

Presentation of Proposal to PC  
Scoring Percentage - 5%  
Evaluated - General

Reviewer Josue A Colon Ortiz  
Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
Date 29/ mayo / 2022

| Scoring Metric                                    | Weight | Comments   | Score (0-5%) |
|---|--------|--|--------------|
| Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee | 5%     | En su presentación demostraron dominio para ejecutar proyectos de construcción y conversión a gas natural, pero no para las tareas para las que serán contratados. | 2            |

Confidential

1.4 Approach to Mobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Josue A. Colon Ortiz  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 29/ mayo/ 2022

| Scoring Metric                             | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|--|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Mobilization Management         | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Operational Takeover Milestones         | 25%    |          | 7            |
| 3. Functional Takeover Milestones          | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines | 25%    |          | 6            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details             | 10%    |          | 5            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.5 Approach to O&M Services  
 Scoring Percentage - 15%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Josue A. Colon Ortiz  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 29/05/2022

| Scoring Metric                 | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach to O&M     | 40%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Organization and Community  | 15%    |          | 6            |
| 3. O&M Operational Execution   | 20%    |          | 6            |
| 4. O&M Functional Activities   | 15%    |          | 6            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details | 10%    |          | 6            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.6 Approach to Decommissioning  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer: Josue A. Colon Ortiz  
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]  
 Date: 29/ May 2022

| Scoring Metric                   | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach              | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs     | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 3. Resource Planning             | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management  | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 6. Site Property                 | 10%    |          | 6            |
| 7. Site Closure & Handoff        | 10%    |          | 2            |
| 8. Communication & Engagement    | 10%    |          | 6            |
| 9. Additional Relevant Details   | 10%    |          | 8            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

Josue Colon  
 Confidential

1.7 Approach to Demobilization  
Scoring Percentage - 5%  
Evaluated - General

Reviewer    Josue A. Colon Ortiz  
Reviewer Signature     
Date    29/mayo/2022

| Scoring Metric                  | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach             | 25%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs    | 25%    |          | 7            |
| 3. Resource Planning            | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Site and Property            | 10%    |          | 4            |
| 6. Communications & Engagement  | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 7. Additional Relevant Details  | 10%    |          | 6            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.8 Recruitment and Staffing  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_  
 Reviewer Signature Josue A. Colón Ortiz  
 Date 29/mayo/2022

| Scoring Metric                            | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|---|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Organization                   | 20%    |          | 6            |
| 2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan          | 40%    |          | 6            |
| 3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union | 10%    |          | 6            |
| 4. Training Program                       | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Communication Plan                     | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 6. Additional Relevant Details            | 10%    |          | 6            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.9 Financial  
Scoring Percentage - 50%

Reviewer: Josué A. Colón Ortiz  
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]  
 Date: 22/mayo/2022

| Category  | Commentary  | Weight | VAES     |               | Genex PR    |               |
|---|---|--------|----------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
|   |   |        | Value    | Score         | Value       | Score         |
| NPV of Decommissioning and Fixed Service Fees               | Net present value of fixed fee payments paid to proponent for operating and decommissioning the legacy generation assets (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 55.00% | \$185.1m | 45            | \$119.9m    | 50            |
| Mobilization Fee  | One-time fee paid to proponent upon mobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 10.00% | \$14.0m  | 9             | \$15.0m     | 8             |
| NPV of Maximum Incentive and Penalties                      | Net present value of maximum incentives and penalties relating to availability, safety, environmental and operating metrics (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 5.00%  | \$9.7m   | 4             | \$34.1m     | 1             |
| NPV of Owner Termination Fee (average per Contract Year)    | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Operator in the event of Owner Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$3.0m   | 1             | \$37.0m     | 2.5           |
| NPV of Operator Termination Fee (average per Contract Year) | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Owner in the event of Operator Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$18.1m  | 2.5           | \$37.0m     | 1             |
| Demobilization Service Fee                                  | Percent of Fixed Service Fee to be paid for demobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | 20%      | 1             | 10%         | 2.5           |
| Net Operator Liability                                      | Represents the amount of liability/risk the Operator is willing to absorb (higher amounts more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 20.00% |          |               |             |               |
| Parental Guarantee  |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 5             | \$45.0m     | 4             |
| Operator's Liability Max Term Cap                           |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 5             | \$20.0m     | 2             |
| Delay Liquidated Damages Max                                |   | 5.00%  | \$0.5m   | 5             | \$15.0m     | 2             |
| Gross Negligence Term Cap                                   |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 5             | \$20.0m     | 2             |
| Maximum Reporting Obligation Charge                         | Maximum penalty for delayed reporting (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | \$50,000 | 1             | \$1,000,000 | 2.5           |
| Total Financial Score (out of 100)<br>(50%)                 |   |        |          | 79.5<br>39.75 |             | 80.5<br>40.25 |

Note: In each of the categories listed above, the proponent with the best score received all total possible points given the category weight. The second proponent received a proportional amount of points based on the difference between its value and the best proponent value. For example, if for a category with 10% weight and the best value is 20 and the second best value is 15, proponent A would receive 10 points and proponent B would receive 7.5 points (10 possible points \* (15/20)). B12

Presentation of Proposal to PC  
Scoring Percentage - 5%  
Evaluated - General

Reviewer DAVID K OWEN  
Reviewer Signature David K Owen  
Date 5/15/02

| Scoring Metric                                    | Weight | Comments   | Score (0-5%) |
|---|--------|--|--------------|
| Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee | 5%     | Over time, questions raised by the Partnership Committee were addressed. Outstanding approval was presented. |              |

CONFIDENTIAL



1.4 Approach to Mobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer DAVID K OWENS  
 Reviewer Signature David K Owens  
 Date 5/25/22

| Scoring Metric                             | Weight | Comments  | Score (0-10) |
|--|--------|---|--------------|
| 1. General Mobilization Management         | 20%    | Broadly discussed a Transition team.<br>As this is a critical phase, specifics about skills and experience of team were not presented | 7            |
| 2. Operational Takeover Milestones         | 25%    | Carefully provided details about its tasks to assume operational control which were thorough  | 8            |
| 3. Functional Takeover Milestones          | 20%    | Did not provide sufficient detail of its functional approach; contemplated organizational structure and collaboration or not doing    | 7            |
| 4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines | 25%    | Good discussion of its Transition Team but not detailed information about staffing needs; critical positions; and team structure      | 8            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details             | 10%    | Known and demonstrated expertise in maintenance and operation of power plants is important.   | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.5 Approach to O&M Services  
 Scoring Percentage - 15%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer DAVID K OWEN  
 Reviewer Signature David K Owen  
 Date 5/25/20

| Scoring Metric                 | Weight | Comments   | Score (0-10) |
|--------------------------------|--------|--|--------------|
| 1. General Approach to O&M     | 40%    | Good overall detail about its O&M approach with identification of specific tasks   | 8            |
| 2. Organization and Community  | 15%    | While it was recognized that the T&D system is critical for community acceptance, specifics were not provided about transition team            | 7            |
| 3. O&M Operational Execution   | 20%    | PH&P's plants are old and require preventive maintenance to maintain operations. Should have operational staff at site not rely on contractors | 7            |
| 4. O&M Functional Activities   | 15%    | Operational Teams to assess plant performance and coordinate with T&D operations is essential  | 7            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details | 10%    | Not clear how third parties and affiliates will enhance O&M performance.   | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.6 Approach to Decommissioning  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer: DAVID K OWIERU  
 Reviewer Signature: David K Owens  
 Date: 5/25/2022

| Scoring Metric                   | Weight | Comments  | Score (0-10) |
|----------------------------------|--------|---|--------------|
| 1. General Approach              | 20%    | As PHE's plants would, a robust decommissioning plan is essential.        | 7            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs     | 10%    | Generally outlined but lacked specific about costs and scope.             | 7            |
| 3. Resource Planning             | 10%    | Recognized use of third-party contractors which is a concern.             | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management  | 10%    | Recognition of need to comply with all laws.                              | 7            |
| 5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing | 10%    | Identifies potential for repurposing other plants.                        | 7            |
| 6. Site Property                 | 10%    | Good description of potential improvements in sites and use of resources. | 7            |
| 7. Site Closure & Handoff        | 10%    | Not responsive.   | 4            |
| 8. Communication & Engagement    | 10%    | Webinars and town hall meetings are good. More comprehensive plan needed. | 7            |
| 9. Additional Relevant Details   | 10%    | Recognizes importance of and implementation of IPR.                       | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.7 Approach to Demobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer DAVID K OWEN  
 Reviewer Signature David K Owen  
 Date 5/25/2022

| Scoring Metric                  | Weight | Comments   | Score (0-10) |
|---------------------------------|--------|--|--------------|
| 1. General Approach             | 25%    | good approach for operational transition and recognition of historic contamination | 8            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs    | 25%    | good exploration of considerations to preserve relationships and regulatory status | 8            |
| 3. Resource Planning            | 10%    | Extensive use of contractors is a red concern                                      | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management | 10%    | Recognition to address/remediate environment/hazardous conditions                  | 8            |
| 5. Site and Property            | 10%    | Not sufficient details provided  | 5            |
| 6. Communications & Engagement  | 10%    | good effort to engage and gain community support. More support is needed           | 9            |
| 7. Additional Relevant Details  | 10%    | Red concern about extensive use of contractors to designate legacy areas           | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.8 Recruitment and Staffing  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer DAVID KOWEN  
 Reviewer Signature David K Owen  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_

| Scoring Metric                            | Weight | Comments   | Score (0-10) |
|---|--------|--|--------------|
| 1. General Organization                   | 20%    | The Organization chart and transition team were not identified                                       | 7            |
| 2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan          | 40%    | Recognize need to have an aggressive recruitment with clear job descriptions, filling critical roles | 8            |
| 3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union | 10%    | Wants competitive compensation and benefit packages but no details on what                           | 7            |
| 4. Training Program                       | 10%    | Comprehensive training program and tracking system to enhance skills                                 | 8            |
| 5. Communication Plan                     | 10%    | Needs better network to attract qualified employees especially in critical roles                     | 7            |
| 6. Additional Relevant Details            | 10%    | Build in human capabilities should be priority   | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.9 Financial  
Scoring Percentage - 50%

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_  
Reviewer Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_

| Category  | Commentary  | Weight | NAES     |       | Genent PR   |       |
|---|---|--------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|
|   |   |        | Values   | Score | Values      | Score |
| NPV of Decommissioning and Fixed Service Fees               | Net present value of fixed fee payments paid to proponent for operating and decommissioning the legacy generation assets (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 55.00% | \$185.1m |       | \$119.9m    |       |
| Mobilization Fee  | One-time fee paid to proponent upon mobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 10.00% | \$14.0m  |       | \$15.0m     |       |
| NPV of Maximum Incentive and Penalties                      | Net present value of maximum incentives and penalties relating to availability, safety, environmental and operating metrics (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 5.00%  | \$9.7m   |       | \$34.1m     |       |
| NPV of Owner Termination Fee (average per Contract Year)    | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Operator in the event of Owner Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$3.0m   |       | \$37.0m     |       |
| NPV of Operator Termination Fee (average per Contract Year) | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Owner in the event of Operator Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$18.1m  |       | \$37.0m     |       |
| Demobilization Service Fee                                  | Percent of Fixed Service Fee to be paid for demobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | 20%      |       | 10%         |       |
| Net Operator Liability                                      | Represents the amount of liability/risk the Operator is willing to absorb (higher amounts more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 20.00% |          |       |             |       |
| Parental Guarantee  |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  |       | \$45.0m     |       |
| Operator's Liability Max Term Cap                           |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  |       | \$20.0m     |       |
| Delay Liquidated Damages Max                                |   | 5.00%  | \$0.5m   |       | \$15.0m     |       |
| Gross Negligence Term Cap                                   |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  |       | \$20.0m     |       |
| Maximum Reporting Obligation Charge                         | Maximum penalty for delayed reporting (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | \$50,000 |       | \$1,000,000 |       |

Total Financial Score (out of 100)  
(50%)

Note: In each of the categories listed above, the proponent with the best score received all total possible points given the category weight. The second proponent received a proportional amount of points based on the difference between its value and the best proponent value. For example, if for a category with 10% weight and the best value is 20 and the second best value is 15, proponent A would receive 10 points and proponent B would receive 7.5 points (10 possible points \* (15/20)).B12

Presentation of Proposal to PC  
Scoring Percentage - 5%  
Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Gerardo Loren  
Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                                    | Weight | Comments | Score (0-5%) |
|---|--------|----------|--------------|
| Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee | 5%     |          | 2.5          |

Gerardo Loren  
Confidential

1.4 Approach to Mobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Gerardo Loran  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/25/22

| Scoring Metric                             | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|--|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Mobilization Management         | 20%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Operational Takeover Milestones         | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 3. Functional Takeover Milestones          | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details             | 10%    |          | 8            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |



1.5 Approach to O&M Services  
 Scoring Percentage - 15%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Gerardo Loran  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                 | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach to O&M     | 40%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Organization and Community  | 15%    |          | 7            |
| 3. O&M Operational Execution   | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 4. O&M Functional Activities   | 15%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details | 10%    |          | 7            |

Gerardo Loran  
Confidential

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.6 Approach to Decommissioning  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer: Gerardo Lopez  
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]  
 Date: 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                   | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach              | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs     | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 3. Resource Planning             | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management  | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 6. Site Property                 | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 7. Site Closure & Handoff        | 10%    |          | 2.5          |
| 8. Communication & Engagement    | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 9. Additional Relevant Details   | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.7 Approach to Demobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Gerardo Lopez  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                  | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach             | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs    | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 3. Resource Planning            | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 5. Site and Property            | 10%    |          | 5            |
| 6. Communications & Engagement  | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 7. Additional Relevant Details  | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.8 Recruitment and Staffing  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer Gerardo Lorán  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 8/22/22

| Scoring Metric                            | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|---|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Organization                   | 20%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan          | 40%    |          | 8            |
| 3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Training Program                       | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 5. Communication Plan                     | 10%    |          | 6            |
| 6. Additional Relevant Details            | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.9 Financial  
Scoring Percentage - 50%

Reviewer Gerardo Lopez  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/23/22

| Category  | Commentary  | Weight | NAES     |       | GeneriPR    |       |
|---|---|--------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|
|   |   |        | Values   | Score | Values      | Score |
| NPV of Decommissioning and Fixed Service Fees               | Net present value of fixed fee payments paid to proponent for operating and decommissioning the legacy generation assets (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 55.00% | \$185.1m | 35    | \$119.9m    | 55    |
| Mobilization Fee  | One-time fee paid to proponent upon mobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 10.00% | \$14.0m  | 10    | \$15.0m     | 9     |
| NPV of Maximum Incentive and Penalties                      | Net present value of maximum incentives and penalties relating to availability, safety, environmental and operating metrics (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 5.00%  | \$9.7m   | 5     | \$34.1m     | 2     |
| NPV of Owner Termination Fee (average per Contract Year)    | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Operator in the event of Owner Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$3.0m   | 1     | \$37.0m     | 2.5   |
| NPV of Operator Termination Fee (average per Contract Year) | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Owner in the event of Operator Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$18.1m  | 2.5   | \$37.0m     | 1.5   |
| Demobilization Service Fee                                  | Percent of Fixed Service Fee to be paid for demobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | 20%      | 1.5   | 10%         | 2.5   |
| Net Operator Liability                                      | Represents the amount of liability/risk the Operator is willing to absorb (higher amounts more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 20.00% |          |       |             |       |
| Parental Guarantee  |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 14    | \$45.0m     | 13    |
| Operator's Liability Max Term Cap                           |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  |       | \$20.0m     |       |
| Delay Liquidated Damages Max                                |   | 5.00%  | \$0.5m   |       | \$15.0m     |       |
| Gross Negligence Term Cap                                   |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  |       | \$20.0m     |       |
| Maximum Reporting Obligation Charge                         | Maximum penalty for delayed reporting (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | \$50,000 | 0.1   | \$1,000,000 | 2.5   |

Total Financial Score (out of 100)  
(50%)

Note: In each of the categories listed above, the proponent with the best score received all total possible points given the category weight. The second proponent received a proportional amount of points based on the difference between its value and the best proponent value. For example, if for a category with 10% weight and the best value is 20 and the second best value is 15, proponent A would receive 10 points and proponent B would receive 7.5 points (10 possible points \* (15/20)). B12

Presentation of Proposal to PC  
Scoring Percentage - 5%  
Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer FERNANDO GIL-ENSENAS  
Reviewer Signature FLG  
Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                                    | Weight | Comments | Score (0-5%) |
|---|--------|----------|--------------|
| Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee | 5%     |          | 3.0          |

Fernando Gil  
Confidential

1.4 Approach to Mobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer Fernando Gil - ENSENAS  
 Reviewer Signature JLG  
 Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                             | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|--|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Mobilization Management         | 20%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Operational Takeover Milestones         | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 3. Functional Takeover Milestones          | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details             | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.5 Approach to O&M Services  
 Scoring Percentage - 15%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer FERNANDO GIL-ENSENAT  
 Reviewer Signature JLG  
 Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                 | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|--------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach to O&M     | 40%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Organization and Community  | 15%    |          | 7            |
| 3. O&M Operational Execution   | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 4. O&M Functional Activities   | 15%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Additional Relevant Details | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |



1.6 Approach to Decommissioning  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - General

Reviewer: FERNANDO GIL-ENSENAT  
 Reviewer Signature: JPG  
 Date: 5/28/22

| Scoring Metric                   | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach              | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs     | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 3. Resource Planning             | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management  | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 6. Site Property                 | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 7. Site Closure & Handoff        | 10%    |          | 4            |
| 8. Communication & Engagement    | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 9. Additional Relevant Details   | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

Fernando Gil-Ensenat  
Confidential

1.7 Approach to Demobilization  
 Scoring Percentage - 5%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer FERNANDO GIL-ENSEÑAT  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                  | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Approach             | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 2. Scope and Estimated Costs    | 25%    |          | 8            |
| 3. Resource Planning            | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Remediation/Waste Management | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 5. Site and Property            | 10%    |          | 5            |
| 6. Communications & Engagement  | 10%    |          | 9            |
| 7. Additional Relevant Details  | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.8 Recruitment and Staffing  
 Scoring Percentage - 10%  
 Evaluated - Genera

Reviewer FERNANDO GIL ENSEÑAT  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/27/22

| Scoring Metric                            | Weight | Comments | Score (0-10) |
|---|--------|----------|--------------|
| 1. General Organization                   | 20%    |          | 7            |
| 2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan          | 40%    |          | 8            |
| 3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 4. Training Program                       | 10%    |          | 8            |
| 5. Communication Plan                     | 10%    |          | 7            |
| 6. Additional Relevant Details            | 10%    |          | 7            |

| Evaluation Criteria:   | Points |
|--|--------|
| Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance  | 0 - 3  |
| Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements | 4 - 5  |
| Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements | 6 - 7  |
| Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements             | 8 - 10 |

1.9 Financial  
Scoring Percentage - 50%

Reviewer Fernando Gil-Ensenet  
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]  
 Date 5/22/22

| Category  | Commentary  | Weight | NAES     |       | Genent PR   |       |
|---|---|--------|----------|-------|-------------|-------|
|   |   |        | Values   | Score | Values      | Score |
| NPV of Decommissioning and Fixed Service Fees               | Net present value of fixed fee payments paid to proponent for operating and decommissioning the legacy generation assets (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 55.00% | \$185.1m | 35    | \$119.9m    | 55    |
| Mobilization Fee  | One-time fee paid to proponent upon mobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 10.00% | \$14.0m  | 10    | \$15.0m     | 9.5   |
| NPV of Maximum Incentive and Penalties                      | Net present value of maximum incentives and penalties relating to availability, safety, environmental and operating metrics (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 5.00%  | \$9.7m   | 5     | \$34.1m     | 1     |
| NPV of Owner Termination Fee (average per Contract Year)    | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Operator in the event of Owner Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$3.0m   | 1     | \$37.0m     | 2.5   |
| NPV of Operator Termination Fee (average per Contract Year) | Average annual net present value of the termination fee to be paid by Owner in the event of Operator Termination (net present value of termination fees divided by number of contract years) (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico). | 2.50%  | \$18.1m  | 2     | \$37.0m     | 1     |
| Demobilization Service Fee                                  | Percent of Fixed Service Fee to be paid for demobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | 20%      | 1.5   | 10%         | 1     |
| Net Operator Liability                                      | Represents the amount of liability/risk the Operator is willing to absorb (higher amounts more favorable to Puerto Rico).   | 20.00% |          |       |             |       |
| Parental Guarantee  |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 5     | \$45.0m     | 4.8   |
| Operator's Liability Max Term Cap                           |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 5     | \$20.0m     | 2.3   |
| Delay Liquidated Damages Max                                |   | 5.00%  | \$0.5m   | 0.5   | \$15.0m     | 5.0   |
| Gross Negligence Term Cap                                   |   | 5.00%  | \$48.0m  | 4.5   | \$20.0m     | 2.0   |
| Maximum Reporting Obligation Charge                         | Maximum penalty for delayed reporting (higher is more favorable to Puerto Rico).  | 2.50%  | \$50,000 | 0.5   | \$1,000,000 | 2.5   |

Total Financial Score (out of 100) -----  
 (50%) 70 | 88.10

Note: In each of the categories listed above, the proponent with the best score received all total possible points given the category weight. The second proponent received a proportional amount of points based on the difference between its value and the best proponent value. For example, if for a category with 10% weight and the best value is 20 and the second best value is 15, proponent A would receive 10 points and proponent B would receive 7.5 points (10 possible points \* (15/20)). B12