

ATTACHMENT A

STATEMENT OF FACTS

This Statement of Facts is incorporated by reference as part of the non-prosecution agreement, dated July 6, 2012, between the United States Department of Justice, Criminal Division, Fraud Section (the “Department”) and The NORDAM Group, Inc., its subsidiaries, and affiliates (“NORDAM” or the “Company”). The Department and the Company agree that, at all relevant times, the following facts are true and correct:

1. NORDAM is headquartered in Tulsa, Oklahoma, incorporated in Delaware, and thus a “domestic concern,” as that term is used in the FCPA, Title 15, United States Code, Section 78dd-2(h)(1)(B). NORDAM is in the business of designing and manufacturing aircraft parts and providing maintenance, repair, and overhaul (“MRO”) services to customers in the United States and abroad, including in China. NORDAM’s customers in China include state-owned and -controlled entities, including airlines created, controlled, and exclusively owned by the People’s Republic of China.

2. NORDAM Singapore Pte Ltd. (“NSPL”) is registered in Singapore and is a wholly owned subsidiary of NORDAM. NORDAM provides MRO services to customers in the Asia Pacific region, including in China, primarily through NSPL.

3. World Aviation Associates Pte Ltd. (“WAAPL”) is registered in Singapore and is an affiliate of NORDAM. WAAPL performs marketing and sales services for both NORDAM and NSPL in the Asia Pacific region, including in China.

4. From 1999 until 2008, employees at NSPL and WAAPL paid bribes to employees of state-owned and -controlled entities in China in order to obtain or retain MRO business with those customers. Several NORDAM employees in the United States were made aware of and

approved these bribes. The bribes were referred to internally as “commissions” or “facilitator fees.” The facilitator fees were paid to “facilitators” who, in fact, were employees of customers. These facilitators were also referred to internally as “internal guys,” “internal ghosts,” or “our friends inside.”

5. The facilitator fees either were paid directly to the customer’s employee by wire transferring money to the employee’s bank account or were paid indirectly by first depositing the money into the personal bank accounts of WAAPL employees, who would then withdraw all or a portion of these fees to pay the customer employees in cash.

6. In or about 2002, in an effort to further disguise the payments to customer employees, three WAAPL employees created fictitious entities and entered into sales representation agreements with those entities. The commissions that NORDAM paid to these fictitious entities were used, at least in part, to pay employees of customers to assist in securing contracts for NORDAM and NSPL.

7. Although many of the bribe payments were paid out of NORDAM’s and NSPL’s gross profits, in some instances NORDAM, NSPL, and WAAPL artificially inflated the customer invoice to offset the bribes paid to those customers’ employees. As a result, in these instances, NORDAM’s customers were unknowingly reimbursing NORDAM for the bribes that NORDAM paid to customer employees to secure the projects.

8. On or about April 22, 2004, a NORDAM employee sent an e-mail to two WAAPL employees, stating, “[d]o what you have to do to get the business. If that means using an agent, then let’s make sure we are discrete when communicating the information in trip reports. I agree . . . that we should not require an agent at every account, however, I also understand the reality of doing business in Asia. I trust your judgment, it is your call.”

9. On or about December 30, 2004, an agent of WAAPL sent an e-mail to a NORDAM employee and two WAAPL employees, stating, “[o]n this deal we also need to cover our friends inside.”

10. On or about December 30, 2004, the NORDAM employee responded to the e-mail described in Paragraph 9, stating, “I don’t see where our friends have done anything to help us here. If our friends can help us, I will agree to split 50/50 with you any amount we get over \$160K.”

11. In all, NORDAM, NSPL, and WAAPL paid as high as \$1.5 million in bribes to secure roughly \$2.48 million in profits from state-owned and controlled customers in China.