

# The Rescue of American International Group, Module E: Maiden Lane III<sup>1</sup>

Lily S. Engbith<sup>2</sup>  
Devyn Jeffereis<sup>3</sup>

November 15, 2019

## Abstract

Starting in mid-2007, the American International Group (AIG) faced increasing collateral calls from counterparties looking to protect their positions in credit default swap (CDS) contracts that AIG had written on troubled residential and commercial collateralized debt obligations (CDOs) ([US COP 2010 – pp. 28-30](#)). Per these agreements, the AIG parent company was responsible for insuring the value of the CDOs against the risk of a negative credit event, such as default ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 5](#)) ([US COP 2010 – pp. 29-30](#)). AIG's immediate need for liquidity on September 16, largely driven by a securities lending program and those collateral calls, prompted the Federal Reserve to lend the company \$14 billion, a loan that grew into an \$85 billion revolving credit facility ([Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 2, 4](#)). But the company continued to face pressing liquidity needs, market losses, and rating agency downgrades. The Fed and Treasury realized they had to restructure AIG's federal assistance to shore up its balance sheet and reassure market participants and rating agencies about the company's viability ([Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 4](#)).

As part of that restructuring, the Federal Reserve Board authorized the creation of Maiden Lane III (ML III), a special purpose vehicle that would purchase CDOs from AIG's counterparties in exchange for the cancellation of their CDS contracts. This would end the liquidity-draining collateral calls and cap AIG's exposure to further losses on the CDS contracts ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)) ([US COP 2010 – pp. 73-74](#)). The purchase was funded by a \$24.3 billion senior loan from the Federal Reserve Bank of New

---

<sup>1</sup> The Yale Program on Financial Stability (YPFS) has written 7 case studies that examine in detail the various elements of the government's rescue of American International Group:

Buchholtz, Alec, Aidan Lawson and Rosalind Z. Wiggins. 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module A: The Revolving Credit Facility."

Engbith, Lily, Alec Buchholtz, and Devyn Jeffereis. 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module B: The Securities Borrowing Facility."

Buchholtz, Alec and Aidan Lawson 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module C: AIG Investment Program."

Engbith, Lily and Devyn Jeffereis 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module D: Maiden Lane II."

Engbith, Lily and Devyn Jeffereis 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module E: Maiden Lane III."

Buchholtz, Alec and Aidan Lawson 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module F: The AIG Credit Facility Trust."

Wiggins, Rosalind 2019. "The Rescue of American International Group, Module Z: Overview."

<sup>2</sup> Research Associate, New Bagehot Project. Yale Program on Financial Stability.

<sup>3</sup> Research Associate, New Bagehot Project. Yale Program on Financial Stability.

York and a \$5.0 billion equity contribution from the AIG parent company ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). The establishment of ML III helped to lessen AIG's exposure to the deteriorating CDO market, end unmanageable collateral calls, and avoid downgrade pressures ([Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 - pp. 4](#)).

**Keywords:** AIG, Maiden Lane III, Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), credit default swaps (CDS), collateralized debt obligations (CDOs), asset purchase, senior loan

A special thanks to the insightful input and feedback provided by Zachary Taylor (Federal Reserve Bank of New York) and Larry Cordell (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia).

\*Please note that any information contained in this study that may be attributed to these two individuals reflect their personal views and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, or the Federal Reserve System.

# American International Group, Inc.:

## Maiden Lane III

### At a Glance

AIG Financial Products (AIGFP) began writing credit default swap contracts (CDS) in 1998 (US COP 2010 – pp. 21).<sup>5</sup> In 2004, AIGFP expanded rapidly into CDS on multi-sector collateralized debt obligations (CDOs) which were backed by a collateral pool of different asset-backed securities (US COP 2010 – pp. 21). These CDS contracts on CDOs would be the main source of collateral calls and mark-to-market losses for AIGFP during the financial crisis (US COP 2010 – pp. 30). Based on these contracts, counterparties would pay regular premiums to AIGFP in exchange for protection against the risk of default (or similar credit events) on the underlying CDOs (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 5). The counterparties could demand additional collateral if rating agencies downgraded AIG or if the market value of the underlying securities declined (AIG 2007 10-k – pp. 17-18). The market for mortgage-linked CDOs began to collapse in the spring of 2007, triggering a wave of collateral calls by AIG counterparties that intensified in 2008 (FCIC 2011 – p. 243) (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 6). As collateral calls mounted in the summer of 2008, AIG found itself in a liquidity squeeze, bound to contracts it could not uphold and unable to reassure counterparties that it could make good on its contractual obligations (US COP 2010 – pp. 29-30).

AIGFP's attempts to negotiate tear-ups of its CDS contracts were wholly unsuccessful (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 51). Furthermore, although a government-instituted Revolving Credit Facility<sup>6</sup> (established on September 16, 2008) had contributed \$20.2 billion to help AIG meet collateral calls, the intervention did not address the falling values of the CDOs on which AIG had written CDS (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 63) (Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 4). Thus, as part of the November 2008 restructuring of federal assistance to the company, the Fed authorized the creation of a special purpose vehicle (SPV) to purchase CDOs from counterparties (AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions). In exchange, counterparties agreed to cancel the CDS contracts (AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions). The facility, named Maiden Lane III (ML III), was funded by a \$24.3 billion senior loan from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY) and a \$5 billion equity investment by the AIG parent company (Maiden Lane Transactions). ML III purchased a portfolio of CDOs for \$26.9

<sup>4</sup> The CDOs acquired by Maiden Lane III had a fair market value of \$29.6 billion, however the net of cash amount paid to the counterparties was \$26.9 billion. This figure is calculated by factoring in the \$0.3 billion of CDO interest and principal proceeds accrued to AIG between the announcement and settlement date and the excess \$2.5 billion of collateral provided by AIGFP stemming from situations in which the credit derivative contracts value exceeded the contract's fair value (Maiden Lane Transactions).

<sup>5</sup> Credit default swaps are private contracts that obligate one party to pay another in the event that a third party cannot meet its obligations (US COP 2010 – pp. 21).

<sup>6</sup> See Buchholtz, Lawson, and Wiggins 2019 for more information on AIG's Revolving Credit Facility (RCF)

Summary of Key Terms	
<b>Purpose:</b>	To facilitate the purchase of collateralized debt obligations from counterparties of AIG Financial Products in order to terminate their related credit default swap agreements, halting cash collateral calls and capping any further losses to AIG from this business (US COP 2010 – pp. 73)
<b>Announcement Date</b>	November 10, 2008
<b>Operational Date</b>	November 25, 2008
<b>Termination Date</b>	November 12, 2014
<b>Legal Authority</b>	Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act
<b>Amount Authorized</b>	Up to \$30 billion senior loan to ML III from FRBNY
<b>AIG Participation</b>	\$5 billion in equity
<b>Peak Utilization</b>	\$26.9 billion to purchase CDOs with a par value of \$62.1B from counterparties who retained \$35B in collateral received earlier from AIG <sup>4</sup>
<b>Participants</b>	AIG, FRBNY

billion, less than half their par value of \$62.1 billion ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). But AIG's counterparties effectively received the full notional value of their contracts, as they retained the rights to \$35 billion in collateral payments previously collected from AIG ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). The CDOs were eventually sold off at auction to various financial institutions, and ML III was terminated with the repayment of all loan and interest obligations to FRBNY on November 12, 2014 ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). In total, the management of ML III would result in a net gain for the benefit of the public of approximately \$6.6 billion ([New York Fed Sells Remainder of Maiden Lane III LLC Securities 2012](#)).

## Summary Evaluation

The creation of ML III is seen as having successfully halted collateral calls and capped AIG's further exposure to losses on its CDSs written on CDOs. However, the intervention faced much criticism after the crisis. Specifically, the FRBNY came under intense scrutiny for not seeking financial contributions from counterparties, which might have allowed it to change the facility's design and either reduce the amount it was required to lend or increase the security of the loan. The Fed argued that negotiating concessions were difficult to attain because they weren't willing to threaten to force AIG into bankruptcy, and it might have taken significant time, resulted in further ratings downgrades of AIG, and created a run by other AIG counterparties at a time when the financial system was already vulnerable ([FCIC 2011 - p. 378-79](#)) ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 56, 68-75](#)).

## Contents

<b>I. Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Key Design Decisions</b>	<b>7</b>
1. Maiden Lane III was created as part of a multi-faceted intervention.	7
2. The Federal Reserve Board authorized the creation of ML III under the legal authority provided by Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act.	7
3. The FRBNY determined that restructuring AIGs CDS contracts was a more effective and stable solution than the alternative options.	7
4. The Fed created a special purpose vehicle to purchase the counterparties CDOs, rather than acquire them directly.	8
5. In order to restructure AIG's CDS contracts the FRBNY considered three distinct options, selecting the as-adopted structure because of its low execution risk, although it required a greater financial contribution from the federal government.	8
6. The FRBNY retained BlackRock Financial Management Inc. as the investment manager for ML III along with other outside vendors for various duties.	9
7. The SPV was funded via a \$24.3 billion senior loan from the FRBNY and a \$5.0 billion subordinated investment by AIG.	9
8. The interest rates calculated on the FRBNY senior loan and AIG's equity contribution were based on the one-month LIBOR.	10
9. The allocation of residual cash flows, after payment and repayment of all debts, would be split 67/33 between the FRBNY and AIG.	10
10. ML III acquired only dollar-denominated cash CDOs.	11
11. Concessions from counterparties were attempted but ultimately abandoned, therefore counterparties received par value for their CDOs.	11
12. Although the stated length of the loan to ML III was 6 years, the FRBNY allowed for the flexibility of an extension and did not announce a fixed timeframe for the auctioning of assets.	13
13. In a process similar to that of ML II RMBS, ML III CDO assets were auctioned off in multiple competitive rounds throughout 2012.	14
14. The government announced the restructuring alongside AIG's third quarter results and provided suggestions to AIG regarding its federal securities filings that disclosed the interventions.	14
<b>III. Evaluation</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. References</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>V. Key Program Documents</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix A: Alternative SPV Structures</b>	<b>25</b>



## I. Overview

### Background

AIG Financial Products (AIGFP) began writing credit default swap (CDS) contracts in 1998 (US COP 2010 – pp. 21). In 2004, AIGFP rapidly expanded into writing CDS on multi-sector collateralized debt obligations (CDOs) which were backed by collateral pools of prime, Alt-A, and subprime residential mortgage-backed, commercial mortgage-backed, and other asset-backed securities (US COP 2010 – pp. 21). These CDS contracts on CDOs would be the main source of collateral calls and mark-to-market losses for AIGFP during the financial crisis (US COP 2010 – pp. 30). Under these insurance-like agreements, AIGFP would receive regular premium payments from a counterparty in exchange for the assurance that the AIG parent company would cover losses in the event that a particularly adverse credit event (such as a ratings downgrade or default) were to affect the value of the counterparty's underlying CDOs (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 5). The counterparties could also demand additional collateral if rating agencies downgraded AIG or if the market value of the underlying securities declined (AIG 2007 10-k – pp. 17-18). The CDS contracts were, at the time, written on highly rated securities, unfortunately the ratings would eventually be downgraded (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 13). The purchase of CDS contracts was beneficial to banks and investors who wanted an extra layer of protection on their holdings and had become pervasive in the CDO market (US COP 2010 – pp. 21). However, when the CDO market deteriorated rapidly in the spring of 2008, AIG found itself struggling to post the collateral required by its counterparties (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 6).

In early 2006, AIG's management had decided to stop writing new CDS on multi-sector CDOs. However, it made no effort to hedge legacy exposures by purchasing CDS contracts from other institutions, and AIGFP continued to write new contracts as late as July 2006 (FCIC 2011 – pp. 200, 201). By June 2007, AIGFP's multi-sector CDO exposure reached \$79 billion (FCIC 2011 – p. 201). In the fall of 2008, the portfolio comprised 140 CDS contracts written on 112 mortgage-related CDOs with \$71.5 billion in notional value for 20 counterparties (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56). As the market value of the CDOs underlying the CDS agreements declined and AIG's own credit rating dropped due to losses on these and other mortgage-related exposures, AIG was required to post more and more collateral to its counterparties (Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 4).

Part of AIG's problem stemmed from the company's collateral practices. AIGFP's CDS traded over-the-counter – directly with counterparties as opposed to on an exchange or through a clearinghouse (US COP 2010 – pp. 216). The company was therefore able to set its own collateral standards, and most contracts did not call for a full payment of collateral due to market changes (McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 93). Instead, AIGFP would only make collateral payments against CDS on CDOs if the decline in value of the CDOs exceeded certain thresholds dependent on AIG's credit rating (AIG 2007 10-k – pp. 18). This system inspired ongoing disagreements between AIGFP and many of its counterparties regarding the actual amount of collateral owed (McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 93). AIG therefore regularly



accrued unpaid debts against its CDS positions that it did not actually owe until its ratings downgrade in September 2008 (McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 93).

Collateral calls increased rapidly in the lead-up to October 2008, totaling \$16.1 billion at the end of July and rising by an additional \$16.5 billion by August 6 (US COP 2010 – pp. 73). When S&P downgraded its rating on AIG to A- with a negative outlook on September 15, AIGFP estimated it needed \$20 billion in order to satisfy collateral calls and transaction termination payments (US COP 2010 – pp. 73). By September 30, collateral demands had soared to approximately \$32 billion (US COP 2010 – pp. 73).

## Program Description

Up until the first restructuring of government assistance on November 10, 2008, AIG had contributed \$14.8 billion of its own cash and borrowed \$20.2 billion (of an available \$85.0 billion) from the Federal Reserve's Revolving Credit Facility to post collateral stemming from AIGFP's CDS business (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 63). While this measure temporarily stabilized AIG's liquidity situation, it failed to address the falling values of the CDOs on which AIG had written CDS contracts (Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 4). Although AIG had been attempting to negotiate tear-ups of the CDS contracts since 2007, its counterparties had insisted on unwinding the contracts at market value, which would have resulted in billions of dollars in additional losses that AIG had been unwilling to take at the time (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 51). It became increasingly clear that the federal government would need to authorize another facility to stem the liquidity drain at its source by purchasing the CDOs from AIGFP's counterparties (Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 4).

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY) had three options on the table: let AIG default on the CDS contracts, continue to lend to AIG so that it could meet its obligations under the CDS contracts, or restructure the CDS contracts to mitigate the financial pressures (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56). The FRBNY decided that the most effective and stable solution was to restructure AIG's CDS contracts. Under time pressure, the FRBNY decided to create a special purpose vehicle (SPV) through which it could purchase the troublesome CDOs and terminate the CDS agreements (US COP 2010 – pp. 73-74). Similar to Maiden Lane II, which the FRBNY created to purchase illiquid and distressed residential mortgage-backed securities (RMBS) from AIG insurance subsidiaries, ML III was financed by a senior loan from the FRBNY and an AIG equity contribution (US COP 2010 – pp. 71, 74). The FRBNY retained BlackRock Financial Management Inc. (BlackRock) to supervise operations and ultimately liquidate ML III assets at competitive auction (AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions).

As part of the program, the FRBNY authorized a senior loan of up to \$30 billion, to be fully collateralized by the ML III asset portfolio (AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions). The terms of the FRBNY senior loan, effective December 3, 2008, specified a six-year duration that could be extended at the discretion of the FRBNY and an interest rate set at one-month LIBOR plus 100 basis points (2.9% as of December 3, 2008) (AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions). AIG was also required to invest \$5 billion on an equity basis to cover losses related to the CDOs' declining value. The equity would accrue distributions at a rate of one-

month LIBOR plus 300 basis points (4.9% as of December 3, 2008) ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)).

Repayment of the senior loan was to commence immediately upon receipt of proceeds from the CDO portfolio. The initial proceeds from maturity and liquidation would be applied in a waterfall structure starting with any expenses incurred by the LLC, then the outstanding FRBNY loan and interest, and finally the AIG equity contribution and its interest ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)). Any residual income or remaining funds would be divided among the FRBNY (67%) and AIG (33%) ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)).

On November 25, 2008, ML III drew down \$15.1 billion from the FRBNY senior loan; it borrowed an additional \$9.2 billion on December 18, 2008 ([US COP 2010 – pp. 77](#)).

Using funds from the FRBNY senior loan and AIG equity contribution, ML III purchased from counterparties the multi-sector CDOs on which AIGFP had written CDS contracts ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)). The CDO portfolio totaled \$62.1 billion at par. The transfer to ML III was settled in two rounds of CDOs with a principal amount of approximately \$46.1 billion on November 25, 2008 and \$16.0 billion on December 18 and 22, 2008 ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77](#)). On the closing dates, the counterparties delivered the CDOs into an escrow account, which ML III funded with \$29.3 billion (collectively, \$24.3 billion FRBNY senior loan and \$5 billion AIG equity contribution) ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77](#)). The escrow agent released \$26.9 billion to the counterparties and delivered the CDOs to ML III<sup>7</sup> ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77](#)). As part of the intervention, participating counterparties would retain the rights to \$35 billion in collateral previously posted by the AIG parent company, a portion of which had been derived from the Revolving Credit Facility, effectively receiving the full notional amount for the CDOs despite their then-current market value of less than 50% of their par (notional) value ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 63](#)) ([US COP 2010 – pp. 74](#)). The counterparties thus received the full economic benefit of the CDS protection and, in exchange, agreed to terminate their CDS contracts ([US COP 2010 – pp. 74](#)).

**Figure 1: Composition of Maiden Lane III Financing**


Source of Funds	Funds Provided (Billions)
Collateral Retained by Counterparties	\$35.00
FRBNY Senior Loan	\$24.30
AIG Contribution	\$5.00
CDO Interest/Proceeds Accrued between Announcement and Settlement Date	\$0.30
Excess Collateral Posted (which was returned to AIG)	\$(2.50)

<sup>7</sup> The CDOs acquired by Maiden Lane III had a fair market value of \$29.6 billion, however the net cash amount paid to the counterparties was \$26.9 billion. This figure is calculated by factoring in the \$0.3 billion of CDO interest and principal proceeds accrued to AIG between the announcement and settlement date and the excess \$2.5 billion of collateral provided by AIGFP stemming from situations in which the credit derivative contracts value exceeded the contract's fair value. (Maiden Lane Transactions)

<b>Par Value of CDOs</b>	<b>\$62.10</b>
--------------------------	----------------

Data from FRBNY "Maiden Lane Transactions"

**Figure 2: Maiden Lane III (Multi-Sector CDOs) Asset Composition by Fair Value**



Source: FRBNY "Maiden Lane Transactions"

Pursuant to an Amended and Restated Investment Management Agreement entered into by and among FRBNY, BlackRock and ML III, originally dated November 25, 2008 (and amended and restated August 23, 2010), the FRBNY retained BlackRock to act as investment manager for the ML III assets ([Investment Management Agreement 2010 – pp. 1](#)). In its role as investment manager, BlackRock was charged with ensuring that ML III could repay the FRBNY senior loan, and then AIG’s subordinated loan, while maximizing proceeds from the liquidation and avoiding any market disruption ([Investment Management Agreement 2010 – pp. 26](#)). In accordance with the Investment Management Agreement, specific individuals in the Investment Support Office (ISO) of the FRBNY were appointed to manage the ongoing relationship with BlackRock and oversee its management of ML III assets ([Investment Management Agreement 2010 – pp. 2](#)). The ISO officer’s responsibilities included acting as point of contact, assessing BlackRock’s performance, modifying investment objectives and risk limits, monitoring the risk composition of assets held, and other functions outlined in the Investment Management Agreement ([Investment Management Agreement 2010 – pp. 2-3](#)). Acting on behalf of ML III, BlackRock could reinvest the proceeds from asset sales only in liquid, short-term securities such as U.S. Treasury or agency securities with a remaining maturity of one year or less, U.S. 2a-7 government money market funds, and reverse repurchase agreements collateralized by U.S. Treasury ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). Moreover, when it came time to sell the assets, BlackRock ran the bid list process that was standard in the industry ([New York Fed Solicits Bids...in Maiden Lane III LLC 2012](#)).

FRBNY also hired Bank of New York Mellon, Deloitte and Touche LLP, and Ernst & Young LLP to perform various functions. Bank of New York Mellon acted as administrator and custodian on behalf of ML III. These services included accounting services, report preparation,

reconciliation of cash and asset balances, valuation services, and other actions outlined in the Transaction Documents ([Administration Agreement 2008 – pp. 2-7](#)). Deloitte and Touche LLP was contracted to perform audit services, performing an audit on the annual financial statements for ML III ([Vendor Information](#)) ([ML III LLC: Financial Statements 2011 – pp. 4-5](#)). Ernst & Young LLP provided closing work, performing an assessment the operational and financial close procedures and assisting with the analysis of accounting matters ([Vendor Information](#)).

## Outcomes

The CDOs, which previously were highly rated, continued to experience downgrades while being held in ML III; by 2009, 78% were rated BB+ or lower and by 2010, 98.3% were rated BB+ or lower ([ML III LLC: Financial Statements 2010 – pp. 17](#)) ([ML III LLC: Financial Statements 2011 – pp. 17](#)). Once markets stabilized in 2012, the senior loan had been repaid to below \$15 billion from CDO interest and principle income and ML III sold off its portfolio in a series of competitive auctions ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). The proceeds were used to repay the FRBNY senior loan, AIG equity contribution, and all accrued interest and associated fees ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)).

Using proceeds from the competitive auction of CDOs held by ML III, the FRBNY senior loan was repaid in full, with accrued interest, on June 14, 2012 ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). According to FRBNY president William C. Dudley, the settlement “[marked] the retirement of the last remaining debts owed to the Bank that stemmed from the crisis-era interventions with Bear Stearns and AIG” ([NY Fed Announces Full Repayment...to...Maiden Lane III LLC 2012](#)).

As a consequence of the ML III intervention, AIG was required to forfeit to its counterparties \$35 billion in collateral previously posted against the CDS contracts ([US COP 2010 – pp. 74](#)). The company was also obligated to post the \$5 billion equity contribution to supplement the FRBNY senior loan ([US COP 2010 – pp. 74](#)). Using receipts from CDO sales, ML III repaid this investment in full, including accrued interest, on July 16, 2012 ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). ML III also allowed AIG to cancel all CDS contracts on multi-sector CDOs, effectively stopping the liquidity drain stemming from additional collateral calls and the financial losses related to the falling value of the multi-sector CDOs.


In retaining collateral previously posted by AIG, counterparties to the CDS contracts effectively received par value for the otherwise steeply discounted CDOs ([US COP 2010 – pp. 74](#)).

Even after downgrades to the securities, ML III made a substantial return on its CDO holdings. ML III bought CDO securities in November and December 2008 for \$26.9 billion, or at a discounted value of 47% of their notional value. Including interest and principal payments on those securities of \$17.1 billion and their ultimate sales value of \$22.6 billion (50% of par), ML III earned a nonannualized return of 35.1%, according to a later academic analysis of public filings ([McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 98](#)). The median security

returned 35%, exceeding the benchmark<sup>8</sup> return by 14% ([McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 99](#)).

On August 23, 2012, the FRBNY announced the sale of all remaining securities held by ML III ([New York Fed Sells Remainder of Maiden Lane III LLC Securities 2012](#)). Residual net proceeds and cash flow generated from the securities provided a net benefit to the US public of approximately \$6.6 billion, including \$737 million in accrued interest on the FRBNY senior loan ([New York Fed Sells Remainder of Maiden Lane III LLC Securities 2012](#)).

**Figure 3: Senior Loan Balance Repayment and \$6.6 Billion Net Gain Earned for the Public**



Source: FRBNY “Maiden Lane Transactions”

Per the original terms of the senior loan, the FRBNY began to wind down ML III operations two years following the final sale of CDO assets ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)). On September 15, 2014, all remaining ML III funds (described by the FRBNY on its website as “Small amount of cash held in reserve” and not separately reported) were distributed to the FRBNY and AIG according to the original terms of the agreement ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). The special purpose vehicle was then terminated on November 12, 2014, and residual funds were allocated to their respective parties on November 20, 2014 ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)).

For details pertaining to the individual offerings and sales of the ML III portfolio through competitive auction, refer to the FRBNY website ([Maiden Lane III: Security Offerings page](#)).

<sup>8</sup> The benchmarks used by McDonald and Paulson (2015) were constructed using 70% ABX.HE.AAA.06-1 (an index of AAA-securitized subprime mortgage loans originated in the last six months) and 30% CMBX.NA.AAA.1-1 (an index of commercial mortgage-backed obligations), it is important to note that similar results were obtained when using the indexes alone



## II. Key Design Decisions

### 1. Maiden Lane III was created as part of a multi-faceted intervention.

Maiden Lane III was one of a set of government interventions assisting AIG. It was announced alongside Maiden Lane II in November 2008 as a restructuring of government financial support ([Maiden Lane Transactions](#)). These two SPVs were aimed at removing assets from AIG's balance sheet to address continuing, significant liquidity drains and to improve its capital in the interest of avoiding ratings downgrades ([Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 4](#)). In all, the FRBNY and Treasury would provide \$182.3 billion in targeted government support to AIG, including loans, asset purchases, and capital investments ([Massad 2012](#)).

### 2. The Federal Reserve Board authorized the creation of ML III under the legal authority provided by Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act.

According to the government legal experts who advised the Federal Reserve, the FRBNY, and Treasury, the reasoning of lending to institutions via a special purpose vehicle “reflected use of the incidental powers conferred on the Reserve Banks” under the Federal Reserve Act ([Alvarez, Baxter, Hoyt 2018 – pp. 12](#)). The ML III SPV was modeled after Maiden Lane I, which was created to assist in the acquisition of Bear Stearns by JP Morgan ([Alvarez, Baxter, Hoyt 2018 – pp. 12](#)). Under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act, the FRBNY loan had to be secured to “the satisfaction of the lending Reserve Bank” ([Title 12 U.S.C. 343, 2007](#)) ([Alvarez, Baxter, Hoyt 2018 – pp. 10](#)). ML III had acquired the CDOs at a substantial discount to their pre-crisis value. The Fed believed the collateral would be “sufficient to repay the loan” once markets improved and the collateral's value increased ([Alvarez, Baxter, Hoyt 2018 – pp. 12](#)).

### 3. The FRBNY determined that restructuring AIGs CDS contracts was a more effective and stable solution than the alternative options.

In order to resolve AIGs CDS issues the FRBNY had three options; it could allow AIG to default on the contracts, it could continue to lend to AIG in order to fulfill collateral calls and related obligations, or it could restructure the contracts to stem the financial pressure ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56](#)). Letting AIG default on its contracts was not a feasible strategy, as it would force AIG into bankruptcy ([Geithner 2010](#)). This would perpetuate the disastrous economic consequences that were meant to be avoided through intervention and risk previously committed government funds ([Geithner 2010](#)). Continuing to lend to AIG was also not a viable option, it would have increased AIGs debt burden at a precarious moment, raising the potential for ratings downgrades and subjecting taxpayers to a potentially open-ended commitment with no additional security ([Geithner 2010](#)). Ultimately, the FRBNY settled on restructuring the contracts by purchasing the assets and cancelling the insurance ([Geithner 2010](#)). This removed the CDS exposure from AIGs balance sheet, thereby eliminating the possibility of default on the contracts, while stemming the continued collateral calls that were threatening a ratings downgrade ([Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 3-4](#)).

**4. The Fed created a special purpose vehicle to purchase the counterparties CDOs, rather than acquire them directly.**

The Federal Reserve did not possess the authority to purchase the CDOs directly from AIG counterparties in order to restructure the CDS contracts ([Title 12 U.S.C. 342 – pp. 111](#)). It was, however, able to facilitate the senior loan to ML III, a SPV and independent legal entity that it created for that purpose ([AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions](#)). Using an SPV to hold troubled assets – in this case, troubled CDOs – allowed the Fed to better manage the collateral and increase the likelihood of repayment ([Alvarez, Baxter, Hoyt 2018 – pp. 12](#)).

**5. In order to restructure AIG’s CDS contracts the FRBNY considered three distinct options, selecting the as-adopted structure because of its low execution risk, although it required a greater financial contribution from the federal government.**

The three options for restructuring AIG’s CDS contracts that were considered included the “as adopted” structure, “three-tiered” structure, and “novation” structure. Each of these structures would use an SPV; however, the interventions taken by the SPV and sources of financing differed.

The “as adopted” structure consisted of an SPV jointly funded by the FRBNY and AIG to purchase CDOs. After selling their CDOs to the vehicle, counterparties would cancel their CDS contracts ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59](#)). This was believed to be the simplest to implement and, among other options, had the greatest chance of attracting widespread participation among counterparties ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60-61, 65](#)).

The “three-tiered” structure would have provided for the creation of an SPV jointly funded by the FRBNY, AIG, and the counterparties ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59-60](#)). Counterparties would then sell their CDOs to the vehicle, cancel their CDS contracts, and retain some of the risk underlying the CDOs ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59-60](#)). Though there was no discussion with counterparties regarding this option, it was rejected due to the complicated nature of pricing individual securities portfolios and the distribution of potential losses among counterparties ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61-62](#)).

The “novation” structure would have also provided for the creation of an SPV ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60](#)). However, rather than cancelling the CDS contracts, AIG would novate (transfer) its positions in the contracts to the SPV. CDS protection for counterparties would remain in place, but would be paid out by ML III rather than AIG ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60](#)). The transferal would be cooperatively funded by the FRBNY, AIG, and the collateral previously posted by AIGFP to counterparties ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60](#)). In addition to retaining their CDO portfolios, counterparties would be required to pay premiums to ML III instead of AIG. They would surrender previously collected collateral to the ML III ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60](#)). The performance of the SPV and the value of the CDOs would be guaranteed by the FRBNY ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60](#)). This option was rejected, among other reasons, because of the difficulty in structuring a FRBNY guarantee that would have to be fully collateralized and capped in value. ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61-62](#)).

In terms of policy considerations, the FRBNY wanted to ensure that it would be loaning against assets of value and that its senior loan would be repaid with interest in a timely manner, regardless of the performance of the CDOs (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62). Speed of execution, both in establishing ML III and throughout the CDO purchase process, was also a key factor in the intervention’s design (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62). Lengthy initial negotiations with AIG counterparties regarding the terms of ML III funding or the pricing of individual CDOs would have threatened the efficacy of the program (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61-62). Furthermore, the FRBNY wanted to avoid the institution of long-term relationships between itself and the counterparties, many of whom were banking organizations over which it exercised supervisory authority (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61-62).

For further detail, please see “Appendix A: Alternative SPV Structures.”

**6. The FRBNY retained BlackRock Financial Management Inc. as the investment manager for ML III along with other outside vendors for various duties.**

As the controlling party of ML III, the FRBNY was tasked with the day-to-day management of ML III’s assets and engaged a number of vendors based on their expertise rather than developing internal departments for each need. However, the FRBNY did increase its internal expertise through targeted hiring in order to assist in decision-making and effectively evaluate recommendations from external vendors. The ISO department, which managed vendor relations, grew from just a few staff to a sizable business unit once all three SPVs were being managed. The FRBNY retained BlackRock Financial Management Inc. (BlackRock) to act as investment manager (Maiden Lane Transactions). BlackRock’s previous work with AIG regarding their swap portfolios and underlying CDOs made them an attractive option (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 12).

FRBNY also hired Bank of New York Mellon as administrator and custodian, Deloitte and Touche LLP as external auditor for annual financial statements, and Ernst & Young LLP to perform closing work (Administration Agreement 2008 – pp. 2-7) (Vendor Information) (ML III LLC: Financial Statements 2011 – pp. 4-5). Although the FRBNY devoted significant attention to the implications of engaging outside vendors, there were a number of potential conflicts of interests that arose between the FRBNY, advisors, and counterparties, which were dealt with on an ad hoc basis (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 122).

**7. The SPV was funded via a \$24.3 billion senior loan from the FRBNY and a \$5.0 billion subordinated investment by AIG.**

The debt and equity structure of ML III was designed to guarantee that the FRBNY senior loan would be repaid even in times of great financial stress, and that the AIG equity contribution would be sufficient to cover losses and protect the senior loan (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 63-64). A stress test conducted by the FRBNY in November 2008 found that the ML III portfolio would still be worth \$27 billion under an extreme stress scenario. While that



represented a loss of 57% of its notional value of \$62.1 billion, that would still be sufficient to cover the FRBNY's \$24.3 billion loan (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 64).<sup>9</sup>

In the case of the \$5 billion equity contribution, ML III's CDO recovery value would total \$2.4 billion under the extreme stress scenario. (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 64-65). The FRBNY did not require a higher equity contribution from AIG because it aimed to minimize the use of funds from the Revolving Credit Facility and avoid undermining the company's position if the \$5 billion were lost entirely (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 65). Alternative options for the one-time equity contribution, including a quarterly payment system or a secured loan through ML III, were rejected as too complex (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 65).

In addition to policy and investment concerns, the FRBNY carefully analyzed the impact of ML III on AIG's long-term stabilization (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62). It had to consider accounting rules that would have required AIG to consolidate any of the ML III structure onto its books (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62). Fed officials felt that consolidating ML III on AIG's books could have "injected volatility into AIG's operations" (Maiden Lane Transactions) (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62). As structured, ML III was therefore consolidated onto the Federal Reserve System's financial statements (Maiden Lane Transactions). Separately, the FRBNY endeavored to create an intervention that would enable AIG to share in potential gains once federal loans and the company's equity position had been repaid (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62). While choosing an alternative structure could have potentially stopped the liquidity-draining collateral calls in the short term, it could also have decelerated the company's return to long-term solvency (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62).

**8. The interest rates calculated on the FRBNY senior loan and AIG's equity contribution were based on the one-month LIBOR.**

The interest rates calculated on the FRBNY senior loan and AIG's equity contribution referenced the one-month LIBOR (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 65). Since LIBOR was also the base rate used for many of the assets in the ML III portfolio the FRBNY felt this was an appropriate interest rate (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 66). The FRBNY also wanted to leave open the possibility of selling the senior loan in the future, and believed that the use of LIBOR and the wide spreads would be attractive to future investors (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 66).

**9. The allocation of residual cash flows, after payment and repayment of all debts, would be split 67/33 between the FRBNY and AIG.**

The allocation of residual funds specified in the original agreement was based upon the division of funding contributed to ML III and what FRBNY officials deemed to be a fair return for its loan and AIG's equity contribution (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 66). Under alternative

---

<sup>9</sup> This analysis was conducted to measure the impact of different hypothetical stress scenarios, ranging from base, stress, and extreme, on the ML III portfolio. For the extreme stress scenario, the analysis assumed 56% housing price declines nationally and 75% declines in California (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 64).

structures, AIG's cash flow provision would have increased in proportion to its equity position, but at a disproportionately higher rate (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 66). This would have complicated the issue of consolidating ML III onto AIG's books: the FRBNY would needed to have taken over at least 55% of the remaining funds to avoid consolidation, in turn providing a 45% share for AIG and an “extraordinarily high rate of return” on its \$5 billion equity contribution (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 66-67). Furthermore, the rating agencies were concerned that in taking this route, the FRBNY would have left AIG in a weaker position (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 67). The FRBNY considered rating agencies' fears along with tax considerations and market perceptions in the creation of the cash flow arrangements (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 67). The FRBNY was also not focusing “on the residual earnings per se” and preferred to take a more conservative position on the senior loan (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 67).

#### **10. ML III acquired only dollar-denominated cash CDOs.**

The FRBNY and BlackRock selected only “CDO tranches referencing U.S. dollar-denominated cash bonds” for purchase by ML III (Maiden Lane Transactions). AIG was thus left with \$12.5 billion in “potentially risky” multi-sector CDOs, most of which didn't meet that eligibility requirement (US COP 2010 – pp. 74-75).

A significant portion of the CDOs that ML III did not purchase was synthetic. Unlike cash CDOs, which hold portfolios of real assets like bonds or MBS, synthetic CDOs are essentially portfolios of long positions on credit derivatives (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77). At the end of 2008, the notional value of AIG's synthetic CDOs totaled \$9.8 billion (US COP 2010 – pp. 75). In an interview with the GAO, the FRBNY expressed concern that synthetic CDOs “might not have met the Federal Reserve System's requirement to lend against assets of value, given that they were not backed by actual assets” (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77). One FRBNY official also cited the complicated nature of unwinding synthetic CDOs as another reason for their exclusion.

Some CDOs were excluded because they were not dollar-denominated. Euro-denominated trades totaling \$1.9 billion in notional value (after conversion to USD) were rejected because of the perceived volatility in forex rates (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77).

Another \$500 million in assets were excluded because various counterparties no longer held the underlying bonds and could not retrieve them for delivery to ML III (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 77).

#### **11. Concessions from counterparties were attempted but ultimately abandoned, therefore counterparties received par value for their CDOs.**

Concessions from counterparties would have provided an additional layer of support against potential losses on the FRBNY senior loan (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 68). The FRBNY also argued that the discounts proposed were justified because the counterparties would profit from participation in ML III. In particular they would be able to release into earnings any valuation reserves booked in connection with the CDS transactions, receive instant liquidity for the CDOs they held, and reduce risk-weighted assets on their balance sheets (GAO-11-

616 2011 – pp. 68). They would also be able to avoid the risk of exposure to AIG on potential future declines in CDO value, as well as eliminate collateral disputes and transaction costs over collection and hedge protection on CDS contracts (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 69). Therefore, the combination of risk mitigation for the Fed loan and benefits from participation for the counterparties made concessions an attractive goal for the FRBNY in the creation of the intervention (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 68).

Before approaching the counterparties to negotiate concessions, the FRBNY asked an advisor to create different potential concession strategies (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 69). The advisor created three scenarios, each with specific methods and concession amounts (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 70). The first option would involve a .50% annual discount on the CDOs notional value until a credit event, up to a maximum of 3.00% (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 70). Under this method, individual concessions ranged from \$2 million to \$322 million, with projected total concessions equaling \$1.1 billion (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 70). The second method was a flat discount of 2% on CDO notional value, resulting in individual concessions varying from \$2 million to \$328 million and total concessions equaling \$1.3 billion (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 70). The final option was a 50% discount on collateral received leading up to the close of ML III, a total discount of 9.6% of the CDO portfolio (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 70). Under this method, individual concessions ranged from \$0 to \$2.1 billion and total concessions would equal \$6.4 billion (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 70).

According to officials, the FRBNY had initially contacted eight of the 16 counterparties with the largest exposure between November 5 and November 6 regarding the possibility of concessions (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 15). All respondents expressed concern about the proposal for a number of reasons (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 16). One issue that arose was that the combination of collateral the counterparties had already collected plus fair market value of the CDOs amounted to the par value of the CDSs; therefore, any concessions would result in voluntarily taking a loss (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 16). In addition, counterparties expected that AIG would not default due to the governments previous actions to avert its bankruptcy and were contractually entitled to the par value of the CDSs (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 16).

The FRBNY would have preferred that AIG take the lead in these negotiations and felt that it was not appropriate to interfere with the sanctity of the CDS contracts while playing the role of creditor throughout the ML III process (YPFS Dahlgren Interview, 03/22/2018) (US COP 2010 – pp. 75) (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 19). If concessions were pursued, severe time constraints would not have allowed for the lengthy negotiations required to calculate individual haircuts, especially given AIGs historical inability to negotiate tear-ups of the CDS contracts and the likely negligible size of the discounts in a successful scenario (Baxter 2010). Factors that would have had to be considered in calculating specific concessions included the varying amounts of collateralized and uncollateralized exposure to AIG, the methods of risk management employed previous to the crisis (e.g. some counterparties had bought hedge protection on AIG or AIG CDS), the differences in credit ratings among the CDOs, and market perceptions on whether the government would continue to provide support (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 80-86). Aside from these complicated calculations, the FRBNY had little bargaining power because it could not threaten an AIG bankruptcy as it had already began to rescue AIG and had tens of billions of dollars at risk prior to beginning

negotiations (Baxter 2010). Even in a scenario where the FRBNY would be able to threaten bankruptcy, the negative reception to this threat by rating agencies could have led to a downgrade exacerbating stress on AIG (Baxter 2010). An additional suggested strategy involved leveraging the regulatory powers of the Fed to coerce counterparties into accepting concessions (Geithner 2010). However, the FRBNY felt this coercion would negatively affect market confidence in AIG, lead to potential downgrades, and was an abuse of authority (Baxter 2010) (Geithner 2010).

The FRBNY concluded that the correct course of action was to compensate the counterparties at par value. This decision proved to be controversial and led to significant testimony and investigation (Baxter 2010) (Geithner 2010). In particular, the strategy would evoke substantial criticism from the Special Investigator General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program (SIGTARP) and the GAO among others (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 29-30) (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56).

**12. Although the stated length of the loan to ML III was 6 years, the FRBNY allowed for the flexibility of an extension and did not announce a fixed timeframe for the auctioning of assets.**

The loan made to ML III by the FRBNY was intended to be repaid from interest and principal payments received from assets if held to maturity, or the proceeds from their sale (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 9). The FRBNY decided not to set a predetermined schedule for selling assets, instead they indicated a willingness to hold the assets to maturity if warranted (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 9). This afforded them the flexibility to liquidate assets when and if market conditions improved (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 9). If it was determined that liquidation was not the proceed-maximizing option, ML III would be able to hold these assets to maturity as the hold-to-maturity proceeds were predicted to be greater than the FRBNY’s senior loan (Baxter and Dahlgren 2010 – pp. 6). The assets of ML III had varying maturities and primarily consisted of multi-sector CDOs, which were backed by a combination of corporate bonds, loans, asset-backed securities, or mortgage-backed securities (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 9).

Since its inception, BlackRock was tasked with the below objective while constantly monitoring market conditions.

“The Manager’s objective is to manage the Collateral in a manner consistent with repayment of the Senior Loan (including principal and accumulated interest), followed by the Equity Contribution Amount (including accumulated preferred distributions representing accrued interest) for as long as the United States Treasury maintains an economic stake in AIG on behalf of the United States taxpayer, while also meeting other obligations in the [payment] waterfall that are senior to the Senior Loan. In meeting the objective, the Manager should strive to maximize sale proceeds” (Investment Management Agreement 2010 – pp. 26).

Due to improved market conditions, ML III’s investment objective was revised in April 2012 to begin exploring the sale of assets, and on August 23, 2012 the FRBNY concluded its sale of ML III assets (Maiden Lane III: Security Offerings page).

**13. In a process similar to that of ML II RMBS, ML III CDO assets were auctioned off in multiple competitive rounds throughout 2012.**

The FRBNY thought it best to hold the CDO assets on ML III's balance sheet until market conditions stabilized and any losses from sales could be minimized ([Maiden Lane III: Security Offerings page](#)). Selling the assets at auction would ensure equal opportunity for institutions to benefit from the sales, and for the FRBNY to determine that "the winning bids represented good value for the public" ([New York Fed Solicits Bids...in Maiden Lane III LLC 2012](#)). There was no fixed timeframe for the sales, which began in April 2012 and concluded at the end of August 2012 ([Maiden Lane III: Security Offerings page](#)).

**14. The government announced the restructuring alongside AIG's third quarter results and provided suggestions to AIG regarding its federal securities filings that disclosed the interventions.**

Knowing that AIG was due to report a substantial loss for the third quarter on November 10, 2008, the government made the decision to announce their financial support restructuring on the same day ([US COP 2010 - pp. 138](#)) ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 53](#)). Credit agencies had notified the FRBNY that they would likely downgrade AIG in the wake of the disappointing earnings announcement and the potential for ensuing market turmoil led the FRBNY to communicate their plans earlier than they might have otherwise ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 53](#)). At 6:00am EST on November 10, 2008 the Federal Reserve Board of Governors and Treasury Department issued a press release which outlined a restructuring of financial support to AIG ([FRB and Treasury announce restructuring of financial support to AIG 2008](#)). This restructuring included purchasing \$40 billion of preferred shares in AIG using TARP funds, changes to the terms of the Revolving Credit Facility, and the introduction of ML II and ML III ([FRB and Treasury announce restructuring of financial support to AIG 2008](#)). The release describes these measures as an attempt to "establish a more durable capital structure, resolve liquidity issues, facilitate AIG's execution of its plan to sell certain of its businesses in an orderly manner, promote market stability, and protect the interests of the U.S. government and taxpayers." ([FRB and Treasury announce restructuring of financial support to AIG 2008](#)).

AIG then filed two 8-K securities filings in December 2008 to formally announce ML III's creation and implementation ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 94](#)). Although AIG retained responsibility for its own filings, the FRBNY was able to review and provide suggestions ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 101-102](#)). One comment from the FRBNY regarding the December 2008 8-K securities filings was that the Schedule A attachment, which contained counterparty and CDO deal information, be kept confidential ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 94](#)). The FRBNY's stated reasoning behind this request was that "the counterparty information was commercially sensitive for the parties involved but did not provide material information to investors, and that disclosure could hurt the ability to sell ML III assets at the highest price, potentially to the detriment of taxpayers and AIG" ([GAO-11-616 2011 - pp. 96](#)). The identities of the counterparties would prove to be particularly consequential due to their receiving par value for the CDOs, see Key Design Decision 11 for more information. According to the Government Accountability Office, the FRBNY did not believe that deal



information regarding ML III would be publicly disclosed and assured counterparties in the transaction that their identities would be kept confidential (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 95). Ultimately, the SEC granted confidential treatment for only some parts of the attachment, and the treatment ended up being inconsequential as AIG disclosed the entirety of the Schedule A attachment in its amended 8-K filing on January 29, 2010 (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 98-100).

Another example of the FRBNY influencing AIG’s securities filings occurred when the FRBNY’s outside counsel requested that the following language be removed from the December 2008 8-K filing (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 100-101). “As a result of this transaction, the AIGFP counterparties received 100 percent of the par value of the Multi-Sector CDOs sold and the related CDS have been terminated.” (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 101). The reasoning behind this change was that it mischaracterized the transaction, since the combination of previously posted collateral along with payments from ML III resulted in counterparties getting paid par value (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 101). The FRBNY’s involvement with AIG filings was indicative of the unique situation presented by ML III, where the FRBNY assumed the role of both a public institution and private market participant (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 102).

In the ensuing years, while managing ML III assets, the FRBNY was transparent in their reporting and announcements. In particular, the FRBNY provided annual audited statements detailing ML III’s holdings throughout its existence (ML III LLC: Financial Statements 2011 – pp. 4-5). Also, since ML III was consolidated on the FRBNY’s books, it’s quarterly fair value (plus normal accounting entries such as interest accruals, senior loan repayments and expenses) and the outstanding loan balance were disclosed in the weekly H.4.1 release of the Federal Reserve’s balance sheet (Maiden Lane Transactions).

### III. Evaluation

As a temporary measure meant to mitigate liquidity pressures stemming from falling multi-sector CDO values and to stop collateral calls on the related CDS contracts, ML III is seen as having succeeded in helping to stabilize AIG (Sender 2012). The counterparties also received accounting benefits from the sale of CDOs and reduced exposure to AIG credit risk (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 68). Furthermore, all associated FRBNY debts and accrued interest were repaid using proceeds from ML III asset sales for a net gain of approximately \$6.6 billion (New York Fed Sells Remainder of Maiden Lane III LLC Securities 2012). Despite these perceived gains for all parties involved, the FRBNY faced widespread criticism for deciding “against plans that would have reduced the size of its lending or increased the loan’s security” (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56). In particular, the Congressional Oversight Panel (COP)<sup>10</sup> felt that efforts taken by the FRBNY to negotiate concessions amounted to their

---

<sup>10</sup> The Congressional Oversight Panel (COP) was a standing committee established by the U.S Congress following the implementation of the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) on October 3, 2008 and was dissolved in 2011. The COP was charged with the objective to “review the current state of financial markets

“going through the motions”, citing the FRBNY’s belief that pursuing concession could lead to downgrades and expressed pessimism regarding the likelihood of their success by senior officials (US COP 2010 – pp. 148). The SIGTARP also held the FRBNY responsible for not having obtained concessions from counterparties, especially considering the discrepancies found between accounts given regarding how much of an effort had been made in the process (FCIC 2011 – pp. 378) (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 68-75).

SIGTARP officials believed that the government had treated the concessions dilemma in a manner that was inconsistent with the rest of the federal rescue (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 29-30). While Treasury and the Federal Reserve were prepared to compel the “nine largest financial institutions” to accept \$125 billion in TARP funding, it was difficult to accept that the FRBNY was unable to negotiate concessions with counterparties in the case of ML III (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 29-30). This perceived disparity led SIGTARP inspector general Neil Barofsky to conclude that

“...there is no question that the effect of FRBNY's decisions -- indeed the very design of the federal assistance to AIG - was that tens of billions of dollars of government money was funneled inexorably and directly to AIG's counterparties” (SIGTARP 2009 – pp. 30).

Academic responses to the intervention differed slightly from those reported in government assessments. Writing for the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, McDonald and Paulson assigned more responsibility to AIG for using “financing (both explicit and implicit) that was subject to termination and cash demands when asset values fell” (McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 102). The counterparties were “entitled to collect collateral as the values of the insured assets declined,” especially given their inability to unilaterally terminate the CDS contracts and reduce exposure to AIG’s risk (McDonald and Paulson 2015 – pp. 102). Others, such as William K. Sjostrom Jr., pointed to the secretive nature of the Maiden Lane III arrangements, especially with regard to the lack of concessions obtained from counterparties (Sjostrom 2015 – pp. 820).

National media responded similarly to the intervention, but with more of an acknowledgement that the government did what was necessary to “keep the system afloat” (Sender 2012). A reporter for *The New York Times* similarly wrote that “federal assistance would...essentially flow through A.I.G.to counterparties” if the economy continued to weaken (Walsh 2008).

## IV.References

Administration Agreement among Maiden Lane II LLC, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as Managing Member, and The Bank of New York Mellon, as Administrator. December 12, 2008. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/BNY\\_Mellon.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/BNY_Mellon.pdf).

---

and the regulatory system.” It was able to hold hearings, review official data, and write reports on actions taken by Treasury and financial institutions and their effect on the economy. (more information can be found [here](#))

Alvarez, Scott G., Baxter, Thomas C., and Hoyt, Robert F. “The Legal Authorities Framing the Government’s Response” (Preliminary Discussion Draft). RESPONDING to the GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS What We Did and Why We Did It. Brookings Institution. September 11–12, 2018. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/17-Legal-Prelim-Disc-Draft-2018.09.11.pdf>.

Amended and Restated Investment Management Agreement by and among Federal Reserve Bank of New York and BlackRock Financial Management, Inc. and Maiden Lane III LLC. August 23, 2010. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/markets/pdf/ml3\\_contract\\_blackrock.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/markets/pdf/ml3_contract_blackrock.pdf)

American International Group. SEC Form 10-K. 2007. <http://www.aig.com/content/dam/aig/america-canada/us/documents/investor-relations/2007-10k.pdf>.

Baxter, Jr., Thomas C. and Dahlgren, Sarah J.: The Federal Reserve Bank of New York’s Involvement with the American International Group before the Congressional Oversight Panel, House of Representatives, 111th Cong., 1 (2010). <http://www.bis.org/review/r100528e.pdf>.

Baxter Jr., Thomas C. “Testimony: Factors Affecting Efforts to Limit Payments to AIG Counterparties.” Committee on Government Oversight and Reform, U.S. House of Representatives. January 27, 2010. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/speeches/2010/bax100127.html>

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. *Federal Reserve Board and Treasury Department announce restructuring of financial support to AIG*. November 10, 2008. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/pressreleases/other20081110a.htm>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. “AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions.” Accessed November 30, 2017. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/aclf\\_terms.html](https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/aclf_terms.html).

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. “Maiden Lane III LLC: Security Offerings.” Accessed July 12, 2017. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/ml3\\_sec\\_offerings.html](https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/ml3_sec_offerings.html).

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. “Maiden Lane Transactions.” Accessed July 12, 2017. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/maidenlane.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Announces Full Repayment of its Loans to Maiden Lane and Maiden Lane III*. June 14, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120614.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Sells Remainder of Maiden Lane III LLC Securities; Marks End of AIG-Related Assistance; Approximately \$6.6 Billion Net Gain Generated for U.S. Public from the Portfolio*. August 23, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120823.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Solicits Bids for TRIAXX CDO Holdings in Maiden Lane III LLC*. May 4, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120504.html>.



Federal Reserve Bank of New York. "Vendor Information." Accessed September 10, 2019. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/aboutthefed/vendor\\_information](https://www.newyorkfed.org/aboutthefed/vendor_information).

Geithner, Timothy F. "Secretary Written Testimony before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform," U.S. Senate, Washington. January 27, 2010. <https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/tg514.aspx>.

Government Publishing Office. United States Code, Title 12, Banks and Banking. 2007. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2007-title12/pdf/USCODE-2007-title12.pdf>

Maiden Lane III LLC. "Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2010 and 2009, and Independent Auditors' Report." March 22, 2011. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual10/MLIII\\_31811.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual10/MLIII_31811.pdf)

Maiden Lane III LLC. "Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2009, and for the Period October 31, 2008 to December 31, 2008, and Independent Auditors' Report." April 21, 2010. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual09/ar09\\_MLIII\\_LL\\_C.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual09/ar09_MLIII_LL_C.pdf)

Massad, Timothy. U.S. Department of the Treasury: Treasury Notes. *INFOGRAPHIC: Overall \$182 Billion Committed to Stabilize AIG During the Financial Crisis is Now Fully Recovered*. September 11, 2012. <https://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Pages/aig-182-billion.aspx>

McDonald, Robert and Paulson, Anna. "AIG in Hindsight," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 29, no. 2 (2015): 81-105. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24292124>.

The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission. *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-FCIC/pdf/GPO-FCIC.pdf>.

Sender, Henry. "AIG: An improbable profit." *Financial Times*. October 22, 2012. <https://www.ft.com/content/bf4e37d6-1c34-11e2-a14a-00144feabdc0>.

Shortfall Agreement between Maiden Lane III LLC and AIG Financial Products Corp. November 25, 2008. <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/5272/000095012308016800/y72879exv10w2.htm>

Sjostrom Jr., William K. "Afterword to The AIG Bailout," *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.* 72, no. 2 (2015): 795-827. <http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol72/iss2/7>.

Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program. "Factors Affecting Efforts to Limit Payments to AIG Counterparties." SIGTARP-10-003, November 17, 2009. [https://www.sig tarp.gov/Audit%20Reports/Factors\\_Affecting\\_Efforts\\_to\\_Limit\\_Payments\\_to\\_AIG\\_Counterparties.pdf](https://www.sig tarp.gov/Audit%20Reports/Factors_Affecting_Efforts_to_Limit_Payments_to_AIG_Counterparties.pdf).

U.S. Congress. Congressional Oversight Panel. *June Oversight Report: The AIG Rescue, Its Impact on Markets, and the Government's Exit Strategy*. 111<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., June 10, 2010. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CPRT-111JPRT56698/pdf/CPRT-111JPRT56698.pdf>.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. *FINANCIAL CRISIS: Review of Federal Reserve System Financial Assistance to American International Group, Inc.* GAO-11-616. Washington, DC, 2011. <https://www.gao.gov/assets/590/585560.pdf>.

Walsh, Mary Williams. "A Question for A.I.G.: Where Did the Cash Go?" October 29, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/30/business/30aig.html>.

Yale Program on Financial Stability. Interview with Sarah Dahlgren, Head of Supervisory Group, Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Yale Program on Financial Stability, March 22, 2018.

## V. Key Program Documents

### Summary of Program

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. "Actions Related to AIG." Accessed February 1, 2018. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/aboutthefed/aig>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. "AIG CDO LLC Facility: Terms and Conditions." Accessed November 30, 2017. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/acf/terms.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. "Maiden Lane Transactions." Accessed July 12, 2017. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/maidenlane.html>

### Implementation Documents

Administration Agreement among Maiden Lane III LLC, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as Managing Member, and The Bank of New York Mellon, as Administrator. December 12, 2008. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/BNY\\_Mellon.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/BNY_Mellon.pdf).

Amended and Restated Investment Management Agreement by and among Federal Reserve Bank of New York and BlackRock Financial Management, Inc. and Maiden Lane III LLC. August 23, 2010. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/markets/pdf/ml3\\_contract\\_blackrock.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/markets/pdf/ml3_contract_blackrock.pdf).

American International Group. SEC Form 8-K. December 2, 2008. <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/5272/000095012308016800/0000950123-08-016800-index.htm>.

Master Investment and Credit Agreement among Maiden Lane III LLC, as Company, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as Controlling Party, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as Senior Lender, American International Group Inc., as Equity Investor, and the Bank of New York Mellon, as Collateral Agent. November 25, 2008.

<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/5272/000095012308016800/y72879exv10w1.htm>.<sup>11</sup>

ShortFall Agreement between Maiden Lane III LLC and AIG Financial Products Corp. November 25, 2008.

<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/5272/000095012308016800/y72879exv10w2.htm>

### **Legal/Regulatory Guidance**

Government Publishing Office. United States Code, Title 12, Banks and Banking. 2007.

<https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2007-title12/pdf/USCODE-2007-title12.pdf>

### **Press Releases/Announcements**

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. *Federal Reserve Board and Treasury Department announce restructuring of financial support to AIG*. November 10, 2008. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/pressreleases/other20081110a.htm>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. "Maiden Lane III LLC: Security Offerings." Accessed July 12, 2017. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/ml3\\_sec\\_offerings.html](https://www.newyorkfed.org/markets/ml3_sec_offerings.html).

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Announces Full Repayment of its Loans to Maiden Lane and Maiden Lane III*. June 14, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120614.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Sells Remainder of Maiden Lane III LLC Securities; Marks End of AIG-Related Assistance; Approximately \$6.6 Billion Net Gain Generated for U.S. Public from the Portfolio*. August 23, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120823.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Solicits Bids for MAX CDO Holdings in Maiden Lane III LLC*. April 18, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120418.html>.

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. *New York Fed Solicits Bids for TRIAXX CDO Holdings in Maiden Lane III LLC*. May 4, 2012. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/news/markets/2012/an120504.html>.

### **Media Stories**

Alloway, Tracy, Demos, Telis, and Bullock, Nicole. "Fed to auction more Maiden Lane III CDOs." *Financial Times*. May 4, 2012. <https://www.ft.com/content/3ee42968-95fa-11e1-a6a0-00144feab49a>.

---

<sup>11</sup> YPFS is currently attempting to source the Maiden Lane III LLC Security Agreement

Bullock, Nicole and Alloway, Tracy. "Hunt for high yields bolsters Maiden Lane III." *Financial Times*. May 2, 2012. <https://www.ft.com/content/8fc29e22-9466-11e1-8e90-00144feab49a>.

Mackenzie, Michael and Braithwaite, Tom. "New York Fed eyes Maiden Lane III sale." *Financial Times*. April 4, 2012. <https://www.ft.com/content/464b8e1a-7e82-11e1-b7e7-00144feab49a>.

Sender, Henry. "AIG: An improbable profit." *Financial Times*. October 22, 2012. <https://www.ft.com/content/bf4e37d6-1c34-11e2-a14a-00144feabdc0>.

Walsh, Mary Williams. "A Question for A.I.G.: Where Did the Cash Go?." *The New York Times*. October 29, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/10/30/business/30aig.html>.

### **Key Academic Papers**

McDonald, Robert and Paulson, Anna. "AIG in Hindsight," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 29, no. 2 (2015): 81-105. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24292124>.

Sjostrom Jr., William K. "Afterword to The AIG Bailout," *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.* 72, no. 2 (2015): 795-827. <http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol72/iss2/7>.

Sjostrom Jr., William K. "The AIG Bailout," *Wash. & Lee L. Rev.* 66, no. 3 (2009): 944-991. <http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=wlulr>.

Wiggins, Rosalind and Metrick, Andrew. 2015. "The Federal Reserve's Financial Crisis Response: Lending & Credit Programs – American International Group." YPFS Case Study 2015-XB-v1. Yale Program on Financial Stability, Yale University.

### **Reports/Assessments**

Alvarez, Scott G., Baxter, Thomas C., and Hoyt, Robert F. "The Legal Authorities Framing the Government's Response" (Preliminary Discussion Draft). RESPONDING to the GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS What We Did and Why We Did It. Brookings Institution. September 11–12, 2018. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/17-Legal-Prelim-Disc-Draft-2018.09.11.pdf>.

American International Group. SEC Form 10-K. 2007. <http://www.aig.com/content/dam/aig/america-canada/us/documents/investor-relations/2007-10k.pdf>.

Baxter, Jr., Thomas C. and Dahlgren, Sarah J.: The Federal Reserve Bank of New York's Involvement with the American International Group before the Congressional Oversight Panel, House of Representatives, 111th Cong., 1 (2010). <http://www.bis.org/review/r100528e.pdf>.

Baxter Jr., Thomas C. "Testimony: Factors Affecting Efforts to Limit Payments to AIG Counterparties." Committee on Government Oversight and Reform, U.S. House of Representatives. January 27, 2010. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/newsevents/speeches/2010/bax100127.html>

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. "Periodic Report Pursuant to Section 129(b) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008: Update on Outstanding Lending Facilities Authorized by the Board Under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act." December 29, 2008.  
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/files/129periodicupdate.pdf>.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. "Periodic Report Pursuant to Section 129(b) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008: Update on Outstanding Lending Facilities Authorized by the Board Under Section 13(3) of the Federal Reserve Act." February 25, 2009.  
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/files/129periodicupdate02252009.pdf>.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. "Report Pursuant to Section 129 of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008: Restructuring of the Government's Financial Support to the American International Group." November 10, 2008.  
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/files/129aigrestructure.pdf>.

Congressional Research Services. *Ongoing Government Assistance for American International Group (AIG)*, by Baird Webel. Report 7-5700. Washington, D.C., March 18, 2010.  
[https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20100318\\_R40438\\_ba7ad3756e59f0f05d5f8fde6dbbad70e99cd859.pdf](https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20100318_R40438_ba7ad3756e59f0f05d5f8fde6dbbad70e99cd859.pdf).

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. "Vendor Information." Accessed September 10, 2019.  
[https://www.newyorkfed.org/aboutthefed/vendor\\_information](https://www.newyorkfed.org/aboutthefed/vendor_information).

Geithner, Timothy F. "Secretary Written Testimony before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform," U.S. Senate, Washington. January 27, 2010.  
<https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/tg514.aspx>.

Kohn, Donald. L. "Testimony on American International Group Before the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs," U.S. Senate, Washington. March 5, 2009.  
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/testimony/kohn20090305a.html>.

Maiden Lane III LLC. "Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2010 and 2009, and Independent Auditors' Report." March 22, 2011.  
[https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual10/MLIII\\_31811.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual10/MLIII_31811.pdf)

Maiden Lane III LLC. "Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, and Independent Auditors' Report." March 20, 2012.  
[https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual11/AR\\_ML\\_III\\_2011\\_Financial\\_Statements.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual11/AR_ML_III_2011_Financial_Statements.pdf)

Maiden Lane III LLC. "Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2012 and 2011, and Independent Auditors' Report." March 14, 2013.  
[https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual12/AR\\_ML\\_III\\_2012\\_Financial\\_Statements.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual12/AR_ML_III_2012_Financial_Statements.pdf)

Maiden Lane III LLC. "Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended December 31, 2013 and 2012, and Independent Auditors' Report." March 14, 2014.

[https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual13/AR\\_ML\\_III\\_2013\\_Financial\\_Statements.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual13/AR_ML_III_2013_Financial_Statements.pdf)

Maiden Lane III LLC. “Financial Statements for the Period October 31, 2008 to December 31, 2008, and Independent Auditors’ Report.” April 2, 2009. <https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual08/MaidenLaneIIIinstmt2009.pdf>

Maiden Lane III LLC. “Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 2009, and for the Period October 31, 2008 to December 31, 2008, and Independent Auditors’ Report.” April 21, 2010. [https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual09/ar09\\_MLIII\\_LLC.pdf](https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/aboutthefed/annual/annual09/ar09_MLIII_LLC.pdf)

Massad, Timothy. U.S. Department of the Treasury: Treasury Notes. *INFOGRAPHIC: Overall \$182 Billion Committed to Stabilize AIG During the Financial Crisis is Now Fully Recovered*. September 11, 2012. <https://www.treasury.gov/connect/blog/Pages/aig-182-billion.aspx>

Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program. “AIG Remains in TARP as TARP’s Largest Investment.” Quarterly Report to Congress, July 25, 2012. [https://www.sig tarp.gov/Audit%20Reports/AIG\\_Remains\\_in\\_TARP\\_Mini\\_Book.pdf](https://www.sig tarp.gov/Audit%20Reports/AIG_Remains_in_TARP_Mini_Book.pdf).

Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program. “Factors Affecting Efforts to Limit Payments to AIG Counterparties.” SIGTARP-10-003, November 17, 2009. [https://www.sig tarp.gov/Audit%20Reports/Factors\\_Affecting\\_Efforts\\_to\\_Limit\\_Payments\\_to\\_AIG\\_Counterparties.pdf](https://www.sig tarp.gov/Audit%20Reports/Factors_Affecting_Efforts_to_Limit_Payments_to_AIG_Counterparties.pdf).

Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program. “Statement of Neil Barofsky Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program.” Quarterly Report to Congress, July 25, 2012. [https://www.sig tarp.gov/Testimony/Testimony%20Before%20the%20House%20Committee%20on%20Appropriations%20Subcommittee%20on%20Financial%20Services%20and%20General%20Government\\_4\\_22\\_2010.pdf](https://www.sig tarp.gov/Testimony/Testimony%20Before%20the%20House%20Committee%20on%20Appropriations%20Subcommittee%20on%20Financial%20Services%20and%20General%20Government_4_22_2010.pdf).

The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission. *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-FCIC/pdf/GPO-FCIC.pdf>.

U.S. Congress. “AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL GROUP’S IMPACT ON THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER FEDERAL INTERVENTION.” Serial No. 111-15. Washington, DC, March 18, 2009. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-111hhrg48868/pdf/CHRG-111hhrg48868.pdf>.

U.S. Congress. Congressional Oversight Panel. *June Oversight Report: The AIG Rescue, Its Impact on Markets, and the Government’s Exit Strategy*. 111<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., June 10, 2010. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CPRT-111JPRT56698/pdf/CPRT-111JPRT56698.pdf>.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. *FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM: Opportunities Exist to Strengthen Policies and Processes for Managing Emergency Assistance*. GAO-11-696. Washington, DC, 2011. <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d11696.pdf>.



U.S. Government Accountability Office. *FINANCIAL CRISIS: Review of Federal Reserve System Financial Assistance to American International Group, Inc.* GAO-11-616. Washington, DC, 2011. <https://www.gao.gov/assets/590/585560.pdf>.

Yale Program on Financial Stability. Interview with Sarah Dahlgren, Head of Supervisory Group, Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Yale Program on Financial Stability, March 22, 2018.

## Appendix A: Alternative SPV Structures

Before implementing the as-adopted structure of Maiden Lane III, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY) considered two additional options to relieve liquidity and downgrade pressures stemming from counterparties' mounting collateral calls (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56). While FRBNY chose against designing the intervention in a way that would have “reduced the size of lending or increased the loan’s security,” it was of utmost importance that a viable program be launched as quickly as possible (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 56). Both alternative SPV structures described below were ultimately deemed too complex to execute properly in light of the time constraints (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 63).

Per the alternative ‘three-tiered’ structure, CDOs would have been transferred to the SPV in exchange for the cancellation of CDS contracts (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59). The program would have been financed by an FRBNY senior loan and an equity contribution from AIG, as well as loans from AIGFP counterparties in the form of a collective mezzanine note (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59). Counterparties would thus have received less than par for the CDOs, despite being allowed to retain collateral previously posted (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59). However, this additional contribution would have provided an additional layer of security against potential losses and may have allowed FRBNY to reduce the size of its senior loan to ML III (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 59-60). Such a benefit would have depended on the size of the mezzanine note and counterparties' willingness to participate fully (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60).

The most important advantage of the three-tiered structure over other options considered was the possibility of the mezzanine note and, therefore, a smaller FRBNY senior loan (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61). This was particularly significant because although the CDO market was still volatile, any losses beyond AIG’s \$5 billion equity contribution would be covered by counterparties (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61). However, negotiations with counterparties regarding the pricing of individual securities and subsequent distribution of potential losses would have been extremely complicated and could have taken a year or longer to work out (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61). Moreover, rating agencies might have had to rate the collective mezzanine notes issued by ML III to counterparties, further delaying the negotiation process (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61). Aside from the expediency issue, though, FRBNY was mainly concerned that entering into ongoing lending relationships with counterparties under its authority could cause future conflicts of interest (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61).

The second alternative considered, referred to as the ‘novation’ structure, would have provided for the transfer of CDS contracts, rather than CDOs, to ML III (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60). CDS protection would therefore remain on counterparties' CDOs and be paid out by ML III rather than by AIG (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60). In accordance with the original agreements, premium payments would be made to ML III, and counterparties would receive future CDS payouts only in the event of a negative credit event (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60). The SPV would be jointly funded by an FRBNY guarantee, an AIG equity contribution, and collateral previously posted to counterparties by AIG and remitted to ML III (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 60). When compared to the as-adopted structure, the novation design could have reduced payments made by ML III to counterparties (GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61).



However, this alternative faced complex legal and logistical issues ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61-62](#)). FRBNY officials concluded that they did not have the authority to implement such a structure because the guarantee would not have met the Federal Reserve System’s requirement to lend against assets of value ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 61-62](#)). Counterparties would also have had to consent to the remission of their collateral to ML III, an action that required coordination and agreement across counterparties ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62](#)). Additionally, this model could have caused concern among ratings agencies and created a further drain of liquidity from the financial system ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62](#)). Lastly, this intervention would neither have addressed the volatile CDO values nor allowed for any potential investment gains to accrue to the government in the way that the as-adopted structure had ([GAO-11-616 2011 – pp. 62](#)).