**Ratings**

| | |
|---|---|
| NEM | HR BBB (G) |
| Outlook | Negative |

**Contacts**

**José Luis Cano**
Executive Director Corporates / ABS
joseluis.cano@hrratings.com

**Jocelyn Hernandez**
Corporates Analyst
jocelyn.hernandez@hrratings.com

**Francisco Medina**
Sr. Corporates Analyst
francisco.medina@hrratings.com

**Luis Miranda**
Sr. Executive Director Corporates/ABS
luis.miranda@hrratings.com

**Definition**

**The rating assigned indicates that the issue or issuer with this rating provides moderate safety for timely payment of debt obligations. Maintains moderate credit risk on a global scale, with weakness in the ability to pay in adverse economic scenarios.**

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nueva Elektra del Milenio (NEM and/or the Company) | Assigned | Long Term Rating | HR BBB (G) / Negative |

**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 is based in accordance with the following methodologies established by the rating agency:

- Rating Methodology for Corporate Debt Credit Risk Evaluation, May 21st, 2014
  https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/Corporate%20Debt%20Credit%20Risk%20Evaluation%20Final.pdf
- General Methodological Criteria, March 28th, 2019
  https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/GMC%20March%202019.pdf

**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 is founded upon the analysis performed under a base case and stress case scenario, which are primarily based on the entity's historic, current and projected financial statements. The credit risk analysis reflects our view of the entity's ability and willingness to make interest and principal payments promptly and in full. The ratings do not reflect expected recoveries in the event of default, nor do they incorporate views about non-credit factors that may impact the trading price of the entity's issues HR Ratings' methodology for Corporate Debt Credit Risk evaluates relative credit risk across different entities within an asset class.

The rating process consists of two basic components:

a) Determination of the Initial Rating (IR) or Quantitative analysis:

HR Ratings makes a quantitative analysis of annual audited reports and intra-annual financial statements that provides insight of the financial administration of the entity. Taking in consideration the historical analysis and guidance given by the entity, HR Ratings projects for the next three years the financial statements in a base and a stress scenario. In order to validate guidance given by the entity, it is compared with historical data and guidance given in past years. Ideally, this methodology assumes the existence of five years of historical data to serve as the basis for making projections. However, in the absence of such history, the analysis committee will decide whether, within the context of each entity or asset class, the information available is minimally acceptable in order to proceed with a rating.

The base case scenario represents HR Ratings' estimate of the most likely evolution over time of the entity's financial position. It considers guidance provided by the entity's senior management team, but we don´t incorporate that guidance as a given. The stress case scenario assumes a less favorable mix of assumptions compared to those utilized in the base case scenario.

Stress case assumptions are determined in relations to those of the base case and are standardized for the asset class in question. The stress case scenario may also incorporate different assumptions that are unique to a specific entity. For example, the stress case may consider less favorable outcomes of a major acquisition, or a significant increase in debt burden after embarking on a sizeable project that could severely affect an entity's financial position.

The main purpose of this methodology is an evaluation of the credit quality of an entity and its debt whose normal servicing is not given any structured preference relative to other forms of debt. However, the final credit ratings of specific debt obligations may be adjusted based on preferences that it might enjoy in situations of distress. For its part, preferred structure debt will generally be serviced by all or part of a specific revenue stream and will have priority (via a cash waterfall) in the receipt of these funds. To ensure the prioritization a trust or special purpose vehicle may be created.

As part of the credit risk evaluation process, the analysis committee may distinguish among preferred, non-preferred and subordinated sub-categories. The committee may also give different ratings to specific debt that is strengthened by credit enhancement mechanisms such as guarantees from financial institutions and development banks. The credit rating process of an entity also takes into consideration related group obligations. This refers to the impact on an entity's debt obligations of credit events on the debt of related parties. In these instances, the ratings may be negatively affected by the relationship to the debt of related parties with lower credit ratings. This extends to other liabilities that might be activated by credit events occurring in related entities.

In measuring the amount of debt, this methodology requires analysts to endeavor to adopt a relatively broad definition such as relevant off-balance sheet obligations or liabilities that may trigger a default. Where appropriate, the Methodology Committee will create more precise definitions tailored to a specific asset class.

Once projections are made, our model calculates the Free Cash Flow (FCF), which is the core concept in order to calculate the four metrics that determine the initial rating. These four metrics are: i) Debt Service Coverage Ratio ("DSCR"), ii) DSCR with cash, iii) Years of Payment of Net Debt and iv) Marketable Assets to Liability Coverage Ratio ("MALC"). The model calculates a weighted average between these metrics and between years in both base and stress scenarios. The weighted sum of the normalized metric values for the two scenarios will determine the IR as converted to a letter grade using HR Ratings' credit risk scale.

The committee also evaluates the trend in the evolution of the key metrics used in the quantitative component of the rating process. Furthermore, a sharp increase in debt amortizations following the conclusion of the forecast period might be viewed as negative and in certain circumstances could justify a decision on the part of the analysis committee to extend the time horizon of the forecast period and recalibrate the relative weights for each year in the measurement of the metrics.

a) Qualitative Adjustments to the initial rating:

Once the IR is determined, the methodology then evaluates the adjustments that might be needed based on the incorporation of a variety of additional qualitative factors. The final adjustment may be multi-notch, either raising or lowering the IR. It is not possible to give a predetermined individual relative weight to any qualitative factor. The analysis committee will determine each factor's impact as neutral, positive or negative. Also, the qualitative component takes into consideration the quality of the information provided and the penalization, if any, of a limited period of historical data.

Among the main qualitative factors that are likely to be highly relevant to all entities are:

i. **Corporate Governance:** This includes factors such as the presence of independent members on the Board of Directors and procedures to provide adequate compliance with locally appropriate regulations regarding internal operations.

ii. **Liquidity and Credit Lines:** Although an entity may be structurally solvent, it could also have liquidity issues not entirely reflected in the DSCR measures. Alternatively, an entity could have access to credit lines that would provide it with liquidity. In evaluating credit lines, it is important to incorporate the degree of commitment that a lending institution has to extend the credit even in times of financial stress.

iii. **Industry Risk:** This includes factors such as the industry's future prospects, the pace of technological change, barriers to entry and cyclicality.

iv. **Company Market Position:** Here we consider whether an entity is a strong or weak participant within the industry, whether or not that position is changing or at risk of changing (e.g., technology, loss of patents), and whether or not a company depends upon a limited number of customers.

v. **Regulatory Risk:** This includes such factors as whether the industry is highly regulated such that participants might face sanctions, and whether the regulation is subject to change such that it could harm or benefit the entity being rated. Political and labour relations risks are also considered here.

vi. **Accounting Risk:** Although this methodology generally assumes the accuracy of information audited by reputable accounting firms, the analysis committee has the prerogative to penalize a rating if it believes that the quality of the information is low, but enough to evaluate the financial evolution of the entity.

vii. **Project and Financial Risk:** Under this factor we review if the company is currently engaged in a new venture or acquisition and if it is it exposed to exchange rate volatility.

viii. **Group Risk:** This refers to factors apart from those included in the debt covenants. An entity might be linked to a powerful group of shareholders that can provide it with financial resources in times of stress. Or, it might be linked to businesses that are weakening and shareholders might decide to transfer resources (via dividends or inter-company loans) from the entity being rated to weaker elements of the group.

ix. **Property enhancements:** Debt may be backed by liens on assets held by the entity. The existence of such enhancements may have a positive impact on the final rating depending upon the legal nature of the lien, the valuation of the property and the prospects of monetizing the asset.

The major difference between local and global ratings is the incorporation within the latter of transfer and convertibility risk. In the determination of our non-sovereign local currency global ratings, a key benchmark will be the difference between the AAA rating that is generally assigned to the local scale, local currency sovereign rating and the global scale, local currency sovereign rating. This sovereign global ratings discount, measured in terms of notches, will generally be applied to a non-sovereign local scale rating to determine its local currency global rating, plus/minus extraordinary factors, if any, considered by the Analysis Committee.

On the other hand, the Analysis Committee has the faculty of deciding if an entity or issuance will enjoy the same level of credit risk as the sovereign risk of the entity where it resides, or if applicable determine to what degree such entity or issuance counts with the support of the federal government, currently and in the future, to be able to respond as a guarantor. The assignment of sovereign risk to an entity is justifiable when it:

a) Provides substantial financial support or income to the Federal or Central Government, consequently a default will immediately deprive the public sector of important revenue flows.
b) Substantial harm to the economy in the case of default of the entity thus places significant burdens on the government such that it will feel obliged to support the entity to avoid non-payment.
c) Significant political influence such that authorities will feel compelled to intervene in order to prevent default.

In those cases, in which an entity or issue is deemed to enjoy sovereign risk status, the rating process, as reflected in the report, will consist of:

a) A discussion as to why the entity or issue merits sovereign risk status.
b) Definition of relevant macroeconomic and business variables, including full financial projections, including a complete stress case analysis.

**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 on the data relied on in determining the credit rating.

The Analysis Committee noted no material limitations on the scope of historical data or on the accessibility to certain documents or other information that would have better informed any credit rating listed in this disclosure form.

The ratings and/or opinions assigned are issued on behalf of HR Ratings, not of its management or technical staff, and do not constitute an investment recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any instrument nor to perform any business, investment or other operation. The assigned ratings and/or opinions issued may be subject to updates at any time, in accordance with HR Ratings' methodologies.

**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 its rating action.

**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 does not use Servicer or Remittance Reports to conduct surveillance of its rating action.

**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:

- Annual Audited reports provided by the Company.
- Inter-annual financial statements and operational results.
- Projections, budget and guidelines provided by the Company.
- Presentations issued by the Company.
- Relevant events and qualitative data provided by NEM.
- Macroeconomic assumption provided by HR Ratings' Economic Analysis area.
- Market and Industry analysis shared by the Company.

**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 quality of the information provided by the entity is considered to be consistent with the quality observed within the asset class.

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

The rating was solicited by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf, and therefore, HR Ratings has received the corresponding fees for the rating services provided. The following information can be found on our website at 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, and (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee. The Analysis has been performed with complete independence from the received fees or any other business relation with the entity and in absolute concordance with the applicable methodologies.

The ratings and/or opinions assigned are issued on behalf of HR Ratings, not of its management or technical staff, and do not constitute an investment recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any instrument nor to perform any business, investment or other operation. The assigned ratings and/or opinions issued may be subject to updates at any time, in accordance with HR Ratings' methodologies.

**11. Explanation or measure of potential volatility to the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(K) of Rule17g-7**

The main factors that could lead to the volatility of the rating are:

- Deterioration of Grupo Elektra results in its commercial or financial segments could directly impact negatively its credit rating and as a consequence affect directly NEM credit rating.
- Higher deterioration of the Mexican economy or slower recovery from the pandemic than expected could lead to lower revenues of the Company and Grupo Elektra than projected.
- Recently implemented strategy named "Mando Unico", which is looking for efficiencies through economies of scale, could not work as expected impacting negatively the EBITDA due to higher overhead / employees' expenses form NEM and Grupo Elektra.
- New investments in stores with an expanded exhibition area for the motorcycle business could not work as expected resulting in lower revenues and a deterioration on the gross margin of NEM due to the importance of this segment for the Company.
- Higher working capital requirements due to a reduction of accounts payable days as a consequence of a change on the conditions agreed with suppliers or higher inventory days and cost due to a deterioration on the supply chain of its may products (motorcycles, telephony and furniture).
- Higher investments in new stores than expected could result in more cash flow requirements for Grupo Elektra and NEM, arising into a higher indebtedness than expected.

- Reduced demand of money transfer services due to high unemployment of migrants, change in foreign exchange rate or other social and health disruptions would lead to a lower income for NEM and Grupo Elektra.
- Any negative impact on the rating for Mexico could affect the global rating for NEM, given the importance of its operations in Mexico and dependence on the country's macroeconomic indicators.

**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**

The rating assigned to NEM is aligned with Grupo Elektra's credit rating considering that Nueva Elektra del Milenio consolidates in Grupo Elektra, representing its commercial and international money transfer businesses. Also, NEM has a strategic relevance for Grupo Elektra as a cash flow generator, accounting in last twelve months (LTM) as of 2Q20 for 31.1% and 51.4% of its total consolidated revenues and EBITDA (without considering intercompany eliminations), respectively. The global credit rating of NEM is also based on the current Sovereign credit rating for Mexico which is HR BBB+ (G) with Negative Outlook.

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. In order to make more valid rankings of creditworthiness our different methodologies will apply stress case scenarios to complement our base case analysis).

.

**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**

**Credit rating based on Grupo Elektra's rating.** NEM credit rating is directly related to Grupo Elektra rating due to the importance of the Company to the Group as it consolidates the commercial business and is an important cash flow generation, however, any modification to the business structure or organigram of Grupo Elektra that changes this relationship could affect the credit rating of NEM. ´The global credit rating of NEM is based on the current Sovereign credit rating for Mexico which is HR BBB+ (G) with Negative Outlook.

**Growth of revenues after the Pandemic and Mexico's economy deterioration.** Is expected that the demand for the Company's products will grow despite the expectative of a slow recovery of Mexico's economy after the Pandemic and is assumed that the Company will have the ability to cover this increasing customer demand for its products or services through its supply chain and distribution. Any change to this assumption could result in lower revenues for NEM and Grupo Elektra which could result in a higher indebtedness or deterioration of their Free Cash Flow generation, possibly impacting negatively their credit rating.

**Access to financial sources.** Is assumed that Grupo Elektra will be able to source sufficient funds through domestic savings and time deposits from Banco Azteca, by obtaining and using lines of credit from other financial institutions or by accessing debt capital markets. If Grupo Elektra and NEM are unable to access these financial sources they may not have enough cash flow to implement their strategies and achieve the expected growth and could result into a deterioration of our Debt Service Coverage Ratio (DSCR) due to a lower cashflow generation possibly impacting negatively their credit rating.

**Indebtedness levels.** Taking into consideration Grupo Elektra and NEM's business plans and investments is expected that both entities will achieve the indebtedness levels assumed in our base scenarios for the period 2020-2022. A deviation of this assumption that resulted in a higher level of years of payment of Net debt to Free Cash Flow could result in a degradation of the credit rating.

**Banco Azteca will effectively control its doubtful accounts.** Is assumed that Banco Azteca will maintain a delinquency ratio below 10%, but, if Banco Azteca is not able to effectively control the levels of its non-performing or poor credit quality loans this could results in a deterioration of Banco Azteca's credit rating and in consequence Grupo Elektra and NEM credit ratings since the bank is part of the consolidated results of the Group.

**The demand for money transfers will continue.** Our estimates consider that the demand for money transfers in amount and number or transactions will continue with the observed growing trend, hence, any reduced demand for money transfer services due to high unemployment, changes in foreign exchange rates or other factors could negatively impact the cash flow generation of NEM and Grupo Elektra and result in a deterioration of our main rations that support the current credit rating, which could outcome in a downgrade.

**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 the credit rating listed in this disclosure form as it is not assigned to an asset-backed security.

**15. Attestation as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(iii) of Rule 17g-7 (Page 4)**

## Credit Rating Attestation

I, José Luis Cano, Corporates / ABS Executive Director 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, October 12, 2020

/s/ José Luis Cano
Corporates / ABS Executive Director
HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V.

# HR Ratings Management Contacts

## Management

**Chairman of the Board of Directors**

Alberto I. Ramos +52 55 1500 3130
alberto.ramos@hrratings.com

**Vice President of the Board of Directors**

Aníbal Habeica +52 55 1500 3130
anibal.habeica@hrratings.com

**Chief Executive Officer**

Fernando Montes de Oca +52 55 1500 3130
fernando.montesdeoca@hrratings.com

## Analysis

**Chief Credit Officer**

Pedro Latapí +52 55 8647 3845
pedro.latapi@hrratings.com

**Chief Officer of Economic Analysis**

Felix Boni +52 55 1500 3133
felix.boni@hrratings.com

**Unsecured Public Finance / Sovereigns**

Ricardo Gallegos +52 55 1500 3139
ricardo.gallegos@hrratings.com

Álvaro Rodríguez +52 55 1500 3147
alvaro.rodriguez@hrratings.com

**Secured Public Finance / Infrastructure**

Roberto Ballinez +52 55 1500 3143
roberto.ballinez@hrratings.com

Roberto Soto +52 55 1500 3148
roberto.soto@hrratings.com

**Financial Institutions / ABS**

Angel García +52 55 1253 6549
angel.garcia@hrratings.com

**Methodologies**

Alfonso Sales +52 55 1253 3140
alfonso.sales@hrratings.com

**Corporates / ABS**

Luis Miranda +52 55 1500 3146
luis.miranda@hrratings.com

José Luis Cano +52 55 1500 0763
joseluis.cano@hrratings.com

## Regulation

**Chief Risk Officer**

Rogelio Argüelles +52 181 8187 9309
rogelio.arguelles@hrratings.com

**Head Compliance Officer**

Alejandra Medina +52 55 1500 0761
alejandra.medina@hrratings.com

## Business Development

**Business Development**

Francisco Valle +52 55 1500 3134
francisco.valle@hrratings.com

***Mexico: Guillermo González Camarena No. 1200, Piso 10, Colonia Centro de Ciudad Santa Fe, Del. Álvaro Obregón, C.P. 01210, Ciudad de México. Tel 52 (55) 1500 3130.***
***United States: One World Trade Center, Suite 8500, New York, New York, ZIP Code 10007, Tel +1 (212) 220 5735.***

**** HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V. (HR Ratings), is a rating agency authorized by the Mexican Banking and Securities Commission (Comisión Nacional Bancaria y de Valores) (CNBV) and registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a NRSRO for government securities, corporates and financial institutions, as described in clause (v), section 3(a)(62)(A) of the U.S. Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and certified as a Credit Rating Agency (CRA) by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA).***

**The rating was solicited by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf, and therefore, HR Ratings has received the corresponding fees for the rating services provided. The following information can be found on our website at 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, and (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee.**

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 HR Ratings classification methodologies, in terms of the provisions of article 7, section II and/or III, as appropriate, of the “General provisions applicable to the issuers of securities and other participants in the stock market”.

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. There Code of Conduct, HR Ratings’ 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 rating fee that HR Ratings receives from issuers generally ranges from US$1,000 to US$1,000,000 (or the foreign currency equivalent) per issue. In some instances, HR Ratings will rate all or some of the issues of a particular issuer for an annual fee. It is estimated that the annual fees range from US$5,000 to US$2,000,00 (or the foreign currency equivalent).



**** HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V. (HR Ratings), is a rating agency authorized by the Mexican Banking and Securities Commission (Comisión Nacional Bancaria y de Valores) (CNBV) and registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a NRSRO for government securities, corporates and financial institutions, as described in clause (v), section 3(a)(62)(A) of the U.S. Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and certified as a Credit Rating Agency (CRA) by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA).***