

Rating: Senior notes / EUR 556.4m / maturing in June 2026 issued by Gode Wind 1 Investor Holding GmbH (Gode Wind 1)

Rating	Expected loss	Expected risk horizon*	Notional	Payment period	Coupon (fixed)	Final maturity
BBB+	0.01%	0.23 years	EUR 556.4m	6 months	375bps	2026

The transaction closed on 15 October 2015. The final rating is based on the information provided as of December 2025. Scope's ratings definitions are available at scoperatings.com.

* The expected risk horizon is equal to the instrument's probability-weighted average duration under all scenarios when assuming a 0% discount rate. For more details please refer to the [General Project Finance Rating Methodology](#).

Transaction and instrument details	
Country / sector / status	Germany / Power / Operational
Group / sector / asset	Renewable power / wind power generation / off-shore wind power generation
Purpose	Funding of the construction and operation of a 346.5 MW offshore wind farm in the German North Sea.
Issuer	Gode Wind 1 Investor Holding GmbH
Sponsors	Nuveen Infrastructure, The Renewables Infrastructure Group, Equitix
Structure / seniority / amortisation	HoldCo structure / senior notes / fully amortising

Rating rationale (summary)

The BBB+ rating reflects the total expected loss (EL) of 0.01% over the loan's life until maturity (equivalent to a 0.23-year constant-exposure expected risk horizon). Key drivers are the low risks during operation, particularly given the experienced sponsors and operator, good technical track record, and strong operational visibility until debt maturity in June 2026. Projected coverage ratios are adequate, supported by robust revenue generation, very limited merchant power price exposure until the notes' maturity, low regulatory risk, and the substantial size of the debt service reserve amount relative to the outstanding debt. The project features a fully amortising debt profile followed by a long remaining useful technical asset life.

EL strength and PD strength rf rf	Construction risks account for 0.0% of total EL. Construction was completed in Q2 2016, with final take-over in Q1 2017, resulting in no construction risk.
EL strength and PD strength a bbb-	Operational risks account for 12.0% of total EL. The operating track record has been good over the last five years. The largely fixed-fee O&M agreement with Ørsted and the maintenance reserve mitigate operating expenditure uncertainties. Counterparty risk is low due to Ørsted's strong record, credit standing and significant commitment to the project.
EL strength and PD strength a bbb-	Revenue risks account for 10.6% of total EL. The priority dispatch of electricity, the absence of price risk due to regulated fixed tariffs, and the generally good quality and reliability of the offshore wind resource mitigate the risk of revenue fluctuations, although subject to certain uncompensated events. The strong economic rationale, negligible risk of retroactive regulatory change in Germany, and high barriers to entry compensate for the project's dependence on subsidies.
EL strength and PD strength bbb bb+	Financial strength risks account for 71.8% of total EL. The recent covenant breach was driven by one-off factors, while forward-looking ratios are considered robust, particularly given the short remaining debt tenor. There is no refinancing risk given the fully amortising structure. The useful economic life following the notes' maturity is at least 15 years, but positive cash flow generation requires the captured electricity market price to exceed the regulatory floor. Project recovery is lower than for Borkum Riffgrund 2 due to the lower turbine model size used, resulting in lower profitability.
EL strength and PD strength a+ a-	Project structure and compliance risks account for 5.6% of total EL. The notes may be structurally subordinated to emergency funding from Ørsted, partly mitigated by a contractual cap on servicing such a loan, the robust governance and security framework, and the experienced sponsors and operator, which hold a significant economic interest in the project.

Analytical Team

Marton Zempleni
+49 30 27891-038
m.zempleni@scoperatings.com

Team Head

Torsten Schellscheidt
+49 40 524 724-100
t.schellscheidt@scoperatings.com

Business Development

Marc-Orell Stadthaus
+49 30 27891-243
m.stadthaus@scopergroup.com

Carlos Terré
+49 30 27891-242
c.terre@scopergroup.com

Related Research

[General Project Finance Rating Methodology](#),
November 2025

[Counterparty Risk Methodology](#),
June 2025

Table of content

- Rating drivers and mitigants
- 1. Transaction summary
 - 1.1. Performance update
- 2. Rating and project risk
- 3. Likelihood of credit impairment events
 - 3.1. Probability of hard default
- 4. Severity of credit impairment events
 - 4.1. Severity analysis of most relevant credit impairment events
 - 4.2. Severity analysis of standard credit-impairment events
 - 4.3. Recovery rate on hard defaults
- 5. Rating stability
- 6. ESG grid
- 7. Legal framework
- 8. Monitoring
- 9. Applied methodology and data
- Appendix I Likelihood and expected recovery of credit impairment events
- Appendix II Recovery distributions under all impairment events

Rating drivers and mitigants

Positive rating drivers

Experienced sponsors. All sponsors are well-experienced, have acceptable credit quality with no equity contribution obligation, good technical capabilities, and have significant economic incentives. TRIG's partial sale to Equitix does not change our sponsor risk assessment.

Low technical operational risks. Ørsted will operate and maintain the project for 20 years from completion. O&M contract prices are largely fixed. The O&M budget includes a sizable maintenance reserve based on the expected variable O&M charges (three-year rolling allocation). The project has good technical track record of operation.

Stable and predictable long-term revenues. No price risk due to fixed feed-in-tariffs until operating-year 20 (high feed in tariff followed by floor price). The good quality and reliability of offshore wind yield in the German North Sea mitigate resource risk.

Acceptable resilience to cash flow stresses. The project demonstrates acceptable resilience to cash flow stress scenarios, including lower wind turbine availability, higher inflation and operating costs.

No refinancing risk. The notes are fully amortising.

Negative rating drivers and mitigants

Structural subordination. The notes may be structurally subordinated to an unforeseen emergency funding from Ørsted provided to the Project in case the Issuer is unable to fund critical works to maintain or restore operation. This structural feature is mitigated by the cap on servicing such contingency loan, good operating performance, the robust governance and security framework and the highly experienced sponsors and operators, which have a significant economic interest in the project.

Weak recent financial performance. June 2025 DSCR of 0.93x reflected a temporary covenant breach, driven by tax prepayment timing and weak wind resource. Debt service was fully met. Forecast DSCRs remain adequate, while NLC and PLCR continue to show strong coverage.

Significant dependency on subsidies. Low regulatory risks, the strong project rationale, and high barriers to entry mitigate the risk of retroactive subsidy cuts.

Post-FiT cashflows reliant on power prices being above the floor price. Following the end of the FiT period, power prices at the regulatory floor price would not cover operating costs in most periods, thereby limiting calculated leverage despite the short remaining loan tenor.


Positive rating-change drivers

The scope for a rating upgrade is limited, but significantly higher cash flows than projected could result in a rating upgrade.

Negative rating-change drivers

Lower energy production or consistently lower cash flows in the operating phase than assumed in our rating case could lead to a rating downgrade.


Credit impairment events (summary)



Source: Scope.

1. Transaction summary

Figure 1: Simplified representation of the transaction structure



Source: Transaction documents and Scope.

Gode Wind 1 Offshore Wind Farm GmbH & Co. oHG is the joint investment of Ørsted and private equity investors. The wind farm is located in the German exclusive economic zone of the North Sea, 34 km from the nearest land. It has a total gross capacity of 346.5 MW, using 55 Siemens 6.3MW turbines on monopile foundations. It holds an unconditional grid connection commitment from the responsible transmission system operator, TenneT TSO GmbH (TSO), on the DolWin Beta grid connection. Ørsted managed the wind farm's development and construction. Construction commenced in Q2 2015 and was mechanically completed ahead of schedule in Q2 2016, with final take-over in Q2 2017. Ørsted (or an affiliate) also manages the O&M of the wind farm and provides a route-to-market for the electricity produced under two separate power purchase agreements for a period of 20 years. The project is fully operational and owned by Ørsted (50%) and a consortium consisting of Nuveen Infrastructure (25%) and The Renewable Infrastructure Group (TRIG, 25%). In August 2024, TRIG announced the sale of 15.2% of the wind farm to funds managed by Equitix Investment Management. The transaction has not yet been completed as it is subject to approvals and consents. TRIG will retain a 9.8% interest in the underlying wind farm.

Ørsted initially divested a 50.0% share in the project and retained the remaining interest. For this purpose, an unlimited partnership under German law was established (Gode Wind 1 Offshore Wind Farm GmbH & Co. oHG, or the OpCo). Ørsted Wind Power A/S (DE HoldCo) and Gode Wind 1 Investor Holding GmbH (the issuer) each hold an equity stake of 50.0% in the OpCo and have equal voting rights governed by a partnership agreement. With holdings in all relevant permits and assets, the OpCo entered into a construction agreement with Ørsted at a pre-agreed construction price. Gode Wind 1 Investor Holding GmbH is an SPV whose purpose is limited to the management of the 50.0% stake in the OpCo and its proportionate funding. Financing needs during construction were covered through the issuance of EUR 556.4m of senior secured amortising registered notes, and a EUR 260m subordinated debt facility. There is no further external debt at project level. The outstanding volume of the senior notes amounts to EUR 35.8m as of the end of June 2025.

1.1. Performance update

The project's actual electricity generation, including compensated curtailment volumes for the first nine months of 2025, was 12.5% below Scope's rating case, primarily due to extremely low wind conditions in H1 2025—a trend also observed across other German North Sea offshore wind projects.

Uncompensated revenue events (grid outages within thresholds and negative price periods) exceeded our rating case assumptions (5.0% actual vs. 3.5% forecast), driven mainly by an increase in negative price events. Turbine availability remained robust, above our rating case assumption, and overall park performance has been adequate.

The actual historic DSCR for the 12-month period ending June 2025 was 0.93x, representing a covenant breach that has been waived by lenders. The previous Scope rating case projected a weak ratio of 1.08x for this period, reflecting higher-than-expected tax payments due to timing effects in Germany's tax prepayment system and subsequent true-up adjustments. The underperformance compared to our prior rating case was primarily driven by weak wind resources in H1 2025.

Scope has updated its rating case forecast to reflect revised inflation projections and slightly adjusted short-term merchant power prices applicable after the end of the feed-in tariff period.

For the 12-month backward-looking DSCR, the minimum is 1.20x and the average is 1.25x. The Note Life Coverage Ratio (NLCR) of 1.29x and Project Life Coverage Ratio (PLCR) of 1.73x remain robust, particularly as our ratio calculations exclude the required debt service reserve amount (secured by an acceptable L/C with a minimum rating of BBB+).

2. Rating and project risk

The rating on the instrument reflects the financial and legal structure of the transaction; the value of the security package; the competitive position of the borrower; the experience and alignment of interests of the sponsors; and the counterparty exposures to key partners in construction (if applicable) and operation.

The total EL on the rated instrument is commensurate with a BBB+ rating. We calculated an EL of 0.01% over the lifetime of the instrument (equivalent to a constant exposure expected risk horizon of 0.23 years) under our rating case scenario (Scope's rating case), which is more conservative than the sponsor's base case scenario.

The EL reflects: i) the likelihood of several idealised credit impairment events with the potential to reduce payments originally promised to the investor; and ii) the severity of such credit impairment events. Credit impairment events represent default-like situations that could impair the project's credit performance in relation to the rated instrument.

Our analysis focuses on 16 credit impairment events grouped in five areas of risk: i) Construction; ii) Operation; iii) Revenue risk; iv) Financial strength, and v) Project structure and event risk.

Figure 2 shows the probability of default (PD) and EL strengths of the instrument in relation to the five risk areas considered in our analysis. Figure 3 shows the relative contribution of each risk area to the total expected loss for the investor in the instrument.

EL and PD strengths

We use EL strength (ELS) and probability of default strength (PD strength or PDS) to indicate the relative robustness of the different credit risk dimensions of a project.

The ELS and PDS indicate what the rating of the project would be if all other credit dimensions were as risky as the dimension under analysis. This is expressed with a symbol from our rating scale but written in lowercase to denote that the strength indication is not a rating.

For example, an ELS of aa+ for the 'Supply interruptions' credit impairment event indicates that the project would be rated AA+ if all dimensions of risk were as safe as the availability of inputs for the project.

Figure 2: PD and EL strengths by risk area





Figure 3: Share total EL contributions by risk area




Source: Scope.

Source: Scope.

Figure 4 shows the idealised credit impairment events that we consider when estimating the EL for the investor, expressed as a probability tree. The tree illustrates the expected likelihood of each impairment, as well its expected severity for the investor – taking into account the leverage of the project. The three most relevant credit impairment events for this transaction are highlighted in green. The most relevant events as regards the impairment likelihood and contribution to total EL are highlighted in light blue.

Figure 4: Visual summary of the project's risks, impairment likelihoods and EL contributions



3. Likelihood of credit impairment events

We calculated an expected impairment likelihood of 0.06% for this project, commensurate with a PD strength of bbb- when expressed using the levels of our idealised PD curves, as per our methodology. The project's PD strength and EL results from the aggregated risk of the construction and operational phases. Figure 2 shows the PD strengths of the different risk areas of this project. PD strengths determine the likelihood of credit impairments under the scenarios linked to the risk area.

We considered 23 risk factors that contribute to the project's total credit risk and drive the likelihood of credit impairment events. These risk factors are categorised in the same five risk areas that we use to group credit impairment events, with the risk contribution from sponsors impacting all five areas of risk. We assessed the risk contribution of each risk factor using a scoring model, in the context of the instrument. The likelihood of a given risk area triggering a

credit impairment event (PD strength of risk area) is derived from the scores of the different risk factors (see Figure 2).

Figure 5 summarises the scores assigned to each of the risk factors defined in our methodology.

Figure 5: Summary of the project's risk factor scores

Risk area	Risk factor	Score	Comment
Sponsors PDS rf	Sponsor's experience, track record and importance of the project	Low	Gode Wind 1 is the joint investment of Ørsted (50% stake; rated BBB/Baa2/BBB+ by three reputable credit rating agencies or CRAs), Nuveen Infrastructure (25% stake; publicly unrated) and The Renewables Infrastructure Group (TRIG, 25% stake; publicly unrated). The sponsor group overall has good credit quality, strong technical capabilities and significant incentives. Ørsted, in particular, has extensive experience with similar projects. In August 2024, TRIG announced the sale of 15.2% of the wind farm to funds managed by Equitix Investment Management. The transaction was completed in March 2025. TRIG retains a 9.8% interest in the underlying wind farm. Our sponsor risk assessment remains unchanged following this sale, given Equitix's financial strength, track record in UK offshore wind investments and significant economic interest based on the reported sale price.
Construction PDS rf	Construction complexity, permits, design and technology	n/a	Construction commenced in Q2 2015 and was finished ahead of schedule in Q2 2016, with final take-over in Q1 2017.
	Construction contracts, budget and schedule	n/a	
	Construction funding and liquidity package	n/a	
	Counterparty risk	n/a	
	Equity contribution risk	n/a	
Operation PDS bbb-	Operational complexity, technology and standing	Average	Operational complexity is average (high technical demands that require specialised equipment and operating skills). During construction, the SWT-6.0-154 turbine model had a very limited track record as it was only the third batch of the turbine's serial production. However, recent turbine availability levels broadly meet initial expectations and indicate low technical risks. Regarding the monopile foundations, we expect low technical risks as Ørsted and the relevant subcontractors have gained significant experience from other monopile designs and installations at other offshore sites. According to the independent technical due diligence, the electrical infrastructure and the offshore substation are proven concepts for offshore wind farms and have already been used for Ørsted's other projects (e.g. Borkum Riffgrund). Grid connection is exposed to increased technical risks since many unscheduled grid outages have occurred since commissioning. Such outages fall outside of the project's control and are eligible for compensation from the TSO, but only after certain grace periods.
	O&M contracts, budget and planning	Low	A comprehensive O&M contract over 20 years fully covers the term of the senior notes. For the initial five project years, Siemens provided maintenance for the turbines via a pass-through service warranty agreement. Overall, the O&M concept comprises a fixed budget, a variable budget and a contingency budget, and benefits from a maintenance reserve account. Ørsted provides a large part of the O&M in return for an annual fixed fee, with fixed operating costs amounting to around 80% of total budgeted operating expenses. The concept and budgets were validated by independent third-party experts, and the assumptions are in line with those of other offshore wind farms operated by Ørsted, according to the technical advisor.
	Lifecycle risk	Very low	Lifecycle risk is very low due to the comprehensive O&M contracts, including the provision of spare parts. No major capex programme is expected during the remaining tenor of the notes.
	Counterparty risk	Low	The O&M provider have adequate credit quality and good track records. There are sufficient alternatives available in the market despite the high specialisation required.
Revenue risk PDS bbb-	Revenue contract	Very low	There is no price risk until the maturity of the rated notes due to the German FiT regulation. Under the established German subsidy regime, the project will receive statutory revenues for electricity sales to the market consisting of: i) an initial (accelerated) FiT for eight years (operating years 1-8) of EUR 194/MWh; ii) an extended (regular) FiT of EUR 154/MWh for an additional 21 months (operating years 9-10); and iii) a price floor of EUR 39/MWh thereafter (operating years 10-20). The extended FiT ends four months before the senior debt maturity; this short period is mitigated by the price floor mechanism and the provision of a six-month debt service reserve. The German regulatory framework is stable, transparent and supportive, with very low probability of adverse changes. There are no mismatches with other contracts.

Risk area	Risk factor	Score	Comment
	Economic fundamentals	Average	Economic fundamentals contribute an average level of risk. The high dependence on FiT is negative. The initial accelerated FiT rate steps down from May 2024 to the extended tariff, and the remaining term of the subsidy period is short. Furthermore, the high barriers to entry, the priority dispatch and the strong project rationale are positive, which, among other things, are underpinned by Germany's ambitious offshore wind target (30GW by 2030) and political support for the asset class.
	Supply / Reserve risk	Low	Uncertainty is low from wind yield, with the standard deviation of P50 net production at 8.4%, as estimated by a reputable wind consultant, especially when compared to other intermittent energy sources (e.g. onshore wind). High-quality wind data measured over more than 10 years at FINO 1 provide comfort on the assessment of resources. The financial model is conservatively based on 10-year P90 estimate.
	Supplier risk	n/a	There is no supplier risk because wind is a natural phenomenon.
	Offtaker risk	Low	Ørsted Salg & Service A/S (rated Baa2 by one reputable CRA) is the offtaker through a direct marketing agreement. It can be replaced at short notice in the event of insolvency, and there are many alternatives on the market. The terms of the direct marketing agreement including the administration fee, balancing fee, and spread risk fee are seen on the market.
Financial strength PDS bb+	Debt repayment	Average	<p>The 12-month backward-looking DSCR as of June 2025 was 0.93x versus the previous 2025 rating case expectation of 1.08x, reflecting significantly weaker-than-expected wind and production volumes. The rating case forecast was already low due to a one-off tax issue, driven by higher-than-anticipated tax payments resulting from timing effects in Germany's tax prepayment system and subsequent true-up adjustments. Scope understands that the covenant breach was waived by lenders and importantly debt service in June 2025 was fully met using the cash available to the borrower. The covenant breach was driven by one-off factors that are not expected to persist or negatively impact future performance.</p> <p>The projected (backward-looking) minimum/average debt service coverage ratios of 1.20x/1.25x in Scope's rating case (P90 / park availability: 94.3% / cost inflation: 2.2% in 2025, 1.8% in 2026, and 2.0% p.a. thereafter / 3.5% losses for grid outages and six-hour events originally unaccounted for / captured power prices of EUR 65/MWh in 2026 gradually declining to the floor price of EUR 39/MWh by 2030) are acceptable.</p> <p>Whilst reduced production due to curtailment as instructed by the TSO is effectively fully compensated for, grid outages are compensated for at 90% of the applicable FiT and only after certain grace periods (such as an interruption over 10 consecutive days or 18 days in aggregate spread over a calendar year). According to the six-hour rule, negative price events are compensated for only when shorter than six hours. The original financing assumptions have not accounted fully for these factors but considering the recurring nature of these events, we apply 3.5% losses associated with these events in Scope's rating case.</p> <p>Note life coverage ratio (NLCR) at 1.29x, and PLCR at 1.73x are adequate. The six-month debt service reserve is provided by an acceptable letter of credit (required rating: BBB+/Baa1 by a reputable rating agency, in this case National Australia Bank and CIBC) for the benefit of the security trustee. Given the advanced stage of amortisation the size of the standard six-month debt service reserve is large.</p> <p>The Average assessment reflects a combination of weak recent financial performance driven primarily by one-off factors, acceptable coverage ratios, and the substantial relative size of the debt service reserve.</p>
	Sensitivity to cash flow stress scenarios	Low	The project demonstrates adequate resilience to cash flow stress scenarios considering the short remaining tenor until maturity.
	Inflation, interest rate and FX risk	Low	Operating costs are indexed to inflation, but FiT revenues are not. Resilience to inflation is robust due to short remaining debt tenor. There are no interest rate or FX risks.
	Refinancing risk	Very low	Refinancing risk is very low because the facility is fully amortising.
	Counterparty risk	Low	The implementation of a cash pool with Nordea Bank (rated by Scope to be sufficiently stable to support the assigned rating), which manages the funds at OpCo level, poses low risk and is subject to A- minimum rating requirement; the account bank is Deutsche Bank (rated A1/A/A by three reputable CRAs), which essentially forwards the semi-annual interest and principal payments and must have a required rating of at least BBB+ under the common terms agreement (CTA).
Project structure and other PDS a-	Financing and legal framework, compliance	Low	The notes may be structurally subordinated to funds provided by Ørsted for emergency repair or reinstatement during the operating phase in certain scenarios. The risk of structural subordination is very low and assumes an inability to fund those works through free cash available at the OpCo or through extraordinary support provided by the issuer's sponsors. Risk-mitigating factors include a defined cap applied to service such an emergency funding loan, the robust governance and security framework, as well as the extensive experience, good credit quality and economic interests of both sponsors. Creditor protection clauses and financial covenants are adequate: default covenants are 1.125x ADSCR (historical) and NLCR; lock-up covenants are 1.175x ADSCR (historical, projected) and 1.225x NLCR.

Risk area	Risk factor	Score	Comment
	Country risk	Very low	Enforcement procedures in Germany are well-established. Germany benefits from very strong sovereign credit quality (Scope: AAA), which provides comfort regarding its ability to maintain and implement policies.
	Events and force majeure risk	Low	Force majeure events are unlikely and the project benefits from good insurance coverage.

Source: Scope.

3.1. Probability of hard default

This instrument faces a lifetime 0.01% probability of hard default, equivalent to a one-year probability of hard default of 0.04%. We derived the lifetime probability of hard default considering the likelihood of credit impairment events combined with the probability of incomplete recoveries after restructuring events (i.e. 13.44%).

4. Severity of credit impairment events

We calculated a total expected recovery rate of 85.83% on credit impairments for the project. The total expected recovery rate is the probability-weighted average recovery rate of all 16 credit impairment events considered under our project finance rating methodology (see Figure 4).

We performed a detailed estimation of the expected severity of the three credit impairment events that are most relevant for investors. These are: i) Revenue deterioration; ii) Operational performance, budget and schedule issues; and iii) Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues (see Figure 6). These three credit impairment events together contribute 83.8% of the EL for investors.

We analysed all other credit impairment events using standard recovery assumptions and applied adjustments to reflect the project's specific characteristics. These adjustments are based on the instrument's seniority, coupon, repayment profile, and project-specific recovery risk factors, which are further detailed in section 4.2.

4.1. Severity analysis of most relevant credit impairment events

We performed a fundamental analysis of the expected recovery rate for the most relevant credit impairment events by stressing cash flows to investors using the project's financial model.

We stressed the key inputs to the project's financial model based on the conditions implied by the respective credit impairment event. We derived the expected recovery rate by calculating the net present value of all cash flows available for debt service under the assumptions of the respective most relevant credit impairment event.

Figure 6: Most relevant credit impairment events

	Name	Driver	E{RR}
Top event 1	Revenue deterioration	Operational performance issues cause a default	93.9%
Top event 2	Operational performance, budget and schedule issues	O&M problems reduce availability leading to O&M contractor replacement at higher fees	93.2%
Top event 3	Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues	Technical difficulties require emergency funding that is extended by Orsted which liability becomes structurally senior at restructuring	73.4%

Source: Scope.

4.1.1 Revenue deterioration

We expect a recovery rate of 93.9% on the instrument upon impairment owing to Revenue deterioration events. The EL contribution from such events is 0.00% (EL strength: bbb+) over the senior instrument's 0.23-year expected risk horizon. This represents 8.2% of the senior instrument's total EL of 0.01%.

Revenue deterioration accounts for 8.2% of the total EL...

We derived the recovery rate under stress from our cash flow analysis. The analysis yields a recovery rate of 93.9% and is based on a Project sale scenario with a stressed capital structure upon restructuring of 66.67% and cost of debt and equity of 5.63% and 15.00%, respectively. The recovery analysis assumes the repayment of claims via Sweeps. Technical issues with the wind turbines lead to lower turbine availability.

Figure 7 shows how the claims on the stressed project value are distributed.

Figure 7: Development of restructuring claims on stressed project value

Revenue deterioration (000s)


■ Total restructuring costs at impairment

■ Senior debt and pari passu claims upon restructuring

■ Rated debt and pari passu claims upon restructuring at Kb1ended

■ Liquidity reserve

■ Equity (subordinated claims)



Source: Scope.

Figure 8 shows the cash flows allocated to the stakeholders of the project after restructuring.

Figure 8: Cash flows from restructuring claims to stressed project value

Revenue deterioration (000s)

■ CF from asset


■ Total super senior claims service

■ CFe

■ Restructuring costs service

■ Total rated debt and pari passu claims service

■ CF to/from liquidity reserve



Source: Scope.


4.1.2 Operational performance, budget and schedule issues

We expect a recovery rate of 93.2% on the instrument upon impairment owing to Operational performance, budget and schedule issues events. The EL contribution from these events is 0.00% (EL strength: a-) over the senior instrument's 0.23-year expected risk horizon. This represents 7.0% of the senior instrument's total EL of 0.01%.

We derived the recovery rate under stress from our cash flow analysis. The analysis yields a recovery rate of 93.2% and assumes a Project sale scenario with a stressed capital structure upon restructuring of 66.67% and cost of debt and equity of 5.63% and 15.00%, respectively. The recovery analysis assumes the repayment of claims via Sweeps. Wind turbine availability is lower leading to the replacement of the O&M provider and 20% higher operating expenses from 2026 onwards.


Figure 9 shows how the claims over the stressed project value are distributed.

Operational performance, budget and schedule issues contribute 7.0% of the total EL...

Figure 9: Development of restructuring claims on stressed project value**Operational performance, budget and schedule issues (000s)**

Source: Scope.

Figure 10 shows the cash flows allocated to the stakeholders of the project after restructuring.

Figure 10: Cash flows from restructuring claims to stressed project value**Operational performance, budget and schedule issues (000s)**

Source: Scope.


4.1.3 Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues

We expect a recovery rate of 73.4% on the instrument upon impairment owing to Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues events. The EL contribution from these events is 0.01% (EL strength: bb+) over the senior instrument's 0.23-year expected risk horizon. This represents 68.6% of the senior instrument's total EL of 0.01%.

We derived the recovery rate under stress from our cash flow analysis. The analysis yields a recovery rate of 73.4% and assumes a Project sale scenario with a stressed capital structure upon restructuring of 66.67% and cost of debt and equity of 5.63% and 15.00%, respectively. The recovery analysis assumes the repayment of claims via Sweeps. Unexpected technical difficulties lead to a reduction in the technical availability of the wind park and escalate to an unscheduled replacement of major components that costs EUR 40m. Due to a funding default by Godewind 1 Investor Holding GmbH, the new components are financed through EUR 40m of emergency funding from Ørsted in the end of 2025, triggering a senior debt payment default in. The emergency funding (contribution loan) has priority over lenders in this restructuring scenario.


Figure 11 shows how the claims over the stressed project value are distributed.

Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues account for 68.6% of the total EL...

Figure 11: Development of restructuring claims on stressed project value

Source: Scope.

Figure 12 shows the cash flows allocated to the stakeholders of the project after restructuring.

Figure 12: Cash flows from restructuring claims to stressed project value

Source: Scope.

4.2. Severity analysis of standard credit-impairment events

We analysed all other credit impairment events using our standard recovery distribution assumption for each type of event. We assigned the project our 'Lower-asset-value resilience' assumptions as defined in our [General Project Finance Rating Methodology](#). The assets of the project have a limited useful life of around 25 years (decommissioning date). The project is partially exposed to cyclical risks during operating years 10-20 (because of the above-the-base-price of EUR 39/MWh) and operating years 20-25 (because of full market price risk).

To calculate expected recovery rates specific to the rated instrument (i.e. tranche-specific recovery rates), we adjusted the standard recovery rate distribution for each event to capture the project's capital structure (section 4.2.1) and assessed the project's specific recovery strength (section 4.2.2).

4.2.1 Seniority and leverage of rated exposure

We adjusted each recovery rate distribution to incorporate the protection to investors resulting from the seniority and leverage of the rated instrument at the expected impairment times. We estimate a protection by subordination of 58.78% during construction, with a detachment point

of 100.00%. We estimate a protection by subordination of 79.39%, and a detachment point of 100.00%, at the expected time of impairment during operation and have used these values to calculate the expected recovery rates. We calculate the first-loss protection buffer using the financial balance sheet (i.e. based on the present value of future cash flows) rather than the accounting balance sheet.

4.2.2 Recovery risk factors

We adjusted the standard recovery assumptions to the specific characteristics of the rated instrument. The analysis of the recovery risk factors resulted in a haircut of 0.0% to the expected tranche-level recovery rates derived from the previous steps.

We assessed the project's specific recovery strength by applying the recovery risk factors shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13: Recovery risk factors

Recovery risk factor	Recovery score	Assessment
Project security	Average	Investors benefit from a typical security package for this kind of transaction, including step-in rights (direct agreements for all major arrangements) looking through the holdco structure. The notes are secured by a first security over all of the issuer's assets (e.g. shares, bank accounts, etc.).
Collateral enforceability	Average	The German legal system is proven, although resolution times are average when compared to those of other Western European countries.
Recovery enhancements	Average	Indemnities and termination provisions are standard.
Fundamental economic value of the project	Average	The recovery risk from the fundamental economic value of the project is average due to the combination of stable cash flow generation (driven by FiTs and low wind-related uncertainty) and a project life coverage ratio of 1.73x under conservative rating case assumptions and excluding the debt service reserve required amount.

Source: Scope

4.3. Recovery rate on hard defaults

The expected recovery upon a hard default of the rated instrument is 0.00%. This hard recovery rate is linked to the probability of hard defaults reported in section 3.1 (i.e. 0.01%). We derived this value by considering that the EL to the investor in the rated instrument (i.e. 0.01%) is constant, irrespective of the definition of the event of default considered in the analysis.

5. Rating stability

This section shows the sensitivity of the rating to changes in the input assessments as considered by the analysts. This analysis has the sole purpose of illustrating the sensitivity of the rating to input assumptions and is not indicative of expected or likely scenarios. Figure 14 shows how the model-implied rating changes for each rating-sensitivity scenario.

The rating is resilient to sizeable changes in assumptions

Figure 14: Sensitivity results

Analytical assumption tested	Shifts considered to inputs	Result
<u>Rating case</u>	No shifts	bbb+
<u>General stress to all risk factors in all areas</u>	Scores reduced by one level	bb+
<u>Shock stress to the risk area with the most relevant credit impairment event</u>	Scores driving risk area of most-relevant credit impairment event (i.e. Revenue deterioration) reduced by two levels	bb-
<u>Haircut to recovery</u>	25% haircut to recovery assumptions	bbb

Source: Scope

6. ESG grid

We analysed ESG risks by examining risk factors (section 3) and recovery risk factors (section 4) of the project. The relationship between credit risk and ESG factors is not direct because ESG factors only impact the performance of a project indirectly and in ways that can be opposite for two given projects. Investors should consider ESG as a different and separate dimension with respect to which a project should be analysed.

The ESG grid in Figure 15 highlights how ESG themes within the three ESG pillars (environmental, social and governance) influence the credit risk of this project and whether they do so in a

positive (i.e. less credit risk for the project) or negative way (i.e. more credit risk for the project). Our ESG grid promotes transparency in credit analysis and shows how credit risk relates to relevant ESG themes.

Figure 15: Project ESG grid

Environmental	Social	Governance
Air pollution and GHG emissions	Employment and labour management	Management, supervision and anti-corruption
Energy efficiency	HSE management	Governance system
Hazardous substances and waste	Social value, affordability, local community relations, human rights	Financial structure complexity
Material sourcing and resource management	Customer stewardship and personal data privacy	Reporting and transparency
Physical risks	Regulatory, reputational and social resistance risks	Political risks, lobbying and public relationships

Source: Scope.

With regard to the environmental pillar, considerations regarding the air pollution and GHG emissions ESG theme are credit-positive for the project. The wind park produces power without emitting any harmful exhaust gases into the air. It requires essentially no water to operate and thus does not pollute water resources. This reduces the risk of stricter environmental protection laws triggering additional capex needs or adverse regulatory action. Considerations regarding the social and governance pillars are neutral for the project.

7. Legal framework

We believe that these agreements are legal, valid, binding and enforceable. This is also supported by the opinion of the legal counsel of the lenders, a reputable multinational legal firm. The transaction conforms to international standards and supports our general legal analytical assumptions.

8. Monitoring

We will monitor the rating over the life of the rated instrument. Our monitoring analysis will be based on the construction reports produced during the construction phase; the payment and performance reports to be provided periodically by the management company during the operational phase; and any other available information such as financial accounts and compliance certificates. The rating will be monitored continuously and will be reviewed on an annual basis, or upon the occurrence of any events affecting the project's creditworthiness.

Scope analysts are available to discuss all the details surrounding the rating analysis and are available to discuss the ongoing monitoring of the transaction.

Scope analysts are available to discuss the rating analysis

9. Applied methodology and data

We applied the analytical framework described in our [General Project Finance Rating Methodology](#), dated November 2025, which can be downloaded from [scoperatings.com](#).

The information supporting our rating analysis was adequate. We used internal and external data sources for the rating of this transaction. We received information about the project from the agent of the issuer. This included the borrower's financial accounts, incorporation documents, material project contracts; due diligence reports; financial and security documents; legal opinions; and the transaction's financial model.

Appendix I Likelihood and expected recovery of credit impairment events


Event	Probability	Expected recovery	EL contribution
Construction delay	0.00%	66.00%	0.0000%
Cost overrun	0.00%	64.56%	0.0000%
Other issues (e.g. technology, counterparty)	0.00%	66.00%	0.0000%
Sponsor equity contribution or credit risk	0.00%	87.37%	0.0000%
Operational performance, budget and schedule issues	0.01%	93.20%	0.0006%
Lifecycle issues	0.00%	95.00%	0.0000%
O&M counterparty issues	0.01%	95.00%	0.0004%
Revenue counterparty issues (fin. or tech. performance)	0.00%	92.21%	0.0001%
Revenue deterioration	0.01%	93.90%	0.0007%
Supply interruptions or reserve issues	0.00%	92.38%	0.0001%
Inflation, interest or currency issues	0.00%	95.00%	0.0001%
Refinancing issues	0.00%	88.58%	0.0002%
Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues	0.02%	73.40%	0.0058%
Country or political issues	0.00%	84.07%	0.0001%
Force majeure or events issues	0.00%	84.07%	0.0002%
Legal or environmental or compliance issues	0.00%	83.91%	0.0002%
No credit impairment events	99.94%	100%	0%
TOTAL FOR RATED EXPOSURE	0.06%	85.83%	0.01%

Source: Scope.

Appendix II Recovery distributions under all impairment events


The following charts show the recovery distributions we assumed for the analysis of the expected recovery of the rated instrument under the different credit impairment events considered in our methodology. The charts also show the expected recovery at the project level and rated-tranche level to illustrate how the capital structure influences recovery. The recoveries shown in these charts are before adjustments to consider the recovery characteristics of this project, and before adjustments for the time-value of money and credit for amortisation.









Figure 16: Recovery distributions under construction credit impairment events



Source: Scope

Figure 17: Recovery distributions under operational credit impairment events



Revenue deterioration**Supply interruptions or reserve issues****Inflation, interest or currency issues****Refinancing issues****Debt repayment or cash flow liquidity issues****Country or political issues****Force majeure or events issues****Legal, environmental or compliance issues**

Source: Scope

Lead Analyst

Marton Zempleni
 +49 30 27891-038
m.zempleni@scoperatings.com

Team Head

Torsten Schellscheidt
 +49 40 524 724-100
t.schellscheidt@scoperatings.com

Applied methodologies

[General Project Finance Rating Methodology, November 2025](#)

[Counterparty Risk Methodology, June 2025](#)

Scope Ratings GmbH

Lennéstraße 5, D-10785 Berlin
 Phone: +49 30 27891-0
 Fax: +49 30 27891-100
info@scoperatings.com

Scope Ratings UK Limited

52 Grosvenor Gardens
 London SW1W 0AU
 Phone: +44 20 7824 5180
info@scoperatings.com



Bloomberg: RESP SCOP
[Scope contacts](#)
scoperatings.com

Disclaimer

© 2026 Scope SE & Co. KGaA and all its subsidiaries including Scope Ratings GmbH, Scope Ratings UK Limited, Scope Fund Analysis GmbH, Scope Innovation Lab GmbH and Scope ESG Analysis GmbH (collectively, Scope). All rights reserved. The information and data supporting Scope's ratings, rating reports, rating opinions and related research and credit opinions originate from sources Scope considers to be reliable and accurate. Scope does not, however, independently verify the reliability and accuracy of the information and data. Scope's ratings, rating reports, rating opinions, or related research and credit opinions are provided 'as is' without any representation or warranty of any kind. In no circumstance shall Scope or its directors, officers, employees and other representatives be liable to any party for any direct, indirect, incidental or other damages, expenses of any kind, or losses arising from any use of Scope's ratings, rating reports, rating opinions, related research or credit opinions. Ratings and other related credit opinions issued by Scope are, and have to be viewed by any party as, opinions on relative credit risk and not a statement of fact or recommendation to purchase, hold or sell securities. Past performance does not necessarily predict future results. Any report issued by Scope is not a prospectus or similar document related to a debt security or issuing entity. Scope issues credit ratings and related research and opinions with the understanding and expectation that parties using them will assess independently the suitability of each security for investment or transaction purposes. Scope's credit ratings address relative credit risk, they do not address other risks such as market, liquidity, legal, or volatility. The information and data included herein is protected by copyright and other laws. To reproduce, transmit, transfer, disseminate, translate, resell, or store for subsequent use for any such purpose the information and data contained herein, contact Scope Ratings GmbH at Lennéstraße 5, D-10785 Berlin. Public Ratings are generally accessible to the public. Subscription Ratings and Private Ratings are confidential and may not be shared with any unauthorised third party.