

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

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 presentacion demostraron dominio de las tareas para las que seran contratados.	5

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

Reviewer Josee A. Celan
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 29 May 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%		8
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%		10
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%		8
4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines	25%		10
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
Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements	8 - 10

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

Reviewer

Jose A. Colon Ortiz

Reviewer Signature

[Signature]

Date

29/Mayo/2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%		10
2. Organization and Community	15%		8
3. O&M Operational Execution	20%		9
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%		9
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%		8

Evaluation Criteria:

- Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
- Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
- Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
- Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points

- 0 - 3
- 4 - 5
- 6 - 7
- 8 - 10

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

Reviewer Jose A. Colón OHTB
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 29/Mayo/2022

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

Evaluation Criteria:

Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
 Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
 Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
 Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points
 0-3
 4-5
 6-7
 8-10

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

Reviewer

Jose A. Cobos Ortiz

Reviewer Signature

[Signature]

Date

29/11/2022

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

Evaluation Criteria:

- Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
- Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
- Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
- Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points

- 0 - 3
- 4 - 5
- 6 - 7
- 8 - 10

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

Reviewer Josue A. Colon Ortiz
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 20/mayo/2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Organization	20%		10
2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan	40%		10
3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union	10%		9
4. Training Program	10%		10
5. Communication Plan	10%		8
6. 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

1.9 Financial
Scoring Percentage - 50%

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

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	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	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)				79.5		80.5
Financial Component Contribution to Total Score (50%)				39.75		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

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

Reviewer DAVID K OWEN
Reviewer Signature David K Owen
Date 5/25/2012

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-5%)
Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee	5%	Presentations improved over time and there was general responsiveness to questions posed by Team. Management team Management team proposed solutions	

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

Reviewer: DAVID K OWENS
 Reviewer Signature: David K Owens
 Date: 3/25/10

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%	Impressed with NAES Comprehensive experience in performing O&M over 350 facilities. Proven and demonstrated skills	8
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%	Superb presentation and comprehensive discussion of the extensive steps for the takeover which good detail and scope. The experience in process, procedures, controls, etc was impressive.	10
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%	Provided sufficient detail about functional areas which will be addressed in the takeover with a general discussion of the areas and milestones that are contemplated.	8
4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines	25%	Clarity about NAES key staff and their bios which helped to understand how the evolving organization will look, supported by third party support. Recognition to address existing talents in P&PA timely in Transition	8
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Extensive knowledge and demonstrated experience and expertise for transitioning power plant operation and maintenance which is impressive. Helpful business legal topics are included to require contractual oversight and prevent miscommunication.	10

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 - NAES

Reviewer DAVID R OWENS
 Reviewer Signature David R Owens
 Date 5/15/2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%	Great details about its overall strategy and approach to improving the performance of an old fleet of power facilities. Specific discussion of steps to mitigate risks and enhance operational control.	9
2. Organization and Community	15%	Recognition of the importance of community acceptance as plant upgrades are Spanish speaking and emphasis on a management team that connects well is considered in community.	9
3. O&M Operational Execution	20%	Thorough and comprehensive discussion of O&M programs focusing on critical areas to reduce outages through preventive maintenance; Emergency Preparedness, Risk Assessments. Specific discussion on plant floor.	10
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%	Functional areas were carefully outlined including a discussion to its safety lifetime and recognition of the importance of environmental compliance matters, which is critical to the EPC.	9
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Aggressive approach to enhance the performance of assets and focus on improving operational efficiencies.	10

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 - NAES

Reviewer DAVID KOWENS
 Reviewer Signature David K. Owens
 Date 5/13/02

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach	20%	As PREP's legacy facilities are old, decommissioning is a critical area. NAES generally described its approach through use of a dedicated team of experts but not sufficient detail of its process.	7
2. Scope and Estimated Costs	10%	This was lacking with too details about costs and schedules. General approach was presented.	7
3. Resource Planning	10%	Without specifics, it was stated that a dedicated team would be assembled to provide all management support.	7
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%	This critical area was discussed in sufficient detail to provide confidence that NAES is familiar with the various products and waste management.	8
5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing	10%	Significant emphasis to suggest for plant transfer and operational control to enhance plant performance and ensure plants for long efficiency.	9
6. Site Property	10%	Not very specific about its dedicated responsibilities.	7
7. Site Closure & Handoff	10%	A standard approach of transferring all appropriate documentation or handoff.	7
8. Communication & Engagement	10%	Keen on establishing an effective community awareness program. Specifics not provided.	7
9. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Decommissioning experience is critical.	7

Evaluation Criteria:

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 - NAES

Reviewer _____

Reviewer Signature _____

Date _____

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach	25%	Comprehensive / Responsive	8
2. Scope and Estimated Costs	25%	Clearly delineated but costs not addressed	7
3. Resource Planning	10%	Recognition of processes to keep business operations efficient	8
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%	Recognition of need to comply with applicable laws	8
5. Site and Property	10%	Checklist recommending work	8
6. Communications & Engagement	10%	Broader and more comprehensive effort needed in view of potential impacts	7
7. Additional Relevant Details	10%		

Evaluation Criteria:

Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
 Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
 Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
 Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points

0-3
 4-5
 6-7
 8-10

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

Reviewer DAVID K. OWEN
 Reviewer Signature David K Owen
 Date _____

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Organization	20%	The organization chart provides good detail and critical positions recruitment and hiring points are well identified, also delineated	9
2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan	40%	It is critical to have a recruitment and staffing plan which provides an opportunity for existing P&E/A employees to apply for positions. Good proposals clear functions.	10
3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union	10%	Comprehensive effort to provide a highly competitive salary and benefit package to attract highly trained, skilled staff.	9
4. Training Program	10%	Support training and development programs focused on employee development and a tracking system to enhance employee learning and experience.	9
5. Communication Plan	10%	A much broader outreach, communications and education program is needed to gain trust and improve transparency.	7
6. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Clear job descriptions and benefits/salary communicated in Spanish and broadly mentioned elsewhere efforts in this area.	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 _____
Reviewer Signature _____
Date _____

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		\$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)

Financial Component Contribution to Total Score (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

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

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

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-5%)
Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee	5%		4%

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

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

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%		9
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%		9
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%		8
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
Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements	8 - 10

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

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

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%		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%		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

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

Reviewer: Gerardo Lopez
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
 Date: 5/10/22

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%		8
5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing	10%		9
6. Site Property	10%		7
7. Site Closure & Handoff	10%		7
8. Communication & Engagement	10%		7
9. Additional Relevant Details	10%		7

Evaluation Criteria:

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

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

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%		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%		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

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

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

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%		8
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: Gerardo Lopez
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
 Date: 5/27/22

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	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%		14		13
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	0.1	\$1,000,000	2.5

Total Financial Score (out of 100)
 Financial Component Contribution to Total Score (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

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

Reviewer FERNANDO Gil-ENSENAT
Reviewer Signature JLGS
Date 5/27/22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-5%)
Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee	5%		3.5

JLGS

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

Reviewer FERNANDO CUI - ENSEÑAT
 Reviewer Signature JLGS
 Date 5/27/22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%		9
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%		9
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%		8
4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines	25%		8
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%		9

Evaluation Criteria:

- Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
- Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
- Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
- Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points

- 0-3
- 4-5
- 6-7
- 8-10

JLGS

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

Reviewer Fernando Gil-ENSEÑAT
 Reviewer Signature JLCS
 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%		8
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%		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
Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements	8 - 10

JLCS

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

Reviewer: FERNANDO GIL-ENSEÑAT
 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%		6
3. Resource Planning	10%		7
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%		8
5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing	10%		9
6. Site Property	10%		7
7. Site Closure & Handoff	10%		7
8. Communication & Engagement	10%		7
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

JGC

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

Reviewer FERNANDO GIL-ENSENAT
 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%		7
3. Resource Planning	10%		8
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%		9
5. Site and Property	10%		9
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

[Handwritten initials]

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

Reviewer Fernando Gil - ENSENOR
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 5/27/22

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%		8
4. Training Program	10%		10
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

[Signature]

1.9 Financial
Scoring Percentage - 50%

Reviewer FERNANDO Gil-ENSEÑAT
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 5/23/22

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	9.5
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%	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%		15.00%		14.10%
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)

Financial Component Contribution to Total Score (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

[Signature]

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

Reviewer

Edison Ariles-Delise

Reviewer Signature

Date

May 28, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-5%)
Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee	5%		4.5

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

Reviewer: Edison Rules - Pch
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
 Date: May 20, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%		8
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%		8
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%		8
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
Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements	8 - 10

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

Reviewer _____

Reviewer Signature _____

Date _____

[Handwritten Signature]
 Edison Auto - Ddt
 May 28, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%		8
2. Organization and Community	15%		8
3. O&M Operational Execution	20%		8
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%		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
Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements	8 - 10

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

Reviewer: Edison Ailes Deliz
 Reviewer Signature: _____
 Date: May 20, 2022

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

Evaluation Criteria:

Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
 Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
 Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
 Complaint; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points
 0 - 3
 4 - 5
 6 - 7
 8 - 10

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

Reviewer _____

Reviewer Signature _____

Date _____

Edison Aris - Delte
May 18, 2022

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

Evaluation Criteria:

- Non-responsive/non-compliant or unable to assess compliance
- Minimally compliant; may indicate risks to meet requirements
- Compliant; indicates fair likelihood of meeting requirements
- Compliant; clearly meets or exceeds requirements

Points

- 0 - 3
- 4 - 5
- 6 - 7
- 8 - 10

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

Reviewer _____
 Reviewer Signature _____
 Date _____

Edison Ailes Delis
 May 28, 2022

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%		8
4. Training Program	10%		8
5. Communication Plan	10%		8
6. 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

1.9 Financial
Scoring Percentage - 50%

Reviewer
Reviewer Signature
Date

Edison Arce - Deke
May 18, 2022

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	35.4	\$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%		24.9		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	0.2	\$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)

Financial Component Contribution to Total Score (50%)

69.6
34.8
89.3
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

*Based on FTI
reco recommendations*

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

Reviewer OMAR J. MARRERO DIAZ
Reviewer Signature *[Signature]*
Date June 1st, 2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-5%)
Presentation of Proposal to Partnership Committee	5%	Very good presentation. Well-documented experience on operating and maintaining similar assets. Certainly, good computer & file technical & operational skills.	4

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

Reviewer OSWD
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 01/12/22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Mobilization Management	20%	Proprietor has experience in performing line types of services for over 300 facilities under mobilization. Proprietor provides detailed mobilization plan.	9
2. Operational Takeover Milestones	25%	Proprietor will provide specific action plan for takeover. Proprietor demonstrated significant experience in using plants & completed mobilization.	9
3. Functional Takeover Milestones	20%	Proprietor provided takeover approach including management oversight. Proprietor also provided examples of reports.	7
4. Staffing Approach & Milestone Timelines	25%	Proprietor provided team member info for most positions. Proprietor also reserve the right to use preferred & transition with which they already have existing agreements. Also provided survey and assessment plan.	8
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Proprietor highlighted that their approach to mobilization has been successful for over four decades of excellence based on their mobilization for over 300 plants.	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 - NAES

Reviewer: OSMD
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
 Date: 6/1/22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach to O&M	40%	It was clear that they have the experience and ability to work with permit holders on daily functions of the units. They will also ensure proper environmental compliance and work with PSD.	8
2. Organization and Community	15%	NAES will manage operations closely with local staff. Payment included bids for unit operation and expected emissions included. Payment reflected commitment to work with local community.	8
3. O&M Operational Execution	20%	Payment provided detailed explanation on plans. Detailed expertise experience with both new & old plants.	9
4. O&M Functional Activities	15%	Payment provided overall plans & perform functional activities. It also proved that has a well-established QC/QA program.	8
5. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Based on their experience, payment intends to use technology to maximize electric output and the useful life of the facilities, while minimizing emissions.	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

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

Reviewer _____
 Reviewer Signature _____
 Date _____

OSND
 [Signature]
 10/1/22

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Approach	20%	Proposant outlined planning and decommissioning phases. Proposant will initiate a competitive team to oversee decommissioning. Plans based on their substantial experience.	6
2. Scope and Estimated Costs	10%	Although costs not provided, proposant explained that costs will vary and depend on number of facilities, scope of demolition, etc.	6
3. Resource Planning	10%	Proposant will use a top-notch and high skilled workforce for the duration of the project and decommissioning of the reactor. Org chart not provided.	6
4. Remediation/Waste Management	10%	Proposant submitted a plan that will be fine tuned for each site wherein all applicable regulations will be met.	7
5. Plant Transfer or Repurposing	10%	Proposant will support either plant transition and eventual control to a new operator, or comply with repurposing, or reuse.	9
6. Site Property	10%	Proposant will create cleanup and site restoration for core efforts. After that, proposant does not anticipate further site presence.	7
7. Site Closure & Handoff	10%	Proposant will complete the transfer/handoff of all facility records.	6
8. Communication & Engagement	10%	Proposant intends to establish a strong public relationship in the community.	7
9. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Proposant is well-suited to perform decommissioning activities using broad experience planning and executing decommissioning services for many clients.	6

Evaluation Criteria: _____ Points

Not-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 - NAES

Reviewer OTJAD
 Reviewer Signature [Signature]
 Date 6.1.2022

Scoring Metric	Weight	Comments	Score (0-10)
1. General Organization	20%	Agreement's organizational chart identifies key personnel leading recruitment and hiring; will also use subcontractors for certain roles.	8
2. Recruitment and Staffing Plan	40%	Agreement provided detail description of its recruitment, strategy and onboarding process including retention of most employees.	9
3. Employee Benefits, Relations and Union	10%	Agreement commits to provide timely, equitable compensation policy.	7
4. Training Program	10%	Agreement has outlined training and professional development program. Many tools available.	9
5. Communication Plan	10%	Agreement provided varied tools for use, not detailed specific efforts.	6
6. Additional Relevant Details	10%	Agreement uses a variety of security sources, and will seek employees of the highest quality.	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: OSMP
 Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
 Date: 10-1-22

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%		15		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	4.5	\$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)
 Financial Component Contribution to Total Score (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