

Hearing Date: May 14, 2019, at 10:00 a.m. (prevailing Eastern Time)
Objection Deadline: May 7, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern Time)

Stephen E. Hessler, P.C.
Marc Kieselstein, P.C.
Cristine Pirro Schwarzman
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

James H.M. Sprayregen, P.C.
Ross M. Kwasteniet, P.C. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Brad Weiland (admitted *pro hac vice*)
John R. Luze (admitted *pro hac vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP
300 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re:)	
)	Chapter 11
WINDSTREAM HOLDINGS, INC., <i>et al.</i> , ¹)	Case No. 19-22312 (RDD)
)	
Debtors.)	(Jointly Administered)
)	

**NOTICE OF DEBTORS' MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER
APPROVING THE DEBTORS' KEY EMPLOYEE RETENTION PLAN**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 23, 2019, the above captioned debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the "Debtors") filed the *Debtors' Motion for Entry of an Order Approving the Debtors' Key Employee Retention Plan* (the "Motion"). A hearing (the "Hearing") on the Motion will be held before the Honorable Robert D. Drain, United States Bankruptcy Judge, United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, 300 Quarropas Street, White Plains, New York 10601, on **May 14, 2019, at 10:00 a.m. (prevailing Eastern Time)**.

¹ The last four digits of Debtor Windstream Holdings, Inc.'s tax identification number are 7717. Due to the large number of Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, for which joint administration has been granted, a complete list of the debtor entities and the last four digits of their federal tax identification numbers is not provided herein. A complete list of such information may be obtained on the website of the Debtors' claims and noticing agent at <http://www.kccllc.net/windstream>. The location of the Debtors' service address for purposes of these chapter 11 cases is: 4001 North Rodney Parham Road, Little Rock, Arkansas 72212.



PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that any responses or objections to the relief requested in the Motion shall: (a) be in writing; (b) conform to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, the Local Bankruptcy Rules for the Southern District of New York, all General Orders applicable to chapter 11 cases in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, and the *Final Order Establishing Certain Notice, Case Management, and Administrative Procedures* [Docket No. 392] (the “Case Management Order”) approved by the Court; (c) be filed electronically with the Court on the docket of *In re Windstream Holdings, Inc.*, Case 19-22312 (RDD) by registered users of the Court’s electronic filing system and in accordance with the General Order M-399 (which is available on the Court’s website at <http://www.nysb.uscourts.gov>); and (d) be served so as to be actually received by **May 7, 2019, at 4:00 p.m., prevailing Eastern Time**, by (i) the entities on the Master Service List (as defined in the Case Management Order and available on the Debtors’ case website at <http://www.kcellc.net/windstream>) and (ii) any person or entity with a particularized interest in the subject matter of the Motion.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that if no Objections are timely filed and served with respect to the Motion, the Debtors shall, on or after the Objection Deadline, submit to the Court an order substantially in the form annexed as **Exhibit A** to the Motion, which order the Court may enter with no further notice or opportunity to be heard.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the Hearing may be continued or adjourned thereafter from time to time without further notice other than an announcement of the adjourned date or dates at the Hearing. The Debtors will file an agenda before the Hearing, which may modify or supplement the Motion to be heard at the Hearing.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that a copy of the Motion may be obtained free of charge by visiting the website of Kurtzman Carson Consultants LLC at <http://www.kccllc.net/windstream>. You may also obtain copies of any pleadings by visiting the Court's website at <http://www.nysb.uscourts.gov> in accordance with the procedures and fees set forth therein.

Dated: April 23, 2019
White Plains, New York

/s/ Stephen E. Hessler

Stephen E. Hessler, P.C.

Marc Kieselstein, P.C.

Cristine Pirro Schwarzman

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

601 Lexington Avenue

New York, New York 10022

Telephone: (212) 446-4800

Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

- and -

James H.M. Sprayregen, P.C.

Ross M. Kwasteniet, P.C. (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Brad Weiland (admitted *pro hac vice*)

John R. Luze (admitted *pro hac vice*)

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

300 North LaSalle Street

Chicago, Illinois 60654

Telephone: (312) 862-2000

Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

Stephen E. Hessler, P.C.
Marc Kieselstein, P.C.
Cristine Pirro Schwarzman
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

James H.M. Sprayregen, P.C.
Ross M. Kwasteniet, P.C. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Brad Weiland (admitted *pro hac vice*)
John R. Luze (admitted *pro hac vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP
300 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re:)	
)	Chapter 11
WINDSTREAM HOLDINGS, INC., <i>et al.</i> , ¹)	Case No. 19-22312 (RDD)
)	
Debtors.)	(Jointly Administered)
)	

**DEBTORS' MOTION FOR ENTRY OF AN ORDER
APPROVING THE DEBTORS' KEY EMPLOYEE RETENTION PLAN**

Windstream Holdings, Inc. and its debtor affiliates as debtors and debtors in possession in the above-captioned chapter 11 cases (collectively, the "Debtors") respectfully state the following in support of this motion:

Introduction

1. The Debtors' employees are instrumental to the success of their business and day-to-day operations. Further, since the commencement of these chapter 11 cases, many employees have been forced to undertake tasks beyond the scope of their usual prepetition work.

¹ The last four digits of Debtor Windstream Holdings, Inc.'s tax identification number are 7717. Due to the large number of Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, for which joint administration has been granted, a complete list of the debtor entities and the last four digits of their federal tax identification numbers is not provided herein. A complete list of such information may be obtained on the website of the Debtors' claims and noticing agent at <http://www.kccllc.net/windstream>. The location of the Debtors' service address for purposes of these chapter 11 cases is: 4001 North Rodney Parham Road, Little Rock, Arkansas 72212.

The Debtors must retain employees who are integral to the Debtors' ongoing business operations to preserve and maximize value during these chapter 11 cases, successfully complete their restructuring, and emerge on a timely basis from chapter 11. By this motion, the Debtors seek approval of a key employee retention program (the "KERP"), which is necessary for the Debtors to maintain stability in their operations and maintain enterprise value and is consistent with retention programs in similar chapter 11 cases.

2. The KERP provides for payment of cash awards to certain of the Debtors' non-insider employees. No potential KERP participant is an insider (as defined in the Bankruptcy Code), but instead play vital rank-and-file functions for the Debtors' businesses. These employees perform essential accounting, cash management, IT infrastructure, legal, human resources, and facilities oversight and maintenance functions for the Debtors. The departure of any of the KERP participants during these chapter 11 cases would disrupt ongoing operations at an important phase in the Debtors' restructuring process. As a result, the Debtors believe implementation of the KERP is necessary and appropriate to avoid costly disruptions.

3. Since March 2019, the Debtors have been working with their advisors, including Willis Towers Watson US LLC ("Willis Towers Watson"), an independent compensation consultant, to evaluate the Debtors' retention and incentive programs. As part of this review process, the Debtors, their advisors, and the compensation committee of the Debtors' board of directors reviewed market data and analyses regarding compensation levels and program structure. In light of the Debtors' circumstances and their restructuring process, the Debtors and the compensation committee (in consultation with their advisors) concluded that implementation of the KERP was appropriate and necessary under the circumstances. The KERP contemplates retention payments made in two installments to each of the KERP participants with an aggregate

approximate cost of \$5,000,000 in 2019. The participants in the KERP will be determined by the Debtors' president and chief executive officer at a later date, with participation and allocations determined in accordance with the guidelines described in this motion.

4. The Debtors and their advisors have engaged with their key stakeholders and the Office of the United States Trustee regarding the KERP, including through diligence, conferences, and ongoing dialogue. The Debtors have provided information to these constituencies and responded to follow-up inquiries, including regarding program design, cost, and the financial metrics and targets necessary to obtain payouts under the program. The Debtors intend to continue these efforts to build consensus around this important program ahead of this Court's hearing on May 14, 2019 on the relief requested herein.

5. The KERP complies with the applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, is similar to plans recently approved in chapter 11 cases, is justified by the facts and circumstances of these cases, and is within the Debtors' sound and reasonable business judgment. For these reasons and the reasons set forth below, the Debtors respectfully request the Court enter an order authorizing the Debtors to implement the KERP.

Relief Requested

6. By this motion, the Debtors seek entry of an order, substantially in the form attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, approving the KERP. In support of the motion, the Debtors submit the declaration of Drew Smith, the Debtors' senior vice president of financial planning and assistant treasurer, and the declaration of Zachary P. Georgeson, senior consulting director at Willis Towers Watson, both filed contemporaneously with this motion.

Jurisdiction and Venue

7. The United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the *Amended Standing*

Order of Reference from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, dated February 1, 2012. The Debtors confirm their consent, pursuant to rule 7008 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”), to the entry of a final order by the Court in connection with this motion to the extent that it is later determined that the Court, absent consent of the parties, cannot enter final orders or judgments in connection herewith consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution.

8. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

9. The bases for the relief requested herein are sections 105(a), 363(b), and 503(c) of title 11 of the United States Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”) and Bankruptcy Rule 6004.

Background

10. The Debtors are a leading provider of advanced network communications and technology solutions for businesses across the United States. The Debtors also offer broadband, entertainment and security solutions to consumers and small businesses primarily in rural areas in 18 states. Additionally, the Debtors supply core transport solutions on a local and long-haul fiber network spanning approximately 150,000 miles and have over 11,000 employees.

11. On February 25, 2019 (the “Petition Date”), each of the Debtors filed a voluntary petition for relief under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. A detailed description of certain facts and circumstances surrounding these chapter 11 cases is set forth in the *Declaration of Tony Thomas, Chief Executive Officer and President of Windstream Holdings, Inc., (I) in Support of Debtors’ Chapter 11 Petitions and First Day Motions and (II) Pursuant to Local Bankruptcy Rule 1007-2* [Docket No. 27], filed on the Petition Date.

12. The Debtors’ chapter 11 cases have been consolidated for procedural purposes only and are being jointly administered pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 1015(b) [Docket No. 56]. The Debtors continue to operate their business and manage their property as debtors in possession

pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. On March 12, 2019, the United States Trustee for the Southern District of New York appointed a creditors' committee pursuant to section 1102 of the Bankruptcy Code [Docket No. 136].

The Key Employee Retention Program

I. The KERP Participants.

13. Certain of the Debtors' employees may be motivated to leave the Debtors' employ during the pendency of these chapter 11 cases due to, among other things, the uncertainty created by the Debtors' ongoing reorganization efforts. The potential KERP participants perform a variety of important business functions for the Debtors that are vital to the Debtors' ability to preserve and enhance stakeholder value. Many of the potential KERP participants have developed valuable institutional knowledge regarding the Debtors' business operations that would be difficult and expensive to replace on an expedited basis, and could very well slow the Debtors' ability to emerge from chapter 11 on a timely basis. Moreover, the potential KERP participants have provided important support to the Debtors' advisors in meeting the additional demands imposed by chapter 11.

14. Given the demands placed upon the potential KERP participants during these chapter 11 cases, the Debtors believe that it is appropriate to make retention payments. Unless the Debtors provide compensation designed to motivate employees to remain with the Debtors throughout the reorganization process, employee attrition could result in costly disruptions to the Debtors' operations. The Debtors respectfully submit that the KERP will increase the likelihood that these key employees are properly motivated to remain with the Debtors during the restructuring process, thereby preserving value for the Debtors, their estates, their creditors, and other parties in interest.

15. Although certain of the potential KERP participants have titles incorporating the word “director,” “vice president,” or “chief,” no KERP participant is an “insider” of the Debtors. Specifically, the KERP participants do not include any employee who: (a) is appointed or hired directly by the Debtors’ board of directors; (b) exercises managerial control over, or has responsibility for, the Debtors’ operations as a whole; or (c) directs the Debtors’ overall corporate policy or governance.

II. The Retention Program.

16. Due to the importance of the KERP participants to the success of the Debtors’ businesses, the Debtors, together with their advisors, worked to develop a retention program designed to offer competitive, fair compensation that would motivate the KERP participants to remain with the Debtors through the duration of their reorganization. Under the proposed program, KERP participants will receive two payments that vest ratably over one year, with 50% on the six-month anniversary and 50% on the one-year anniversary following execution of an award agreement. As noted above, the proposed KERP will not exceed \$5,000,000 in the aggregate.

17. The key terms of the KERP are summarized as follows:

- ***Eligible Participants:*** The KERP awards will be provided to select non-insiders that may be high retention risk and/or essential to the ongoing operations.
- ***KERP Awards:*** KERP awards represent fixed cash amounts payable in two installments based on continued employment of the participant through the applicable payment dates (except as provided below).
- ***Payment Dates:*** 50% of each participant’s KERP payment will be paid six months following the effective date of the award agreement, with the remaining 50% paid twelve months following the effective date.
- ***Allocation:*** The Debtors expect to immediately allocate approximately \$3,500,000 to 4,000,000 and reserve the remainder of the \$5,000,000 for reactive needs that develop. In no circumstance will an individual receive an award over the amount of \$250,000. In determining which employees will receive KERP grants, the Debtors’ management team will consider (1) high

retention risk and/or essential to ongoing operations, (2) key sales personnel, and (3) employees with a heavier workload due to the bankruptcy cases.

- **Termination of Employment:** If a participant's employment is terminated by the Debtors without "cause" or due to death or disability, any then unpaid portion of the KERP payment will be accelerated and paid. If a KERP Participant's employment is terminated voluntarily or by the Debtors for cause, any remaining unpaid portion of the KERP payment will be forfeited.

18. The KERP supplements certain non-insider, ordinary course retention bonus payments that the Debtors allocated prepetition to certain employees.² The Debtors do not anticipate that these employees will participate in the KERP, although they should not be disqualified from future participation should their circumstances change.

19. Under the KERP, the Debtors' senior management team would have discretion to determine the amounts of KERP grants within certain specified ranges. These ranges are based on seniority level existing bonus allocation practices. A summary of average minimum, mid-range, and maximum³ KERP awards for each seniority level is below:

Non-Insider Group	Average Salary	Average Min KERP Award	Average Mid KERP Award	Average Max KERP Award
EVP	\$314,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$200,000
SVP	\$279,905	\$80,000	\$110,000	\$140,000
VP	\$195,716	\$40,000	\$60,000	\$80,000
Senior Directors, Sales VPs	\$160,415	\$15,000	\$22,500	\$30,000
Directors, Sales Directors	\$137,498	\$10,000	\$17,500	\$25,000

² The Debtors intend to honor the prepetition non-insider retention allocations in the ordinary course of business consistent with the relief granted by the Court in the *Final Order Authorizing the Debtors to (I) Pay Prepetition Employee Wages, Salaries, Other Compensation, and Reimbursable Employee Expenses and (II) Continue Employee Benefits Programs* [Docket No. 378].

³ Notwithstanding these ranges, as referenced above, no KERP bonus will exceed \$250,000.

Non-Insider Group	Average Salary	Average Min KERP Award	Average Mid KERP Award	Average Max KERP Award
Sales Individual Contributors	\$71,962	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$30,000
Individual Contributors & Staff Managers	\$107,571	\$6,000	\$8,000	\$10,000
Others (Non-Bonus Eligible)	NA	\$1,000	\$5,500	\$10,000

III. Reasonableness of the KERP.

20. As set forth in the Georgeson declaration, the Debtors and their advisors reviewed the KERP to determine whether the design, structure, and cost of the KERP is reasonable and consistent with market practice. The Debtors designed the KERP keeping in mind their goals of maximizing the value of their estates for the benefit of all interested parties and ensuring that their operations are conducted in an effective and stable manner through emergence from chapter 11.

21. The Debtors worked closely with their advisors to ensure that the KERP is reasonable compared with postpetition retention plans implemented in other chapter 11 cases. In particular, and as set forth in more detail in the Georgeson declaration, personnel from Willis Towers Watson analyzed comparable non-insider retention plans approved in recent chapter 11 cases. Willis Towers Watson benchmarked comparable retention plans from select chapter 11 cases of sixteen different companies that filed petitions from 2014 through 2018 with pre-petition annual revenues greater than approximately \$1.5 billion. Based on this review of comparable retention plans, the Debtors believe that the total cost of the KERP is reasonable relative to market comparables.

22. The Debtors submit that the award opportunities in the KERP reflect a reasonable, market-based approach and are justified under the circumstances of these chapter 11 cases.

Further, the KERP's total cost of \$5,000,000 is reasonable in absolute terms when compared to the aggregate costs of key employee plans approved in other chapter 11 cases.

Basis for Relief

I. The KERP Is a Sound Exercise of the Debtors' Business Judgment.

23. The Debtors' implementation of the KERP is a sound exercise of their business judgment. Section 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that a debtor "after notice and a hearing may use, sell or lease, other than in the ordinary course of business, property of the estate." 11 U.S.C. § 363(b)(1). To approve the use of estate property under section 363(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code, a debtor must show that the decision to use the property outside of the ordinary course of business was based on the debtor's business judgment. *See, e.g., In re Chateaugay Corp.*, 973 F.2d 141, 143 (2d Cir. 1992) (holding that a judge determining a 363(b) application must find a good business reason to grant such application); *see also In re Lionel Corp.*, 722 F.2d 1063, 1070 (2d Cir. 1983) (requiring "some articulated business justification" to approve the use, sale or lease of property outside the ordinary course of business); *In re Glob. Crossing Ltd.*, 295 B.R. 726, 743 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2003); *In re Ionosphere Clubs, Inc.*, 100 B.R. 670, 675 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1989) (noting that the standard for determining a Section 363(b) motion is "a good business reason"); *In re Borders Grp., Inc.*, 453 B.R. at 473 ("In approving a transaction conducted pursuant to section 363(b)(1), courts consider whether the debtor exercised sound business judgment.").

24. Once a debtor articulates a valid business justification, the law vests the debtor's decision to use property outside of the ordinary course of business with a strong presumption that "in making a business decision the directors of a corporation acted on an informed basis, in good faith and in the honest belief that the action was taken in the best interests of the company." *In re Integrated Res., Inc.*, 147 B.R. 650, 656 (S.D.N.Y. 1992) (citations and internal quotations omitted), *appeal dismissed*, 3 F.3d 49 (2d Cir. 1993); *see also In re Johns-Manville Corp.*, 60 B.R.

612, 615–16 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1986) (a “presumption of reasonableness attaches to a debtor’s management decisions” and courts will generally not entertain objections to the debtor’s conduct after a reasonable basis is set forth). Thus, if a debtor’s actions satisfy the business judgment rule, then the transaction in question should be approved under section 363(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code.

25. The implementation of the KERP is a proper exercise of the Debtors’ business judgment and is in the best interests of their estates and the interests of all stakeholders in these chapter 11 cases. The potential KERP participants—along with their skills, knowledge, and hard work—are critical to ensuring that the Debtors continue to maximize stakeholder value. The potential KERP participants are familiar with the Debtors’ businesses and have the experience and knowledge necessary to ensure the Debtors’ continued operations during the chapter 11 cases. Indeed, the potential KERP participants have already played a vital role in the Debtors’ smooth operations during these chapter 11 cases. The Debtors cannot easily replace the potential KERP participants without adversely affecting the Debtors’ operating efficiency and distracting management from the Debtors’ restructuring efforts. Accordingly, the Debtors’ decision to implement the KERP is a valid exercise of business judgment and in the best interest of the Debtors, their estates, and all parties in interest in these chapter 11 cases.

II. The KERP Is Justified by the Facts and Circumstances of these Chapter 11 Cases.

26. Section 503(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code permits payments to a debtor’s employees outside the ordinary course of business if such payments are justified by “the facts and circumstances of the case.” 11 U.S.C. § 503(c)(3). Importantly, section 503(c)(3)’s “facts and circumstances” justification test “creates a standard no different than the business judgment standard under section 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code.” *In re Velo Holdings, Inc.*, 472 B.R. 201, 209 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2012); *In re Borders Grp. Inc.*, 453 B.R. 459, 473–74 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.

2011) (evaluating debtors' KERP under business judgment rule); *In re Dana Corp.*, 358 B.R. 567, 576–77 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006) (describing six factors that courts may consider when determining whether the structure of a compensation proposal meets the “sound business judgment test” in accordance with section 503(c)(3) of the Bankruptcy Code). Accordingly, whether a retention plan is justified by the facts and circumstances of the case and the analysis of whether the approval of such plan is a sound exercise of the debtor's business judgment are the same.

27. In the context of approving compensation programs, courts in the Second Circuit have considered the factors identified in *In re Dana Corp.*, when determining if a compensation proposal and the process for developing it meet the “sound business judgment” test:

- Is there a reasonable relationship between the plan proposed and the results to be obtained, *i.e.*, will the key employee stay for as long as it takes for the debtor to reorganize or market its assets?
- Is the cost of the plan reasonable in the context of the debtor's assets, liabilities, and earning potential?
- Is the scope of the plan fair and reasonable: does it apply to all employees, or if not, does it discriminate unfairly?
- Is the plan or proposal consistent with industry standards?
- What were the due diligence efforts of the debtor in investigating the need for a plan, analyzing which key employees need to be incentivized, what is available, and what is generally applicable in a particular industry?
- Did the debtor receive independent counsel in performing due diligence and in creating and authorizing the incentive compensation?

In re Dana Corp., 358 B.R. at 576–77 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2006); *see e.g.*, *In re Residential Capital, LLC*, 491 B.R. 73, 85–86 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2013) (applying the *Dana* factors to the debtors' retention plan for non-insiders and approving the plan as an exercise of sound business judgment); *In re Borders Grp. Inc.*, 453 B.R. at 473–74 (same). No single factor is dispositive, and the Court has discretion to weigh each of these factors based on the specific facts and circumstances before

it. *See, e.g., In re AMR Corp.*, 490 B.R. 158, 166 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2013). Even the total absence of a factor may be permissible, so long as the interests of the Debtors are sufficiently protected. *See In re Borders Grp., Inc.*, 453 B.R. 459, 477 (finding that the lack of independent counsel was “not fatal” where the presence of other factors ensured “that the [d]ebtors’ interests were sufficiently protected.”); *In re Glob. Aviation Holdings Inc.*, 478 B.R. 142 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. 2012) (noting that “the relatively modest size of the proposed bonus payouts made the retention of independent legal counsel economically inefficient.”). The Debtors respectfully submit that the proposed KERP satisfies the standard set forth above, each as discussed more fully below.

28. **First**, there is a reasonable relationship between the KERP and Debtors’ need to retain important employees. The Debtors, in consultation with their advisors, designed the KERP to motivate and reward the KERP participants for their significant efforts given the increased demands placed upon them in connection with the chapter 11 process and the uncertainty presented by an on-going reorganization process. The KERP will ensure that the Debtors have the appropriate staff on hand to facilitate a timely exit from these chapter 11 cases, thereby maximizing value for the Debtors’ estates. Specifically, the Debtors designed the KERP to ensure that the KERP participants remain employed with the Debtors through the duration of the chapter 11 cases. A failure to retain the KERP participants would cause the Debtors to incur significant time and money to hire and train replacement employees, which would, in turn, hinder their reorganization to the detriment of all parties in interest.

29. **Second**, the cost of the KERP is reasonable given the Debtors’ assets and liabilities. As discussed above, Willis Towers Watson engaged in a benchmarking analysis to assist the Debtors with the design of the KERP. The costs associated with the KERP are within the range of market practice as compared to plans proposed and approved at similarly situated companies in

chapter 11. Accordingly, the costs are reasonable and well-justified given the size of the Debtors' businesses.

30. **Third**, the scope of the KERP is fair and reasonable. The Debtors will undertake a careful selection process and receive input from their advisors in determining the specific employees that should be eligible. All potential KERP participants would be employees that provide necessary services across the Debtors' businesses. Retaining employees who serve multiple entities allows the Debtors to leverage employees who are essential to the Debtors' chapter 11 efforts and continued efficient operation.

31. **Fourth**, the Debtors submit that the KERP is consistent with industry practice. As outlined in the Georgeson declaration, the KERP is more cost-effective than retention plans in other, similar chapter 11 cases in terms of total costs. With respect to eligibility, metrics, and payout timing, the KERP is similar to other plans recently approved in chapter 11 cases.

32. **Fifth**, the Debtors performed their due diligence in determining the need for the KERP. In developing the plan, the Debtors consulted with department heads to determine which employees were likely to leave or even actively searching for new work. As set forth more fully in the Georgeson declaration, the Debtors' then compared their proposed retention awards for KERP participants against similarly situated companies in chapter 11.

33. **Sixth**, the Debtors relied in part on the independent review of Willis Towers Watson and their other advisors in developing the KERP. Moreover, the Debtors have actively shared information regarding the KERP with their key creditor constituencies and the Office of the United States Trustee. Because of this open engagement, the Debtors believe that the interests of their estates have been adequately protected and that the KERP is justified by the facts and circumstances of these chapter 11 cases.

34. Accordingly, the Debtors respectfully submit that the KERP satisfies the “business judgment standard” identified in *In re Dana Corp.* Indeed, courts in this district have routinely granted relief well in excess of that requested herein. *See, e.g., In re Westinghouse Electric Co. LLC*, No. 17-10751 (MEW) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Sept. 12, 2017) (approving a KERP for 210 of the debtors’ non-insider employees with total cost of \$13,831,879); *In re Aéropostale, Inc.*, No. 16-11275 (SHL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 1, 2016) (approving a KERP for 38 employees with approximate payout of \$1.4 million); *In re SunEdison Inc.*, No. 16-10992 (SMB) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. July 29, 2016) (approving a KERP for 126 employees with an estimated payout of \$7.0 million); *In re NII Holdings, Inc.*, No. 14-12611 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. December 10, 2014) (approving a KERP for twelve employees with an approximate total cost of \$1.24 million).

III. Section 503(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code Is Inapplicable to the KERP.

35. Because none of the KERP participants are “insiders” as that term is defined by the Bankruptcy Code, section 503(c)(1) is inapplicable. Section 503(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code restricts payments made to “insiders of the debtor for the purpose of inducing such person to remain with the debtor’s business”—*i.e.*, those insider plans that are essentially “pay to stay” plans. 11 U.S.C. 503(c)(1). By its terms, section 503(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code does not apply where—as is the case here—participants in a retention-based program are not insiders.

36. Section 101(31) of the Bankruptcy Code provides that where a debtor is a corporation, insiders include any “(i) director of the debtor; (ii) officer of the debtor; (iii) person in control of the debtor . . . or (iv) relative of a . . . director, officer or person in control of the debtor.” 11 U.S.C. § 101(31)(B). Courts have also concluded that an employee may be an “insider” if such employee has “at least a controlling interest in the debtor or . . . exercise[s] sufficient authority over the debtor so as to unqualifiably dictate corporate policy and the disposition of corporate assets.” *In re Velo Holdings, Inc.*, 472 B.R. 201, 208 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.

2012) (citations omitted). It is well- established that an employee’s job title, alone, does not make such employee an “insider” as defined by the Bankruptcy Code. *See In re Borders Grp. Inc.*, 453 B.R. 459, 469 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2011) (noting that “[c]ompanies often give employees the title ‘director’ or ‘director- level,’ but do not give them decision-making authority akin to an executive” and concluding that certain “director level” employees in that case were not insiders).

37. Although certain KERP participants hold titles including the term “director,” “vice president,” or “chief,” as set forth in the Smith declaration, none of the potential KERP participants are “insiders,” as such term is defined by section 101(31) of the Bankruptcy Code. None of the potential KERP participants have discretionary control over substantial budgetary amounts or significant control with respect to the Debtors’ corporate policies or governance. Therefore, the Debtors respectfully submit that none of the KERP participants constitute “insiders” of the Debtors, and the restrictions of section 503(c)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code is inapplicable to the KERP.

Waiver of Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h)

38. To implement the foregoing immediately, the Debtors seek a waiver, to the extent required, of the fourteen-day stay of an order authorizing the use, sale, or lease of property under Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h).

Motion Practice

39. This motion includes citations to the applicable rules and statutory authorities upon which the relief requested herein is predicated and a discussion of its application to this motion. Accordingly, the Debtors submit that this motion satisfies Local Rule 9013-1(a).

Notice

40. The Debtors have provided notice of this motion to: (a) the entities on the Master Service List (as defined in the Case Management Order and available on the Debtors’ case website

at www.kccllc.net/windstream) and (b) any person or entity with a particularized interest in the subject matter of this motion. The Debtors respectfully submit that no other or further notice is necessary.

No Prior Request

41. No prior request for the relief sought in this motion has been made to this or any other court.

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

WHEREFORE, the Debtors respectfully requests that the Court enter the Order granting the relief requested herein and such other relief as the Court deems appropriate under the circumstances.

Dated: April 23, 2019
White Plains, New York

/s/ Stephen E. Hessler

Stephen E. Hessler, P.C.

Marc Kieselstein, P.C.

Cristine Pirro Schwarzman

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

601 Lexington Avenue

New York, New York 10022

Telephone: (212) 446-4800

Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

- and -

James H.M. Sprayregen, P.C.

Ross M. Kwasteniet, P.C. (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Brad Weiland (admitted *pro hac vice*)

John R. Luze (admitted *pro hac vice*)

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

KIRKLAND & ELLIS INTERNATIONAL LLP

300 North LaSalle Street

Chicago, Illinois 60654

Telephone: (312) 862-2000

Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

Counsel to the Debtors and Debtors in Possession

Exhibit A

Proposed Order

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re:)	Chapter 11
WINDSTREAM HOLDINGS, INC., <i>et al.</i> , ¹)	Case No. 19-22312 (RDD)
Debtors.)	(Jointly Administered)

ORDER APPROVING THE DEBTORS' KEY EMPLOYEE RETENTION PLAN

Upon the motion (the “Motion”)² of the above-captioned debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, the “Debtors”) for entry of an order (this “Order”), approving the Debtors’ key employee retention plan (the “KERP”), all as more fully set forth in the Motion; and upon the Smith declaration and the Georgeson declaration; and this Court having jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and the *Amended Standing Order of Reference from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York*, dated January 31, 2012; and this Court having the power to enter a final order consistent with Article III of the United States Constitution; and this Court having found that venue of this proceeding and the Motion in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and this Court having found that the Debtors’ notice of the Motion and opportunity for a hearing on the Motion were appropriate under the circumstances and no other notice need be provided; and this Court having reviewed the Motion and having heard the statements in support of the relief requested therein at a hearing

¹ The last four digits of Debtor Windstream Holdings, Inc.’s tax identification number are 7717. Due to the large number of Debtors in these chapter 11 cases, for which joint administration has been granted, a complete list of the debtor entities and the last four digits of their federal tax identification numbers is not provided herein. A complete list of such information may be obtained on the website of the Debtors’ claims and noticing agent at <http://www.kccllc.net/windstream>. The location of the Debtors’ service address for purposes of these chapter 11 cases is: 4001 North Rodney Parham Road, Little Rock, Arkansas 72212.

² Capitalized terms not otherwise herein defined shall have the meanings ascribed to such terms in the Motion.

before this Court (the “Hearing”); and this Court having determined that the legal and factual bases set forth in the Motion and at the Hearing establish just cause for the relief granted herein; and upon all of the proceedings had before this Court; and after due deliberation and sufficient cause appearing therefor, it is HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Motion is granted as set forth herein.
2. Pursuant to sections 503(c) and 363(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code, the KERP is hereby approved.
3. The Debtors are authorized, but not directed, to implement the KERP and make the payments contemplated thereunder at the times specified in the Motion.
4. The Debtors may add a replacement participant(s) to the KERP upon the resignation or the termination for cause of any KERP participant.
5. Notwithstanding Bankruptcy Rule 6004(h), the terms and provisions of this Order shall be immediately effective and enforceable upon its entry.
6. The Debtors are authorized to take all actions necessary to effectuate the relief granted in this Order in accordance with the Motion.
7. The Court retains exclusive jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising from or related to the implementation, interpretation, and enforcement of this Order.

White Plains, New York
Dated: _____, 2019

THE HONORABLE ROBERT D. DRAIN
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE