

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

Reviewer Josué 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 29/04/2022

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 Ortiz
 Confidential

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) (50%)				79.5 39.75		80.5 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. 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

Gerardo Lopez
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
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

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

Reviewer Edison Antó Delic
Reviewer Signature [Signature]
Date May 16, 2022

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

Edison Avilés
Confidential

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

Reviewer Edison Avilés-Delgado
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date May 10, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%	Edison Avilés Confidential	9
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%		9
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%		9
4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines	25%		9
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%		9

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 Edison Avilés - Delk
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date May 20, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%	Edison Avilés Confidential	9
2. Organization and Community	15%		9
3. O&M Operational Execution	20%		9
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%		9
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

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

Reviewer: Edison Andrew Debi RPO
 Reviewer Signature: _____
 Date: May 18, 2022

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

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

Edison Andrew Debi RPO
 Confidential

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

Reviewer Edison Aviles-Del
 Reviewer Signature _____
 Date May 18, 2022

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

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 - General

Reviewer Edison Avilés Delt
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date May 16, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Organization	20%		9
2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan	40%		9
3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union	10%		9
4. Training Program	10%		9
5. Communication Plan	10%		9
6. Additional Relevant Details	10%		9

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 Y. Madison Avila-Delo
 Reviewer Signature _____
 Date May 20, 2022

*

Category	Comments	Weight	NAES		Garcia/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	35.4	\$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	9.3
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	1.4
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	0.2	\$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	1.2
Demobilization Service Fee	Percent of Fixed Service Fee to be paid for demobilization (lower is more favorable to Puerto Rico).	2.50%	20%	1.3	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%		17.9		13.9
Parental Guarantee		5.00%	\$48.0m	5	\$45.0m	4.7
Operator's Liability Max Term Cap		5.00%	\$48.0m	5	\$20.0m	2.1
Delay Liquidated Damages Max		5.00%	\$0.5m	5	\$15.0m	5.0
Gross Negligence Term Cap		5.00%	\$48.0m	4.7	\$20.0m	2.1
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%)

69.6
34.8

88.3
44.2

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

* Based on FTI recommendations,

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

Reviewer Omar S. Marrero Dir
Reviewer Signature Omar S. Marrero
Date June 1st, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-5%)
Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee	5%	good presentation. Although is a different approach to PABs / it also included ^{commercial} competitive terms.	4

Omar Marrero
Confidential

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

Reviewer Dustin J. Marano DM
 Reviewer Signature DJM
 Date 6-1-22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%	Proponent's parent company owns and operates facilities and will support DOD transition. Transition plan of proponent has been provided. NO mention of cost plan. Expenses	7
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%	Proponent's checklist will guide transition plan, includes major task-oriented activities.	7
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%	Much of this ^{work} will be done during mobilization by Proponent	6
4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines	25%	Information very high level not provided as to transition team and management. Proponent identified critical employee positions.	7
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%	NO further information was provided	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 - General

Reviewer Orlando J. Obando Diaz
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 0-1-2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%	Proposal provided extensive detail for its approach. Key areas included well response plans, asset management, and hazard assessment, fuel concessions, etc.	7
2. Organization and Community	15%	Transition team main roles were provided. Subcontractors will provide services to support needs. Entered to hire and contract local.	8
3. O&M Operational Execution	20%	Proposal provided information as to its approach, including staff supported by on site workers.	7
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%	Proposal program document team to review CRAMS system and coordinate with IT teams.	8
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Proposal highlighted its global experience.	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

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

Reviewer Orlando S. Ramos Diaz
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 0-1-2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach	20%	General approach will include asset preservation, mobilization, stabilization, and permit process.	7
2. Scope and Estimated Costs	10%	Program outlined consideration for below grade activities, enrichment, and concrete.	7
3. Resource Planning	10%	Contract issues & costs will impact decommissioning activities.	4
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%	Program will be done in accordance with all applicable laws before any work is done.	7
5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing	10%	Program believe some assets should be repurposed.	7
6. Site Property	10%	Sites will be secured to ensure public safety.	7
7. Site Closure & Handoff	10%	No sufficient FTRs was provided.	2
8. Communication & Engagement	10%	Process will be quarterly since of FTRs.	6
9. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Program believe any assets should be conserved and will work with SPR on the FTR.	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

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

Reviewer Quinn J. Mando JMC
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 6-1-2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach	25%	Request provided approved to Reestablishment for site transfer or decommissioning and for operational costs.	8
2. Scope and Estimated Costs	25%	Request provided conditions for scope.	8
3. Resource Planning	10%	Project will use subcontractors, and Subcontractors & equipment group provided.	7
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%	Subcontractors will support Contamination and Remediation activities.	7
5. Site and Property	10%	Few details were provided for transfer.	4
6. Communications & Engagement	10%	Army Communication plan was provided.	9
7. Additional Relevant Details	10%	No more info was provided.	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 - General

Reviewer Oliver J. Alvarez Diaz
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 6-1-22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Organization	20%	Transition has not been fully identified. Priority positions will be addressed during reorganization. Plans will be shared further with P.R. Branch.	7
2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan	40%	Leadership positions were identified. Third Party talent commitment will support talent acquisition.	8
3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union	10%	Program will determine the number of best matches for former Region employees. Multi-sited work strategy will be implemented.	6
4. Training Program	10%	Program will implement an HRSS program that complies with regulatory bodies. Training will be provided and supported.	8
5. Communication Plan	10%	Program will post roles in star internal board with communication to employees. Internal employees will be first considered.	7
6. Additional Relevant Details	10%	NO further information was provided.	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: Orlando J. Marrero
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
 Date: 6-1-22

Category	Commentary	Weight	NAES		Genera 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
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	3
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	10%	2
Net Operator Liability	Represents the amount of liability/risk the Operator is willing to absorb (higher amounts more favorable to Puerto Rico).	20.00%				14
Parental Guarantee		5.00%	\$48.0m	5	\$45.0m	4.5
Operator's Liability Max Term Cap		5.00%	\$48.0m	5	\$20.0m	2.5
Delay Liquidated Damages Max		5.00%	\$0.5m	5	\$15.0m	5
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)
(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