

December 4, 2017

RE: Credit Rating for Peruvian International Bonds

Executive Summary:

This letter is in response to your request for ratings from Egan-Jones Ratings Co. (“Egan-Jones”) on the Peruvian Sovereign Bonds (the “Bonds” or “International Bonds”) listed below and described more completely in Appendix I. The Bonds were issued between 1997 and 2015 by the Republic of Peru (“Peru”). The Bonds are currently paying but other bonds of Peru are not, as described more completely in the “Willingness to Pay” section below. Our concern is that while Peru has the ability to pay, it has been lacking in its willingness to pay and at least in Egan-Jones’ opinion, willingness to act in an even-handed manner with its creditors.

Based on our view of the information described below, and subject to the qualifications listed below, we are assigning a rating of “BB” to the Bonds with a developing watch¹.

Note, Egan-Jones is not an NRSRO (as defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the U.S.) for the purposes of sovereign and municipal issuers.

Rating Rationale:

Assigning an appropriate rating to the Bonds rests on several factors:

- the underlying credit quality of Peru,
- Peru’s willingness to pay, and
- Peru’s willingness to act in an even-handed manner with creditors, and
- the governing law and jurisdiction of the Bonds.

Credit Quality of Peru:

As indicated in Appendix I, the Bonds were issued by Peru, the credit quality of which we view as fairly high. In 2016, the overall economy recovery was seen in Peru with the evidence of GDP growth of 3.9% compared to the prior year’s 3.3%. Although Peru experienced expanding current account deficit and fiscal deficit in 2016, Peru’s credit ratios are still in the top range of the rating table, which indicates its strong credit quality. However, the significant portion of government debt held by non-residents (nearly 40%) is a structural factor that leaves the sovereign exposed to a possible reversal of capital flows, e.g., in the event of a Fed rate hike.

¹ According to Egan-Jones methodology, Egan-Jones derives its “watch” assignments from the differences between current and projected ratings. The absence of a projected rating is denoted by a “developing” watch.

Peru ratios	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Government Debt/GDP (%)	20.5	20.3	20.7	23.0	25.6
Government Surplus/Deficit to GDP (%)	2.3	0.9	-0.1	-2.1	-2.6
Nominal GDP Growth (%)	6.0	5.9	2.4	3.3	3.9

Indicative Credit Ratios	AA	A	BBB	BB	B	CCC
Government Debt/ GDP (%)	100	115	130	145	170	200
Government Surplus/Deficit to GDP (%)	2.5	0.5	-2.0	-5.0	-8.0	-10.0
Nominal GDP Growth (%)	3.5	3.0	2.0	1.0	-1.0	-5.0

Willingness to Pay:

While Peru has a relatively strong ability to service its debt, willingness to pay is lacking. Peruvian Land Reform Bonds (the “Land Reform Bonds”) were issued between 1969 and 1982 under the Republic of Peru’s (“Peru”) New Agrarian Reform Decree Law No. 17716. The Land Reform Bonds were issued to compensate, albeit at a discount, landholders who had been expropriated as part of Peru’s land reform policy. The Land Reform Bonds were denominated in Soles Oro, Peru’s currency at the time, which has since been replaced first by the Inti in 1985 and then by the Nuevo Sol in 1991. Since the first issuance of the rating last year, we did not see any material change on the Land Reform Bonds. The Land Reform Bonds remain unpaid and are experiencing current and ongoing default. Successive Peruvian governments have made efforts to avoid this obligation. Although in January 2014, the Ministry of Economy and Finance (“MEF”) issued the valuation formulas through Supreme Decrees 017-2014-EF and 019-2014-EF in order to update outstanding principal value of the Land Reform Bonds, the MEF’s formulas appear to eliminate nearly the entire amount owed under the Land Reform Bonds.² Moreover, the MEF mentioned that it has to balance Peru’s fiscal ability and financial sustainability with the obligation to pay the Land Reform Bonds. The Guidelines also set out a “mandatory” procedure for bondholder claims. To initiate that administrative procedure, however, any bondholder

² For example, Peru issued a 1,000,000 Soles Oro Class A Bond (Serial Number 12997) on August 24, 1970 with a 6% stated interest rate and 20 year maturity. Under the traditional CPI methodology used throughout Peru, the amount owed under this Bond would be 16,041,031 Nuevo Soles as of April 30, 2015. However, under the MEF’s formulas, the amount owed under this Bond would only be 26,662 Nuevo Soles as of April 30, 2015 (approximately 0.17% of the amount owed under the CPI methodology).

that is a party to ongoing judicial proceedings seeking payment of the value of the Land Reform Bonds must first “abandon” with prejudice those proceedings and any rights to participate in any other legal proceedings in the future. Peru has restructured its sovereign debt several times in the past. But it has never asked creditors to waive their procedural rights just to reconcile the amount due.

The laws of Peru also apply to currently performing Bonos Soberanos issued by Peru and the MEF’s valuation formulas and payment priority rules were issued in accordance with the instructions of the Peruvian Constitutional Tribunal (the highest Constitutional Court in Peru). Therefore, it is entirely possible that the Supreme Decrees may serve as a precedent for Peru, and holders of the Bonos Soberanos, governed under Peruvian local law, may also be subject to an involuntary reduction of principal and subordination to other creditors of Peru based on their status as a natural person or entity and as an original or secondary purchaser. The precedent being set at the highest levels of both the executive and judicial branches of the Peruvian government with respect to the Land Reform Bonds negatively impacts our view of the Bonos Soberanos and potentially other sovereign debt issued under Peruvian law.

The Peruvian International Bonds were issued under New York law and are denominated in US dollars. Egan-Jones believes that the Peruvian government has more incentive to fulfill its obligation on international bonds than the Land Reform Bonds and Bonos Soberanos, in order to maintain its credibility in the international capital markets. Moreover, the fact that these Bonds are governed by the law of the State of New York helps mitigate creditors’ exposure to what we perceive as weak rule of law in Peru, since any disputes related to the Bonds would take place in a New York court of law. However, the New York forum does not protect creditors from Peru’s unwillingness to honor its debts or abide by the rule of law.

Nota Bene:

According to EJR rating methodology, “Character - the integrity of management or in the case of sovereigns, leadership, structure, and policy” - is the first of the five key assessment criteria to evaluate credit quality. We view the Peruvian government’s poor character of fulfilling its obligations with respect to the Land Reform Bonds as a significant credit weakness, which affects our credit rating on the Peruvian International Bonds rated herein.

Conclusion:

After considering the underlying credit quality of Peruvian government, the willingness to pay by the Peruvian government, and its refusal to deal in an even-handed manner with its creditors, our decision was to affirm the ratings listed in the Executive Summary. Attached in the Appendices is additional information. We conclude that Peru has the

ability but lacks the willingness to honor this and perhaps other debts in the future.

Copyright © 2017, Egan-Jones Ratings Company, Inc. (“Egan-Jones”). All rights reserved. The information upon which Egan-Jones ratings and reports are based is obtained by Egan-Jones from sources Egan-Jones believes to be accurate and reliable. Egan-Jones relies on third party reports and information and data provided and Egan-Jones has not, unless required by law or internal policies/procedures, independently verified or performed due diligence related to the accuracy of information, data or reports. Egan-Jones has not consented to, nor will consent to, being named an “expert” under federal securities laws, including without limitation, Section 7 of the Securities Act of 1933. Please note that expected or final ratings are not recommendations to buy, hold or sell the securities. Egan-Jones is not an advisor and is not providing investment advice, strategy or related services. Egan-Jones hereby disclaims any representation or warranty, express or implied, as to the accuracy, timeliness, completeness, merchantability, and fitness for any particular purpose or non-infringement of any of such information. In no event shall Egan-Jones or its directors, officers, employees, independent contractors, agents and representatives (collectively, Egan-Jones Representatives) be liable (1) for any inaccuracy, delay, loss of data, interruption in service, error or omission or for any damages resulting therefrom, or (2) for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, compensatory or consequential damages arising from any use of ratings and rating reports or arising from any error (negligent or otherwise) or other circumstance or contingency within or outside the control of Egan-Jones or any Egan-Jones Representative, in connection with or related to obtaining, collecting, compiling, analyzing, interpreting, communicating, publishing or delivering any such information. Ratings and other opinions issued by Egan-Jones are, and must be construed solely as, statements of opinion and not statements of fact as to credit worthiness or recommendations to purchase, sell or hold any securities. A report providing an Egan-Jones rating is neither a prospectus nor a substitute for the information assembled, verified and presented to investors by the issuer and its agents in connection with the sale of the securities. Egan-Jones is not responsible for the content or operation of third party websites accessed through hypertext or other computer links and Egan-Jones shall have no liability to any person or entity for the use of such third party websites. This publication may not be reproduced, retransmitted or distributed in any form without the prior written consent of Egan-Jones. ALL Egan-Jones RATINGS ARE SUBJECT TO DISCLAIMERS AND CERTAIN LIMITATIONS. **Egan-Jones is not an NRSRO (as defined by the SEC) for the purposes of sovereign/ municipal issuers and structured finance/ABS issuers.**

Appendix I

Peruvian Sovereign Bonds

INTERNATIONAL BONDS	Identifier	Ticker	Issue Date	Currency	Maturity
Peruvian Government International Bond	EH7704370	PERU	3/30/2009	USD	3/30/2019
Peruvian Government International Bond	EF0211476	PERU	7/19/2005	USD	7/21/2025
Peruvian Government International Bond	TT3256233	PERU	3/7/1997	USD	3/7/2027
Peruvian Government International Bond	TT3294333	PERU	3/7/1997	USD	3/7/2027
Peruvian Government International Bond	ED2276944	PERU	11/21/2003	USD	11/21/2033
Peruvian Government International Bond	EG2224053	PERU	3/14/2007	USD	3/14/2037
Peruvian Government International Bond Aggregated	EI4660938	PERU	11/18/2010	USD	11/18/2050
Peruvian Government International Bond 1st Issuance		PERU	11/18/2010	USD	11/18/2050
Peruvian Government International Bond 2nd Issuance		PERU	2/1/2012	USD	11/18/2050
Peruvian Government International Bond 3rd Issuance		PERU	11/7/2014	USD	11/18/2050
Peruvian Government International Bond 4th Issuance		PERU	3/27/2015	USD	11/18/2050

SEC Rule 17g-7(a) Disclosure

Below are the disclosures as required by Paragraph (a) of Rule 17g-7.

1. The symbol in the rating scale used to denote the credit rating categories and notches within categories and the identity of the obligor, security, or money market instrument as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(A) of Rule 17g-7:

For by Peruvian International Bonds issued by Peruvian government we have assigned the rating of BB. There are three notches in our rating categories (e.g., A-, A, and A+) other than those deep into speculative grade; for CC, C, and D there are no notches.

2. The version of the procedure or methodology used to determine the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(B) of Rule 17g-7:

We are using methodology available in our Form NRSRO Exhibit #2 dated Oct 6, 2017 available via egan-jones.com under the tab at the bottom of the page "Methodologies".

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

The credit rating assigned reflects our judgement regarding the future credit quality of the issuer. Regarding the specific assumptions used, please refer to the report.

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

Our rating pertains solely to our view of current and prospective credit quality. Our rating does not address pricing, liquidity, or other risks associated with holding investments in the issuer.

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

Our rating is dependent on numerous factors including the reliability, accuracy, and quality of the data relied used in determining the credit rating. The data is sourced from publicly-available 10Q and 10K statements, quarterly reports, 8K filings, earnings reports, and other similar sources and in the case of private issuers, information provided mainly by issuers. In some cases, the information is limited because of issues such as short operating histories, the lack of reported data, a delay in reporting data, restatements, inaccurate accounting, and other issues. Such shortcomings are not always readily apparent. EJR aims to identify such shortcomings and make adjustments using its best judgement.

6. Whether and to what extent third-party due diligence services have been used in taking the rating action as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(F) of Rule 17g-7:

EJR does not utilize third-party due diligence services.

7. How servicer or remittance reports were used, and with what frequency, to conduct surveillance of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(G) of Rule 17g-7:

Servicer or remittance reports normally pertain to structured finance issuers; this report does not pertain to a structured finance issuer (EJR is not an NRSRO for structured finance or sovereigns/ municipal issuers.) Re. surveillance, the minimum time period for corp. issuers is normally one year.

8. A description of the data that were relied upon for the purpose of determining the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(H) of Rule 17g-7:

EJR uses 10Q and 10K statements, quarterly reports, 8K filings, earnings reports, and other similar sources for ratings on publicly-traded issuers and in the case of private issuers, on information provided mainly by issuers.

9. A statement containing an overall assessment of the quality of information available and considered in the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(I) of Rule 17g-7: The information is generally high quality and readily avail.

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

EJR is paid by a person other than the obligor, issuer, underwriter, depositor or sponsor to determine this credit rating.

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

Our rating aims to assess the probability of the payment of obligations in full and on-time. Factors which affect such probability and in turn, our rating include changes in the operating performance of the issuer, changes in capital structure, and merger and acquisition events.

12. Information on the content of the credit rating as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(L) of Rule 17g-7:

Regarding the historical performance of the credit rating, our rating transition matrix is available in our Form NRSRO, exhibit 1. The expected probability of default and the expected loss in the event of default is listed on the first page of this report.

13. Information on the sensitivity of the credit rating to assumptions as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(M) of Rule 17g-7:

Below is a summary of the impact of the 2 assumptions which independently would have the greatest impact on our "Implied rating":

	Assumptions			Resulting Implied Rating		
	Base	Case 1	Case 2	Base	Case 1	Case 2
Total Debt / GDP (%)	17.5	20	15	BB	BB	BB
Interest Expense / Taxes (%)	5.8	6.5	5.2	BB	BB	BB
Nominal GDP Growth (%)	8.8	9.6	8.0	BB	BB	BB
Repayment on Land Reform Bonds	No	Yes		BB	BBB	
Fairly treatment on Land Reform Bond Bondholders	No	Yes		BB	BBB	

14. If the credit rating is assigned to an asset-backed security, a description of: (1) the representations, warranties, and enforcement mechanisms available to investors; and (2) how they differ from the representations, warranties, and enforcement mechanisms in issuances of similar securities, as required by Paragraph (a)(1)(ii)(N) of Rule 17g-7:

This credit rating is not assigned to an asset-backed security.

ATTESTATION FORM

In compliance with the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Rule 17g-7(a), the Egan-Jones analyst who published the report is responsible for the rating action and to the best knowledge of the person:

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

Analyst Signature

Today's Date

Steve Zhang

Dec 4, 2017

.....
Steve Zhang
Sr. Rating Analyst

Reviewer Signature

Caroline Ding

Dec 4, 2017

.....
Caroline Ding
Rating Analyst

Sovereign Rating Methodology (Non-NRSRO)

Scope and Limitations: Sovereign Issuer Credit Quality Ratings (CQR) are a forward-looking assessment of a sovereign's capacity and willingness to honor its existing and future obligations in full and on time. Sovereigns are assigned two CQRs: a Local-Currency CQR, which reflects the likelihood of default on debt issued and payable in the currency of the sovereign, and a Foreign-Currency CQR, which is an assessment of the credit risk associated with debt issued and payable in foreign currencies.

Key Rating Drivers: EJR's approach to sovereign risk analysis is a synthesis of quantitative and qualitative judgments. The quantitative factors EJR uses are:

- Debt in relation to GDP.
- Surplus or deficit in relation to GDP.
- Debt plus potential under-funding of major banks in relation to GDP.
- Interest expense in relation to taxes.
- GDP growth.
- Foreign reserves in relation to debt.

Debt levels for many sovereign issuers have increased at an accelerating rate over the past decade, affecting implied ratings. EJR also considers unemployment levels and funding costs. EJR recognizes that no model can fully capture all the relevant influences on sovereign creditworthiness, meaning that its sovereign ratings can and do differ from those implied by the rating model. Some of the qualitative factors that impact its ultimate assessment of credit quality include the flexibility, stability and overall strength of the economy, efficiency of tax collection, acceptance of contract law, ease of doing business, trade balances, prospects for future growth and health and monetary policy, and economic freedom. These subjective and dynamic qualitative issues are not captured by the model but affect sovereign ratings

For additional information, please see Exhibit 2: Methodologies in EJR's Form NRSRO.