

First and Beech

Venture Owner,

LLC

HR BB+ (G)

Stable Outlook

US\$73.0m Term

Loan

HR BB+ (G)

Stable Outlook

31875*AA5



Elizabeth Martínez

Corporates Manager

Lead Analyst

elizabeth.martinez@hrratings.com



Mariana Méndez

Sr. Analyst

mariana.mendez@hrratings.com



Heinz Cederborg

Corporates Sr. Executive Director

heinz.cederborg@hrratings.com

Rule 17g-7 Information Disclosure Form

The Rating Action Commentary (RAC) associated with this disclosure form is an integral part of the form.

1. **Symbol, Number, or Score in the Rating Scale used by HR Ratings as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(A) of Rule 17g-7:**

Entity/Instrument	Rating Action	Rating Type	Rating Code
First and Beech Venture Owner, LLC	Assignment	Long Term Rating	HR BB+ (G) / Stable Outlook
US\$73.0m Term Loan	Assignment	Long Term Rating	HR BB+ (G) / Stable Outlook

2. **Version of the Procedure or Methodology used to determine the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(B) of Rule 17g-7:**

The rating assigned by HR Ratings to the entity and its associated debt is based in accordance with the following methodologies established by the rating agency:

- Corporate Debt Credit Risk Evaluation, February 2024

https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/Corporates_2024.pdf



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

3. Main assumptions and principles used in constructing the procedures and methodologies to determine the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(C) of Rule 17g-7

The methodology describes the process used to assess the ability and willingness to meet corporate debt payment obligations in a timely manner and as originally agreed, including dependent structured debt and real estate investment trusts. The process consists of a quantitative analysis based on four financial metrics (three for structured debt) and an analysis allowing for qualitative adjustments, including adjustments related to ESG factors.

The corporate methodology involves the creation of financial models based on HR Ratings projections and when relevant historical performance data. The projections are made under a Base and Stress scenario, both incorporating the relevant historical data. The formal rating period generally incorporates five years of information. The four metrics used in this analysis are: (i) debt service coverage; (ii) debt service coverage including end of previous period cash (iii) years to payment, which measures the ratio between annual free cash flow and net debt; and (iv) the ratio between a market value estimate of corporate assets and its total liabilities. For real estate companies, the fourth metric is replaced by the loan to value ratio.

For both the Base and Stress scenarios the annual weighted average of each metric value is calculated. These annual averages are converted into a numerical rating scale, which is the same for each metric. Subsequently, and for each scenario, the weighted average of the metric numerical ratings is calculated. The final quantitative score is the weighted average of the two scenarios. If historical information is available, this process generally considers two reported and three projected years. However, the methodology considers the possibility of using different rating or time periods, with fewer reported years, and in the case of real estate leasing companies with seven instead of five years.

The rating obtained through this quantitative analysis can be adjusted positively or negatively by applying qualitative notches, which are divided into two categories: general and ESG. General adjustments refer to factors that could over time affect the quantitative rating especially when HR Ratings concludes that these factors cannot be adequately incorporated into the quantitative models. This includes ESG factors that are analyzed to determine their significance for and potential influence on credit risk. The environmental factor analyzes the corporate's environmental approach and policies, considering its lines of business and daily operations, as well as exposure to natural phenomena and environmental regulations. For the social factor, the business approach is evaluated first then the corporate policies regarding all levels of employee benefits, career plans and ability to retain talent and inclusion are evaluated.

Finally, the corporate governance analysis considers five aspects: (i) internal regulations of the corporation, considering their scope, formality and mechanisms for continuous adaptation, (ii) quality of senior management and administration, considering their financial strategies and history of crisis management, (iii) transparency and quality of the information provided, as well as history of non-compliance, (iv) risk associated with the regulatory framework to which each corporation is susceptible and the risk associated with the macroeconomic environment, and (v) management and mitigation strategies associated with the entity's operational risk, as well as the technological tools available for performing daily operations.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

HR Ratings is giving a negative adjustment given that the Project is still under construction and will be completed by 4Q25, which creates some uncertainty in the free cash flow generation for the following periods.

4. Potential limitations of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(D) of Rule 17g-7

- HR Ratings does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information.
- Ratings and/or opinions assigned by HR Ratings are based on an analysis of the creditworthiness of an entity, issue or issuer, and do not necessarily imply a statistical likelihood of default.
- The credit ratings do not opine on the liquidity of the issuer's securities or stock.
- The credit ratings do not consider the possible loss severity on an obligation default.
- The credit ratings are not an opinion of the market value of any issuer's securities or stock, or the possibility that this value suffer a deterioration.

5. Information on the uncertainty of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(E) of Rule 17g-7

The Analysis Committee noted no material limitations on the reliability, accuracy and quality of the data relied on in determining the credit rating.

The third party did not provide HR Ratings with audited or historical financial information due to the project is still in construction and therefore, is not yet generating income. For this reason, HR Ratings decided to give a negative notch due to the uncertainty risk this represents for the rating.

6. Use of third party due diligence services as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(F) of Rule 17g-7

HR Ratings did not use third party due diligence services for the rating.

7. Use of servicer or remittance reports to conduct surveillance of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(G) of Rule 17g-7

HR Ratings did not use Servicer or Remittance Reports.

8. Description of types of data about any obligor, issue, security or money market instrument relied upon for determining credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(H) of Rule 17g-7

Among the main information used for the rating is:

- Construction Loan Agreement provided by a third party.
- Industry information provided by a third party.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

- Revenue and KPI estimations and Proforma provided by a third party.
- Appraisal Report prepared by Apprise, provided by a third party.
- Monthly Debt Waterfall for 2023-2028 provided by a third party.
- Investment Memos provided by a third party.
- Construction Status Report and Monitor Reports provided by a third party.

9. Overall assessment of quality of information available and considered in determining credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(I) of Rule 17g-7

The financial information was purely projected due to the Project is still in construction and will not be fully operational until 2026. Nevertheless, the quality of the information provided by the entity is considered to be consistent with the quality observed in ratings that use a similar methodology.

10. Information relating to conflicts of interest as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(J) of Rule 17g-7

The aforementioned rating was not requested by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf. However, the rating was requested by an investor whose identity is kept confidential to the general public, therefore, HR Ratings has received from the investor the corresponding fees for the provision of its rating services. The following information can be found on our website <https://www.hrratings.com/>: (i) The internal procedures for the monitoring and surveillance of our ratings and the periodicity with which they are formally updated, (ii) the criteria used by HR Ratings for the withdrawal or suspension of the maintenance of a rating, (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee, and (iv) the rating scales and their definitions.

HR Ratings was paid for services other than determining credit ratings during the most recently ended fiscal year by the person that paid to determine this credit rating.

11. Explanation or measure of potential volatility to the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(K) of Rule 17g-7

1. Factors that are reasonably likely to lead to a change in the credit rating:

- **Project Risk.** If the Company is unable to complete the construction of the Project by 4Q25 or is unable to maintain a vacancy rate equal to or lower than our projections, it could result in a minimum to strong negative impact on the rating.
- **Reduction in DSCR levels.** If the Company reduces the FCF due to lower operating results or higher working capital requirements through the forecasted period (2025-2031), reaching an average DSCR level below 0.4x, the rating could have a moderate negative impact.
- **Balloon Payment Risk.** Over time, and assuming that the Company is not able to refinance its debt before its maturity in 2027, the rating could suffer a strong negative impact.
- **Faster revenue generation.** If the Company is able to generate higher FCF than expected, reflecting an average DSCR and DSCR with Cash above 1.0x and 1.6x respectively for the 2025-2031 (vs. 0.7x and 1.1x in our baseline scenario), the rating could be upgraded.



2. The magnitude of the change that could occur under different market conditions determined by HR Ratings to be relevant to the rating:
- **Stronger competition.** If the Company is unable to adjust to a highly competitive environment in the U.S., leading to a decrease in footprint and therefore affecting its Revenue generation capability, the DSCR would be impacted. If these metric levels are below 0.4x, this could have a negative moderate impact on the rating.
 - **Lower US economic growth.** If the Company is not able to adjust to low economic growth in the US, it could affect its Free Cash Flow generation. If this is reflected in an average DSCR with cash of 0.8x during the forecasted period of 2025-2031, it could have a moderate negative impact on the rating.

NOTE: The Credit Analysis Committee must convene to review and discuss the changes that could occur under different market conditions. All the ratings issued by HR Ratings must be approved by the Credit Analysis Committee in accordance with the applicable methodology and the information available at the time. However, the magnitude of a potential change in the rating that could reasonably occur as a result of the impact of the factors listed above are characterized by the following summary chart:

Rating change impact	Number of notches
Minimum	(0-1)
Moderate	(2 - 3)
Strong	>3

12. Historical performance and expected probability of default and expected loss in event of default as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(L) of Rule 17g-7

For historical performance of each rating listed in the disclosure form, click on the link in the ratings table presented on the first page.

Our credit ratings need to be understood as rankings of the relative creditworthiness of different entities or credits. Creditworthiness takes into consideration both the ability and willingness to meet debt obligations in the manner prescribed in the relevant documentation. Default refers to the noncompliance of previously agreed obligations.

As our ratings measure relative creditworthiness, they do not necessarily reflect any specific statistical probability of default. However, HR Ratings provides to the market participants the default rate for historical default and loss statistics for the class or subclass of the credit rating. Although the default rate is not the expected probability of default or loss given default, we consider it the ratio that could be interpreted by market participants as such. The default rate for each of the asset classes in which HR Ratings provides ratings and for each rating category is publicly available for each calendar year at: https://www.hrratings.com/regulatory_disclosure/transition_matrix.xhtml



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

13. Assumptions made by HR Ratings in determining announced credit ratings and examples of how assumptions impact the rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(M) of Rule 17g-7

1. Assumptions made in the rating process that, without accounting for any other factor, would have the greatest impact on the credit rating if proven false or inaccurate:

HR Ratings bases its ratings and/or opinions on information obtained from sources that are believed to be accurate and reliable. The assumption is that the information provided is reliable and credible, however, does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information.

- Our estimates consider a 2026-2031 revenue CAGR of 18.6%, mainly driven by the construction and beginning of operation of the First and Beech Project which is expected to be fully completed by 4Q25. This revenue CAGR incorporates a gradual unit absorption of 20 apartments per month, beginning in February 2026 and ending in December of the same year. After that, we assume a global occupancy rate of 96% for 2027-2031.
 - We are taking into consideration that the Company would incur operating expenses along with the construction finalization and the revenue generation capability gradually increases, reaching this way an EBITDA margin of 72.7% in 2031.
 - Regarding net investment in the Project, we estimate that First and Beech Venture Owner will realize a total investment of US\$113.1m.
 - Regarding debt, under both scenarios, we expect that the Company will make complete use of the US\$73.0m Construction Loan from 2024 to 2026 to fund the construction of the First and Beech Project. The Construction loan facility has an interest rate of SOFR + 4.5%, with a SOFR floor of 3.5%. It has zero amortizations with only balloon payment at 4Q27, at which we expect a refinancing of the same amount of US\$73.0m. We expect this new refinancing to be a whole new loan under slightly better conditions (-100bps vs. the 4.5% original spread) than the Construction Loan to reflect the less existing risk due to the construction completion. We additionally anticipate another refinancing of this new loan in 4Q31 to 4Q35 with the same characteristics as the first refinancing. It is important to mention that we are considering the amortization of the original loan and the first refinancing in our Net Debt Service.
 - As a result of the above, in our base scenario we expect an average DSCR and DSCR with Cash of 0.7x and 1.1x for 2025-2031, respectively.
2. Analysis, using specific examples, of how each of the assumptions identified in the preceding paragraph impacts the credit rating:
- If the Company's revenue generation during the period projected (2025-2031) is 21.1% lower than our baseline projections, it could result in a lower rating.
 - Regarding our EBITDA margin, if there is an increase of ~3% in operating expenses that would lead to an average EBITDA margin of 57.8% for 2025-2031 (vs. 63.7% on our base scenario), the rating could be impacted negatively.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

- If the Company had greater investment in the Investment Properties account, for the construction of the First and Beech project and this increase was funded through debt, which pushed debt amounts to higher levels than expected, the rating could be impacted negatively.
- If the Company's accumulated FCF falls by 29.1% relative to our Base scenario increasing its LTV metric above ~72%, the rating could be negatively impacted.
- Considering the previous point, if the average DSCR with Cash decreases below 0.8x in the rating period (2025-2031), this could result in a lower rating.

14. **Representations, warranties and enforcement mechanisms available to investors as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(N) of Rule 17g-7**

The reporting of representations, warranties, and enforcement mechanisms does not apply to any of the credit ratings listed in this disclosure form.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

Credit Rating Attestation

I, Elizabeth Martínez, Corporates Manager have the responsibility for this rating action and, to the best of my knowledge:

- No part of the credit rating was influenced by any other business activities;
- The credit rating was based solely upon the merits of the obligor, security, or money market instrument being rated;
and
- The credit rating was an independent evaluation of the credit risk of the obligor, security, or money market instrument

Mexico City, April 2, 2024

/s/ Elizabeth Martínez, Corporates Manager
HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V.



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM

* HR Ratings, LLC (HR Ratings), is a Credit Rating Agency registered by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (NRSRO) for the assets of public finance, corporates and financial institutions as described in section 3 (a) (62) (A) and (B) subsection (i), (iii) and (v) of the US Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The aforementioned rating was not requested by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf. However, the rating was requested by an investor whose identity is kept confidential to the general public, therefore, HR Ratings has received from the investor the corresponding fees for the provision of its rating services. The following information can be found on our website <https://www.hrratings.com/>: (i) The internal procedures for the monitoring and surveillance of our ratings and the periodicity with which they are formally updated, (ii) the criteria used by HR Ratings for the withdrawal or suspension of the maintenance of a rating, (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee, and (iv) the rating scales and their definitions.

The ratings and/or opinions of HR Ratings de México S.A. de C.V. (HR Ratings) are opinions regarding the credit quality and/or the asset management capacity, or relative to the performance of the tasks aimed at the fulfillment of the corporate purpose, by issuing companies and other entities or sectors, and are based on exclusively in the characteristics of the entity, issue and/or operation, regardless of any business activity between HR Ratings and the entity or issuer. The ratings and/or opinions granted are issued on behalf of HR Ratings and not of its management or technical personnel and do not constitute recommendations to buy, sell or maintain any instrument, or to carry out any type of business, investment or operation, and may be subject to updates at any time, in accordance with the rating methodologies of HR Ratings.

HR Ratings bases its ratings and/or opinions on information obtained from sources that are believed to be accurate and reliable. HR Ratings, however, does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information. Most issuers of debt securities rated by HR Ratings have paid a fee for the credit rating based on the amount and type of debt issued. The degree of creditworthiness of an issue or issuer, opinions regarding asset manager quality or ratings related to an entity's performance of its business purpose are subject to change, which can produce a rating upgrade or downgrade, without implying any responsibility for HR Ratings. The ratings issued by HR Ratings are assigned in an ethical manner, in accordance with healthy market practices and in compliance with applicable regulations found on the www.hrratings.com rating agency webpage. HR Ratings' Code of Conduct, rating methodologies, rating criteria and current ratings can also be found on the website.

Ratings and/or opinions assigned by HR Ratings are based on an analysis of the creditworthiness of an entity, issue or issuer, and do not necessarily imply a statistical likelihood of default, HR Ratings defines as the inability or unwillingness to satisfy the contractually stipulated payment terms of an obligation, such that creditors and/or bondholders are forced to take action in order to recover their investment or to restructure the debt due to a situation of stress faced by the debtor. Without disregard to the aforementioned point, in order to validate our ratings, our methodologies consider stress scenarios as a complement to the analysis derived from a base case scenario. The fees HR Ratings receives from issuers generally range from US\$1,000 to \$1,000,000 (one million dollars, legal tender in the United States of America) (or the equivalent in another currency) per offering. In some cases, HR Ratings will rate all or some of a particular issuer's offerings for an annual fee. Annual fees are estimated to vary between \$5,000 and US\$2,000,000 (five thousand to two million dollars, legal tender in the United States of America) (or the equivalent in another currency).

Media Contact

comunicaciones@hrratings.com



@HRRATINGS



HR RATINGS



WWW.HRRATINGS.COM