. It went public in 1986 under the |
| 17 | that means obviously you have to be truthful | 17 | leadership of Mr. Weill and a series of |
| 18 | to government investigator. But I have no | 18 | other individuals. |
| 19 | reason, Mr. Prince, to doubt your veracity. | 19 | And then from 1986 until 1998, |
| 20 | A Thank you for that. | 20 | commercial credit engaged in a series of |
| 21 | Q But I am obligated just to put | 21 | acquisitions and changed its name as it went |
| 22 | you on notice. | 22 | along so that by 1998, the company that was |
| 23 | A Duly noted. | 23 | Commercial Credit was then known as |
| 24 | Q Could you please state your full | 24 | Travelers Group. Travelers Group then in |
| 25 | name for the record? | 25 | 1998 merged with Citicorp creating |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE Citigroup.

My tenure with these various companies, I started as an attorney in 1979 with Commercial Credit. I became general counsel of the company in about 1984 or thereabouts. I continued as general counsel of the company through its various iterations and name changes until the time of our merger in 1998, at which time I became the co-general counsel of the merged entity, Citigroup.

My partner, as co-general counsel, retired a year or so later. So I then became sole general counsel in about 1999. I stopped being general counsel I think sometime in 2000, maybe the fall of 2000, and was promoted to be chief administrative officer.

Then in about 2001, I was chief administrative officer. And then in 2002, I became the head of our corporate and investment bank. Then in 2003, became the CEO of the company and in 2006 became chairman.

## 6

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
the board. And he continued with that official designation. But Bob's role was a more informal or nuanced one than the title would suggest.

Bob was a very important member of our board, of course. But he was also very involved in the strategic direction of the company, not so much the day-to-day operations. But where the company should be focused going forward, how it should grow, how it should think about its future. He was also fairly involved in client work, both in the private bank, on our institutional side. Given Bob's background, given his extremely high reputation, he was someone that people in our client base wanted to meet.

Q I understand things changed in the summer of 2007 in terms of the frequency of your interactions with Mr. Rubin. But prior to say summer of 2007 from let's say when you became CEO in October 2003 through early 2007, how often would you meet with Mr. Rubin?

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

A Well, with permission I will just disagree if I may with the premise.

Q Please.
A It didn't really change in the summer of 2007. As I am sure we will talk later, we talked about different things.

Q Yes, sir.
A But Bob's office was literally right next to mine. It was separated by a little conference room, but it was 20 feet away. And Bob and I would talk -- if we were both in the office, we would talk three or four times a day. He would walk into my office, I would walk into his office.

If one or the other of us wasn't physically in town that day, then we might talk by phone every other day. So, the level of interaction was frequent.

Bob was someone that I very much valued bouncing ideas off of, testing ideas. And when you are the CEO of a large company, there are very few people that you can do that with. But Bob's background and his general knowledge of the world was very

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | significant, and so I would bounce lots of | 2 | the company. Its size of the pie, if you |
| 3 | different ideas off of him. | 3 | understand what I mean by that, I don't |
| 4 | Q You mentioned Mr. Rubin having a | 4 | remember it growing significantly, going |
| 5 | role in the strategic direction of the | 5 | from X percent to two X percent or something |
| 6 | company. | 6 | of the company. |
| 7 | Were there any particular areas | 7 | It may have been that the entire |
| 8 | at he focused on in terms of strategic | 8 | dustry grew and the company grew. So, I |
| 9 | direction, any particular areas of the | 9 | remember it not as growing in a dramatic |
| 10 | business? | 10 | sense. The numbers may suggest you are |
| 11 | A Well, I would say no. | 11 | right. I apologize if I am wrong there. |
| 12 | If you were to step back and look | 12 | In terms of Bob's influence and |
| 13 | at our company from a distance, you would | 13 | growth and so forth, obviously Bob's |
| 14 | see that we had that three or four basic | 14 | background from Goldman Sachs and his long |
| 15 | groups of activities. One would have been | 15 | history in the securities business gave him |
| 16 | our international business, which was quite | 16 | a pretty special feel for that business as |
| 17 | large and quite important. One would have | 17 | compared to say our consumer business. |
| 18 | been our U.S. consumer business, and one | 18 | But, on the other hand, Bob was |
| 19 | would have been our corporate and securities | 19 | long removed from being a trader. He hadn't |
| 20 | business. | 20 | been a day-to-day trader for a long time. |
| 21 | We have we had private banking | 21 | And so it was much more of where do we want |
| 22 | activity, that probably would not have been | 22 | the business to go in three years and |
| 23 | quite as high on the list. But those first | 23 | five years and ten years than it was in the |
| 24 | three groupings, each of which of course is | 24 | next six months let's try to do more of X , |
| 25 | broken down into dozens of individual 10 | 25 | if you understand the distinction I am 12 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | businesses, I would say he spent a fair | 2 | drawing. |
| 3 | amount of time on each of them. | 3 | So, with that overview, you know, |
| 4 | Q Mr. Prince, it seemed from -- | 4 | Bob was very much involved in all of our |
| 5 | please correct me if I am wrong -- it seemed | 5 | strategic activities. I am sure there were |
| 6 | from some of the reports and $P$ and Ls that $I$ | 6 | dozens of things that he participated in. I |
| 7 | have seen that the investment bank, CMB, | 7 | am hard pressed to pull out one to tell you. |
| 8 | grew substantially from 2003 to 2007. | 8 | I am sorry. |
| 9 | Was Mr. Rubin involved in any | 9 | Q As CEO, who directly reported to |
| 10 | strategic decisions that helped grow that | 10 | you? I am trying to distinguish between, |
| 11 | bank? | 11 | you know, at the end of the day I assume |
| 12 | A Well, I am not sure whether | 12 | every one in the company ultimately reports |
| 13 | capital markets and banking grew -- I am | 13 | up to the CEO. |
| 14 | thinking about the premise of your question | 14 | A All 350,000 people. |
| 15 | if I may and then I will come to the actual | 15 | Q Yes, sir. |
| 16 | question itself. | 16 | But who directly reported; in |
| 17 | Q Sir, please, if at any time any | 17 | other words, who were the direct reports to |
| 18 | of my premises are incorrect, we are on a | 18 | you as CEO? |
| 19 | fact finding mission, so correct me, please. | 19 | A We had a group that we called the |
| 20 | A I am trying to make sure we have | 20 | Business Heads group. And in many companies |
| 21 | the full answer and the correct answer. | 21 | it would have been called a Management |
| 22 | Q Yes, sir. | 22 | Committee or an Executive Committee. We |
| 23 | A I think that capital markets and | 23 | called it Business Heads for reasons which |
| 24 | banking, I don't remember that in that | 24 | aren't particularly pertinent to the |
| 25 | period of time growing in relationship to 11 | 25 | question. And that is a good grouping, to |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE answer your question. It would have been the most senior leaders of line operations. So the head of our consumer business, the head of our corporate investment bank, the person who ran our business in Asia, that sort of grouping, as well as our most senior staff people. So, the head of risk, the head of legal, our chief administrative officer, our chief operating officer. It was more or less 10, 11, 12 people, something in that range.

## Q How often would the Business

 Heads group meet? How often would you meet with the Business Heads group?A Every Monday morning.
Q How long approximately would those meetings go?

A Seemed like forever sometimes. But it was officially for -- first an hour, then an hour and a half, then two hours as we wanted to cover more and more. So I would say for overview purposes an hour and a half to two hours.

Q Would this be a situation where

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE second hour we would talk about the budget process for next year. So we are going to do this then, this then and this then and so forth. Or we might talk about an upcoming meeting with an employee group in Japan and what are we going to accomplish in this particular area. Or we might talk about an acquisition for the company. We acquired companies right along. That sort of thing.

So first half, a go-around, the second half a one off kind of activity.

Q Would you give a presentation or have a role in that meeting? Say at the end of the meeting would you share your thoughts? Or what was your participation in the meeting, in those meetings typically?

A It was a pretty informal meeting. So I would typically start by saying here are three or four things that are on my mind this morning. And then we would go around the table, and then we would have this special project or one-off activity. But it wasn't a formal meeting and it typically wouldn't have a formal agenda. We might
Interview - CHARLES PRINCE people would go around the room and report on their various areas, or would there be a set agenda for these type of meetings?
A You are very intuitive. There would be both. In other words, it was intended first and foremost as information sharing. We had lots of businesses, lots of areas, some of them the people who ran them were physically separated from each other: Uptown, downtown, Europe and so forth. And it was important for those people to interact frequently so that I knew what you were doing, you knew what I were doing, we could collaborate as necessary.
The first half of each meeting would typically be a going around the table, what is going on in your business, what is going on in my business and so forth.
The second half of the meeting would typically be involved with special -or what is the right way to put it -- one off kinds of activities.
It might -- I am just picking examples at random. It might be in the

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE have a follow-up from last week or something like that. But it wasn't a formal meeting with prepared remarks or anything like that.

Q Mr. Prince, you mentioned a few persons by title, and I just wanted to put some names with those titles.

You said the most senior risk officer. Is that the chief risk officer?

A Yes, Dave Bushnell.
Q He would have been during the relevant time period of 2003 to 2007?

A Yes.
Q Head of legal, is that Mr.

## Helfer?

A Yes, Michael was the general counsel that whole time. I am not sure whether Michael was on the Business Heads or not.

MR. KARP: He was not.
THE WITNESS: Lou Kaden was on and Lou Kaden was the chief administrative officer and also a lawyer. And Lou represented the legal, the audit, and the foundation

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | and certain other functions. | 2 | chief risk officer level who understood how |
| 3 | BY MR. BONDI: | 3 | those businesses worked. |
| 4 | Q I've noticed Mr. Kaden's name in | 4 | David had been a trader much |
| 5 | board minutes and several documents that | 5 | earlier in his life and understood the |
| 6 | your counsel has produced. | 6 | mechanics of how the business worked. |
| 7 | What was his role as chief | 7 | Making it independent of the businesses, I |
| 8 | administrative officer? | 8 | think most people nowadays do that. I am |
| 9 | A Yes. Chief administrative | 9 | grateful that we were a little ahead of that |
| 10 | officer would typically be -- and would be | 10 | making it independent. It didn't get paid |
| 11 | the case for Kaden -- would typically be | 11 | based on the profits of the business unit, |
| 12 | someone who managed the administrative | 12 | it didn't get paid based on volumes or |
| 13 | functions. And so that would typically be | 13 | revenues. And I think that is just good |
| 14 | all of the staff functions, legal, audit, | 14 | corporate governance. |
| 15 | public relations, the foundation. | 15 | Q Would Mr. Bushnell as chief risk |
| 16 | In many companies, in most | 16 | officer have a normal reporting role at this |
| 17 | companies it would also include risk. But | 17 | Business Heads group meeting? Would he |
| 18 | in our company when I became CEO in 2003, I | 18 | provide a report? |
| 19 | think literally the first thing I did that | 19 | A Yes. He would be part of the |
| 20 | day, literally, was to put David in that job | 20 | go-around. |
| 21 | and to change the reporting structure so | 21 | Q You mentioned the chief operating |
| 22 | that he no longer reported to the chief | 22 | officer. Who was that during the 2003 to |
| 23 | administrative officer and the risk function | 23 | 2007 time frame? |
| 24 | no longer reported to the business units. | 24 | A I don't know when Bob Druskin |
| 25 | Before that, it had reported inside the | 25 | became chief operating officer, but it was |
|  | 18 |  | 20 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | business units. | 2 | at least halfway through. And so for the |
| 3 | And from that time through my | 3 | last couple of years at least, maybe the |
| 4 | whole tenure, the chief risk officer was a | 4 | whole time, but at least the last couple of |
| 5 | member of our Business Heads group and was a | 5 | years Bob Druskin was the chief operating |
| 6 | direct report to me. | 6 | officer. |
| 7 | Q Why did you make those changes | 7 | Q What did Mr. Druskin do as the |
| 8 | with respect to the chief risk officer? | 8 | chief operating officer? |
| 9 | A The two changes, one putting him | 9 | A Well, his job, like most chief |
| 10 | in the job and then making it separate. | 10 | operating officers, is to focus on, focus a |
| 11 | I thought that the fellow who was | 11 | hundred percent of his time on the inside |
| 12 | the chief risk officer before David whose | 12 | part of the job, running the company. The |
| 13 | name was Petros, P-E-T-R-O-S, Sabatakakus | 13 | various business units reported to me and I |
| 14 | (phonetic). Just do the best you can, but | 14 | was responsible for the overall direction of |
| 15 | it sounds, it spells sort of like it sounds, | 15 | the company and so forth. But there was a |
| 16 | Sabatakakus. He was a very good fellow but | 16 | lot of travel involved in my job. And |
| 17 | did not have any understanding, detailed | 17 | someone needed to be at the desk every day |
| 18 | understanding of how the securities business | 18 | making sure the trains ran on time, to use a |
| 19 | worked. And I was very concerned that | 19 | cliched phrase, and that was Bob's job. |
| 20 | Petros would not be able to adequately | 20 | Q When you first became CEO in |
| 21 | manage the risk function as it related to | 21 | 2003, were there some regulatory problems |
| 22 | our securities business. And so Petros was | 22 | that were immediately on your radar? |
| 23 | going to retire, and so he retired. We put | 23 | A There were, there were regulatory |
| 24 | Bushnell in the job, I put Bushnell in the | 24 | problems at many times, so I am not sure |
| 25 | job, to make sure that we had someone at 19 | 25 | which ones in particular you are referring 21 |


| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to. | 2 | So if you wanted to grow ten percent a year, |
| 3 | Q What I was getting at is we have | 3 | so you wanted to grow your revenues from a |
| 4 | read about problems in Japan, problems with | 4 | hundred to 110, okay, just a simple math |
| 5 | bond traders in Europe. | 5 | like that, you would have to go out and buy |
| 6 | Were those problems that were in | 6 | \$10 billion of revenue somewhere. There |
| 7 | your focus when you became CEO in 2003, or | 7 | aren't a lot of companies that have |
| 8 | did they come about later? | 8 | $\$ 10$ billion of revenue. And so identifying |
| 9 | A Okay, I understand the question | 9 | them, courting them, and negotiating that |
| 10 | now, sorry. | 10 | and integrating that, it gets more and more |
| 11 | When I became CEO in 2003, I | 11 | difficult as the absolute size of the |
| 12 | thought that the most important thing I | 12 | organization gets bigger. |
| 13 | needed to focus on was turning the company's | 13 | So an acquisition strategy, if |
| 14 | focus from an acquisition driven strategy to | 14 | you are small, you can double and triple and |
| 15 | more of a balanced strategy involving | 15 | quadruple in size just by acquiring things. |
| 16 | organic growth. If you look at the history | 16 | If I can, can I give an analogy? |
| 17 | of the company and how it combined and so | 17 | Q Please. |
| 18 | forth, we had been very, very busy with | 18 | A If you had a law firm -- |
| 19 | acquisitions. And the larger the company | 19 | everybody here is a lawyer except this nice |
| 20 | became, the harder it is to grow a company | 20 | lady. Everybody here is a lawyer. |
| 21 | through acquisitions, just by definition. | 21 | Q Karen is not. |
| 22 | If you have a business that | 22 | A She is going to be a lawyer some |
| 23 | makes -- I am making up examples -- that | 23 | day. Everybody here is a lawyer or is going |
| 24 | makes \$100 and you want to grow ten percent | 24 | to be a lawyer. |
| 25 | a year, you have to buy something that makes | 25 | If you have a law firm of 500 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | \$10. If you have a business that makes a | 2 | lawyers, which is not a small law firm, a |
| 3 | million dollars in this example and you want | 3 | medium sized law firm, and you wanted to |
| 4 | to grow ten percent a year, then you | 4 | double in size, you would have to go find |
| 5 | obviously have to buy a much larger company. | 5 | another 500 lawyers somewhere. Maybe one |
| 6 | And so and the company became larger and | 6 | firm of 500 or maybe two of 250, something |
| 7 | larger and larger, it became clear to me | 7 | like that. And there would be the |
| 8 | that relying as much as we had historically | 8 | appropriate complications of doing that: |
| 9 | on acquisitions was not an appropriate | 9 | Finding them, negotiating with them, |
| 10 | course going forward and we had to have more | 10 | integrating them into a culture and so |
| 11 | balance and have more organic growth. | 11 | forth. |
| 12 | Q Why wasn't it an appropriate | 12 | If you had a law firm of 5000 |
| 13 | model going forward, this expansion model | 13 | lawyers and you wanted to double in size, it |
| 14 | that you have described? | 14 | would be almost impossible to do that |
| 15 | A I apologize. I thought I | 15 | because there aren't 5000 lawyers out there |
| 16 | explained it. Let me try it again. | 16 | somewhere to find and integrate. And then |
| 17 | The larger the size of the | 17 | if you did that and you had 10,000 lawyers, |
| 18 | entity, the more difficult it is to grow by | 18 | then you wouldn't have anybody you could |
| 19 | buying things. That is, you have to buy | 19 | double with. You sort of run the string out |
| 20 | more and more and more as your absolute size | 20 | as it were if you understand what I mean as |
| 21 | gets bigger. | 21 | I am trying to describe it. |
| 22 | So to use very rough numbers, | 22 | So in that context, we had grown |
| 23 | during my tenure the company had about a | 23 | very rapidly and very well, I think, and our |
| 24 | hundred billion dollars of revenue a year, | 24 | growth pattern had been quite good. But it |
| 25 | 80 to 100 billion dollars of revenue year. | 25 | sort of topped out in terms of the ability |
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE to do that in just a practical sense. And so my judgment was that at that point we needed to continue to do acquisitions, but make sure that the businesses we had on their own were growing to contribute to that. So, maybe instead of growing -again, I am making up these numbers, just as an example.

Instead of growing ten percent through acquisitions, we would grow five percent through acquisitions and five percent through organic growth. So more of a balance. Does that make sense?

Q Yes, sir.
A So that is what I thought going
in. Now your question was what about the regulatory issues.

What happened was that almost immediately we got diverted into these regulatory problems. So, in 2003, we had a regulatory problem with our consumer business here in the States. And then I think it was in early 2004 that the Japan situation began to unfold in complicated

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE were robust enough that they would have a reasonable prospect for preventing the kinds of issues that had come up in Japan and in Europe.

The Japan private bank episode was one in which -- as I recall it, one of the bankers in Japan had engaged in some inappropriate activities with a client that was a charity or something like that. And the regulators over there became very focused on regulatory processes in Japan. And then as that was unfolding, the MTS trade happened in Europe.

The Japan issue was a pretty clear regulatory violation in Japan. The MTS one was less clear as to whether it was a violation, but it provoked quite a controversy. I believe that the Fed did not want those kinds of incidents to occur and wanted us to, in colloquial terms, take a time out and to make sure that everything was working very properly inside the company and to make sure that we had very robust regulatory processes.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE ways. And then the MTS trade you mentioned in Europe was I think in the fall of 2004. Dim recollection.

So we had -- in 2004, we had two or three instances which in a cumulative sense caused various regulators to stop and say: Gosh, you guys got to tighten up your ship here a little bit.

Q Was one of those regulators that suggested that you tighten up the ship, was that the Federal Reserve when they put a hold on the acquisitions in growth that Citigroup could do?

A Yes.
Q What was their reason for putting a hold on acquisitions in growth at Citigroup, external growth?

A I have to think back now. That was quite a while ago.

My recollection of it is that they were -- let me think now to make sure I am recalling it correctly.

I believe that their reasons were to make sure that our regulatory processes

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q During that time out as you have described, what did you do to address the Federal Reserve Board's concerns?

A We did lots of things. If I can give you a summary answer, and then you can ask anything further from that.

We obviously had quite a process of increasing our regulatory functions: The lawyers, the audit function, the control functions.

We also embarked on what we called the five-point plan, which was an all-employee program. All 350,000 employees had to go through training sessions in which we emphasized the company's core values. We emphasized long-term results over short-term results. We emphasized protecting the reputation of the company. Everyone had to go through this training; everyone had to certify that they had gone through this training.

We had anonymous 360 reviews of all of our managers so that if anybody had a concern that their manager was engaging in
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE inappropriate activity they could report this and so forth and so on. The five-point plan was a quite large undertaking. We had progress points against it that we reported on to the Fed and others.

Q Was that five-point plan a success?
A Well, whenever you are talking about changing culture or reinforcing culture, it is something that is judged over the long term. I believe that since that 2004, 2005 time period we have not had -- to my knowledge, we have not had the kind of regulatory eruptions or problems that we had in the 2003, 2004 time frame. And if the goal of the program was to prevent those from recurring and if they have not recurred, then I think you would say it probably was successful.

Q In this time frame from 2003 and 2005, approximately how much of your time was devoted to addressing these types of regulatory issues that we have been talking about and implementing the five-point plan?

A It is hard to say. Well, over 50

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE percent.

Q Approximately how many subsidiaries or affiliates did Citigroup have during your tenure at CEO?

A I have no idea.
Q Over hundred or so?
A Well, over a hundred, yes. They are all listed in the $10-\mathrm{K}$ filing, pages and pages and pages of them.

Q How many countries did you operate in?

A My recollection was that we operated in 102 countries. I don't know whether that was exactly right. I never went and counted each 102, but we always said it was 102 .

Q How did you ensure out of the 102 countries and the many subsidiaries that Citigroup had, how did you ensure that critical information was reported up to you that needed to be reported up to you?

A That is a very good question, and something that any manager of a large organization needs to focus on. We focused

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE on that a lot and tried to ensure that we had multiple pathways for information. Again if I can I will describe three or four to give you a sense of it.

One way of doing that was through what you might think of as a normal management structure. So all of our operations, all of our people, all of our countries were organized into some kind of a management hierarchy. So this business reported to this person, reported to this person and up to someone who was on the Business Heads Group. Or this region, this country and this region reported to someone up on the Business Heads group. And so the, in a management hierarchy sense, the person on the Business Heads was responsible for managing his or her business down to the bottom of that level, that vertical level of activity. That is one. In some ways that was the primary or central method of management flows.

We also had our various staff functions. So legal, audit, risk, in some

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE ways our public relations function had

 parallel vertical structures.So, to take an example, if we had a business operation in India, there would be a risk person assigned to them. There would be a lawyer assigned to that in India. There would be an audit person assigned to that in India. And those people would report up their own vertical management chains parallel to the business vertical chain up to someone who was at a reporting level with the Business Heads.

So lawyers would report up their legal management chain up to the general counsel and then to the chief administrative officer, the audit function in a similar way and so forth. So, we had our management of business chain, we had our several administrative function chains, and then we had a wide range of direct to the employee communications. So, we would do once a year an employee survey, an anonymous employee survey, which would ask various questions which could then be collated and reported on
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE and so forth.

We had anonymous hotlines for reporting concerns or problems. Most of that turned out to be about employee issues, but some of it related to the business and it was certainly promoted as for the business.

So these are just several
examples. We were constantly looking for additional ways to get information up and to get information across because these vertical structures I have described, you don't want the information to sit inside those. You want them to go across as much as you can.

Q In the 2007 year immediately preceding the financial difficulties in the market starting in the summer and during that time frame of summer through November 2007, did you feel as CEO sufficient information was reaching you so that you could evaluate the situations at Citigroup?

A I certainly thought so at the time. We had lots of information on lots of

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE different scores. We are sitting here three years later almost looking back at one very significant issue. But at the time in the summer of 2007, we were looking at lots of issues. I mean what turned out to be the CDO problems in our fixed income business were not the biggest issue on the list of things we were looking at in the summer of 2007.

And so if you imagine lots of information flowing on lots of different subjects in lots of different geographies, I thought we had pretty good information flow.
$Q$ I know we are sitting here three years later. And so in retrospect, was there any information in retrospect that you wish you had sooner?

A You know, that is a hard question to answer because the fundamental issue -and I know we will get into this I'm sure in great detail later. But the fundamental issue was that the believed strength or credit worthiness of the so-called super senior tranches of these securitized

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE products, that that belief was incorrect. And when you say to yourself would you have liked to have had more information about that, I am not sure at the time that more information would have changed anyone's belief.

Instruments were downgraded in the middle of October, and I think until that point most of the people thought they were very, very, very safe.

So, your question is there any information I wish I had gotten earlier is a hard question to answer because of that. It wasn't so much a flow of information as it was wrong conclusions about the information that people had.

Q Who made the wrong conclusions?
A Well, we have to talk in more detail about that. I mean the rating agencies, the people in the business, the regulators, everybody made the wrong conclusions.

Q We are jumping ahead of ourselves I know, Mr. Prince?

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
A I am sorry.
Q No, that is my fault, sir. I do want to talk to you in length about the CDO business and what happened there.

A Right.
Q But let me get back to more about the business and how it operated.

I have seen a report that said that you used to joke about not having one good culture but five or six good cultures.

Is that something that you would joke about, is that true that you said something like that?

A I am sure I said that in jest at some point.

Q What did you mean by five or six good cultures there?

A The company had grown through acquisition, as I said. As we got bigger, many of the acquisitions were quite large. And any company that you acquire which is large and has its own historical base of activities will have its own culture. And so if you look at various companies that

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | were component parts of Citigroup, they had | 2 | is no question that was part of our effort |
| 3 | come to be part of Citigroup through | 3 | in the five-point plan. And as I said, we |
| 4 | acquisition. So we had started with | 4 | were trying to move from a confederation of |
| 5 | Commercial Credit, let's say. That was one | 5 | companies and confederation of cultures to a |
| 6 | culture. We had the Travelers Insurance | 6 | more unified culture. |
| 7 | culture when this was part of the company. | 7 | In terms of an unwieldy -- I |
| 8 | We had the Citibank culture, which was part | 8 | don't know, it didn't seem unwieldy to me. |
| 9 | of the company. We had the Salomon Brothers | 9 | Q In retrospect was it unwieldy? |
| 10 | culture, which was part of the company. And | 10 | A No, it didn't feel unwieldy to |
| 11 | so forth and so on. | 11 | me. Probably did work as well as the |
| 12 | Merging those cultures into a | 12 | Treasury Department. |
| 13 | single culture, into a Citigroup culture, | 13 | MR. BONDI: I would like to |
| 14 | what we tried to described in our five-point | 14 | show you a document. |
| 15 | plan as the one-Citi initiative, a one-Citi | 15 | (Thereupon, the e-mail Bates |
| 16 | culture as opposed to a confederation. That | 16 | numbered Citi FCIC E 31616 was marked |
| 17 | was what I was trying to describe. | 17 | CR Exhibit 1 for Identification, as of |
| 18 | Q I don't have much spare time, but | 18 | this date.) |
| 19 | in the little that I do, I like to do some | 19 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 20 | reading. And as you can imagine, most of my | 20 | Q For the record for her point, I |
| 21 | reading these days is focused on the | 21 | showed you what is Bates numbered Citi FCIC |
| 22 | financial crisis. | 22 | E 31616, which appears, sir, to be an e-mail |
| 23 | A I can recommend many other good | 23 | from you to Mr. Druskin copying David |
| 24 | books for you. | 24 | Bushnell and Mr. Crittenden and Mr. Kaden. |
| 25 | Q Yes, sir. | 25 | I want to focus your attention, sir, on what |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | One book that I recently read was | 2 | you say in your e-mail that is dated October |
| 3 | former secretary Paulson's book. And there | 3 | 2nd, 2007. And please, you know, there is |
| 4 | was something in that book about Citigroup | 4 | e-mails underneath that and please feel free |
| 5 | that struck me. | 5 | to read the entire context. But I did want |
| 6 | He said that -- and I will | 6 | to focus your attention on that first |
| 7 | represent that this was from the book. But | 7 | statement or the, excuse me, your e-mail |
| 8 | he said that "Citigroup had an unwieldy | 8 | that, says, "Incredible lack of |
| 9 | organizational structure." And then he went | 9 | coordination. We really need to break down |
| 10 | on to say: "It lacked a single unifying | 10 | the silos," exclamation point. What is the |
| 11 | culture or clear business strategy." | 11 | context there of your statement? |
| 12 | What is your reaction to that | 12 | A Let me just read this. |
| 13 | statement? | 13 | Q What was the context of your |
| 14 | A Well, I don't have much reaction | 14 | statement there about "incredible lack of |
| 15 | to that statement. People have points of | 15 | coordination. We really need to break down |
| 16 | view. Hank is a decent person, and if that | 16 | the silos," exclamation point? |
| 17 | is his point of view, then good for him. | 17 | A Well, I don't remember the e-mail |
| 18 | Q I take it you don't share that | 18 | exchange. But what I see in reading it is |
| 19 | point of view? | 19 | that someone in our consumer business -- I |
| 20 | A Well, when I ran the company I | 20 | can identify the names if you would like. |
| 21 | didn't share that point of view. Now I | 21 | But someone in our consumer business was |
| 22 | don't have a point of view. I am a retiree. | 22 | looking at some new business in the credit |
| 23 | But I am not trying to avoid the | 23 | card area, apparently something called |
| 24 | question. Look, we were trying to develop a | 24 | Revolution Money. And our credit card |
| 25 | more robust culture for the company. There | 25 | people, the consumer business people, were 41 |


| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | looking into this somehow and in the course | 2 | In the summer of 2007, not the |
| 3 | of looking at it, perhaps to buy it or | 3 | fall of 2007, the summer of 2007, the |
| 4 | something like that, it turns out that this | 4 | biggest issue we were focused on was the |
| 5 | company that they were examining actually | 5 | deterioration in the leveraged lending |
| 6 | had quite a detailed relationship with our | 6 | business, the loaning of money to KKR, |
| 7 | corporate side business. And so that came | 7 | Carlyle, people like that. |
| 8 | to my attention, that one of our entities | 8 | The CDO problems, which in the |
| 9 | was pursuing an outside group that it turned | 9 | fall of 2007, then came to have such serious |
| 10 | out another entity inside the company had a | 10 | impact and which we are talking about today, |
| 11 | great relationship with or some kind of a | 11 | were not the highest thing on the list in |
| 12 | relationship with. And I expressed a sense | 12 | the summer. |
| 13 | of frustration that that information wasn't | 13 | The leveraged lending activity |
| 14 | being shared across business lines, across | 14 | related both to our fixed income business or |
| 15 | the silos. | 15 | our lending business on the one hand. And |
| 16 | You remember a moment ago I | 16 | our advisory business in the investment |
| 17 | talked about the importance not only of | 17 | bank, different from the fixed income |
| 18 | information flow going up the vertical | 18 | business, the investment business, and so |
| 19 | columns but going across. And it would have | 19 | those were silo issues as it related to |
| 20 | been nice, I apparently thought, if other | 20 | leveraged lending between those two parts of |
| 21 | consumer people had checked with our | 21 | the corporate and investment bank. |
| 22 | corporate people: Do you know anything | 22 | The CDO business, which in the |
| 23 | about Revolution Money? Or if our corporate | 23 | fall came to have such prominence, didn't |
| 24 | people had turned to our consumer people and | 24 | have those kinds of cross business issues |
| 25 | said we are doing business with this company | 25 | inside the corporate and investment bank. |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | Revolution Money, you ought to take a look | 2 | It was pretty exclusively inside the fixed |
| 3 | at them instead of it working out the way it | 3 | income business. |
| 4 | worked out here. But I'm inferring all this | 4 | Is that clear? |
| 5 | from reading. I don't have any independent | 5 | Q Uh-huh. |
| 6 | recollection of it. | 6 | To shift gears, I want to ask you |
| 7 | Q In relation with the events in | 7 | about another area of our focus and that is |
| 8 | the fall of 2007 relating to challenges in | 8 | the mortgage origination business. |
| 9 | the marketplace, did you observe any other | 9 | (Thereupon, the printout of |
| 10 | silos at Citigroup? | 10 | remarks of April 19, 2007 to the |
| 11 | A In the fall of 2007, the issues | 11 | Greenlining Institute's 14 Annual |
| 12 | that we are examining here today were pretty | 12 | Economic Summit in Los Angeles, |
| 13 | much contained inside the fixed income | 13 | California was marked CR Exhibit 2 for |
| 14 | business and didn't involve so much cross | 14 | Identification, as of this date.) |
| 15 | business activities. | 15 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 16 | Q Was there any silos within the | 16 | Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what |
| 17 | investment banking business that you | 17 | $I$ will represent is a printout from some |
| 18 | observed? | 18 | remarks that you gave on April 19, 2007, to |
| 19 | A Oh, sure. Sure. | 19 | the Greenlining Institute's 14 annual |
| 20 | Q Did the silos in the investment | 20 | economic summit in Los Angeles, California. |
| 21 | bank pose any challenges during the | 21 | I wanted to ask you about a few |
| 22 | financial crisis or leading up to the | 22 | of the statements you made. And if you |
| 23 | financial crisis? | 23 | could look to page two of that, I will draw |
| 24 | A I have to give you a slightly | 24 | your attention to the bottom half of that |
| 25 | long answer; I am sorry for that. | 25 | document. In particular, the paragraph that |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE starts with: "And so" and I will just read the statement for the court reporter and the record and ask you to comment on it.
"And so the combination of two or three factors, several of them good: Excess liquidity and the desire for homeownership have combined with one, which I think is not so good which is the arbitrage of regulatory responsibilities and have led to very aggressive, very exotic mortgage products which are then pumped into some of our communities where they are clearly not appropriate. And then when the housing bubble naturally tips over, we go through cycles all the time, then it is exposed that those products were not appropriate, but there was no regulatory framework which they went through."

What do you mean aggressive, very exotic mortgage products?

A Well, there are a number, but there are two in particular that I think would fit that category. One is the negative amortization mortgage product and

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE into communities, to people, who probably shouldn't have had them and who were susceptible to the overselling of these aggressive brokers.

Q Generally, do you know if the products that you have described, were they part of an originate-to-hold model where that the mortgage brokers would hold them on their books, or were they part of a model that would distribute them on to the secondary market for securitization, or do you know?

A The latter.
Q What role did financial institutions like Citigroup play in terms of this secondary market demand for the mortgages that you have described?

A What I was describing here of course as you see in the next paragraph, I say. "We have not participated in that. We have not been a lender of exotic, aggressive mortgages. We have not done option ARMs or negative amortization products in the subprime community."

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

 the other was the adjustable ARM product. I am sure you know what those are. I won't bother explaining them. But I think in both cases they posed real concerns for people getting in over their heads.Q Why were they posing concerns for people getting in over their heads? Was it the type of the product? Was it who they were being marketed to? What was the concern there?

A Well, because they weren't based on what I would call traditional lending criteria but were based in large part upon an expected appreciation in home value, they had the potential, potential, for being oversold. That is, sold to people who wouldn't necessarily qualify for those mortgage products unless the future appreciation would occur. And with the process of regulating the origination of mortgages, then and now, being as spotty as it is, it led to the possibility of very aggressive brokers going out in a largely unregulated way and selling these products
"And our businesses -- " and I was focused here particularly on our consumer finance business and our mortgage business," -- were not in the business of originating those mortgages." And that part of our business was an originate and hold business.

Q Were there mortgage types, mortgage products, that your securitization business would purchase for securitization purposes into RMBS that your mortgage origination business would not originate?

A Yes.
Q What did you see in terms of Citigroup's role in the demand for those products if it was securitizing these products from other originators?

A There is a continuum of activity in my judgment at one end of which I would see our activities as being inconsistent with what I have described here in this speech. And at the other end of the activity as not being inconsistent with that description in my speech.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
By that I mean that if we have a situation where our fixed business is buying and trading with other institutions securities which are traded in the marketplace and those securities have characteristics that relate to these activities, I would not see that as inconsistent with what I have said here in the speech. That is, I would not see us as participating in that business.

At the other end of the spectrum, if we were funding directly people who were doing this so that someone could say we were indirectly doing it instead of directly doing it, I would say that was not consistent with what we wanted to do as a company.

So, the activity you asked about would depend for me on where it was in that continuum. And one way to think about it is the closer we got to the actual origination of these products, the more uncomfortable I would feel with that. If it was already out in the marketplace and it was trading among

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE is okay and one notch to the right is not okay. So I am not sure I am going to be able to answer the question with that degree of specificity.

For the company as a whole we had laid down the prescription that we did not want to be involved in the origination of these mortgages. And so I can't -- in part because the mechanics that you are describing are pretty discreet mechanics inside the way the trading desks worked. I am not sure I can answer as specifically as that question would suggest.

## Q I have a more general macro question.

In your opinion, what role did Wall Street investment banks and large financial institutions play in promoting very aggressive, exotic mortgage products that were originated by brokers, mortgage brokers, and then sold off to investment banks and financial institutions for securitization?

A Well, that is a very broad

> Interview - CHARLES PRINCE institutions who were trading lots of different securities and this is one of the securities they were trading, it is in the public marketplace, then it is already out there. It is being traded and we are just participating in a trading activity.
> But if we are actually getting really close to the origination process, if we were enabling the origination process, then I would see that as inconsistent with the direction that we had laid out for the whole company which was not to originate these products.
> Does that answer your question.
> Q I think so. Let me ask a few questions based on that.
> With respect to RMBS, securitization of mortgages in the RMBS, would you say that that is closer to the origination than say purchase of RMBS on a structuring desk for CDOs?

A I am not sure I can pars the middle part of that continuum. I am not sure I can say well, one notch to the left

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE question. It is a very good question and from a policy standpoint it is the right question to ask.

I think that the right way to think about that question is this: In the middle of the decade, the middle of 2000 to 2010 decade, the investing environment was one where there were what seemed to be historically artificially low interest rates. That is, investing professionals thought that we were in a period where rates were unusually low.

Some people thought that was because of the way that capital flows worked with China and other companies buying treasuries at such significant amounts that is it reduced interest rates. Some people thought it was because the Fed had lowered interest rates after the tech bubble burst and after $9 / 11$ to save the economy. But for whatever reason on any kind of historical basis, rates seemed unusually low.

Some people thought -- and I
believe Alan Greenspan's been quoted -- that

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
there was a new parodyne of risk, that in other words it was not a temporary phenomenon, but it was going to be a more extended phenomenon.

In that context, the growth of securitized products securitized products -the securitized products grew and the growth of it became quite strong as the industry was trying to create through financial engineering safe, higher yielding assets.

In that context the need for raw material to securitize was high almost in the way that securitization could be seen as a factory line. You needed raw material to put in the front end of that.

I believe that in hindsight, the lack of adequate regulation of the origination of mortgages created a situation where the demand side, the pull side of that equation found a place where more raw material could be created than could be created safely. So that as more and more and more of these subprime mortgages were created as raw material for the

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE the wrong end of the spectrum.

A Well, I have described a continuum where at the level of publicly trading securities, I did not have a problem with that level of activity. And that the closer we got to the origination function itself of these mortgages, the less comfortable I was with that. And if we were close to the origination of that, then I would be uncomfortable with that.

I found out at the end of my tenure, I did not know it before, that we had some warehouse lines out to some originators. And I think getting that close to the origination function being that involved in the origination of some of these products is something that I wasn't comfortable with and that I did not view as consistent with the prescription I had laid down for the company not to be involved in originating these products.
(Thereupon, the document Bates
marked Citi FCIC 91764 and 91765
continuing on to 765 , which purports
marked Citi FCIC 91764 and 91765
continuing on to 765 , which purports

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

 securitization process, not surprisingly in hindsight more and more of it was of lower and lower quality.And at the end of that process, the raw material going into it was actually bad quality, it was toxic quality, and that is what ended upcoming out the other end of the pipeline. Wall Street obviously participated in that flow of activity.

Q Did Citigroup participate in that flow of activity?

A I think in hindsight, some of the structures we did at the end were not on a point in the continuum that I was comfortable about with when I found out about them. That is, I think at the end of the process, in hindsight, as I understood what was in some of those, I think that our team was closer to the wrong end of the continuum that I had set forth than, in hindsight, I was comfortable with.

Q If I can get you to elaborate on what products you are speaking about there that you said your team you thought was on

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
to be the warehouse lines of credit with mortgage originators from 2000 to
2010 was marked CR Exhibit 3 for Identification, as of this date.)
BY MR. BONDI:
Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what was produced by Citigroup's counsel and has been Bates marked Citi FCIC 91764 and 91765 continuing on to 765, which purports to be the warehouse lines of credit with mortgage originators from 2000 to 2010. Have you ever seen this document?

A I have not.
Q You spoke a few minutes ago about concern over warehouse lines. Did any of the originators on this list cause you concern?

A The only name that I recognize is Ameriquest and that was a business that our guys wanted to buy. And I told them we couldn't buy it unless after they bought it they did not originate any more of these loans. Other than that I don't recognize any names on the list, I'm sorry.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q Prior to the Ameriquest acquisition --
A I recognize Banco Popular, but that is a bank.

Q Prior to the Ameriquest acquisition, were you aware that Citigroup had warehouse lines of credit extended to Ameriquest?

A I think just before, I think just before. I think, I think just before they proposed buying it they said we had some lines out to them. I don't remember the size of the lines or that detail, but I remember them saying we had some lines out to them. They were struggling with this and that, and we wanted to buy them because after the credit crisis, they had a good platform for originating good mortgages. And I said we, I wouldn't permit them or approve them buying it unless they agreed that from the day we bought it going forward, they wouldn't originate any more of these bad loans, which they eventually said yes to and I think they went ahead and bought it.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q How did you feel when you learned that Citigroup had warehouse lines to Ameriquest originate bad loans?

A I think as I said just now, I am just going to repeat myself, I think the closer we got to originating loans, the more I thought that was inconsistent with my direction for the company.

Q In let's just say January 2007, in January 2007, would you have known about these warehouse lines of credit that had been extended to Citigroup? Was this something that was on your radar?

A Extended by Citigroup, no.
Q I have roughly totaled up the initial facility size of over $\mathbf{\$ 1 1}$ billion.

Would it have caused you concern if in January 2007 someone came to you and said we have over $\mathbf{\$ 1 1}$ billion in facilities to mortgage originators?

A Well, to mortgage originators who are originating these bad products, yes.

Q Do you know what kind of products were being originated by the mortgage

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE originators on this list?

A I don't.
Q But you later learned that Ameriquest in your words were originating bad loans.

A Well, again, my judgement was these were not the kind of loans we wanted to originate. I will call them the exotics. Bad could mean bad credit. I am not focused on the credit quality at this point. I am focused on the type of loan they were originating, the exotic loans that I referred to in my speech that you gave me a moment ago.

And when the Ameriquest acquisition was presented to me, it was presented in the context that they were having some difficulties, it was an opportunity to buy something at a lower value because they were having difficulties I think in a regulatory sense, and that those regulatory issues related to these exotic loans that they had been originating. And I said we can't buy it if they are going to originate these exotic loans going forward; we don't do that.

MS. BUERGEL: Just to be clear, each warehouse line is governed by several written agreements that specify the types of loans that can be put into the line. So the lines don't extend to just any activity of each of the warehouse originators. They each have very specific agreements that govern.

THE WITNESS: You asked me if I would be surprised if we had lines out to people originating, I have no idea whether these people originated exotics, whether our lines with them allowed them to put exotics with it, I have no idea. You gave me a list of names and numbers, I don't know how they connect at all. BY MR. BONDI:

Q In other words, as CEO you didn't approve the warehouse lines?

A Good heavens, no, no.

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q I noticed New Century on the | 2 | he said that this was a platform for |
| 3 | warehouse line list here. It states there | 3 | originating mortgages, meaning a company |
| 4 | was an opening date of the warehouse | 4 | with offices around the country with a |
| 5 | facility of August 1st, 2006 and a | 5 | technology base, with trained people and so |
| 6 | termination date of March 8, 2007. | 6 | forth. And that this platform was available |
| 7 | During that time frame of | 7 | for us to purchase, that at the time we were |
| 8 | August 1st, 2006, to March 8, 2007, were you | 8 | looking at it, the mortgage business had |
| 9 | aware that Citigroup had a warehouse | 9 | some difficulties, but in his judgement, |
| 10 | facility with a warehouse line to New | 10 | those would be temporary. And that when the |
| 11 | Century? | 11 | temporary difficulties in the mortgage |
| 12 | A No. | 12 | business was over, this would be a very |
| 13 | Q And on this list there is several | 13 | valuable platform to have as part of the |
| 14 | times where it is listed nonagency whole | 14 | company. |
| 15 | loans. | 15 | Q How did you become comfortable |
| 16 | A Right. | 16 | ith the decision? |
| 17 | Q What is a nonagency whole loan? | 17 | A There with two aspects to the |
| 18 | A In the mortgage business there | 18 | decision. One is the financial aspects, we |
| 19 | are agency loans and nonagency loans. | 19 | are going to pay so much, we are going to |
| 20 | Agency loans are those you can put on to | 20 | make so much and so forth. And the second |
| 21 | Fannie and Freddie. So there is a buyer of | 21 | was whether or not we would buy something |
| 22 | those. | 22 | which had this history of doing these |
| 23 | Nonagency loans are those | 23 | things. And as I said a moment ago, I said |
| 24 | Fannie and Freddie won't buy for I don't | 24 | we wouldn't buy it if they were going to |
| 25 | know what reason. There is some set of | 25 | continue to originate those. We weren't 64 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | criteria by which they will do it. So the | 2 | going to be in that business. We had |
| 3 | agency business is a business that has much | 3 | suffered the revenue loss in our consumer |
| 4 | more of a flow activity to it. The | 4 | side of not being in that business for |
| 5 | nonagency business doesn't have that same | 5 | several years. And we weren't going to |
| 6 | purchaser on the other end. | 6 | start now. And the financial side of it, |
| 7 | Q Are nonagency loans securitized | 7 | that is how much we paid and the return on |
| 8 | in the RMBS? | 8 | the investment and so forth, I don't |
| 9 | A I don't know the answer to that. | 9 | remember the details of that, but it came |
| 10 | Q I want to ask a few more | 10 | out well enough. And on the basis of those |
| 11 | questions if you don't mind before we take | 11 | two things being right, my recollection is |
| 12 | break if you are okay. | 12 | that we approved it and they went ahead. |
| 13 | A Sure. | 13 | Q Was the motivation to purchase |
| 14 | Q You mentioned the decision to | 14 | Ameriquest driven in any part by Citigroup's |
| 15 | acquire Ameriquest. Who at Citi was | 15 | potential exposure to Ameriquest? |
| 16 | involved in that decision to acquire | 16 | A I don't remember that, no. |
| 17 | Ameriquest? | 17 | Q Did Mr. Maheras ever express |
| 18 | A It was presented to me by Tom | 18 | concern over Citigroup's exposure to |
| 19 | Maheras. | 19 | Ameriquest leading into the transaction to |
| 20 | Q What did Mr. Maheras say when he | 20 | purchase Ameriquest? |
| 21 | presented this as a potential acquisition | 21 | A I don't remember that. I |
| 22 | for Citigroup? | 22 | remember it being an opportunity to buy |
| 23 | A I will just repeat what I said a | 23 | something during what he thought would be a |
| 24 | moment ago. | 24 | temporary dip in the mortgage market. |
| 25 | I think, my recollection is that | 25 | Q Did you ever see any reports that 65 |
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE were presented to you during the negotiations to acquire Ameriquest expressing concern over the loan qualities, loan quality of the files at Ameriquest?

A I don't remember it, but I am sure in the context of it. Remember, we were going to buy something that had a history of problems. We weren't buying a gold-plated business. We were buying a business that had difficulties. And we were buying, trying to buy it because it was inexpensive reflecting those difficulties. So, I am comfortable without recalling it that there was a strong examination of the loan book and that David and his people were heavily involved in that, but I don't recall it independently.

Q In retrospect, was the decision to acquire Ameriquest a wise decision, a wise investment?

A My guess is no. But the honest answer is I don't know what happened to it. I think, I think we bought it in 2007, didn't we? Is that right?

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE higher quality mortgages being made?

A There is much public talk about that. That is a question posed for policy makers.

I think that if you look at the starkest version of it and you look at an institution that at one end of the spectrum originates and holds everything, and you look at the other end of the spectrum at an entity which originates and doesn't hold anything, in the starkest terms, the first one, the originate and hold, has to care more about the quality of assets than the one that originates and doesn't hold. That is at the starkest level.

I don't remember the names of the institutions, but I remember reading about several brokers who originated mortgages, went out of business, sort of fly by night kind of people, and then showed up two weeks later, same guys, different corporate name, originating, so forth. And I read an article that said some of those people now are setting up shop to refinance mortgages.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q Yes, sir. I believe the transaction closed in September of 2007.

A Yeah. Well, it wasn't part of the company very long on my watch, so I am
not sure whether it was good or bad.
Q Do you want to take a break?
MR. KARP: Sure. That will be fine.

MR. BONDI: Thank you. We will take a break.
(Brief break.)
MR. BONDI: We will go back on record.
BY MR. BONDI:
Q I wanted to get your thoughts on the concept of originate-to-hold versus originate-to-distribute mortgages.

Because earlier we talked about how Citigroup's mortgage origination generally held these mortgages in their portfolio.

Do you think that an
originate-to-hold model versus an originate-to-distribute model results in

If you think about that at that level, then I think that the point is well taken. There is another category of institutions that originate and distribute where the institutional consequences of distributing bad products are quite negative.

So, take Lehman brothers as an example or Bear Stearns as example. These are firms where there is an institutional interest, or there was an institutional interest, in continuing to do business, in continuing to have a good reputation as a counter party.

And for institutions like that, I would say those folks would be one step removed from the starkest version of originate and distribute, doesn't necessarily care about the quality of the products.

So, clearly the more you hold, the more you are going to care about it. But I don't think it is an either/or necessarily, I think it could be either/or or maybe a little bit in the middle.

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q I would like to show you what has | 2 | of so-called super senior tranches of |
| 3 | been marked as Exhibit 4. | 3 | transactions." |
| 4 | (Thereupon, the presentation | 4 | In the time frame of April 2007 |
| 5 | Bates Citi 7657 was marked CR | 5 | to June 2007 when this presentation was |
| 6 | Exhibit 4 for Identification, as of | 6 | given to the SEC, were you aware that the |
| 7 | this date.) | 7 | CDO desk at Citi had exposure to subprime |
| 8 | BY MR. BONDI: | 8 | collateral in ABS CDOs through its purchase |
| 9 | Q And for the record, I will | 9 | of so called super senior tranches of |
| 10 | identify that it is Bates Citi 7657 and it | 10 | transactions? |
| 11 | was produced by Citigroup's lawyers to us. | 11 | A I don't recall having that |
| 12 | First of all, just looking at the cover | 12 | information then, no. |
| 13 | page, do you recall if you ever received or | 13 | Q You weren't aware that Citigroup |
| 14 | saw this presentation? | 14 | had super senior positions on its books in |
| 15 | A I have seen it. Can I say I have | 15 | April or June of 2007? |
| 16 | seen it in preparation? | 16 | A No, I don't think so. |
| 17 | MR. BIRENBOIM: Yes. | 17 | Q The next sentence says, "The |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: Do I violate | 18 | probability of default is deemed by rating |
| 19 | something if I say that? | 19 | agencies to be extremely small, so this |
| 20 | MR. BIRENBOIM: No. | 20 | exposure is not aggregated in our totals." |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: I have seen it in | 21 | In the time period of April |
| 22 | preparation. | 22 | through June of 2007, would you have been |
| 23 | BY MR. BONDI: | 23 | aware that the exposure from the super |
| 24 | Q Prior to preparing for today's | 24 | senior tranches were not aggregated in your |
| 25 | interview, did you ever see this document? | 25 | totals? 72 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | A I don't recall seeing it before | 2 | A No, I don't think I had any |
| 3 | that, no. | 3 | exposure to or discussion of or knowledge of |
| 4 | Q If you could take a look at what | 4 | the area until it sort of came up in |
| 5 | is the third page marked 7659, which looks | 5 | September. |
| 6 | to be another title page, another cover page | 6 | MS. BUERGEL: To be clear, the |
| 7 | from perhaps the earlier time this was | 7 | totals being referred to there are the |
| 8 | presented, do you recognize this | 8 | totals in the deck, in this |
| 9 | presentation or receiving this presentation? | 9 | presentation, and I think your |
| 10 | A I would give you the same answer. | 10 | question implied your totals as in |
| 11 | Q I ask you to flip to page seven | 11 | your Citigroup totals, and I just |
| 12 | of this presentation, which I will represent | 12 | think that is an unfair way to ask the |
| 13 | was the presentation given to the SEC in | 13 | question. The totals are the totals |
| 14 | June of 2007. | 14 | in this deck. |
| 15 | A So I am clear, page seven is | 15 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 16 | "Overview, Where Exposure is Found"? | 16 | Q The next paragraph refers to |
| 17 | Q Yes, sir. | 17 | liquidity puts. In the time period of April |
| 18 | A Thanks. | 18 | to June 2007, were you aware of liquidity |
| 19 | Q If you look in the section, the | 19 | puts associated with asset backed commercial |
| 20 | bullet, direct your attention to the bullet | 20 | paper which was associated with super senior |
| 21 | titled. "Super Senior and Liquidity Put | 21 | tranches of CDOs? |
| 22 | Positions." | 22 | A I would give you the same answer, |
| 23 | The first subparagraph there, | 23 | which is no. |
| 24 | "The CEO desk has exposure to subprime | 24 | Q Going back to both of these, when |
| 25 | collateral in ABS CDOs through its purchase | 25 | did you first become aware that Citigroup 73 |
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| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | owned super senior positions in CDO | 2 | A Yes, that was probably later than |
| 3 | tranches? | 3 | September. The CDOs were the first things |
| 4 | A I think that the first time it | 4 | that came up and then the liquidity puts |
| 5 | came to my attention as any kind of an issue | 5 | came up afterwards. |
| 6 | would have been in the September 2007 time | 6 | Q What was your reaction when you |
| 7 | frame. As I said earlier in the summer, the | 7 | heard about the liquidity puts? |
| 8 | focus as it related to the corporate | 8 | A Well, it is hard to give an "as |
| 9 | investment bank, which again was only one | 9 | of then" answer because so much has happened |
| 10 | part of the company -- we had a lot of | 10 | since which has colored that. But if can, I |
| 11 | things going on in the company, but as far | 11 | will put it in a little context. |
| 12 | as it related to that part of the company, | 12 | The banks, financial |
| 13 | the focus was on the leveraged lending | 13 | institutions, are in the business of |
| 14 | portfolio. And I think the issues of the | 14 | providing liquidity. It is not at all |
| 15 | CDOs and super seniors so forth came up as | 15 | unusual for a financial institution to |
| 16 | any kind of an issue was in September, came | 16 | provide a liquidity support, one of the main |
| 17 | up to me as any kind of an issue. | 17 | lending instruments for a bank is a |
| 18 | Q Prior to September 2007, were you | 18 | commercial paper back-up line. So all of |
| 19 | even aware that Citigroup held positions in | 19 | the major companies in the U.S., the |
| 20 | super senior tranches of CDOs? | 20 | manufacturing company, industrial companies, |
| 21 | A No. | 21 | fund themselves through commercial paper. |
| 22 | Q There is refe | 22 | And they take out back-up lines from banks |
| 23 | liquidity puts? | 23 | to guarantee that if the commercial paper |
| 24 | A Uh-huh. | 24 | market seizes up, they can go borrow money |
| 25 | Q Was your understanding of 74 | 25 | from the banks. Commercial paper back-up 76 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | liquidity puts in this context? Do you have | 2 | lines. Every bank issues them, every major |
| 3 | one? | 3 | company has them to back up their commercial |
| 4 | A Well, as I have come to | 4 | paper issuance. It is a way of getting the |
| 5 | understand it since, a liquidity put is | 5 | benefit of the lower cost of short-term |
| 6 | something which obligates the company, | 6 | funding without taking the risk of the |
| 7 | obligates the bank, to fund someone if they | 7 | short-term funding. |
| 8 | can't find liquidity to fund it themselves. | 8 | From the bank's standpoint, the |
| 9 | So, in this case if someone owned | 9 | risk of the liquidity guarantee for |
| 10 | something and was funding it through selling | 10 | commercial paper being called upon is quite |
| 11 | commercial paper to the outside world and | 11 | low. And so you make some money off of |
| 12 | for some reason they couldn't sell the | 12 | that, but you don't have a huge exposure. |
| 13 | commercial paper, then Citigroup would be | 13 | So, the notion of a liquidity |
| 14 | obligated to provide the funding for them. | 14 | guarantee extended someone else is not an |
| 15 | Now, that is a general answer. | 15 | unusual notion, not one which is strange or |
| 16 | And that is the level of my understanding of | 16 | which would cause one's eyebrows to raise. |
| 17 | it. There may be more detailed | 17 | In the context of the CDO |
| 18 | complications mechanically, but that is my | 18 | business of course it turned out to be quite |
| 19 | understanding of it. | 19 | a negative. But at the time this first came |
| 20 | Q When did you first become aware | 20 | to my attention in the September time frame, |
| 21 | that there were liquidity puts associated | 21 | even at that point people believed that the |
| 22 | with commercial paper sold by Citigroup | 22 | super seniors would not have any losses. |
| 23 | relating to the super senior tranches of | 23 | So, again, I am reconstructing |
| 24 | CDOs? Would that have been September 2007 | 24 | what happened in September for you because |
| 25 | as well? | 25 | sitting here today looking backwards, you |
|  |  |  |  |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE would have an entirely different view. But in reconstructing what happened then, the notion that there were these better than triple A rated instruments out there, that we were providing liquidity support for, those words would not have excited anyone.

As it turned out, when the rating agencies downgraded everything multiple steps in a single several days, that changed the world. But when it first came up, I don't remember it being a moment of great excitement.

Q When you talk about it first coming up, that was in September?

A To me, yes, first coming up to me in September.

Q September 2007?
A Yes, middle. As I said I think the CDO issue came up in the middle of September. The liquidity puts came up a week or so later.

Q If you could flip to the page 11 of this deck, which is Bates Citi 7673.

A Yes.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q Direct your attention to the first part where it is under super senior book, the second dash.
"This so-called super senior tranche is viewed by the rating agencies to have an extremely low probability of default, less than 0.01 percent."

Was that what was represented to you in September 2007 from persons at Citigroup?

A I am going to give you a long answer that is yes. The long answer is I don't know whether they used these words, I don't know whether they used this percentage number of one basis point, but the context of this sentence is what was represented.

Q Direct your attention to the fifth dash down under that section super senior book, states: "Our current open position as 14.6 billion."

Do you recall in September 2007 being told the amount of the open position on super seniors that Citigroup held?

A I can't reconstruct it that

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE finely, meaning that I have had so much -it has been such an issue since then, and all of the information and the conversations have telescoped, that I can't reconstruct in my mind whether in late September when people first talked to me about this they said and the number is X . I can't reconstruct that, I am sorry.

Q Take me back to September 2007 when you were first told about the super senior tranches. Who told you?

A My best recollection is that at one of our Business Heads meetings Tom Maheras brought it up.

Q Why did Mr. Maheras bring it up?
A I can't put myself in his head. I don't know the reason for that.

Again, as I am reconstructing that time period, we had spent several months talking and focussing on the leveraged lending book. And, again, it is a little bit of speculation on my part, but my guess is that in that context, Tom said at one of the meetings, you know, we should

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE also think about the CDO book. He brought it up then. That is my recollection of how it came up.

Q As you sit here today, what precisely do you remember Mr. Maheras saying about the super senior tranches?

A Again, I can't reconstruction it because so much has happened. The intensity of the next 30 days, more or less, sort of collapses everything in my mind. And I don't -- because it wasn't presented at the time in a startling fashion, you know, you remember things if they startle you, if they surprise you, if they stand out in your memory.

This one didn't start that way.
This was: Let me also mention this. And then it got bigger and bigger and bigger obviously over the next 30 days. So if you look back to the first one, there is nothing about that first conversation which with stand out in your mind.

Q At what point did the super senior positions cause you alarm?

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
A Well, let me, if I can, turn around at the end and back it up. It might be an easier way to answer the question.

The super seniors really, the whole process around the super seniors really collapsed when the rating agencies downgraded, all the rating agencies down graded thousands of securities from triple A to basically junk in a day or two. And that, that kind of collapse in the judgment of the rating agencies was a precipitous, meaning like a big explosion.

If you back up from that, that was as I recall middle of September kind of time frame, middle of October kind of time frame. If you back up from that a week or so, so maybe the first week of October, we were engaged in a dialogue -- me, Tom Maheras, several of our other people -- of a round of almost daily telephone calls and meetings, what is happening in the market as it relates to these kinds of securities. And those meetings or telephone calls would involve myself, Tom Maheras, Randy Barker,

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE as we went along and I was more and more uncomfortable with this and more and more uncomfortable with Tom's conclusion on ultimate valuations, that is when I really began to have some very serious concerns about what was going to happen.

Q What was making you feel more and more uncomfortable with Tom Maheras' conclusion that Citigroup would never lose a penny on its super seniors?

A Well, the external environment during those 30 days, three or four weeks time frame, it was obviously continuing to deteriorate and all of the, all of the indicators that I could see that related to certain trading indices, what other people in the industry were to doing, et cetera, et cetera, you know, as you look around the world, the things you see happening suggested a further deterioration. And Tom and Randy and others were pretty resolute that we were thinking about this in the wrong way, that these instruments had been structured in way that they would hold their

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE several of their people at a lower level in the organization. Bob Rubin was in a number of them. Bob Druskin was in a number of them. Lou Kaden was in a number of them. This is in the couple of weeks, as I recall it, ten days before the rating agency downgrades.

During that period of time, I had convened these daily meetings and calls because I was more uncomfortable with the situation. And yet during that period of time, Tom had said and said till his last day at work: We are never going to lose a penny on these super seniors. We are never going to a lose penny on these super seniors. And of course we were going through accounting closings, you would close a month, you would close a quarter and so forth.

And when you do that, you have to engage in certain decision-making processes as it relates to valuations. And so there was a natural, driven by the calendar, a natural internal dialogue about this. And

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE triple A value, that we wouldn't lose any money, I would say leading right up to when the rating agencies collapsed.

Q For the record, Mr. Maheras, at the time he said this, was the CEO of the investment bank?

A I think at that point Tom and, Tom Maheras and a fellow named Michael Klein were co-CEOs of the investment bank, corporate and investment bank.

Michael focused on the investment banking side of the house. And Tom Maheras focused on the fixed income or trading side -- fixed income equities, sort of the trading side of the house versus the investment bank side of the house.

Q You mentioned Randy. Is that Randy Barker?

A Yes, sorry.
Q What was Mr. Barker's role in September 2007?

A As best I can recollect it, Barker was the head of the fixed income business under Maheras. So, again, I'll

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE make sure I am as clear as I can be.

Maheras and Klein were co-heads of an entity and the entity basically had two halves and Klein had the half which was the investment banking side and the corporate lending side. And Maheras had the, all the trading businesses. So fixed income and equities and commodities and so forth.

And under Maheras, then, on this side of the -- there were various businesses. As I membered, fixed income, equities, commodities, rates and currencies and so forth. And I think that Barker was the head of the fixed income part of that trading side of the business. Maheras had been the head of the fixed income business before he stepped up to being the co-head of the whole thing.

## Q In terms of this belief that

 Citigroup was not going to lose any money on its super senior CDO positions, that was a belief that was shared by Mr. Maheras and Mr. Barker?
## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

A I believe so, yes.
Q Who else shared that belief?
A Gosh, I don't know. There were I am sure other people inside fixed income who shared that belief. I am not sure that anyone else of the people that I mentioned on these calls and meetings that I set up that were outside of the fixed income business ever expressed that. I think that was pretty well contained to the fixed income business, but of course they understood it better than, or were supposed to understand it better than the rest of us.

Q How early in September would Mr. Maheras have shared this belief that Citigroup was not going to lose any money? Was that contemporaneous with the first time he presented the super senior positions as being on the books to you, or was that at a different time?

A What I remember about that is that throughout the entire time period we discussed this, meaning till the last day and any time before that, it was here are

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
these positions, this -- somebody says this might be an issue or this indicator suggests it might be an issue or something like that, but don't react to that. We are not going to lose any money on these positions; they are good.

Q Your reference to the last day. When was the last day?

A Well, Tom left the business in the second week in October, I think, something like that, of 2007?

Q And then following that time period, the belief that Citigroup was not going to lose money on super senior positions was no longer expressed within the organization? I am just trying to get a sense --

A I think what happened after that was that we changed management when Tom left and then basically over the -- then I think either just before he left or just after he left, the rating agencies collapsed and then there was a fairly short period of time, maybe it was a week, maybe it was ten days,

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE during which the analysis of the positions vis-à-vis the new lowered ratings was done up and then that led to the time when I resigned.

Q When Mr. Maheras first expressed to you that Citigroup was not going to lose a penny on its super senior CDOs, did you ask to see any stress testing?

A I can't -- I can't reconstruct the time frame during which we did that because as we were going through the end of September and closing the books, there was some stress testing done by Gary Crittenden and others working with Maheras.

I am confident, without
remembering, that the first time Tom brought it up, he didn't say and here's a stress test to prove what I'm saying. I mean, he didn't do that. But whether or not a couple days later or a week later there was stress testing or whether that was two or three weeks, later I can't separate those in my mind.

But it was not a situation where

Pages 86 to 89

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE the first time it came up at our Business Heads meeting, if that is how I recall it, he would have had a big, you know, brief in support, it wouldn't have been that kind of a situation.

## Q When Maheras first said that

 Citigroup was not going to lose a penny on its super senior position, was Mr. Bushnell present?A It was a Business Heads meeting. David would have been at the meeting. Whether he was absent that day for some reason, whether he was out of the room or not, I can't remember. But it was at a meeting at which David would have been present.

Q Do you ever recall Mr. Bushnell expressing his belief on the super senior positions?

A I think that David -- David was part of these daily telephone calls and meetings we had during that interim period. So, again, I can't reconstruct carefully enough the first time Tom mentioned it

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE versus the next day versus the next day.

But I think if you take the 30 days from mid September to mid October, clearly by the time sort of the second week in October was coming along, so two thirds of the way through their process, we are in these daily meetings and calls and so forth, I think David was cautioning that I am not sure Tom is right about this. I can't remember him saying those exact words so I am not suggesting that.

But the tonality, if I can use that word, of the people was Tom and Randy were resolute, you know, don't, don't do something here which you are going regret, you not going to lose money on those things. Don't take a huge write down or a big reserve. And I would say that Gary Crittenden and David Bushnell -- if I can put it sort of at the other end of the figurative table -- were saying, you know, I am not sure that is right; I think we should test this a little bit more. It was that kind of a dynamic.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE I insisted that that be the case. And as part of the restructuring process that resulted from Barker leaving the company, so not that day but within several days afterwards, Maheras came to me and said that he thought he did not want to continue. And those were the circumstances of him leaving.

## Q So it was your decision to

 terminate Mr. Barker?A Yes.
Q Did you consult anyone else on the decision to terminate Mr. Barker?

A I am sure I did. I am sure I talked to Druskin, I am sure I talked to Rubin, I am sure I talked to a number of people, but it was my decision, not theirs.

Q And did you decide to terminate anyone else in connection with this CDO business?

A I don't remember anybody else that I took action on personally, no. I mean I know a number of people were terminated, but I don't think anyone else I acted on personally.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q What was the nature of Mr. Maheras' departure from Citigroup?

A I have actually tried to reconstruct that in my mind, and it is a little fuzzy around the edges. But here's the essence of it.

There came a point in time when it was my judgment that Randy Barker should leave the company. And that judgment was based on my view that we were going to end up losing money on these positions and that someone else should manage the process of recovering what we could from that issue. It is very customary in the banking world that if someone makes a loan, any kind of a loan, and it goes bad, that the work out of that loan should be managed by someone other than the person who put it on the books, someone who is objective and doesn't have any history with it, so on. And so that was my judgment, that that should happen.

Maheras and Barker were quite close personally. And I would say it is fair to report that Tom resisted that. But

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Q I want to ask you about the | 2 | was now back on Citi's books? |
| 3 | liquidity puts that are also referenced in | 3 | A I am not sure whether that |
| 4 | this document. | 4 | happened when I was there or not. I mean |
| 5 | Can you tell me what you recall | 5 | there was quite a discussion about taking |
| 6 | about the time you first were told about the | 6 | these things back on to Citi's books, but I |
| 7 | liquidity puts associated with the asset | 7 | thought that happen after I left. |
| 8 | backed commercial paper issued from the, | 8 | Q I would like to show you another |
| 9 | secured by the super senior tranche? | 9 | document which has been marked number five. |
| 10 | A I can't really. Again, I want to | 10 | (Thereupon, the documents Bates |
| 11 | put it in the context of what was happening. | 11 | Citi FCIC 24594 were marked CR |
| 12 | We spent the summer thinking | 12 | Exhibit 5 for Identification, as of |
| 13 | about the leveraged lending book. Then in | 13 | this date.) |
| 14 | the middle of September Tom Maheras says | 14 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 15 | well, you know, we also have to think a | 15 | Q I am showing you what has been |
| 16 | little bit about these CDOs and so forth. | 16 | produced to us by Citigroup, it is Bates |
| 17 | And then that sort of the separate channel | 17 | Citi FCIC 24594 and it is some attachments |
| 18 | started happening. And then my best | 18 | along with a cover e-mail from a Christina |
| 19 | recollection is that a week or two later | 19 | Pretto to you dated July 30, 2007. |
| 20 | somebody said well, the CDOs are X , but also | 20 | First, who is Christina Pretto? |
| 21 | have liquidity puts relating to the CDOs. | 21 | A She was one of our PR people. |
| 22 | But it in my mind sort of folded into the | 22 | Q Do you recall receiving this |
| 23 | same issue, and it wasn't as if a third | 23 | e-mail on or about June 30, 2007? |
| 24 | train of activity went along as compared to | 24 | A I don't. |
| 25 | it just being a larger second train of 94 | 25 | Q I would like to turn your 96 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | activity if that makes sense to you. | 2 | attention to the second attachment here, |
| 3 | So, it is not as if somebody came | 3 | second attachment to the e-mail. It is |
| 4 | up one day and said ah, liquidity puts, and | 4 | Bates Citi FCIC 24607 and it is a Power |
| 5 | I said oh, liquidity puts. It wasn't that | 5 | Point deck entitled Tracking the Twin Storms |
| 6 | sort of a moment. It was sort of adding on | 6 | Catalyst of Market Volitity. |
| 7 | to existing discussion. | 7 | A Gotit. |
| 8 | Q When do you recall being informed | 8 | Q Do you recognize this document, |
| 9 | or were you informed about the size of the | 9 | sir? |
| 10 | exposure associated with the liquidity puts? | 10 | A I am sure I have seen it, but I |
| 11 | A I can't remember the specifics of | 11 | can't remember in what context I saw it, I |
| 12 | when that number was put on the table or not | 12 | am sorry. |
| 13 | put on the table. | 13 | Q Do you recall seeing it during |
| 14 | Q Do you recall ever being | 14 | your tenure as CEO at Citigroup? |
| 15 | eventually told of the number associated | 15 | A I am sorry, I can't place it as |
| 16 | with that? | 16 | to whether I saw it then or whether I saw it |
| 17 | A Sure. Obviously in hindsight I | 17 | during preparation. |
| 18 | have read all the papers and I know what | 18 | Q I would like to draw your |
| 19 | happen and so forth. But I can't | 19 | attention to the first page of the |
| 20 | reconstruction in my mind a particular time | 20 | presentation on the executive summary. |
| 21 | when someone came in and said here's the | 21 | A Yes. |
| 22 | number and that sticks out in my mind. | 22 | Q The third bullet down states, |
| 23 | Q The commercial paper that was | 23 | "The value of investment grade CDOs built up |
| 24 | associated with the liquidity puts, do you | 24 | out of subprime mortgages has declined |
| 25 | recall being told that the commercial paper | 25 | dramatically leading to significant losses. 97 |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE Total damage has been estimated at 50 to 100 billion."

Do you recall having the, do you recall hearing that statement or reading that statement in or about July 30, 2007 ?

A I don't, but the -- it was clear that in the summer of 2007, many of the CDOs had, many parts of the tranches of the CDOs were declining in value. I want to distinguish that between the super seniors. Super seniors, at that point no one thought had any issues. In fact, no one thought those had any issues until October. But it is clear that some of the lower tranches had declined in value by the summer. So, do I remember seeing that at the time, no. I mean I see it on the piece of paper now. MR. KARP: Just so the record is clear, because the quote would not revealed this, this is for the entire industry.
A For the entire industry.
Q I think the presentation in fact is titled Catalyst of Market Volatility.

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE In the summer of 2007, did it

 case you any concern that there were significant losses looming in the CDO business in general? When I am talking about business, I am talking about industry business, not necessarily Citi specific.A At the time, people believed that the housing market would decline to a certain degree. Without having read the document, you can see in the little box on this page under "consumer" that it says, "Subprime foreclosure delinquency will likely impact less than one percent of U.S. housing stock."

And at the time, people believed that the housing market would be affected in ways where some of the lower or lowest of the tranches of CDOs would be affected. I think at the time no one had any or I know at the time no one had any idea or hint that the housing decline would be as significant or as broad as it turned out to be. So, your question was about CDOs, I didn't think about CDOs at that point in time. We were

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
thinking much more broadly about how would it affect the real estate business generally, how would it affect our consumer business, which has an originate and hold strategy. The parts of the CDOs that would be affected based on our thinking at the time wouldn't be things that we owned at all. So, the answer to your question is no, but it is a very long no.

Q So, in the summer of 2007, it was your understanding that you did not, you meaning Citigroup, did not hold the lower tranches of CDOs that were being affected?

A That was my understanding, yes.
Q In the summer of 2007, did you ever ask Mr. Maheras or any of his colleagues in the investment bank, what tranches do we hold or what is our exposure?

A You know, in hindsight that is an excellent question. At the time, it wouldn't have occurred to anyone to do that. And if someone had asked the question, the answer that would have been given wouldn't have in any way given you different

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

 information.I believe it is true that not only the risk function, but the management of the business believed that our holdings and our activities were a hundred percent mark to market on a daily basis, so that we had no nonmarked risk.

I believe that at the time people felt that there were almost literally no scenarios under which the super seniors could be touched, so it wouldn't have occurred to anyone either to ask the question or to volunteer the information to say now don't forget, we also have these super seniors which are triple A and there is no chance in the world that they will ever be touched. That wouldn't have come up in a normal context.

Looking back, I mean it is very easy to see that is the one issue that you should have asked. I understand that. But at the time, you have to deal with what was reality at the time and whether it was the presentation that you just showed me to the

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
SEC or the internal dynamics of marking to market, the super seniors were not thought to be of subprime character, as I have gone back now and looked at that time.

Obviously at the time it wasn't a topic of discussion. But as I looked at it in hindsight, it is clear that people didn't think of it as being in that character or that category at all.

So, your question was did anyone examine Tom Maheras on what the other categories were we hold and how do you think about it and so forth, that wasn't part of a real world situation at the time.

Q In the summer of 2007 when events were unfolding in the market as described in this presentation, did you ask anyone at Citigroup to run any stress test to see how is Citi going to fair if events unfold in the market, if things deteriorate in the market?

A I didn't have to. People ran stress tests all the time. There is an index of -- and I can't remember the name of

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q If I could get you look at one additional page on this document here, which is the next page, 24609.

A Yes.
Q And it says, the title, Tracking the Twin Storms. Highlighting the Parallels. And to your counsel's point, I believe this is describing the market as a whole?

A Yes.
Q There is a section on the left, the subprime mortgages, it says, "Which securities are involved?" It says, "CDOs built out of subprime mortgages."

At the time you got this presentation in July of ' 07 , summer of ' 07 , did you realize that Citi had CDOs that were built out of subprime mortgages?

A You know, I can't honestly recall. As I said, the first time that CDOs came up as any kind of an issue for us, any kind of a problem or concern, was in the mid September time frame. This was I think talking about the industry as a whole. I

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE don't remember anybody saying: And don't forget, Chuck, we got some of these as well. I don't remember that as well.

MR. LERNER: For the record, I
don't think he said he remembered
receiving it at that time.
MR. BONDI: I understand that.
Q I was asking you if you understood at the time, though, generally, not based on this presentation, but generally the CDOs that Citigroup had were built out of subprime mortgages?

A I am not sure that I at that point in time even had any specific understanding of our, of the mechanics of our CDO business. This was, this was a very small part of one part of one division of the company. I mean, we had a large business. There would be no reason, unless I happened to have worked in the fixed income business, for me to have any familiarity with that detailed level of product activity.

Q On this same page, there is a

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE section called, looks like What Went Wrong? Under subprime mortgages it says, "Lax lending standards, high LTVs, piggyback loans, low or no doc and teaser rates."

Are the description of the mortgage types on this presentation here the types of mortgage products that we talked about earlier in connection with your Greenlining Institutional speech that you had some concerns about?

A Some yes and some no. The ones I mentioned earlier as examples of exotic mortgages were the negative amortization and the adjustable ARMs, which have to do fundamentally with how much you are required to pay back on a current basis. And by deferring how much you have to pay on a current basis, you are really betting on home price appreciation rather than the ability of the borrower to pay.

These items that are referred to here, some of these relate to that and some don't: So teaser rates or a category of ARM mortgages, but they are not necessarily
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE the old days, you would have an 80 percent LTV. You couldn't borrow more than 80 percent of the value of the house. And then it would go to 90 percent, then 95 percent and then a hundred percent. In some cases people were doing 105 and 110 percent LTV. And so that is a different issue. It is a related issue.

And if you put them altogether, that is really the worst possibility. If you have something where the borrower says I make so much money, but they really don't, and you have a situation where the appraisal says it is worth a hundred thousand dollars and it really isn't. And then you are lending 110 percent LTV against an inflated LTV, then you are really in trouble. And that is basically, you know, if you pick an example of a horrible loan, at the end of the process, you had borrowers who had no income borrowing 105 or 110 percent of an inflated LTV value, and then walking away from the loan, and not surprisingly the loan didn't have much value.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE adjustable ARMs. Adjustable ARMs are you the borrower can decide how much you want to pay fundamentally.

A teaser rate could be that, or it could be simply it is two percent for the first 12 months and then it jumps to 12 percent. So you don't get to decide. It is an automatic, it is a formulaic change.
So it could be similar or it could be different.

A low or no doc loan is one that doesn't have to do necessarily with you the borrower deciding how much you can pay back on a current basis, but could simply be that you say you have so much income and you don't have so much income. Or the appraisal saying that the house is worth a hundred thousand dollars and it is really only worth $\$ 50,000$. So it could be a different category of issue than the ability to pay issue.

High LTVs and piggyback loans basically go to how much of the value of the house is loaned against. Some of the -- in

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q Mr. Prince, is it fair to say based on what you testified earlier that during your tenure at Citigroup, you wouldn't have known if any of these mortgage types high LTV, big piggyback loans, no or low doc or teaser rates were somehow in the CDOs that Citigroup had created?

A Well, I think that is correct. The reason I am hesitating a tiny bit in answering is I think at the very end, in the last week or so of my tenure, there were some suggestions that there was a little more of this, not a lot, but a little more of this in some of our originations or some of our CDO products than I had understood before. But if you take that caveat, that one week a little more information, a little more -- if you take that caveat to your question, the answer would be yes.

Q I am going to ask you, sir, to take a look at another document.

I am going to show you what has been produced to us by Citigroup, Citi FCIC E 24768. And it is an e-mail chain. At the

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | top of the e-mail chain is an e-mail from | 2 | you know what he is referring to and what |
| 3 | you to Mr. Druskin dated August 3rd, 2007. | 3 | are you referring to? |
| 4 | (Thereupon, the e-mail chain | 4 | A The -- there are some unusual |
| 5 | Bates Citi FCIC E 24768 was marked CR | 5 | aspects to running a securities business, |
| 6 | Exhibit 6 for Identification, as of | 6 | both in the way that people participate and |
| 7 | this date.) | 7 | in the way you manage the business. |
| 8 | BY MR. BONDI: | 8 | In most businesses, you have a |
| 9 | Q It is responding to an earlier | 9 | budget forecast, you do certain activities |
| 10 | e-mail to you from Mr. Druskin. | 10 | to generate revenue, you try to hold down |
| 11 | First, at the bottom of this | 11 | your costs, you try to make a profit. And |
| 12 | e-mail, let's talk about the first e-mail | 12 | most of those activities, if you are |
| 13 | here, there is an e-mail from William | 13 | building refrigerators or something, have |
| 14 | Kister. | 14 | some level of predictability to them, some |
| 15 | A Yes. | 15 | level of direction to them. You have long |
| 16 | Q Looks to a distribution list, and | 16 | term contracts with suppliers, you have long |
| 17 | it is titled Citi Markets and Banking | 17 | term contracts with customers, you have an |
| 18 | Revenue Highlights for August 2nd, 2007. | 18 | ability to see into the future a little bit. |
| 19 | A Yes. | 19 | In the securities business, your |
| 20 | Q And July Update. | 20 | ability to see is measured on a daily basis. |
| 21 | First off, would is William | 21 | You have a budget for the year, you have a |
| 22 | Kister? | 22 | budget for the month, for the quarter. You |
| 23 | A I have no idea. I am sure he is | 23 | have analysts who are predicting what you |
| 24 | a very valuable employee of the company, | 24 | are going to make without knowing what the |
| 25 | though. 11 | 25 | markets are going to do. And you are held |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | Q Is this an e-mail that you | 2 | to the standards of your earnings estimates. |
| 3 | received? | 3 | So, today as we sit here there is |
| 4 | A Yes. This is our daily report. | 4 | an earnings estimate out for Citi that says |
| 5 | The markets and banking business would, | 5 | at the end of the first quarter, their |
| 6 | because of the kind of business it is, had | 6 | earnings ought to be X. And a large part of |
| 7 | to close their books every day and so every | 7 | Citi's earnings today relate to the |
| 8 | day you would get the results from the day | 8 | securities business. |
| 9 | before of activity. And so we would get one | 9 | The people who put those analyst |
| 10 | of these every day. This one happened to be | 10 | estimates together have no idea whether the |
| 11 | for that particular day. | 11 | markets are going to be up, down or sideways |
| 12 | Q And you would get these e-mails | 12 | between now and the end of March and yet |
| 13 | on a daily basis during your entire tenure | 13 | they have estimates out there. So on a |
| 14 | as CEO? | 14 | day-by-day basis, inside the company, your |
| 15 | A Yes. | 15 | reviewing the progress of your business day |
| 16 | Q Were these e-mails that you would | 16 | by day by day against your budget, against |
| 17 | have read on a daily basis? | 17 | the outside world's estimates and some days |
| 18 | A You bet, you bet. | 18 | the markets will be way up and you make lots |
| 19 | Q Looks like Mr. Druskin in | 19 | of money and you feel great. And some days |
| 20 | response to this e-mail says to you, "This | 20 | the markets are way down and you lose lots |
| 21 | looks like water torture, just awful." And | 21 | of money and you feel awful. |
| 22 | you respond, "Worse." | 22 | So, on this particular day if you |
| 23 | A Yes. | 23 | look at the first line of the first e-mail |
| 24 | Q What was he referring to and what | 24 | in the chain under "daily commentary," it |
| 25 | were you referring to in your response, if | 25 | says, "Fixed income markets lost \$66 113 |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
million, $\$ 100$ million below forecast. Meaning that we for that day had hoped to make 166 million I guess, right? No, if we -- we hoped to make $\$ 34$ million that day, more or less, and instead we lost $\$ 66$ million that day. All right? And then there are a series of sub-bullets below that which break to fixed income business down by components.

And then you go down a little bit and you see the next heading is fixed income underwriting, gained $\$ 2$ million, but that is still 6.8 million below forecast. And then the next heading was equity markets made almost $\$ 6$ million, but that is still $\$ 9$ million below forecast. So, when you put the whole thing together -- is there a total at the bottom? I haven't read these in a long time. Here it is at the top.

The revenue for August 2nd, day 2 of 23 -- so we are measuring it for the month -- was a loss of $\$ 49$ million, 162 million below forecast. Month to date revenue -- so again we are measuring how we

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q But were you concerned about conditions more broadly than just that day in this August time frame here? Were you concerned more generally about the direction that the market was heading?

A Well, sure is the answer. But again I would ask you to put this in context.

When we reported our results at the end of the second quarter -- so this is now mid-July, early July for the end of the second quarter, we reported both on a quarterly basis the second quarter and for the first six months of the year, the first and second quarters together, the best results in the company's 200-year history, the first quarter of 2007 -- first half of 2007 was the best six months in the 200-year history of the company. This is now 30 days after we reported the results. So was I concerned about where the markets were heading? Sure. But the markets are typically slow in August.

In hindsight of course it got

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
are doing against the month's budget was a loss of twenty-five, two hundred fifty one below forecast.

So, this is a daily snapshot that comes out. It came to, it comes to 10 or 11 people, mostly in the corporate banking business and to a couple of us at headquarters. And Druskin got his and said these daily losses are awful; they are like water torture, meaning day after day after day. And I apparently sent back something saying that it wasn't worse than water torture. I can't recall exactly the context in which I said that, but it may be self evident.

Q In other words, this wasn't a typical time period in the market?

A Oh, for all I know, this is day two of 23 and there is a cumulative, for all I know week before that we made a bunch of money. So this is one snapshot on one day.

Q This is reacting to that particular point in time?

A Right.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE much worse, but I am trying to recollect how I felt at that point in time. We were doing great in the first six months of the year. And in July we recorded those results, we had our annual off-site with the board in July. We as a group, as a company felt very good about where we were. And then August came, it was a little slow. Then in September the leveraged lending thing went a little more south on us, et cetera.

So I would not see this even recalling it now, this is not a canary in a mine signalling some great calamity coming. It is daily report that Druskin and I both complained gosh, we had a bad day yesterday.

Q What was the, as you put it, the canary in the coal mine? What was it to you that you thought these aren't normal conditions, we are headed to awful times ahead?

A When the rating agencies collapsed.
Q That was the October time frame?
A Mid October.
Q 2007.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE What in your view is the significance of the rating agencies to the overall financial crisis?

A Well, I mentioned earlier an overview that I have of the currency flows and the artificially low interest rates, you remember all that.

I think as part of that the increase in structured products resulted in an increase the complexity of financial products almost by definition. The structured products were more complex than simpler products. And I think as investors were looking for enhanced yields in an artificially low yield environment and as the industry created more structured products to try to satisfy that demand, the rating agencies performed an absolutely key go, no-go, kind of role.

If the rating agencies hadn't approved the products, hadn't certified them as it were, people wouldn't have bought them. The more complex the instruments are, the more people rely on the ratings. And so
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q Why is that your belief, though, what is the basis for your belief to say that you didn't believe your team relied exclusively or primarily on ratings?

A Salomon Brothers, Tom Maheras and his team, were widely thought of as the best fixed income house on Wall Street and had been for a long time.

I was frequently told by the regulatory agencies that David Bushnell was the best risk manager on Wall Street. It would have been inconceivable in that circumstance for people with those levels of experience and activity to primarily rely or exclusively rely on some third party to do their due diligence. It is inconceivable to me that would be the case.

## Q In July of 2007, in an article

 with the Financial Times, you were quoted as saying, "When the music stops in terms of liquidity, things will be complicated. But as long as the music is playing, we have got to get up and dance. We are still dancing." What did you mean by that quote?Interview - CHARLES PRINCE it is two sides of the same coin to say that as products became more complex, ratings became more important.

And as the industry grew in those four, five years in the middle of the decade, the structuring business grew, the ratings became more and more and more important. And that is why when the rating agencies collapsed and downgraded, you know, swathes of securities, not one, not one grades, not two grades, but collapsed them to junk bond status, it destroyed really, it was the precipitating event in the financial crisis.

Q How much did Citigroup rely on ratings for its own decisions with respect to its for instance CDO holdings?

A I don't know the answer to that. I mean I wasn't involved in those decisions. My belief is that the team did not rely exclusively on the ratings, they didn't rely primarily on the ratings because I think our people were better than that. But I don't know is the answer.

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

A Well, I thank you at least for the courtesy of using the entire quote. The Financial Times likes that so much and applies it so broadly that they don't put in the first part about liquidity stopping and being complicated.

This was a quote, or part of an interview I gave in Japan, as I recall it, to an FT reporter. And what I was referring to was the leveraged lending business. And you will recall that I said a couple of times that in the summer of 2007, the problem child focus in our corporate and banking business was on leveraged lending. Let me back up a step there. In the leveraged lending business, we and other members of Wall Street had been in the business of lending money to the private equity firms. And the private equity firms had pushed the banks to the point where the terms and conditions of that lending were quite favorable to the private equity firms and were quite unfavorable for the banks. And all this has

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE been widely reported.

The -- and widely recorded in the context of these were really quite unusual circumstances for the banks to loan money to the private equity firms on these kinds of terms.

In talking about this private equity lending business in the context of this interview, what I was trying to convey was the sense that for a number of reasons, it was impossible, in my view, for any one major participant on its own to stop doing those kinds of loans. Nothing illegal about these loans. The question was were they on good terms for the lender, were they smart for the lender to do? And it was my judgment then and it is my judgment now that it was impossible for any individual institution to simply say I am not going to to that anymore.

And of course if I had called my counterparts at the other banks and said let's all say we are not going to do it this way, smart lawyers would have said you are

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE going to go to jail if you do that.

So, my notion was -- and I guess it was either unartfully phrased or too artfully phrased that as long as that situation obtained, as long as the music was playing, that you had to, you had to dance to that music. You had to be part of that activity level. Although, I did point out that when this excess liquidity driven situation for the industry changed, it would be complicated. But this was, I want to emphasize, this was all in the context of the lending to the private equity firms. It had nothing to do with the mortgage business, it had nothing to do with what turned out to be CDOs. That was not part of my thinking or on the radar screen at all.

Q Appreciate that clarification.
Something you said that struck me as interesting again from the book that $I$ referenced earlier from Mr. Paulson.

A You marked that up quite a bit, those tabs.

Q You should see my other books.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
This is a reference on page 69 of Secretary Paulson's book, and I do want you to know I read other books beside Secretary Paulson's books.

MR. KARP: I see you read
Chairman Bernanke's books. MR. BONDI: And other, and others.

## BY MR. BONDI:

Q Secretary Paulson is referring to an event, a dinner at the New York Fed in June 26th of 2007. About a month or so before this quote it seems like, June 26, 2007.

And he recounts this dinner, says that you were present. Do you remember being at a New York Fed dinner on June 26, 2007 with Secretary Paulson?

A I don't remember the date, but it was common for then Chairman Geithner of the New York Fed to have dinners for the Wall Street CEOs at which Secretary Paulson or others would come.

Q On the bottom of page 69 , he

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE writes, "Chuck Prince, the Citigroup CEO, asked whether given the competitive pressures there wasn't a role for regulators to tamp down some of the riskier practices."

Basically, he asked, "Isn't there something you can do to order us not to take all these risks?" And he goes on to say, "Not long after I remember Prince was quoted as saying: As long as the music is playing, you have got to get up and dance."

Do you remember expressing in form or substance to Secretary Paulson this question of isn't there something you can do to order us not to take all these risks?

A Yes.
Q Can you elaborate on the context of that question?

A I am not sure I understand your question.

Q What was your conversation that you recall with Mr. Paulson about can't regulators do something to prevent us from taking all those risks? What was the context of Mr. Paulson's quote of you and

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE this conversation you had, do you recall having a conversation to that nature?

A We were -- Geithner had organized this dinner. And again I am not sure of the exact date, so I am not -- I don't know whether that was the date or not. But there was a dinner in the summer of that year at which almost all of the heads of the various banking and security houses were present. I was present, and Paulson was up to visit to talk to people. It was part of his normal outreach of staying connected with the industry and so forth.

And in the course of that, there was a discussion about the lending to the private equity firms and how some of those terms had, through a process of competition, had gotten to a point where they were really quite unfavorable for the lenders. And I remember expressing my view in this group context that none of us could individually back away from that business for a number of reasons, which I thought were important. And that as a result -- and that we couldn't

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE production. I will represent that it appears that this letter was sent, identical letter was sent to multiple people. There are two cover letters with this particular exhibit; one is to Mr. Rubin and one is to Mr. Thomas. And the letter is, it appears to be signed by you.

First of all, do you recall sending this letter on August 15, 2007?

A Well, you have just handed me something and I haven't read it, but it appears to be the monthly letter that I would send to the board. That is why you have two cover letters, because it would have been sent, an identical letter would have sent to each person on the board. And I would typically send this along either with the materials for the next upcoming board meeting. Or if we didn't have a board meeting coming up, I would simply send a stand alone letter. And this was a practice to find a way to give a little more of a narrative or my thoughts about how the company was doing to our board members

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE agree among ourselves not to do it. And that I thought it was an appropriate role for the regulators, since they recognized this unfavorable situation for the banks and the lenders and that the Fed directly and the Treasury Department perhaps indirectly had some oversight responsibility for the industry, that since we couldn't do it individually, we were prohibited from doing it as a group, that given their mandates, that they ought to consider directing us to tighten up. And that was the context.

Q So again it was in the context of leveraged lending?

A Yes.
Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you another document that was produced by Citigroup, Bates Citi FCIC 4648.
(Thereupon, the document Bates
Citi FCIC 2648 was marked CR Exhibit 7
for Identification, as of this date.)
A Yes.
Q And I note for the record that there are two identical cover pages in this

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE because we sent them so much information for their meetings that there was no overview or there was no context. There wasn't enough of a context, I was concerned.

So, I got into the habit of saying you are going to get a big a stack of materials, but before you read that, here's a, how I am viewing the company and how we are doing right now. That is the context for these letters and this appears to be the one I sent in August of '07.

Q Directing your attention up -first before we to that, Mr. Thomas was a member of the board?

A Yes.
Q And Mr. Rubin was a member of the board, obviously?

A Yes.
Q Page two of the letter which is Bates 4651, draw your to the paragraph that is next to the heading Credit Markets.

A Yes.
Q And you state, "You have read a great deal about the credit markets.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Whatever you have read, the reality is probably worse."

And then you go on at the end of that paragraph to say it is a very difficult and dangerous situation with few historical precedence.

What was on your mind in terms of this paragraph? And please read the entire paragraph. I have only drawn two sentences out of the paragraph. But what was your thinking, what was on your mind when you wrote that paragraph?

A Well, I am not sure I can reconstruct it except to say that I was trying to give a context for what they were reading in the papers. And, again, I don't have in mind exactly what was in the papers then. But it is clear as I read this paragraph that I was trying to give them a sense that as directors of the company, these are quite difficult issues, quite complicated issues.

And at the time -- this is early August. At the time, my guess is that what

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
As you go through it -- I am just sort of skimming the balance of the next couple of pages -- you can see that the first thing I talk with is leveraged lending. And I have got a couple of paragraphs on that. And then at the bottom of page three, I say, "We have exposures in both leveraged lending and to a more limited degree in the subprime area. We consciously did not originate these aggressive products, but did purchase some as part of portfolio acquisitions" and so forth.

And so I think this is very consistent with what I told you earlier about in the summer, our primary focus was on the leveraged lending or the private equity lending kind of area. And only in a subordinate sense with what was happening in the mortgage markets and there my belief was that we didn't have as much exposure.

Q And this was belief because you were not aware at the time of the super senior positions?

A And frankly, if I had been aware

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE of the super senior -- the short is yes, that is correct. If I had been aware, there is nothing about the super seniors at that point in time which would have suggested to anyone including me that we would have had a big loss from this.
$Q$ At the time you wrote this letter, you also weren't aware of the liquidity puts and the exposure from the liquidity puts?

A That is correct.
Q We talked about earlier this twin storms presentation that was sent to you on e-mail on July 30, 2007.

A Yes.
Q That seems to have been a couple weeks before this letter to the board of August 15, 2007. The twin storms presentation that had been sent to you two weeks earlier on e-mail refers to industry losses and CDOs of 50 to a hundred billion dollars.

I didn't notice anywhere in the letter to the board that you mentioned CDOs
was in the papers was probably not as -- it was probably mixed, as is often the case in the papers where you have some people saying it is going to be really bad or this could be quite difficult. And you have other people saying oh, it is a great buying opportunity and so forth.

And what I was trying to give them was a sense that there is really, there are really issues here that we are looking at very carefully.

Q In the next paragraph, you state, "There are two basic credit issues facing the market. The leveraged lending problem and the subprime problem."

Were these the two basic areas that you were focused on at the time that this letter was written in August 2007, that the leveraged lending problem and then the subprime problem?

A Well, I guess the short answer is I hope so. If I told the board these were the two issues, I would hope those were the ones I was focused on.

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | or exposure to CDOs. Why not? | 2 | purchased some as part of the portfolio |
| 3 | A Well, again, I doubt if I had in | 3 | acquisitions." What was your basis to say |
| 4 | mind that we had any CDOs at all or any CDO | 4 | that we, for that statement we did purchase |
| 5 | exposure at all. I think the closest you | 5 | some as part of portfolio acquisitions? |
| 6 | get to that is on the bottom of page three, | 6 | A I think it is important to -- in |
| 7 | that last paragraph there. And again I | 7 | answering your question I think it is very |
| 8 | think this pretty accurately reflects my | 8 | important to understand the way this |
| 9 | thinking at the time. I was always very | 9 | parenthetical is constructed, please. |
| 10 | candid with the board. The worse thing you | 10 | Q Please. |
| 11 | can do is try to not tell them things. And | 11 | A I am going to paraphrase it, if I |
| 12 | I wanted them to have my thinking as they | 12 | may. We didn't originate these products in |
| 13 | got ready for our board meeting so that when | 13 | our U.S. consumer business but did purchase |
| 14 | they showed up, they at least understood how | 14 | some as part of portfolio acquisitions. |
| 15 | I viewed the issues. And I think this is a | 15 | That is all referring to the U.S. consumer |
| 16 | pretty good, pretty accurate, pretty candid | 16 | business. And then I turned to capital |
| 17 | summary of how I viewed the problem in | 17 | markets and baking. And in our corporate |
| 18 | whatever date this was, mid August. | 18 | business, we did underwrite mortgage backed |
| 19 | Q You were chairman of the board at | 19 | securities, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, |
| 20 | the time you wrote this letter? | 20 | right? |
| 21 | A I was. | 21 | So when you referred to purchase |
| 22 | Q Just to be complete for the | 22 | some as part of the portfolio acquisitions, |
| 23 | record, the paragraph that you referred to | 23 | that was still in our consumer business. |
| 24 | on the bottom of page three, I will just | 24 | That had nothing to do with the fixed income |
| 25 | read it for the record so it is complete, 134 | 25 | business. 136 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | you said, you wrote, "We have exposures in | 2 | Q I see? |
| 3 | both leveraged lending and to a more limited | 3 | A I am sorry to be very specific, |
| 4 | degree in the subprime area. (We | 4 | but you have to read the sentence very |
| 5 | consciously did not originate these | 5 | carefully that way. |
| 6 | aggressive products in our U.S. consumer | 6 | Q I appreciate the clarification |
| 7 | group, but did purchase some as part of | 7 | and I am glad that you pointed that out. |
| 8 | portfolio acquisitions and, in CMB, we did | 8 | So that part, the some as part of |
| 9 | underwrite mortgage backed securities | 9 | our portfolio acquisitions had nothing to do |
| 10 | representing subprime products originated by | 10 | with CMB or fixed income? |
| 11 | others.)" | 11 | A Right. That was our retail |
| 12 | A Close paren, period. Sorry. | 12 | mortgage business which bought all kinds of |
| 13 | Q Oh, yes, close paren period. | 13 | mortgages and almost always sold them to |
| 14 | Yes, sir. | 14 | Fannie and Freddie as part of that whole |
| 15 | A Old lawyers never die. I am | 15 | flow of the mortgage business nationally. |
| 16 | sorry. | 16 | Q Appreciate that. Thank you. |
| 17 | Q I just wanted to be complete that | 17 | MR. BONDI: Let me mark this |
| 18 | we got that. | 18 | eight. |
| 19 | A Yes. | 19 | (Thereupon, the e-mail chain |
| 20 | Q What was your basis, though, | 20 | Bates marked Citi FCIC E 36374 was |
| 21 | because earlier -- I am just trying to | 21 | marked CR Exhibit 8 for |
| 22 | understand. | 22 | Identification, as of this date.) |
| 23 | Earlier you had testified that | 23 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 24 | you weren't aware of the super senior | 24 | Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what |
| 25 | positions, but here you did write, "We 135 | 25 | was produced by Citigroup and marked Citi |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
FCIC E 36374. It is an e-mail chain between yourself and Mr. Rubin. And I would like to first direct your attention to the first e-mail in this chain. At the bottom is one from yourself to Mr. Rubin dated Sunday September 9th where you begin with "Dear Bob, welcome back from Korea."

A Uh-huh.
Q There is a section that says a question regarding rescheduling.

A Uh-huh.
Q And the first star says, "Had good first meeting with Tom Maheras," et cetera, "re: CMB results."

What are you referring to about "good first meeting" there?

A The context of this e-mail chain is that I had set up these meetings, which started as a Tom, I want you and your folks to come and explain to me exactly what the situation is with these securities. I understand your point of view on them, but I want to understand the detail of them very carefully.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
October, I began to be more uncomfortable with Tom's representations on these issues and began to press him more on these and to inquire into more and to say I want understand this better. I want to be much more detailed about this and so forth.

This would have been in the context of him mentioning at that Business Heads meeting I mentioned to you. And so that was the context in which I shifted focus from the private equity lending and said okay, I want to really look at this much more carefully. That is how these came about.

Q Were these meetings held in the library outside your office?

A The first couple of them were. Then we had one or two that were downtown where that business is located so that we didn't -- we wanted to have a broader group of people. So if Maheras wanted to bring six or seven of his people, instead of having them all traipse uptown, the three or four of would go downtown. I wanted to see
Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
That eventually migrated from a one or two or three sets of meetings to becoming almost a daily update on the markets. But this was at the beginning of the: I want to understand much more carefully than your representation of what is going on here.
And what I am doing here in this bottom e-mail is telling Bob who was in Korea for the first meeting apparently, that we had a good first meeting and I would like to schedule two more follow-ups before our board meeting. And so Bob, what is your schedule like? Druskin is in this place, that place. I want to do it on Wednesday. Can you make the second meeting we are having with Tom and his people?
Q Just so I'm clear, what prompted your desire to have a greater understanding about this business and schedule these meetings? What was the precipitating event or events?
A I think I said earlier that in the time frame of the September into

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE them in person, judge them in that way. And then after a while we began to do them on the telephone as we were more monitoring market activities.

Q Do you recall Mr. Maheras at this first meeting quantifying the exposure to Citigroup associated with CDOs?

A You mean from a position?
Q Yes, sir.
A I don't remember. I don't know whether he did or not is what I am saying.

Q The next e-mail up is a response from Mr. Rubin to you dated also September 9th, 2007.

And he says, "According to Lou, Tom never did provide on on clear and direct answer on the super seniors. If that is so, and the meeting did not bring that to on on head, isn't that deeply troubling not as to what happened -- that is a different question that is also troubling, but as to providing full and clear information and analysis now?"

What do you understand Mr. Rubin

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE to have meant by those statements?

A He was reflecting, apparently, on comments from Lou Kaden who was in the meeting and who had worked with Bob Rubin for many, many, many years.

Apparently, Kaden had talked to Rubin after the first meeting that Rubin was not in and had said to Rubin that -- I am just, based on what Bob says here, Kaden must have said that Maheras wasn't a hundred percent forthcoming or something like that. And Bob was reflecting that comment, Kaden's comment to Rubin, back to me.

Q Did you share that belief that Mr. Maheras was not forthcoming?

A Well, the top of the e-mail chain is my response to Rubin, so that really is how I reflected that, how I reacted to that comment.

Q For the record you responded, "I thought for first meeting it was good. We weren't trying to get final answers, so I didn't see Tom avoid any questions. Also, want more back channel with Dave $B$ and he

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE that because he was obviously traveling.

Q Did you ultimately have these as you described it back channel conversations with David Bushnell?

A Yes.
Q And can you tell me what those conversations entailed? What did you ask and what did he say?

A Again, I testified briefly, but I'll do it in more detail.

Throughout this period, it was a continuum, it was an evolving process in which the outside environment suggested that the CDO market or the CDO securities, that the water level would rise on these tranches and that the lowest level would be hit and then well maybe the next level might be hit. And maybe then the next level might be hit. And throughout that whole process, Tom in mid September some time said well, we have got some of these super seniors up here, but they will be a hundred percent fine.

And as figuratively the water
level was rising, I began to be more

Q And what was Mr. Bushnell saying to you in response to those back channel conversations?

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | A What I can't do, unfortunately, | 2 | What is meant by global credit |
| 3 | is I can't disaggregate what happened in day | 3 | trading? |
| 4 | by day sense. This was a period of time of | 4 | A That would have been the |
| 5 | no more than 30 days. Maybe less, maybe it | 5 | reference to that part of the business that |
| 6 | was three weeks. It was very intensive. It | 6 | was involved, what we would call fixed |
| 7 | was not the only issue that we were dealing | 7 | income. |
| 8 | with for the company. And so I can't, I | 8 | Q Fixed income? |
| 9 | didn't keep a diary, I don't have any way of | 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | saying well this on date David said this and | 10 | Q There is a heading called what |
| 11 | then the next day he said that. And on that | 11 | Happened in July and August? |
| 12 | date Maheras said this versus that, I can't, | 12 | A Yes. |
| 13 | I can't disaggregate any of that. | 13 | Q And there is a bullet that says |
| 14 | (Thereupon, the Power Point | 14 | "poor risk management and balance sheet |
| 15 | deck Bates marked FCIC 99654 was | 15 | management." |
| 16 | marked CR Exhibit 9 for | 16 | What do you understand by that |
| 17 | Identification, as of this date.) | 17 | statement, poor risk management and balance |
| 18 | Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what | 18 | sheet management? |
| 19 | has been produced by Citigroup Bates Citi | 19 | A What I think they meant by that |
| 20 | FCIC 99654 and it appears to be a Power | 20 | was -- because the subsequent sub bullet |
| 21 | Point deck CEO discussion on global credit | 21 | says note that no limits were breached. So, |
| 22 | markets dated September 12, 2007. Do you | 22 | it is not -- it is a little bit of, in my |
| 23 | recall ever seeing this document? | 23 | view, the senior people in the business |
| 24 | A I have clearly seen it in | 24 | saying the junior people shouldn't have had |
| 25 | preparation. And I remember being surprised 146 | 25 | these positions. 148 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | because of the cover which says CEO | 2 | Q Who were the senior people you |
| 3 | discussion. Because I never made any kind | 3 | are referring to and who were the junior |
| 4 | of presentation that even looked like this | 4 | people? |
| 5 | and then I realized it was somebody | 5 | A Maheras and Barker were the |
| 6 | presenting to me. | 6 | senior people and you can see a couple lines |
| 7 | I have a vague recollection of | 7 | below that, it says "invoked complete |
| 8 | the document, but I am very clear that | 8 | overall of trading management" and it |
| 9 | whether it was this document or something | 9 | mentions three names of people who are, |
| 10 | like this document, this kind of information | 10 | quote, gone. |
| 11 | would have been presented to me in about | 11 | Q Those names Higgins, Pichler and |
| 12 | that time frame. | 12 | Choi, who are these people? |
| 13 | Q Do you recall having a meeting on | 13 | A I have no idea. |
| 14 | or about Wednesday, September 12, 2007, in | 14 | MS. BUERGEL: Just understand, |
| 15 | the library outside your office with Mr. | 15 | Mr. Prince gave his understanding of |
| 16 | Maheras and Mr. Barker and Mr. Bushnell and | 16 | what global trading credit was. That |
| 17 | others? | 17 | actually was a subset of the fixed |
| 18 | A I am sure that happened and I am | 18 | income business run by Mr. Higgens and |
| 19 | sure that was one of the meetings that I | 19 | Mr. Pichler. It was a very specific |
| 20 | referred to in my previous answer. | 20 | trading desk known as global credit |
| 21 | Q I would like to draw your | 21 | trading. So, this slide actually |
| 22 | attention, sir, to the page 99657. | 22 | refers to that business which was not |
| 23 | A Yes. | 23 | the CDO business and not the leveraged |
| 24 | Q And it is entitled Global Credit | 24 | lending business, but a separate |
| 25 | Trading. 147 | 25 | trading operation. 14 |


| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | THE WITNESS: Uh-huh, okay, | 2 | $Q$ And the next, the next bullet |
| 3 | thank you. | 3 | says: "Deal volume grew 50 percent from |
| 4 | MS. BUERGEL: It also, if you | 4 | 2005 to 2006 with a 30 percent increase in |
| 5 | look at the third quarter Q, took | 5 | revenues." |
| 6 | significant losses in the third | 6 | Is that something you of that |
| 7 | quarter. | 7 | known prior to September 12, 2007, that the |
| 8 | BY MR. BONDI: | 8 | deal volume grew 50 percent from '05 to '06 |
| 9 | Q If you will flip the page to the | 9 | with a 30 percent increase in revenues? |
| 10 | next page, sir. | 10 | A Too small. |
| 11 | A Yes. | 11 | Q You indicate that that business |
| 12 | Q Titled This Page is Global | 12 | was too small. |
| 13 | Structured Credit. | 13 | A To be reported on it at that |
| 14 | A Uh-huh. | 14 | senior level. |
| 15 | Q Global structured credit is the | 15 | Q To be reported to you at a senior |
| 16 | CDO business within global structured | 16 | level. |
| 17 | credit? | 17 | But it ultimately caused some |
| 18 | A Well subject to my counsel's | 18 | significant losses to Citigroup. |
| 19 | better thinking, I think so. | 19 | A Correct. |
| 20 | Q The first bullet talks about the | 20 | Q In retrospect, should the CDO |
| 21 | CDO market experienced extremely high growth | 21 | business and its operations have been |
| 22 | rate over the last three years, about the | 22 | elevated up to your level prior to |
| 23 | volumes increased 95 percent from 2005 to | 23 | September 2007? |
| 24 | 2006. And then the next bullet I want to | 24 | A Well, that is obviously a |
| 25 | draw your attention to, "Citi consistently | 25 | fundamental question. |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | ranked number one or two in the overall CDO | 2 | I think that you would have to |
| 3 | business." | 3 | ask it in a slightly broader way. |
| 4 | Were you aware of Citi's | 4 | If someone had elevated to my |
| 5 | approximate rating as compared to its | 5 | level that we were putting on a $\$ 2$ trillion |
| 6 | competitors in the CDO business through your | 6 | balance sheet, \$40 billion of triple A |
| 7 | tenure as CEO? Is that something that would | 7 | rated, zero risk paper, that would not in |
| 8 | have been on your radar, that Citi was | 8 | any way have excited my attention. |
| 9 | ranked number one or number two? | 9 | So, the simple question of should |
| 10 | A No. The CDO business was a | 10 | I have been told about that business, if I |
| 11 | product deep inside our fixed income | 11 | may, that question by itself doesn't lead |
| 12 | business, and we would have measured our | 12 | anywhere. What has to happen is that there |
| 13 | fixed income business three or four ways | 13 | has to be a way for risk professionals going |
| 14 | competitively. But we wouldn't have gone | 14 | forward to think about the possibility of |
| 15 | down to that lower level in terms of product | 15 | risk in ways which are useful. In other |
| 16 | activity in terms of what came to me or | 16 | words, it is not useful for -- it wouldn't |
| 17 | senior management. | 17 | have been useful for someone to come to me |
| 18 | Q From 2003 up until September 2007, | 18 | and say now, we have got $\$ 2$ trillion on the |
| 19 | would people in the business meeting have | 19 | balance sheet of assets. I want to point |
| 20 | said to you along the lines of: Our CDO | 20 | out to you there is a one in a billion |
| 21 | business is getting a lot bigger or we are | 21 | chance that this \$40 billion could go south. |
| 22 | getting a lot better? Is that something | 22 | That would not have been useful information. |
| 23 | that would have come up at Business Heads | 23 | There is nothing I can do with that because |
| 24 | meeting with you? | 24 | there is that level of chance on everything. |
| 25 | A Too small. | 25 | It turned out that the |
|  | 151 |  | 153 |
|  |  |  | Pages 150 to 153 |

[^0]Interview - CHARLES PRINCE possibility of risk for these assets was not understood. So, people would have had to give me information not only about the position, but about the risk characteristics which information would have been useful to me.

So I am sorry to give you a long answer, but simply telling me that our volume grew from X to Y wouldn't have really told me anything. And in fact, the proof of that is that as late as middle October, Tom Maheras -- best fixed income guy on Wall Street -- was telling me you are never going to lose a penny on these instruments.

So, if somebody had come to me in September and said now don't forget you got... it wouldn't have made any difference.

Q There is a section on that same page, it says Lessons Learned. The second bullet says, in quotes, "Market standard" end quote, "Warehouse agreements were not robust. Practical limitations in our ability to enforce them." What does that mean?

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

A What I think that means -- and I am not a hundred percent sure, so I am going to give you my best thought on it.

What I think that means is that the warehouse means that we -- as I have understood subsequently, we get mortgages and put them in sort of a holding pen, a warehouse as it were. And then from that warehouse of mortgages, create structured products. And that the market standard warehouse agreements in hindsight were not as creditor lender bank friendly as they should have been.

So the ability to say to an originator, we are going to give you back the mortgages; we are not going to keep them in our warehouse; we are not going to sell them out to the market; we are going to put them back to you, those agreements were not as, quote, robust, didn't have lender friendly enough standards.

And practical limitations on our ability to enforce them, which I think refers to the fact that if the originator

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE goes bankrupt, then you don't have anybody to put them back even if your agreements say if they don't meet these standards, I can give them back. I think that is what that sentence means.

## Q The next bullet says,

 "Implemented significant changes to risk management in January; i.e., Donald Quinton in CDO business and Mickey Batia in ABS correlation," end of paren. Dash, "However, not completely built out by time of market disruption."What do you understand to be meant by that bullet?

A I don't know who the people are. I think this falls under the heading of the more senior people, Maheras and Barker, saying we have changed the people. But them saying -- as they did on the previous page. But them saying here: We were caught in between making the change, I didn't and still don't put much stock in that sentence having much relationship to anything.

Q Next bullet, "Business model not

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

 well diversified," dash "too much reliance on one asset class. One of the primary initiatives for 2007 was to increase mix of asset classes-consummated in time."What do you understand, sir, to be meant by that bullet point?

A I don't know what that means. I mean I can read the words, but I don't understand it in this context.

Q And two pages later, Bates numbered 99660, titled Lessons Learned/ Opportunities Under Global Structured Credit, talks about, there is a bullet that says, "Redeployment of resources. Time frame within six weeks."

What was being done there or what was being contemplated there?

A I don't remember. I remember actually in this meeting them saying we are going to do something in the next weeks. I frankly can't remember what it was and of course in hindsight whatever it was it didn't make much difference. But I don't remember what it was. I am sure the people

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
who put it together can tell you, but I don't.

Q And last question on this one, it says, "Redefine constraints and structures with risk management."

What do you understand by that bullet?

A I think it relates to the first bullet, which says, "Focused on resizing given revenue opportunities."

What they were saying here was that the structured business is going to be significantly smaller. They thought it was going to be still meaningful but much smaller than it had been. Turned out, of course, there isn't any structured business. And I think what they said was that given this smaller size, we are going to resize this, meaning we are going to get rid of people and make it a smaller business and so forth. And I think that in that context they were saying: And risk limits will shrink correspondingly with a smaller size of the business.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
In the line you just referred to, in the bracket, at the end of it it says "Corporate HQ UTC dot-com." See that?

Q Yes?
A The very long bottom of it says "see you then, George." Do you see that.

Q Yes.
A This is George David, a board member, who was the CEO or chairman of the UTC Corporation at the time. So he had sent something to Gary Crittenden and copying me either in anticipation of a board meeting or after a board heating. But it took me a little while to figure this out.

Q Do you understand this e-mail seems to be focused on CDOs?

A Let me read it again. I am sorry.

Well, as I read it, it seems to me he is talking about most of the things that are in the corporate investment bank. So he talks about the warehouse, he talks about CDOs, he talks about leveraged lending commitments, and he talks about trading

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q Okay. If I may do one more document before we take a break for lunch. (Thereupon, the e-mail chain
Bates Citi FCIC E 31582 was marked CR
Exhibit 10 for Identification, as of this date.)
BY MR. BONDI:
Q Mr. Prince, I showing you what has been produced by Citigroup and it is Bates Citi FCIC E 31582.

A Uh-huh.
Q It is an e-mail chain. The bottom e-mail says "from CEO's office corp."

A Uh-huh.
Q To, it appears to be Mr.
Crittenden and cc yourself dated September 26, 2007.

A Right.
Q First, what does this CEO's office corp. mean? Is that an e-mail that you would have sent out?

A Took me a while to figure this out myself. Here are the, here's the Rosetta Stone to figure this out.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE inventories of fixed income securities. So CDO is part of what he is talking about, but not all of what he is talking about.

Q I want to direct your attention to a statement that he makes in the bottom of the first paragraph there. It says, "The rate spikes of the last three to four months (and associated liquidity), were the three or four Six Sigma event. So the question is whether-how our models missed this. Alternatively, are our models too specific to individual businesses and/or exposures such that they don't encompass the big/rare event affecting the big/combined warehouse as outlined here."

A Uh-huh.
Q What do you understand to be Mr. David meaning by these three sentences?

A George ran UTC, and United Technologies Corporation is a business, as are many manufacturing businesses, built on the concept of Six Sigma. While I don't understand it completely, my understanding is that Six Sigma relates to a manufacturing

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE process in which you try to minimize defects in the manufacturing process to a very, very small degree.

George always thought that it was a useful thing to try to apply the notion of how you manage screwing cars together to the banking business. And so he would say: Your lending doesn't meet a Six Sigma level of activity. I never could quite figure that out, honestly. And so as I read these two sentences, he seemed to be saying that there was a three or four Six Sigma event, whatever that is, and the question is how our models missed this, et cetera, et cetera.

And I think he was expressing in language that would be consistent with a manufacturing business the same, in some ways the same concept I mentioned just a moment ago that risk has to think about how to provide risk judgments on what he would call a three or four Sigma event; in other words, a very unusual kind of event. So that is what I understand him to be saying.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE what I think he meant by that was do our risk models measure businesses at a small individual level without aggregating.

So you could have a situation, for example, where we had real estate exposure in four or five parts of our business and because we measured each of those risks individually, each of the risks would seem smaller. But if you step back a little bit and you say well, wait a minute, you actually got real estate risk in four or five pockets, when you put the four or five pockets together in an aggregate base, it is a much bugger number.

That is not what happened here.
We didn't have significant damage from four or five parts of the business individually which were small but when you aggregated them they were big, that didn't happen here.

What happened was a very small part of the business that had enormous consequences. So his question, which is a perfectly appropriate question, was are your, are your risk models, do they

> Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
> Q As you sit here today, you don't know what that three or four Six Sigma event means?

> A Six Sigma refers to frequency. Six Sigma is supposed to be the ultimate, you know, one in a million or one in a billion or something. And three or four must be getting close to that level.

> It is a bad analogy. I analogize
> it to the Richter scale. A ten on the Richter scale was the biggest earthquake ever. This may be a three or four, meaning it is a larger rather than a smaller one. But I don't really understand Six Sigma. I am sorry.

> Q In the sentence he says, "Alternatively, are our models too specific to individual businesses and/or exposures such that they don't encompass the big/rare event affecting the big/combined warehouse as outlined here. What did you understand by that sentence?

A What I think he meant by that -and again I'm guessing a little bit. But

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE aggregate disparate risks across the company -- perfectly appropriate question -was not pertinent to what actually turned out to be the case here.

Q The e-mail above that from a woman named Karen Lowely (phonetic) to you. And she says, "I gave this to GC would said it was a DB issue. Dave called to say he is available to fill you in on this once you return." I assume DB is David Bushnell.

A Yes.
Q And the Dave referred to here is David Bushnell?

A Yes.
Q GC is that Michael Helfer?
A Gary Crittenden. Karen Lowely was my assistant, so she saw this come in, saw my e-mail. I was tied up obviously, apparently. And she said to me by e-mail: I gave this to Gary Crittenden, and Gary said it was Bushnell's issue and Bushnell called to say he can talk to me when I went I want. And my e-mail back was tell him to be prepared to join the 4:30 meeting. We

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE must have had a meeting with George David.

Q You indicate for your assistant to tell him to be prepared, he meaning David Bushnell, to be prepared to respond.

A Right.
Q Did Mr. Bushnell respond to George David's concerns about the three or Six Sigma event not being caught by the models?

A I can only assume so in the $4: 30$ meeting orally. I don't remember being -- I don't remember this. I mean you showed it to me, but don't have an independent recollection of it. I don't remember any back and forth.

Q Do you recall anything about what Mr. Bushnell might have said at this 4:30 meeting concerning the models?

A No.
Q Before we go off record, I understand there might be a scheduling issue. Do you have a hard stop today, sir?

A Well, I guess I would just like to understand how long we are going to go or

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE didn't believe that there was any prospect of loss in the CDOs in September of 2007.

A The super senior.
Q Super senior CDOs, excuse me.
What was Mr. Crittenden's view of that in September 2007?

A I already said, I think he was cautious about that. I described a couple times the figurative notion that Randy and Tom were at one end of a figurative table. It was actually a round table. But figuratively, and that David and Gary were figuratively at the other end of the table expressing caution about them.

Q You described in detail earlier about when you first learned and had an understanding of the CDOs and the positions associated with those CDOs.

But my question is: Who should have in your mind prior to the events that we have been discussing in the fall of 2007, who prior to those events do you believe should have had an understanding of the positions that were being taken with respect

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE what your thoughts are about that. I have some things scheduled in sort of the late afternoon time frame.

MR. BONDI: I think hopefully
we will be finished by four, if that
is sufficient by your schedule.
THE WITNESS: That would be a little late, but I will certainly accommodate that. I will make some changes during the break.

MR. BONDI: I will try my best to finish earlier.

THE WITNESS: Of course. And I
will try to give you yes or no
answers. How is that?
MR. BONDI: No, I want you to
give full and complete answers. We
are a fact finding commission here, so
full and complete answers, please.
Why don't we take a brief lunch break?
(Lunch recess.)
BY MR. BONDI:
Q Mr. Prince, you described how Mr. Maheras and Mr. Barker expressed that they

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE to super senior tranches on CDOs?

A I believe that people at various levels of the management chain were aware of this, that is to say I don't believe that there was at certain levels of the organization any surprise that we had these positions. Whether it was the person on the desk itself or his or her manager, and those people led up in a management chain eventually to Randy Barker.

I don't know whether this product was a significant enough product before the September, October time frame, was seen to be significant a product that it would have gotten to Randy's attention. I don't know the answer to that.

My guess is it would not having been significant enough to be on Maheras's radar screen. I am not sure whether it would have been for Barker. But below that one, two, three layers below that, I am sure that it was at the right level.

The question that you are asking
I think really is in hindsight, given what

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
has happened to this, even though it was a very small position in an absolute sense, in a relative sense, what should have been known about this, who should have known about this, and I think that if there had been any inkling, any suggestion that $\$ 40$ billion of assets could go to zero, that we wouldn't have had those positions.

And so the risk infrastructure, even though in hindsight we had these horrible problems, the risk infrastructure was quite robust. Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of risk officers, very detailed risk limits. We had a number of regulators embedded into the organization. It was a pretty transparent place as it related to taking on risk.

In hindsight, the problem was that no one thought that these were risky. So, if I may, your question of who should have known about these, as I said earlier in my case, simply knowing about them wouldn't have done anything. One would have had to know about them and to have thought about

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE before it he got back from Korea and then several as you describe after he returned from Korea.

Do you recall what the focus of these meetings that you testified to earlier? Were they solely on CDOs, or were they CDOs and leveraged lending and other matters?

A My best recollection is that they were primarily CDOs and at some point we hooked in the folks from the U.S. consumer mortgage business to give their point of view on the market situation as it related to real estate. And this was in the context -- when we had the meetings, we didn't talk about, quote, CDOs. We talked about the real estate market. And the impact on the real estate market would than translate into the CDOs. So I want to make sure I am clear about this.

We didn't get in a meeting and say okay, what about the CDOs? We didn't do that. We would get in the meetings and we would say we have got these securities

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

them in a way that no one was thinking about them.

On a going forward basis, how that is accomplished, not only the knowledge but the character of the knowledge, I don't know the answer to that. The risk people, the risk professionals, have to look at the likelihood in different ways.

Risk is composed of the likelihood of something happening and the consequences of something happening. Here the likelihood was quite small, but the consequences were devastating. So the question is how do you put that together? And it is really not just who should have known, but who should have known what about it, not just factually, but in a judgmental way. Who should have had a different risk judgment about these assets. That is I think if I may, that is a more complex way of asking the same question.

## Q We talked earlier about some

 e-mails between you and Mr. Rubin talking about setting up meetings, one that occurredInterview - CHARLES PRINCE positions, they are supposed to be gold plated, but the real estate market is deteriorating. What are you seeing in the market about this? Who is buying this? Somebody is willing to pay X cents on the dollar for that. There was a trade. How do see that? Is that going to be a getting better situation or getting worse situation? I was trying to judge where the market was moving in that sense.

And so we would get input from the trading desks, we would get input in, towards the end I remember we would get input from our real estate people in the consumer business, certainly from the risk people. And I think that as part of that, as part of market color, we would also some times get trading activity on the leveraged lending book. So, somebody might say well, somebody just bought a piece of this private equity deal for 90 cents on the dollar. So that would be part of our mix of market color. But a primary focus would have been on the real estate market which would then

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE have translated into the CDO valuations.

## Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what

 was produced by Citigroup and has been marked Citi 1611657. It appears to be a Power Point deck entitled Global Structured Credit Products, The Way Forward, September 2007, Michael Raynes.(Thereupon, the document marked
Citi 1611657 entitled Global
Structured Credit Products, The Way
Forward, September 2007, Michael
Raynes was marked CR Exhibit 11 for
Identification, as of this date.) BY MR. BONDI:

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Ido.
Q How do you recognize this document?

A I remember at one point we were having these meetings that described. I said I want to meet the fellow that is doing this. I want to meet as it turned out Michael Raynes. And I remember Maheras and Barker said: What do you need to meet him

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
A I think that Raynes was scared to death in the meeting. And I have a dim recollection that Barker told me afterwards, after the meeting, that Raynes expected me to fire him in the meeting. And so I think that my judgment of him in the meeting was probably not an objective or an accurate one. That is to say he was under a lot of pressure, he was under a lot of stress because of the context of the meeting.

He seemed to know the business. He seemed to have a much more optimistic view of the long term nature of the business, much more reflective of we are going through a dip, quite a large dip. But, but you know, don't give up precipitously kind of approach to it. That is about all I remember.

## Q Did you ultimately fire Michael

 Raynes?A No. The only person I acted on was Randy Barker.

Q Did you ask anyone else to fire anyone associated with the CDO business?
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE for? I said with all that is going on, I actually want to be able to see the guy. I don't want to get it indirectly, I don't want to get it filtered. I want to look at this person, I wanted him to talk to me directly about what is going on. So, they got Raynes to come over and people put this thing together and he came up and sat in the library with our group and made this little presentation.

Q Was this the first time you had met Michael Raynes?

A Yes, first and only time. First and only time.

Q Who was Michael Raynes?
A He was this guy. I am sorry to put it this way. He was the guy who ran this. I didn't know who he was other than that. I learned since we hired him from Deutsche Bank. All I knew was he was this guy.

Q What was your impression after the meeting that they had with Mr. Raynes of Mr. Raynes?

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
A No, I think I have answered that question. The only person I ever acted on in this context was Randy Barker.

Q Just wanted to make clear that you hadn't asked someone else to fire someone else.

A No.
Q Mr. Prince, I would ask you to turn to the page that is four, five pages into the deck, Citi 1611661, the topic says Development and Structured Credit at Citi. A Yes. Okay.
Q The first bullet says, "Prior to June 2006, structured credit products was managed in silos." What does that mean?

A What that means -- and there are three sub bullets below that -- is that like any business, the capital markets and banking business is organized into operating units. And apparently structured credit products activities happened in several of these business units. That is what those words mean to me. By the way, all of these units that he mentions are within fixed

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE income.

Q Do you know if the various silos under structured credit products, cash versus synthetic, New York versus London, capital markets versus trading, do you know if they utilized the same valuation methodologies for super senior tranches of CDOs?

A I don't. But I would be amazed if they didn't because we had a risk function which was separate from the businesses.

Q If you would flip two pages later to 665?

A "Analysis of what went wrong."
Q Yes. The analysis of what went wrong and proposed strategic changes."

First point. Significant
dependence on distribution as proxy hedge to warehoused assets."

What do you understand that to mean?

A What that means is that the belief that Citi would be able to distribute

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE the products out of the warehouse was the significant dependence on part of this and was used in his view as a proxy hedge, meaning that the assets in the warehouse weren't otherwise hedged. And that I think in one of the Barker presentations that we looked at earlier, there was some reference to Citi's historical strength in distribution wasn't sufficient for something or other, and I think that is the same point.

Q What was your reaction to hearing that point about the significant dependence on distribution as a proxy hedge to warehoused assets?

A I don't remember any particular reaction to this single point on this single page of the presentation.

Q Did you agree with looking at this page 665 of what went wrong on these bullets? Did you agree with any of the analysis as to what went wrong when it was presented to you?

A Well, I don't have any way of

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE really answering that and the reason for that is this: In this presentation for this discussion by Raynes, he wasn't saying anything different than Maheras or Barker had been saying. And my, my view of this meeting was I simply wanted to hear it from the horse's mouth, if you understand what I mean. I wanted to make sure that he was saying this and that he actually believed it. But I don't think and I haven't reviewed this carefully obviously; you just handed it to me, but I don't think there is anything in here which is different than what Maheras and Barker was saying.

So, it is not as if I was getting new information. The only new information I was getting was that the guy running the desk believed this to be the case.

Q The bullet that says, "Unprepared for draconian meltdown scenario with respect to largest collateral asset. Risk limits too high."

What do you understand by the largest collateral asset? Is that the

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE subprime mortgages?

A Yes, I think he said that on an earlier page actually. As I was turning to get to this page, he said, I think he said something to that effect on page 658, the first page in the deck. "CDO market has come under significant assault this year prompted by an unprecedented fall in value of its largest asset class subprime mortgages."

Q Is reference to risk limits too high, was that the risk limits on the positions that could be accumulated on the books of Citi?

A I think that what it is referring to is if you look across to the right side of the page opposite that bullet, the change, the left side is what went wrong. The right side is what they would propose to do about it.

The change opposite that first bullet that you referred to is change in traditional CDO business model with respect to warehousing and counter party risk. I

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE think this is the same point that we looked at a few minutes ago on this different document or a different document that talked about our market standard warehouse agreements weren't robust enough and our ability to put the loans -- I think that is what this is really referring to, that on a going forward basis, we would propose that our warehouse be much more not at our risk through the way that the agreements were structured and through monitoring the counter parties so that we would have the ability to put the loans back to somebody else. We wouldn't be stuck holding the bag as it were. And that the people we would put them back to would have to be of substance. I think that is what that means.

So, on the left risk limits too
high, I think what he is referring to is that the way the warehouse agreements were structured and the nature of the counter parties didn't have us, give us the ability to put things back to people.

## Q The next bullet, "Utilized

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE not a financial hedge would have been appropriate prior to this time period?

A Do I have that view thousand or did I have a view then? I don't understand the question.

## Q I will clarify that. When Mr. Raynes was presenting

 this to you --A Right.
Q -- did you have a view that there should have been a hedging strategy in place in the past prior to this point where he is recommending a hedging strategy?

A I understand the question now, thank you.

At the time of this presentation, which as I recall was in either late September or early October, he was basically talking about what went wrong and how we are going to do it better going forward.

At that point in time, it was already -- I will put it -- becoming clear that we were going to have at what we thought at the time were modest losses in

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE balance sheet specifically on super senior without a defined hedging strategy but within risk limits." Is that consistent with what Mr. Maheras was telling you earlier?

A I am not sure that Tom ever used those words. But I think it relates to the first bullet on the page, meaning that our hedge or our protection against the exposure wasn't a financial hedge with a counter party and so forth. But our hedge effectively was our ability, our historical demonstrated strong, et cetera, et cetera, ability to distribute.

And that I think what he is saying here is that because we had such a long history of being able to distribute the products out of the warehouse, that we didn't need, we thought we didn't need, to put a financial hedge on them while they were in the warehouse and that that was a problem. I think that is what he is saying here.

Q Did you have a view whether or

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE this book. I think at the time -- well, I think even in mid September we were talking in the hundreds of millions of dollars. So at this time it was somewhere between Maheras' zero and a little bit more than that. But we thought we were going to have some modest losses in that area or worried about it.

And so at that point in time, of course I would have preferred to have had somebody else with that risk. And of course I would have preferred to have had somebody else have hedging exposure to us on what was in our warehouse.

But, the context here wasn't: Why didn't you have it before, what did you think about, why didn't you do it before? The context here was: I know we didn't have it. The reason we didn't have it was because we thought we could distribute everything. Historically we have been able to distribute everything. But going forward, we are definitely going to have hedges in place. That was the context of

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE the presentation.

Q How successful, do you know how successful Citigroup was in selling super senior positions?

A I don't know the answer. I don't whether our folks tried to sell a lot, didn't sell a lot, held them because they were thought to be so safe, I don't know the answer to that.

Q Flip to two pages later, 667, title of that page: Where Will The Alpha Opportunities Be In The Next Six to Twelve Months? The last bullet, "Reemergence of better structured CDO opportunties-finding higher fee potential given dislocation and potential competitor shifts."

A Uh-huh.
Q What do you understand Mr. Raynes to have meant by that?

A Well, this was his: We are in a dip in the road. And the business will immerge in a better way, there will still be structured CD opportunities, we will be able 186

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE were painting an overly rosy picture for you of the CDO business?

A Well, it turned out to be overly rosy. At the time, I didn't think of it using those words. I obviously didn't accept what they were saying or I wouldn't have gone through the process I went through. But I didn't think of it as being overly rosy. I thought of it as being much more of defensive role. People, when they do something, they are usually pretty defensive about it. It is very hard for somebody to say I did X and then to turn around and say that wasn't a very good thing to do. It is a very hard thing for people to do. And it is why I mentioned earlier, if you have a loan that goes bad you always put somebody else in charge of the work out. And I really thought at the time that they were underestimating the complications or the difficulties. But I didn't think it was in an overly rosy sense that they were, you know, consciously painting it to be better. I think that they were just sort of dragging

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE to charge for more it because a number of our competitors won't be still in the business.
$Q$ And did you form an opinion about whether this was a potential in the future for Citigroup based on what Mr. Raynes was telling you?

A I guess I thought at the time that it was a very optimistic view, that he was selling his view.

If we were in the mode of saying we don't think this business is coming back we are going to shut this business down, he would have been out of a job. So, just in a practical sense people don't usually kick themselves out of a job. So I took this to be his selling point that look, I know we are going through a rough patch now, but it is not going to be that bad and on the back end of this, it is going to be a much better business for us.

Q Did you feel as a whole, Mr. Prince, that the business persons such as Mr. Maheras and Mr. Barker and Mr. Raynes

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE their feet if you understand the distinction I am drawing, and that is how I thought they were thinking about it.

Raynes I thought was selling. The other guys I think were thinking, you know, we have been through a lot of market dislocations, I don't want our bosses who are not in the business, haven't been in the fixed income business for 25 years, I don't want them to lose confidence or to lose resolve over a market dislocation. We have been through lot of these. It is not -- I know it looks bad now. We always come out of it. It is always going to be -- it was that kind of a context.
$Q$ And what was your view in September and October's time frame of Mr. Bushnell's performance as a chief risk officer?

A I think -- I told you earlier that I was told many times that David was the best risk officer on the street. I believed that then. And I still think very highly of David's skills. I think that

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | David has to, has to reflect on what could | 2 | what I would have done with that |
| 3 | have been done differently, what must have | 3 | information. |
| 4 | been done differently because I don't think | 4 | If I had gone to Tom Maheras' |
| 5 | it is satisfactory to simply say well, these | 5 | office in the spring of 2007, the spring, |
| 6 | things happen. But at the time I wouldn't | 6 | after HSBC had their problems in the early |
| 7 | have traded David for anybody else. So that | 7 | part of the year with associates, and I had |
| 8 | is the only way I can answer the question. | 8 | said Tom, I am nervous about these super |
| 9 | Q And, Mr. Prince, as a former CEO, | 9 | seniors. Let's say I had that information. |
| 10 | do you reflect on how things could have been | 10 | And I said I want you to sell these triple A |
| 11 | done differently to have avoided or | 11 | rated securities. And he would have said |
| 12 | minimized the losses that Citi experienced? | 12 | well, why? And I would say because I am |
| 13 | A As CEO? | 13 | nervous that in the long run, we are going |
| 14 | Q Yes, sir. | 14 | to see a real estate crisis like we have |
| 15 | A Well, I have obviously thought | 15 | never seen since the depression. And I |
| 16 | about that a lot. The context I bring to | 16 | think that despite all the smart people who |
| 17 | that analysis is this: We had a \$2 trillion | 17 | have done all the structuring, that the |
| 18 | balance sheet for the company as a whole. | 18 | flood waters will actually get all the way |
| 19 | We were involved in lot of different | 19 | up to that super senior level, I think I |
| 20 | businesses in lot of different geographies | 20 | would have sounded like a lunatic. No one |
| 21 | around the world. We ended up in a | 21 | thought that would be the case in the |
| 22 | situation where a very, very small relative | 22 | industry. |
| 23 | dollar value of assets caused great harm to | 23 | Now, there are some hedge funds |
| 24 | the company. What could I have done | 24 | and so forth who bet against the real estate |
| 25 | realistically to have changed that? And I 190 | 25 | business, and I have seen that. But our 19 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | have turned that over in my mind over and | 2 | regulators from multiple regulatory agencies |
| 3 | over and over again, as you might expect. | 3 | were fully embedded in our business. The |
| 4 | I have said earlier that simply | 4 | rating agencies had this stuff rated higher |
| 5 | having the information that was known at the | 5 | than triple A. For someone not with a fixed |
| 6 | time, I am not sure would have made much | 6 | income background to have gone and made that |
| 7 | difference. If David Bushnell would come to | 7 | kind of direction to the largest fixed |
| 8 | me in June or July or a year earlier, the | 8 | income business on the street, I think I |
| 9 | end of '06, and said I want you to | 9 | don't excuse myself by saying that really |
| 10 | understand that we are increasing our | 10 | wasn't a realistic situation. |
| 11 | activity in this particular area or had said | 11 | So then I think well maybe, maybe |
| 12 | we are retaining these super seniors and had | 12 | it is because you weren't schooled in the |
| 13 | described to me what that meant and what the | 13 | business, maybe because you didn't come up |
| 14 | quality of the assets were and so forth as | 14 | through fixed income or maybe because we had |
| 15 | believed by the rating agencies, as believed | 15 | a big business and you were worried about |
| 16 | by him as a risk professional, I think he | 16 | the consumer business or the acquisition in |
| 17 | would have pointed to the reported comment | 17 | Latin America that you were working on or |
| 18 | of Alan Greenspan that super seniors were as | 18 | something like that. But I see whether it |
| 19 | safe as U.S. treasuries. I think he would | 19 | is Merrill Lynch or Bear Stearns, Lehman |
| 20 | have pointed to Bernanke's comment that he | 20 | Brothers, firms that were much smaller, much |
| 21 | did not see a large real estate crisis | 21 | more focused, led by people who were long |
| 22 | coming. I saw something from our chief | 22 | time traders, market participants, missed |
| 23 | economist, Lou Alexander, contemporaneous | 23 | the same issue. |
| 24 | which said he not think we were going to | 24 | So, I think to myself well, if I |
| 25 | have a serious recession. So I am not sure | 25 | were Tom Maheras, would I have made a 193 |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
different call, if I had that kind of a background? I don't think he would have. So that leads me to, well, what could you have done? I know what I did do, which is that when the losses went from the hundred or 200 or 300 that people with talking about to 8 billion on a day, that I immediately resigned. I don't know what else I could have done. I am not satisfied with that answer. But I don't know sitting here today what I could have done differently.

If I had had information of a different character about the assets, I clearly would have acted on that. I turned down the Ameriquest deal, I turned down a number of deals where our consumer people wanted to buy lower quality assets. I directed our consumer finance people not to originate these loans. I think if I had had, if I had had the right information I would have acted.

Q Why did you resign?
A Well, this was quite a significant event, quite a negative event,

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE look, this is going to be a big problem. Now, at the time we didn't realize that other people had very similar problems. I said this is going to be a big problem. And I am willing to continue to fight this fight. But my advice to you, if I were your lawyer, my advice to you is to accept my resignation. I said you are going to need a new person to lead us out of this difficult situation. You are going to need a new person who will start with a reservoir of credibility which where mine will be exhausted by this and so I will continue to serve if that is your decision, but my advise to you is to accept my resignation. And by about Wednesday afternoon, Thursday, they had decided to accept my resignation.

## Q When do you recall first discussing super senior positions on CDOs with the board of directors?

A I am going to refer back to the 30 days or so that started with the middle of September and ended with the very end of October.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE and it happened on my watch. How could you not resign?

Q Did someone ask you to resign?
A Just the opposite. When I told -it was in the paper, I am sure you read the story. When I drove home and Gary called me and told me it wasn't going to be two or 300 million but it was going to be 8 billion -I will never for get that call -- I continued driving, and I got home, I walked in the door, I told my wife, I said here's what I just heard and if this turns out to be true, I am resigning.

And I called Rubin that afternoon or the next morning, I can't remember, and I told him, and he said you can't do that. You can't, et cetera, et cetera. And it turned out to be true on Monday.

And so I called our senior, our lead director Alain Belda, and I handed him my resignation letter. I would say for that Monday, Tuesday into Wednesday of that week, they, several board members argued with me not to resign. And I told them, I said

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
And if you were to fast forward that loop, if you were to have sort of a time frame fast forward, you would see that the issue first came up as a problem on my radar screen and then moved to a discussion among our group that I described in the library group, and then got on to the board's radar screen and then became an examination in a very detailed sense with Gary about valuations and valuation models and so forth and so on. And then was the end of the table. So without knowing specifically, I would have to have people recreate the paper trail.

My sense is that it was probably in sort of two-thirds of the way through that process which would have put us about the second week in October. I could be off. It wasn't before that 30-day started and I was gone after that. So it was sometime in that 30 days or so, and my best guess is it is about two-thirds of the way through that process.

Q Did any board member ask why

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE didn't you tell us about this sooner? Did anyone express frustration or concern with not learning about the super senior tranches sooner? <br> A Well, the answer is sure. As the thing unfolded, there was much: How did we get into this position? Why didn't we know this? How could we not know -- I am talking about me as well as them. I mean everybody. How could we have such a small part of the company with such apparent safety turn out to be so toxic? How could that be? How could it possibly be the case that something that the markets saw as triple A, the rating agencies saw as triple A, it was way off on the edges over here, a tiny little thing really, how could that blow up in this kind of way? Everybody was saying that. <br> Q Now you alluded to valuations and valuation models. <br> What were the challenges with valuing the super senior tranches of CDOs? <br> A These had to be mark-to-market, and when you have to mark-to-market things

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE developed by Citigroup and others at the time?

A I don't know the answer to that, I am sorry. My sense was that they already existed, but I don't know the answer.

Q I would like to turn your attention to the same document, page 1611679. It is entitled Current Risk Exposure and Mitigation.

A Yes.
Q It lists liquidity puts, 24.5 billion, ABS CDO cash inventory 2.3 billion. And the ABS CDO warehouse of 0.9 billion. Was that your understanding in September 2007 of the current exposure to those three items?

A I can't really tell you. Again, during that time frame from mid September to late October, at some point the numbers were mentioned to me. My recollection is that the liquidity puts were a little bit after the super seniors that were held on the books. But whether that was new information the day it was presented, I can't remember.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
and there is no market, that becomes complicated.

So, the way the accounting works, although I am not an accountant, the way the accounting works is that you use various models. And as I recall it, we used three or four models: Discounted cash flow model, a model that was based on the Case-Shiller index going from here to here. Three or four different models like that. At some point, one of our competitors made a big write-down, I don't remember who that was, and so that was -- well, they must have used a model of X backing into what their valuations were. So we looked at that as a model. Gary really led that process. But I remember there were at least three or four different models, and I think during the time I was there we finally settled on one that sort of averaged all of them across, is my recollection.

Q Were the models that you described, were they models that already existed or were these models that were being

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q What is meant by exposure?
A Well, it has lots of different meaning in lots of different contexts.

In context in which we are talking about, it would typically refer to something that is either where we have a liability I -- I started to say where we have exposure. Where we have a liability.

So, if you have an asset on your book, you have exposure to that asset. If you have someone who has a put to you or you have a backup line to that person, then you have exposure to that person and that amount. It is, it is a liability that is on your books or could be on your books.

MR. BONDI: Mark that, please.
(Thereupon, the e-mail Bates
marked Citi FCIC E 16495 was marked CR
Exhibit 12 for Identification, as of this date.)
BY MR. BONDI:
Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what has been produced by Citi and Bates marked Citi FCIC E 16495. It appears to be an

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | e-mail from Andrew Liveris to you. | 2 | exposure that was in Mr. Rayne's |
| 3 | Who is Andrew Liveris? | 3 | presentation of the global structured credit |
| 4 | A Andrew Liveris was on our -- | 4 | products, A Way Forward, and what Mr. |
| 5 | well, still is on their board, is the CEO of | 5 | Crittenden was saying in this recorded |
| 6 | Dow Chemical. | 6 | earnings call on October 1st, 2007? |
| 7 | Q And below talks, below his e-mail | 7 | A I can only try to put these |
| 8 | to you it appears to be another e-mail that | 8 | together based on looking at the two |
| 9 | you are on Leah Johnson? | 9 | documents. That is to say, I don't have, |
| 10 | A Leah Johnson was the head of | 10 | remember having any discussion with Gary |
| 11 | public relations for Citi. | 11 | about the number was $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or Z . My guess is |
| 12 | Q And it says, subject is Q3 | 12 | that -- |
| 13 | earnings announcement. And it has attached | 13 | MR. BIRENBOIM: I don't think |
| 14 | is a copy of the press release that we plan | 14 | you should be guessing. |
| 15 | to release and a transcript of the | 15 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 16 | prerecorded call. | 16 | MS. BUERGEL: If you don't have |
| 17 | A Uh-huh. | 17 | any understanding of how this is put |
| 18 | Q I would like to draw your | 18 | together, Mr. Prince, the recorded |
| 19 | attention to page three of the recorded call | 19 | call transcript and how it relates to |
| 20 | transcript? | 20 | the deck, then you shouldn't |
| 21 | A What is the Bates number. | 21 | speculate. |
| 22 | Q Bates number is 16498. | 22 | THE WITNESS: As I said, I |
| 23 | A Got it, thank you. | 23 | don't have a recollection of that. |
| 24 | Q Draw your attention to the | 24 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 25 | penultimate bullet down there. 202 | 25 | Q Did you agree as of October 1st, 204 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | A Uh-huh. | 2 | 2007 that Citigroup's exposure was 13 |
| 3 | Q It says, "Starting in January of | 3 | billion at the end of June and then declined |
| 4 | this year, we began to lower our exposure to | 4 | slightly this quarter? |
| 5 | the subprime assets as we saw the market | 5 | A Again I can't, I don't have an |
| 6 | changing. At the beginning of this year, we | 6 | independent recollection of how Gary came to |
| 7 | had 24 billion of secured subprime exposure | 7 | these numbers. You have shown me the other |
| 8 | in our lending and structuring business. | 8 | exhibit with a long list of numbers. And |
| 9 | That number was 13 billion at the end of | 9 | you have asked me why these numbers are |
| 10 | June and declined slightly this quarter." | 10 | different than those numbers. I don't know |
| 11 | Do you recall Mr. Crittenden | 11 | the answer to that. |
| 12 | saying that in a recorded transcript call on | 12 | Gary was responsible for putting |
| 13 | October 1st, 2007? | 13 | all the numbers together. It is not as if |
| 14 | A I don't have an independent | 14 | we sat with that exhibit on one side of the |
| 15 | recollection of it. I know we did do a | 15 | table and this on the other side of the |
| 16 | recorded call, and I assume this is | 16 | table. You are very appropriately I guess |
| 17 | accurate, but I don't have an independent | 17 | putting these together, but I don't recall |
| 18 | recollection of it. | 18 | how we got to those numbers so I can't |
| 19 | Q A few minutes ago on the | 19 | really other than guessing which I have been |
| 20 | Exhibit 11, we saw a list of other exposure. | 20 | asked not to guess, I can't really help you |
| 21 | Here Mr. Crittenden said the number was 13 | 21 | with that. |
| 22 | billion at the end of June and declined | 22 | Q The Raynes presentation from |
| 23 | slightly this quarter. | 23 | September 2007 lists substantially more |
| 24 | A Uh-huh. | 24 | exposure. |
| 25 | Q Why the discrepancy between the 203 | 25 | MR. BIRENBOIM: What page are |


| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | you referring to? | 2 | billion in October to 55 billion on November |
| 3 | MR. BONDI: I am referring to | 3 | 4,2007? |
| 4 | page Citi 1611679. | 4 | A Well, I feel like I am edging |
| 5 | MR. BIRENBOIM: Those numbers | 5 | into the same territory we just covered on |
| 6 | are in September? | 6 | the earlier question, so I am hesitating to |
| 7 | MR. BONDI: In September. | 7 | see if my lawyers want to say anything. |
| 8 | MR. BIRENBOIM: This is in | 8 | MR. BIRENBOIM: You should |
| 9 | October. | 9 | testify to what you have personal |
| 10 | MR. BONDI: Correct. | 10 | knowledge to, not just to what you |
| 11 | BY MR. BONDI: | 11 | read in the papers afterwards or |
| 12 | Q Mr. Crittenden this October talks | 12 | speculation. |
| 13 | about exposure being 13 billion at the end | 13 | THE WITNESS: What I have |
| 14 | of June and declined slightly this quarter. | 14 | personal knowledge of is the |
| 15 | Did you ever ask Mr. Crittenden | 15 | following: On the Saturday, eight |
| 16 | how are you coming up with something less | 16 | days before that Monday, Gary |
| 17 | than 13 billion when internally we are | 17 | Crittenden called me and told me we |
| 18 | hearing something a lot more than 13 | 18 | weren't looking at a couple hundred |
| 19 | billion? | 19 | million bucks, but we were looking at |
| 20 | MS. BUERGEL: Mr. Bondi, there | 20 | eight billion dollars. |
| 21 | is a lot whole lot of language about | 21 | On Monday of that week, so a |
| 22 | what exposure means here. You are | 22 | Monday before November 4th, I sat with |
| 23 | plucking that out of a multi-paragraph | 23 | Gary and as I recall it one or two |
| 24 | transcript. And Mr. Prince, I will | 24 | people from our securities business |
| 25 | remind you if you don't have actual 206 | 25 | and worked through their analysis of 208 |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | facts to offer, you shouldn't | 2 | how, when I went home on Friday it was |
| 3 | speculate. | 3 | a couple hundred we were possibly |
| 4 | MR. LERNER: You can answer yes | 4 | going to have to deal with, and |
| 5 | or no. | 5 | 72 hours later it was 8 billion. And |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: I don't remember | 6 | over the course of that day on Monday, |
| 7 | the question that far yes or no. But | 7 | I became convinced that their |
| 8 | I don't have any independent | 8 | calculation at the end of that day was |
| 9 | recollection of how he got to those | 9 | correct. And that is when I handed in |
| 10 | numbers, so all I could do would be to | 10 | my resignation. And really didn't |
| 11 | guess. | 11 | have any substantive involvement after |
| 12 | Q I don't think that was my | 12 | that. |
| 13 | question. I will let the court reporter | 13 | Q Let's move on to 13. |
| 14 | read it back just to get it right. | 14 | (Thereupon, the document Bates |
| 15 | (Thereupon, the record was read | 15 | marked Citi FCIC E 41087 was marked CR |
| 16 | back by the reporter as recorded | 16 | Exhibit 13 for Identification, as of |
| 17 | above.) | 17 | this date.) |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: No. | 18 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 19 | BY MR. BONDI: | 19 | Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what |
| 20 | Q On November 4th, 2007, Citigroup | 20 | was produced by Citi and it is Bates marked |
| 21 | announced that it had 55 billion in subprime | 21 | Citi FCIC E 41087. |
| 22 | exposure mentioning in disclosing the super | 22 | A Correct. |
| 23 | senior tranches and the liquidity puts. | 23 | Q And it is a cover e-mail |
| 24 | Do you have any understanding of | 24 | attaching a, appears to be Power Point |
| 25 | how the announced exposure went from 13 207 | 25 | presentation. The cover e-mail is from 209 |


| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Sheffali Welch e-mail on behalf of Gary | 2 | Q I know we talked about many of |
| 3 | Crittenden to you and it is dated | 3 | these same lessons, and I just wanted to ask |
| 4 | October 14, 2007. | 4 | you on these six lessons learned that were |
| 5 | "All attached, please find the | 5 | presented to the board did you agree that |
| 6 | audit committee deck for tonight's call at | 6 | these were lessons learned to Citigroup? |
| 7 | 9 p.m." | 7 | A Oh, I don't know. This -- these |
| 8 | Do you recall attending the audit | 8 | quote lessons learned were presented at a |
| 9 | committee call at 9 p.m. on October 14, | 9 | time when the fullness of the issues weren't |
| 10 | 2007? | 10 | completely understood, I think. |
| 11 | A I don't think there was an audit | 11 | So if I were sitting here today, |
| 12 | committee call on the, at 9 o'clock. My | 12 | I wouldn't from a policy standpoint try to |
| 13 | belief is that the 9 o'clock call was a prep | 13 | determine whether someone's suggestions of |
| 14 | call because it says sent Sunday, | 14 | lessons learned put up in October of 2007 |
| 15 | October 14th. The presentation says October | 15 | were the appropriate ones, whether they were |
| 16 | 15th. And the list of people it was sent to | 16 | implemented fully or not. |
| 17 | would have been the kind of group we would | 17 | Since the time of this |
| 18 | get together with to prepare for tomorrow's | 18 | presentation, there has been almost a |
| 19 | meeting. And so my guess is that the Sunday | 19 | complete change in personnel at the company |
| 20 | night call assuming there was one, I don't | 20 | in the areas that we are talking about, and |
| 21 | recall a specific call, but assuming there | 21 | I think I would much more importantly look |
| 22 | was one was a prep call among these various | 22 | at what those new people thought the lessons |
| 23 | people. | 23 | learned were as opposed to what people |
| 24 | Q Do you recall attending the audit | 24 | thought at this point in time. |
| 25 | committee meeting or call on October 15th? $210$ | 25 | Q Mr. Prince, I am showing you what $212$ |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | A Well, I certainly would have gone | 2 | was produced by Citi Bates marked FCIC 2970. |
| 3 | to the board meeting. I don't think this | 3 | (Thereupon, the document Bates |
| 4 | was just an audit committee presentation. I | 4 | marked FCIC 2970 was marked CR |
| 5 | think this was, I think this was actually | 5 | Exhibit 14 for Identification, as of |
| 6 | presented to the whole board. It may be | 6 | this date.) |
| 7 | that Gary's assistant misspoke, it may be | 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | that it was presented first to the audit | 8 | Q It is a discussion of October CMB |
| 9 | committee and then to the full board. I | 9 | performance, presentation to the board of |
| 10 | think this was the big presentation to the | 10 | directors October 31, 2007. |
| 11 | board and I don't think it was just an audit | 11 | A Yes. |
| 12 | committee. So -- and I am sorry to be | 12 | $Q \quad$ Do you recognize this document? |
| 13 | particular. The answer to your question | 13 | A Oh, I don't have an independent |
| 14 | about the audit committee is no, but I think | 14 | recollection of it, but it certainly looks |
| 15 | it was presented to the full board and I was | 15 | like something that was presented. |
| 16 | there for that. | 16 | Q Sure. If you wouldn't mind |
| 17 | Q On page 37 of the deck, Citi FCIC | 17 | taking a moment just to flip through it. |
| 18 | E 41124, there is a "lessons learned" page? | 18 | A Uh-huh. |
| 19 | A Lots of lessons learned pages, | 19 | Q To familiarize yourself with it. |
| 20 | aren't there? | 20 | A Yes, okay. |
| 21 | Q Yes, sir. And if you wouldn't | 21 | Q If you flip to page eight of the |
| 22 | mind just reading these six just to yourself | 22 | deck, Citi FCIC 2978, there is a list of |
| 23 | in the interest of time and let me know when | 23 | subprime marketing methodology continued and |
| 24 | you are finished. | 24 | it lists the ABCP. Did you understand ABCP |
| 25 | A I have read them. | 25 | to mean the asset backed commercial paper |
|  | 211 |  | $213$ |


| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | associated with the liquidity puts? | 2 | Q Please. |
| 3 | A Uh-huh, I think so, yes. | 3 | A If you look at pages four and |
| 4 | Q And the high grade ABS CDOs, | 4 | five, this is actually a key chart, you can |
| 5 | mezzanine ABS CDOs and ABS CDO squared | 5 | see the three lines. They were in color on |
| 6 | transactions, when this was presented to the | 6 | the original chart, but for here I will |
| 7 | board of directors on October 13, 2007, do | 7 | refer to them as the top line, middle line |
| 8 | you recall any reaction -- | 8 | and the bottom line. The bottom line, it |
| 9 | MR. BIRENBOIM: October 31st. | 9 | was the sort of the lowest quality. You can |
| 10 | MR. BONDI: Sorry? | 10 | see in the very bottom, it is the right hand |
| 11 | MR. BIRENBOIM: I think you | 11 | reference which ends with triple B minus. |
| 12 | said 13 or maybe I misheard. | 12 | And the middle line and the middle reference |
| 13 | BY MR. BONDI: | 13 | is to single A. Do you see that at the |
| 14 | Q The presentation to the board of | 14 | bottom of the page? And the left side of |
| 15 | directors on October 31, 2007? | 15 | the page you see the triple A, that is the |
| 16 | A Yes. | 16 | top line. |
| 17 | Q On page eight when it lists the | 17 | And so if you look across, this |
| 18 | various positions that Citigroup had and the | 18 | is an historical chart on page four, and you |
| 19 | net exposure associated with those positions | 19 | can see that the bottom line, the worst |
| 20 | as of September 30, 2007, do you recall any | 20 | quality over the course of the first part of |
| 21 | reaction by any of the board members when | 21 | the year going to March ' 07 , you can see |
| 22 | they heard this? | 22 | that first vertical line there, March '07, |
| 23 | A The exposures? | 23 | the bottom line deteriorated and then picked |
| 24 | Q Yes, sir. | 24 | back up to a kind of a 75 percent level. |
| 25 | A You know what I can't do? I 214 | 25 | And then in June began to deteriorate. And |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | can't separate the different meetings, as | 2 | in June, but only in June, the single A, the |
| 3 | obviously as the, as the situation | 3 | middle one, started to deteriorate. So up |
| 4 | deteriorated, there was more and more | 4 | until, up until June, even the single A |
| 5 | concern. But I can't in my mind remember | 5 | product hadn't really been affected. |
| 6 | whether this meeting had this conversation | 6 | The top line, the triple A, which |
| 7 | or that meeting had that conversation. | 7 | is the super senior kind of quality stuff, |
| 8 | To the extent of exposures, if, | 8 | straight as a line across, no impact at all. |
| 9 | if the question was more narrowly did | 9 | It began to waiver a little bit in that |
| 10 | someone say something extraordinary about | 10 | July, August time frame. You can see as we |
| 11 | the total number on the page or any of the | 11 | go into September, you see the line that |
| 12 | components that led up to the total, I don't | 12 | says 8/29 and into September, it is trended |
| 13 | remember that. But you have to put it in | 13 | back up and it is almost at a hundred |
| 14 | context, I think. The exposure that we were | 14 | percent again. And then you flip the page |
| 15 | looking at here in terms of the impact on | 15 | and you see that after the ratings |
| 16 | the company was a couple hundred million | 16 | downgrade, the top line began to deteriorate |
| 17 | bucks and in a company that earned five | 17 | in that far right side of the page. |
| 18 | billion dollars quarterly, you don't want to | 18 | Q I am sorry, you are looking at |
| 19 | lose $\$ 200$ million obviously, but there was | 19 | page five? |
| 20 | nothing on this page that would have caused | 20 | A Now I am over to page five. |
| 21 | one of the directors to say my gosh, what is | 21 | Bates number 975. |
| 22 | going on here, because that is not the | 22 | Q And it is the last box, I |
| 23 | information that was being presented. And I | 23 | apologize, the copy looks a little bad, it, |
| 24 | know you are on a fact finding mission. Can | 24 | looks like 10/11? |
| 25 | I direct you to something? 215 | 25 | A 10/11 Moody's something 217 |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE downgrade.

Q I think it is et al, Moody's et al downgrade?

A Yeah. That was really the only time -- you can see a little wavering on the top line in the middle but it actually recovers into the September time frame and then when the downgrade happens, that is when it falls off a cliff.

And so I point this out because this is a very good visual reminder of when Tom Maheras or somebody says look, the super seniors are not going to be touched. They would point at this chart, and they would say look, you can see that even though this has gone down, this one is straight as an arrow. And then in the summer we would say but it is still going down. And he would say yeah, it is, but you can see the top one is coming back up. It will be okay. Don't panic here. Don't go crazy here. This is going to be fine.

That was the context of the discussions as we came into the late summer.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE anything in ABS CDO2, it could be low or high grade, but I think all of this related to the super seniors which may be why the marks that are shown on page eight, the projected marks, are so low.

Q Mezzanine ABS CDOs, that wouldn't have been super senior, though, would it?

A I don't know the answer to that. I don't though the answer to that. And the reason I don't know the answer is mezzanine could refer to a place on the hierarchy of the structure, or it could refer to a loan that is in the middle of credit, a loan portfolio. In other words -- I am sorry it is so confusing. You could have a subprime loan that is structured so that the highest tranche was thought to be triple A. And mezzanine could refer to something that is midway up that tranche. Okay?

But it is all based on a subprime loan at the bottom. You can also have a situation where a mezzanine loan to a corporation, to anybody, not real estate, a mezzanine loan could be structured. And

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE I am sorry to divert you from your question, but this is a very good pictorial, these two pages, of what happened over the course of that summer and into the fall.

Q I appreciate that. I thank you. We definitely are trying to get at the facts. I appreciate the clarification. Does the, on page eight of the Power Point where it lists the high grade ABS, the mezzanine ABS, CDOs, and the ABS CDO squared, did any of those three translate to any of these three lines on the graph on page five?

A It would -- the lines on page five deal with the credit rating. So anything on page eight that related to triple A these would relate to. So, if the high grade ABS CDOs were super seniors, then they would definitely be in the top line. If the ABS CDO2 transactions related to super seniors, they would be in the top line as well. On page eight are formats that relate to quality of assets. They are not directly related. It could be

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE then you can have a low quality mezzanine loan, a middle quality mezzanine loan, and a high quality mezzanine loan. And I don't know whether this is referring to real estate in the middle of the structure or to a type of loan, like an auto loan would be a loan which would be structured or a credit card loan could be structured.

A mezzanine loan is a kind of a loan, and I don't know whether it is referring to that kind of a loan or a structure in the subprime structuring. I am sorry. Maybe it can be determined, but that is why I don't know which one it is.

Q This October 11th line pertaining on page five of the graph pertaining to Moody's et al downgrades. Seems very significant.

A I will say.
Q And I am interested to know, was your view that Moody's and others got it right on October 11, 2007, or that they got this downgrade wrong? Or what is your view of these downgrades that occurred on

| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | October 11, 2007? | 2 | say they haven't and they won't. But that |
| 3 | MR. BIRENBOIM: What his view | 3 | because no one's willing to take the risk |
| 4 | was at the time or what his view was | 4 | that they won't, no one is willing to buy |
| 5 | looking back now? | 5 | them. And because it is a mark-to-market |
| 6 | MR. BONDI: That is a fair | 6 | paper, you have to value it not on the |
| 7 | characterization. Let's take those, | 7 | ultimate, although insurance companies hold |
| 8 | both of those questions so we make | 8 | it that way, right, but securities firms |
| 9 | sure the record is clear. | 9 | have to mark-to-market. And so in that |
| 10 | BY MR. BONDI: | 10 | sense I don't know whether or not in the |
| 11 | Q At the time what was your view of | 11 | long run the marks are correct or not |
| 12 | the downgrades? | 12 | correct. I know that it caused a |
| 13 | A At the time what Maheras and | 13 | precipitous drop in value, it caused havoc. |
| 14 | Barker and our folks said was that these | 14 | I mean this was the precipitating event that |
| 15 | will be accounting marks, not economic | 15 | broke the financial system. And there were |
| 16 | marks. What they meant by that was that | 16 | a lot of things that happened since that |
| 17 | because the ratings are cut, there will be | 17 | could have been done better or worse. But |
| 18 | an accounting loss instead of being marked | 18 | this is the thing that broke the financial |
| 19 | on your books at -- I am making up a | 19 | system. |
| 20 | number -- a hundred, they will be marked on | 20 | MR. LERNER: I think you ought |
| 21 | your books at 50. But they would say in the | 21 | to give Mr. Prince a two-minute break |
| 22 | long run, if you hold the instrument, not if | 22 | if this is a convenient time. |
| 23 | you are trading it, but if you hold on to it | 23 | MR. BONDI: Sure. |
| 24 | and wait for it to pay out because it is a | 24 | (Brief break.) |
| 25 | bond, that you will be paid all of your | 25 | BY MR. BONDI: |
| 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE | 1 | Interview - CHARLES PRINCE |
| 2 | money plus interest. So, in an economic | 2 | Q We mentioned before the break or |
| 3 | sense, there won't be an ultimate loss. | 3 | we were talking before the break |
| 4 | There will be an accounting loss, not an | 4 | mark-to-market accounting. |
| 5 | economic loss. That is what they would say. | 5 | A Yes. |
| 6 | I would say at this point I don't know | 6 | Q What role did mark-to-market |
| 7 | whether that is true or not. In other | 7 | accounting play in the difficulties at |
| 8 | words, I don't know whether or not sitting | 8 | Citigroup? |
| 9 | here today the super senior tranches are in | 9 | A Well, I think for every one on |
| 10 | default. Maybe you know. I don't know. | 10 | the street, if you have to mark-to-market |
| 11 | I read something in the paper the | 11 | and there is no market, as I said earlier, |
| 12 | other day about something with Goldman and | 12 | it makes it very complicated. And if you |
| 13 | AIG where they said that the Goldman -- the | 13 | have a temporary liquidity problem and today |
| 14 | worst Goldman originated tranche had lost | 14 | the liquidity problem has abated at least if |
| 15 | 90 percent of its value or something like | 15 | not solved, but it is abated, if you have a |
| 16 | that but was not in default. So I don't | 16 | temporary liquidity problem, then that has a |
| 17 | know whether in the long run these ratings | 17 | negative circle or loop that makes things |
| 18 | reflect economic losses. It may be the | 18 | worse and worse and worse. So, if you can't |
| 19 | case. I think if Maheras were sitting here | 19 | sell something at a price, then you have to |
| 20 | he would say we structured these so that as | 20 | mark it lower. If you have to mark it |
| 21 | the flood waters of default rose, there were | 21 | lower, it makes it harder to sell which |
| 22 | no circumstances under which the waters | 22 | makes it down and down and down and down. |
| 23 | would breach into the super seniors. | 23 | So, there is a negative |
| 24 | Without knowing, I would bet that | 24 | reinforcing loop from mark-to-market |
| 25 | if Maheras were sitting here today he would | 25 | accounting. You don't have that with loans, |

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE you don't have that in the insurance business. It is an unusual feature of the securities business.

## Q Speaking more generally about the

 financial crisis and the markets as a whole, in your view, what was mark-to-market accounting's role in the financial crisis as a whole? Do you view it as a significant factor in the crisis, a contributing factor, a minor point? I am just trying to get a sense of your views in terms of the overall crisis and mark-to-market accounting's impact.A I recognize that is a very controversial subject and you have lots of views on it. I think that mark-to-market account was somewhere between a contributing factor and a significant factor, somewhere between. And I think it has the effect of being pro-cyclical, meaning it worsens things rather than helping to make things less worse. And that is a negative.

Q Are there any lessons learned in the space of mark-to-market accounting that

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE mark-to-market accounting involved stating a mark, but only having to recognize on making this up, a third of it, assuming you have stated an intention to hold the instrument, and you have to recognize a third of it this year and a third of it next year and a third of it -- now the mark market will change as you go along. So it is a third of whatever the mark is at that point in time and so forth. I don't think anybody would do this, but that is my point of view. You are asking me my point of view.

My point of view is that it is not an either/or. It is a how do you recognize the mark. But if you have a situation where you have a precipitous event, there is no ability to deal with that and the damage is accelerated by that precipitous event.

## Q Mr. Prince, Citigroup was during

 your tenure supervised by the OCC, Federal Reserve, Federal Reserve Board of Bank of New York, among other regulators.Interview - CHARLES PRINCE you have thought of in terms of what we can do differently in the future with respect to mark-to-market accounting or accounting in general?

A I actually have a point of view on that. The debate is between people who think that there ought to be mark-to-market accounting because there is a purity of that. There is -- you don't want people hiding things on their books, you don't want them to be zombie banks and so forth.

And people at the other end that say mark-to-market accounting really causes the fall in value to be accelerated and to be so forth, so on.

I think that mark-to-market accounting ought to be treated in much the same way, a bad analogy, but an analogy, that pension accounting has created.

So, if I have a company and my pension plan is underfunded, I am not required to make it all up today. I can make it up over couple of years. And I think if you had a situation where

## Interview - CHARLES PRINCE

 Q The FDIC.Were your regulators in your opinion asking the right questions of Citigroup and Citicorp personnel?

A That is a very general question.
Our regulators were for the most part embedded in the organization. They had offices at the company. They were there full-time. I met with the regulators on a very frequent basis. They met with our directors, with the audit committee. They met with our auditors. They met with Dave Bushnell frequently. There was nothing that we were doing that wasn't fully transparent to the regulators.

In the context of what we are taking about, the question is were they asking the right questions, they clearly didn't ask the questions that related to the ultimate losses on the super seniors. Neither did Tom Maheras. Neither did the rating agencies.

So, I think that the
regulators -- and I would say this with

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE great respect. I think the regulators were in the same category of believing based on the information they had that these positions would not turn out to be very dramatic loss positions for the company.

So I don't think it was a matter them asking the right questions or wrong questions. It is much like the discussion we had earlier about information flow. I think they had the information, but it turned out to be completely wrong for everybody.

## Q A lot of debate, Congress and on

 Main Street and Wall Street and elsewhere about regulations and whether the crisis that we experienced was a failure of regulation or regulations. And I wanted to know, Mr. Prince, do you have a view of that? Were there regulations that failed during the crisis or leading up to the crisis? Were there regulations that were missing that you believe should have been in place?A I think clearly -- we talked

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE earlier about the regulatory structure of the origination of mortgages. This is done on a state by state basis. It is very spotty. In some states it is more robust than in others. In some states it doesn't exist at all. And I really think that among the many causes of what happened, the increasingly unhealthy nature of the raw material that went into the securitization factory was a big contributor. And if we had had better regulation of the creation of that raw material, we would have -- I don't think we would have had the crisis honestly. That is more the absence of regulation or the unevenness of regulation, that is an area that I would focus on. I frankly don't see much of that talked about.

Q How were you compensated at Citigroup? Was it a metrics? How did your compensation get developed.

A Well, there is very extensive disclosures in our proxy statements about the compensation, so I would be reluctant to summarize all that. I think the best

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE approach would be to try to read the disclosures in the proxy statement which had year by year by year very extensive and detailed discussions about that.

Q There have been much debate over compensation in general and about the incentives that go along with compensation.

In retrospect, do you believe that the compensation structure at Citigroup vis-à-vis the employees in the investment bank, structured credit, caused or contributed to some of the decisions that were being made that ultimately led to losses to Citigroup?

A Let me talk to, let me talk a little bit about how compensation worked at our company and make it personal, talk about me.

I had a career with the company which company and its predecessors was almost 30 years and was fortunate enough to be CEO for four years.

In that time frame, certainly for all the periods that were pertinent to my

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE having a leadership position the last 15, 20 years, our compensation was split between cash and stock. And for most of that time frame, we were required to retain so long as we were employed a hundred percent of the stock. We had no ability to sell and cash out.

When we merged with Citicorp in 1998, we lowered that requirement from a hundred percent to 75 percent, meaning you could sell 25 percent of your stock. In my case, I didn't do that. I kept a hundred percent. And over the course of 30 years, built up because of the percentage of your compensation that went into stock and the requirement to hold it, I built up 30 years, a career's worth of compensation in stock which I watched go from $\$ 52$, $\$ 53$ a share to $\$ 0.97$. And virtually every share of stock I ever got I still own.

I think that that compensation program aligned me pretty well with stockholders. So I think from the standpoint of the leadership of the company,

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE if you have that kind of a program, you are pretty well aligned. Now, I can't speak to people who might have sold some of their stock, might have sold their stock after they left the company, I didn't do that.

At lower levels of the company, at the level of someone running a particular desk, there I think that it is possible that the compensation structure could incent people to act aggressively.

You may remember I talked about the five-point plan in trying to emphasize to everyone long term versus short term. In Japan, don't go for the short term and risk the reputation of the company.

In the MTS trade, don't do that quick trade at the risk of putting off all of our clients. And despite all that, I can see situations where someone might have, do something because they were incented in the short run.

But I think that is not really the issue. I think the issue for Wall Street is there structure of compensation

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
I have read in the papers about the Lehman stuff and so forth. And if it is true that they did that just for quarter end, that's not appropriate.

But most institutions don't do it that way. They don't, they don't do it at the end of a quarter and then back on and off, on and off. But the notion that having off balance sheet activities is normal doesn't answer the question.

In Citi's case, as it turned out, there were certain asset classes that came back on the balance sheet. Most all of that happened after I left the company. So, I can only speak to it in the context of an outsider. But in that context, I think that again it is the precipitous nature of actions more than the actions themselves, I think. The suddenness of it, the inability to react, and so in much the same way that the rating agencies, the collapse of their thinking about structured products precipitated the decline of the triple A tranches, the liquidity crisis apparently

> Interview - CHARLES PRINCE which incents organizations to go in directions, not individuals to go in directions. And all I can speak to is what happened in my case, and in my case I don't think it had that effect.

> Q We have been looking at the accounting and the losses at Citigroup and one thing that struck me was the amount of off balance sheet activity at Citigroup.

> Do you have any views in terms of whether the off balance sheet accounting caused or contributed to any of the financial problems at Citigroup in terms of when items came on balance sheet?

A That is a very broad and complicated subject, and I am sorry to respond that way.

The notion of having items off balance sheet is not in itself an unusual or complicated item. Almost all financial institutions have some activities or some assets that are off balance sheet. It is not appropriate to do off balance sheet activities to manage your quarter end. And

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE forced these vehicles to be reconsolidated. And on a going-forward basis, I don't think that the right answer is to say you can't have things off balance sheet, but I do think there has to be a way to think about dealing with a precipitous reversal of those activities.

Q In December of 2007, after you had left the company, Citigroup made the announcement that it would bring on assets and liabilities associated with the seven structured investment vehicles out of London.

A Uh-huh.
Q The SIVs.
I know that occurred after your departure, but what role did you have in discussions concerning those SIVs prior to your departure?

A John Havens on our calls -remember I said we had these calls periodically. John Havens was charged with managing the SIVs and the liquidity of the SIVs. He had taken that on as part of new
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Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
incorrect. I assume that people knew what we had there.

We did not correctly assess, I guess that might be closer to it. No one correctly understood what it meant to have those exposures in the CDO trading book. And I would say with respect, the Fed didn't either.

Q The next paragraph, the penultimate sentence I would draw your attention to, it begins with "it also did not properly," the "it" I will submit, if you carry over from the two prior, three prior sentences, it appears to refer to the firm, Citigroup.
"It also did not properly highlight the funding and liquidity implications of on-boarding assets and in the case of certain counter-party credit exposures such as liquidity puts that had been written to CDO conduits, under measured their potential impact."

What is your reaction to that statement by the Fed?

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE the board and so forth, I would disagree with that. I think that we presented information to the board in a very timely fashion.

Q The next sentence pertains to the board itself. It says, "The board of directors in turn does not appear to have posed the proper questions to senior management in the early stages of the subprime mortgage crisis which otherwise might have caused senior management to report more meaningfully and completely on the potential impact on the firm's risk exposures and future earnings."

Again, do you have any reaction to that statement?

A I simply disagree with it. I don't think that the board could fairly be criticized in light of what market professionals, the rating agencies and the regulators, in light of the conduct of those parties over the course of 2007, I don't think that our board can be criticized for what they did over the course of 2007.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
A Again, without having read the whole document and without having read the company's response to it, all I can say is that the Fed was embedded in our organization, understood what we were doing. And beyond that I don't really have a comment on this.
$Q$ And if you would bear with me, sir, I have a few more to ask you here.

A Sure.
Q The next paragraph, "Senior management, as well as the risk management function charged with independent monitoring responsibilities, did not properly identify and analyze these risks," carrying over I think from the prior paragraph, "in a timely fashion and were slow in presenting them to the board of directors and the audit and risk management committee."

What is your reaction to that statement?

A The first part of the statement I would have the same reaction I had before. The second part, slow in presenting them to

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q The next paragraph, bear with me.
A I understand.
Q I want to go through the next paragraph at the least, please.
"Exasperating this situation was the fact that communication among the independent risk management function business line management and senior management on aggregated inherent subprime risk across portfolios and products proved to be inadequate when credit and market conditions deteriorated in 2007."

Do you have a reaction to that sentence?

A I don't think that the issues that we had in 2007 related to risk across portfolios and products. I think it was pretty well encapsulated in the fixed income business.

I think that in 2008, in a broad consumer slow down, there were products in different areas, very similar to the rest of the industry. But I think that in 2007 it was actually a very narrow product, not a

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE broad based set of products.

Q Do you know if the CDO desks at Citigroup were communicating with other entities within the Citigroup umbrella that had some dealings with mortgages or the real estate market such as the RMBS securitization desk or such as the origination teams at Citi financial? Do you know if there was communication from the CDO desk to other areas of the entities?

A I don't.
Q If there was not, would that have surprised you?

A Communication about what?
Q Conditions in the real estate market and the decline?

A I would have expected that anyone in trading business would have reached out to as many sources of market information as one could get. And that you would have a more welcome reception from members of the family. So it seems to me logical that all of the parts of our business that dealt with mortgages would have had a natural

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE business and had the background and the responsibility for running that business, I think it's probably correct to say that they incorrectly discounted the probabilities that the deterioration, et cetera, et cetera.

What I would object to or what I would not agree with is the use of the word probability instead of possibility.

## Q What do you mean by that?

A The sentence says, "Senior management incorrectly discounted the probability that something would happen." It clearly wasn't probable that something would happen. It was -- in the spring and summer of 2007, it was at best remotely possible. It was at the far end of unlikely at that point in time, looking at every external indicator, the documents you have shown me today proved that.

So, it was not a probability that was discounted in that time period. It was a remote possibility. I think they did discount, if I can change the words, they

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE inclination to call and get market color. That is all I can add.

Q Looking back at the document, the next sentence in that paragraph says: This, meaning the communication -- strike that. We have already covered I think that sentence or at that least that concept.

The next sentence though, it starts with, "Senior management incorrectly discounted the probability that the deterioration that was becoming evident in the CDO market and in the subprime credit conditions during the spring and summer of 2007 would have such a significant deleterious affect on the firm's valuation of its assets and its ability to syndicate problematic assets."

What is your reaction to that statement?

A Well, senior management presumably includes more than just the CEO and the CFO and so forth. If you include in that Tom Maheras and Randy Barker, the people who were running the fixed income

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE incorrectly discounted the remote possibility that the deterioration, et cetera, et cetera.

Without agreeing with every single word, I think if you were to say that Maheras and Barker in the summer, not the spring, but in the summer made a mistake about this possibility, this fairly remote possibility, one of the documents said 0.01 percent, I think, if their view of that turned out to be as wrong as it was, then yes, they were incorrect about that. But I think it was later in the year and I think it was a remote possibility, not a probability.

Q The next sentence reads: "While the firm ultimately released those managers whose businesses incurred the losses, some other remedial actions were slow in coming after the subprime CDO exposure was identified and its ramifications on earnings were announced.'

Do you have any idea what the, whether there were other remedial actions

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE that were slow in coming after the subprime CDO exposure was identified and its ramifications on earnings were announced?

A I don't know the answer to that.
Q That may have occurred after your --
A Presumably the ramifications on earnings refers to our announcement in mid October and I was gone, yes, late October, early November, and I was gone after that.

Q When was your official last day?
A I think I was on the payroll until the end of December, but my last day as CEO was November 4th.
$Q$ The last sentence of that paragraph is, "Two rounds of CEO write-downs were announced before a unit was formed to concentrate on loss mitigation and enhancing the CDO valuation process."

What is your reaction to that statement?

A I don't have any reaction. I mean I know what the words mean but I think it happened after I left.

MR. LERNER: If you are done

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
our consumer group had significantly underperformed for a number of years and that he should be very watchful of the performance of U.S. consumer business. And please don't take that out of context. It is not that I didn't talk to him about the securities business. But he had a background in the security business. And so I am sure we talked about the securities business, but it is not as if I felt that there was anything special that I was going to add to his thinking on the subject, but he did not have a background in the consumer business.

Q Take you back in time, Mr. Prince, to some testimony that you gave on April 29, 1998?

A That is a different lifetime, isn't it? Testimony where, if I may ask?

Q I will get to that. It was a hearing before the House Financial Services Committee on bank mergers on April 29, 1998. This was about a year before the Financial Services Modernization Act, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act which repealed

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE Glass-Steagall. And you said something there, and I just will read it for the record to get your reactions.
"The size, resources and diversity of operations of the new company will provide the financial strengths and stability necessary to survive and grow in today's rapidly changing world.
"Whether it is a country crisis, a real estate crisis or any other crisis, it is clear that the financial services company of tomorrow and its customers must have the ability to withstand shocks.
"As companies become larger and more diverse, they are better able to serve as a source of strength and stability, not only for their affiliates but most importantly for their customers. This is what we will do for the $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ million customers of Citigroup."

What is your reaction to hearing that statement now that you had made on April 29, 1998?

A I am not sure how to answer the

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE question.

Q Fair enough. That was general, and I should be more specific.

Do you feel that your description in terms of the size, resources and diversities of operations of Citigroup that had developed as a result of the merger with Travelers, the Citicorp/Travelers merger, and the growth through the years, put it in a better position to withstand financial shocks?

## A Yes.

Q The model that you were describing in terms of the companies becoming larger and larger, more diverse and better able to withstand shocks, is that still your view to this day in terms of companies being larger and better able to absorb shocks as opposed to more focused and streamlined, or are we talking about two different things?

A Well, I think we are talking about a couple of different things.

In the case of the financial

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE businesses. I don't think that is the right conclusion to take from that.

Q Do you feel like Gramm-Leach-Bliley and the repeal of Glass-Steagall contributed in any way to the financial crisis?

A Well, it is very interesting. You understand of course that by the time of Gramm-Leach-Bliley, the Glass-Steagall Act in a legislative sense only applied to the insurance business, that the Fed had long had authority to have banks and be in the securities business. And in fact when Travelers and Citi merged, the only issue that had to be dealt with was the combination of the insurance business with the bank, not the combination of the securities business.

But I take your question to be the combination of securities businesses with banks, whether or not that is a good thing or a bad thing, whether this ought to cause us to revisit, whether that is permissible or not.

The variety of firms that had

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE crisis, what we saw was that a variety of firms, some small, some medium, some large, encountered significant problems. Bear Stearns was a fraction of the size of Citigroup, Merrill Lynch was somewhere in the middle. AIG was probably bigger in some ways. And some were brokerage houses, some were banks, some were insurance companies. We see a whole variety of institutions that were hit very hard by the super senior issue, basically.

So, I don't think that from the financial crisis one could reasonably take a view that size, type of business, or any of those characteristics were determining characteristics. I don't think you could, in light of Bear Stearns I don't think you could come away and say well, gosh, the bigger the company, the more complex, the more difficult it is. I don't think in light of AIG you can come away and say well, it is the banks. I think, I think it is not something that fits into one of those types of businesses or big versus small

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE problems, I am talking the 2007, 2008 time frame, not the consumer slow down after that, were mostly securities firms. Bears Stearns, Merrill Lynch -- Goldman and Morgan both bank holding companies because of this. Lehman Brothers of course. In our case, the Salomon Brothers business part of Citi. It was mostly the securities firms. And what happened was that the Fed had to take over responsibility for those in a funding and regulatory sense.

So, if we were to say we are going to enforce a separation of these businesses, I am not sure what we would get from that. The Fed had to take on the securities businesses. As I understand it, there is not much prospect for the Fed to let go of the securities business going forward, so they got it both ways.

My sense is that combining a volatile business with a more stable business is actually good, not bad. So, again, if you wanted to roll the clock back to the time when the securities businesses

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE weren't as important as they were -- in the Great Depression, the banks were the main conduit to the capital markets; they are not any more, then I could see that.

But I don't think that question, and I don't mean it in a disrespectful way, I don't think that question deals with the reality of the modern world. The reality of the modern world is that securities firms and banks and insurance companies are all participants in the capital markets and there is no way to artificially segregate them.

Q Your testimony more recently on March 7, 2008, before the house committee on oversight and government reform, you testified that the risk models eventually proved to be inadequate.

A When was this?
Q March 7, 2008.
A What was that in the context of? 2008, I am sorry, yes, I have got it, right.

Q House oversight committee?
A I got it, sorry.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE "When do you think the damage occurred?" And you responded, "Well, I think honestly that the lending patterns began to deteriorate pretty significantly in 2006."

In 2006, when the lending patterns began to deteriorate, did that sound off any alarms in your mind that there could be trouble ahead?

A Let me make sure that we are working with all the comments in the right area.

When I talked about lending standards deteriorating, I was talking about the lending standards in the origination of mortgages. And if you look at the subprime mortgage originations, as you know they are done by semi annual tranches. And it is really in the 2006 tranches and the first tranche in 2007 that the quality really began to deteriorate. So that is what I was talking about in the raw material.

That judgment, that conclusion can only be seen in hindsight, that is as those tranches of originations for the

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
Q I think the title of the hearing was "CEO pay and the mortgage crisis."

You testified, and I am
paraphrasing, that the risk models ultimately proved to be inadequate.

Do you still agree with that view that the risk models at Citigroup ultimately turned out to be inadequate?

A I think the risk models in the industry, I think the risk models of the rating agencies, I think the risk models of the regulators, I think everybody's risk models turned out to be inadequate.

Q During that hearing Congressman Kanjorski asked you the following. He said, "Mr. Prince, your bank was in trouble. Didn't you get any reports that there were such horrible failures in the system?"

You responded, "I think Congressman, that in all on honesty, by the time some of those reports surfaced in the spring of 2007, most of the damage had already been done. That is --" and Congressman Kanjorski interrupts and says,

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE industry had earlier and earlier and higher and higher default rates, it became clear in hindsight that in 2006 and 2007 the underwriting criteria had fallen off significantly.

When I talked about by the spring of 2007, the damage had been done, I was referring to the comments of Tom Maheras and Randy Barker that when they saw the bottom line in that chart on page five that I talked about, when they saw the triple B line start to deteriorate, which really happened when the HSBC had their problem with associates in March, they said to me and the board and others after the fact, in September, October, that they tried to go out and hedge the positions. And there wasn't enough liquidity in the market, there wasn't enough volume to hedge it.

And so my point was that whatever we owned in the spring, that top line that was still flat, there was no ability to get off of that by the time the spring came. And I was referring to them having said that

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE they tried to increase the hedging and wasn't able to. So, I am sorry, I am not sure I have answered your question. Is there more to the question that I didn't answer?

## Q Let me ask it a little bit

 differently, and that is lending practices in the subprime origination space --A Right.
Q -- as of, as an industry began to deteriorate if 2006.

Do you agree with that, not -outside of Citigroup?

A The industry.
Q And Citigroup had a CDO business that relied on RMBS, residential mortgage backed securities, where the underlying asset of those residential mortgage backed securities were subprime mortgages originated by other originators other than Citi.

My question I guess is the
following is: If you had known in 2006 that
Citigroup had substantial positions on its

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE
The rating agencies knew about that. The press had stories about those kinds of issues. But everybody believed and everybody believed up until October of 2007 that the strength of the structuring process would keep the rising flood waters away from the super seniors. It is just as simple as that.

And so it is not just the characterization of the underlying asset. It is also the characterization of the result of the securitization process. And as I said, for all I know, the super seniors are still paying out. That was the question. Now, in hindsight, if I knew a fraction of what I knew today, would I go and can them to get this stuff off books, of course I would. What is the difference between Citi and another bank? Our guys didn't sell the super seniors. It is just as simple as that. If our folks had sold the super seniors, you would be asking me why we were so much smarter than Merrill Lynch. How did we get it right, you would

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE books of CDOs and underlying those CDOs were mortgages of originators that had deteriorating lending standards, if you had known that in 2006, could you have asked Mr. Maheras or Mr. Barker, take hedge positions on that? Could you have asked people to take defensive mechanisms that would have prevented Citigroup from having substantial losses in the future?

A Look, the answer that helps me is to say yes. But that is too simplistic an answer even though it serves my personal interest. The reality is that it would have depended upon both an appreciation of the underlying quality of the asset and the belief in the strength of the securitization model.

In '06, everybody, the rating agencies, everybody knew that lending standards were lax. They didn't know they were deteriorating, but they knew they were lax. It is not as if no doc and low doc loans or the fact of negative amortization products was unknown in 2006 or early 2007.

Interview - CHARLES PRINCE be asking me. And that decision was made 17 levels below my office by people who had, I believe, a good faith belief in what they were doing. But it's overly generous to me to say if I had known X would I have gone and changed the world. I would like to say yes, but I think it is more complicated than that.

Q If I heard correctly today, though, in 2006 and early 2007, you didn't know the positions --

A Correct.
Q -- that were being taken on CDOs?
A Correct.
Q I have learned to always ask one question at the end that and that is, is there anything, Mr. Prince, that you expected me to ask or expected to talk about today that we haven't?

A Gosh, you have covered so much ground, so quickly. We talked about the rating agencies, we talked about the regulators, we talked about risk. We talked about the board. I can't think of anything
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