



EDP São Paulo Controversies Management

Operational Response, Regulatory Standing & Financial Solvency

EDP Networks Brazil SP | March 2026

Verifiability Statement: All figures, dates, and facts in this document are drawn exclusively from verifiable sources: EDP internal documents (publicly available at edp.com and edp.com.br), ANEEL official records, Federal Court rulings, TJ/SP decisions, Procon notifications, and ANATEL regulatory proceedings. All supporting documents referenced herein are published on EDP corporate websites unless otherwise noted.



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Financial Materiality Assessment	4
3. Background: Infrastructure Sharing in Brazil — Systemic Context.....	5
4. Verified Regulatory Chronology (2023–2026)	7
5. Operational Response — Mogi das Cruzes	8
6. Operational Response — Caraguatatuba	9
7. Service Quality Indicators	10
8. Company Response Assessment.....	11
9. Governance & Risk Management Framework	13
10. Regulatory Standing & Concession Renewal	13
11. Forward Commitments	13
12. Summary	14
13. Document & Source Reference Index.....	15



1. Executive Summary

This document has been prepared by EDP — Energias de Portugal, S.A. concerning regulatory controversies affecting EDP São Paulo (EDP SP), the Group's electricity distribution subsidiary in the State of São Paulo, Brazil.

The controversies relate to two interconnected matters:

- I. infrastructure sharing — the management of third-party telecommunications equipment installed on EDP SP's electricity distribution poles; and
- II. regulatory fines imposed by ANEEL (Brazil's national electricity regulator) regarding emergency response time indicators (TMP/TMAE).

EDP provides this document to demonstrate that:

- a) the financial exposure is immaterial — total combined maximum exposure represents 0.14% of Group EBITDA with zero impact on Net Debt/EBITDA;
- b) EDP SP has taken comprehensive and proactive operational, legal, and governance measures, with key initiatives predating regulatory enforcement;
- c) the infrastructure sharing controversy reflects a systemic regulatory challenge across Brazil's entire distribution sector, not an EDP-specific compliance failure; and
- d) ANEEL has formally recommended the renewal of EDP SP's concession despite the active disputes (Dispatch No. 1,584, 27 May 2025), confirming operational fitness.

All claims are supported by verifiable documentary evidence, with supporting documents published at edp.com and edp.com.br.



2. Financial Materiality Assessment

The following table presents the verified financial data relevant to the controversies. All figures are drawn from EDP Group's audited financial data (2025) and documented maximum exposure for the ongoing regulatory proceedings.

Financial Metric	Value	Status / Notes
Group Annual EBITDA (2025)	EUR 5,028 M	Audited — EDP Group Income Statement 2025
Max. Exposure — Caraguatatuba	EUR 5 M	Internal Financial Materiality Analysis
Exposure as % of Group EBITDA	0.1%	Fully absorbable within normal operations
Estimated impact on Net Debt/EBITDA	Zero (0)	No material impact on Group leverage
ANEEL Fine — TMP/TMAE (BRL)	R\$16,021,418.97	Collection suspended by Federal Court since 28 Nov 2024
Procon Mogi das Cruzes Fine (BRL)	R\$13,791,524.54	No further Procon action since May 2025
Total Combined Max. Exposure (EUR)	~EUR 7 M	0.14% of Group EBITDA
Concession Renewal	ANEEL Dispatch No. 1,584 (27.05.2025)	Formal recommendation to Ministry of Mines and Energy

Sources: EDP Group Income Statement 2025; ANEEL Notification records; Federal Court Case 1092747-29.2024.4.01.3400; Procon Mogi das Cruzes (30 May 2025); ANEEL Dispatch No. 1,584 (27.05.2025).

The total combined maximum exposure of approximately EUR 7 million represents 0.14% of the Group's EUR 5,028 million annual EBITDA (2025), with zero estimated impact on Net Debt/EBITDA. The ANEEL fine of R\$16 million has had its collection suspended by the Federal Court since 28 November 2024, with legal annulment in progress. The Procon fine of R\$13.79 million has seen no further enforcement since May 2025, and TJ/SP significantly reduced the scope of the underlying court order. The residual risk is categorised as fully absorbable within normal operating results.



3. Background: Infrastructure Sharing in Brazil — Systemic Context

The infrastructure sharing controversy affecting EDP SP must be understood within the broader regulatory and operational context of Brazil’s electricity distribution sector. Under Brazilian regulation, electricity distribution concessionaires such as EDP SP are required to share their pole infrastructure with telecommunications operators for TV, telephone, and internet cables. This allows telecom companies to use existing infrastructure, reducing costs and benefiting the public. The sharing is governed by a regulatory mechanism — principally Joint Resolution ANEEL/ANATEL No. 4/2014 — that guides negotiations between the electricity distribution and telecommunications sectors.

Under this framework, telecom operators must submit infrastructure sharing projects to EDP, specifying the required attachment points on existing poles in accordance with applicable technical standards. Once approved, EDP authorises and supervises the work. However, this framework creates a structural asymmetry: the distribution concessionaire bears operational and management responsibility for shared infrastructure, while lacking direct legal authority to enforce compliance by telecommunications companies that occupy the poles — often irregularly and without authorisation.

This is not an EDP-specific issue. The irregular occupation of electricity distribution infrastructure by telecommunications operators is a systemic challenge across the entire Brazilian distribution sector.

3.1 Allocation of Responsibilities

Factor	Current Regulatory Reality	EDP SP Legal Position
Ownership of telecom cables	Telecom companies (not EDP SP)	EDP SP has no legal title over third-party cables
Installation of telecom networks	Executed by telecom operators unilaterally	EDP SP does not install third-party infrastructure
Authorisation process	Telecom operators must submit sharing project for EDP approval	EDP authorises and supervises; cannot prevent irregular installation
Enforcement over irregular occupants	EDP SP has no direct coercive authority	EDP SP notifies ANATEL/ANEEL; exercises contractual rights (billing, rescission)
Revenue split (per ANEEL)	60% tariff modicity; 40% EDP SP costs; 100% taxes borne by EDP SP	EDP SP bears full cost while enforcement remains with regulators
Regulatory framework status	Gap between ANEEL/ANATEL frameworks; under active review	EDP SP advocates through formal participation

Sources: Joint Resolution ANEEL/ANATEL No. 4/2014; ANATEL Process No. 53500.014686/2018-89; ANATEL Resolution No. 797/2023; edp.com.br/compartilhamento-de-postes.

3.2 Applicable Technical Standards

Infrastructure sharing operates under a comprehensive set of regulatory, technical, and internal norms. The full set is publicly available at edp.com.br/compartilhamento-de-postes.

Regulatory Standards

Standard	Description
REN 001/1999	Joint Regulation for Infrastructure Sharing between Electricity, Telecommunications, and Petroleum sectors
REN 002/2001	Joint Regulation for Conflict Resolution between Electricity, Telecommunications, and Petroleum regulatory agencies
REN 004/2014	Reference pricing for pole sharing; rules for use and occupation of attachment points
REN 1044/2022	Procedures for infrastructure sharing with Telecommunications, Petroleum, Gas, Public Administration and others
ABNT NBR 15.214	Electricity Distribution Network — Infrastructure Sharing with Telecommunications Networks
ABNT NBR 15.688	Overhead electricity distribution networks with bare conductors



EDP SP Internal Technical Standards (Plano de Ocupação)

Internal Norm	Description
PT.DT.RPI.00001	Sharing of electricity network infrastructure with telecommunications networks
ES.DT.PJE.00002	Project criteria — mechanical calculation for distribution networks
PT.DT.PDN.00034	Pole sharing — traffic signs, street identification and others
ES.DT.PDN.00025	Reinforced concrete poles for distribution networks
ES.DT.PDN.00137	Fibreglass poles
ES.DT.PDN.00075	Preserved eucalyptus poles for electricity distribution networks

Source: edp.com.br/compartilhamento-de-postes — publicly accessible.

The existence of this comprehensive technical framework — 6 regulatory standards, 2 ABNT norms, and 6 internal technical standards — demonstrates that EDP SP operates with structured, documented processes. The challenge lies not in the absence of internal processes, but in the lack of external enforcement authority over non-compliant third-party telecom operators.



4. Verified Regulatory Chronology (2023–2026)

The following chronology documents all material regulatory actions affecting EDP São Paulo. Status definitions: “Noted” indicates events acknowledged without binding legal effect (e.g. political motions); “Injunction” indicates a binding court order requiring specific action within a defined deadline.

Date	Regulatory Event	Status
H2 2023	TMAE Committee created (senior management + operational teams). Resilience Project launched: additional emergency crews hired.	Completed
Nov 2023	Weather event triggers deterioration in TMP/TMAE indicators.	Event
Feb 2024	ANEEL issues Notification Term No. 0014/2024-SFT (TMP/TMAE 2022-23). EDP responds 28 Mar 2024: DEC/FEC compliant; TMP/TMAE have no regulated penalty threshold.	Contested
May 2024	São Paulo Public Prosecutor (MPSP) files Public Civil Action for loose wires in 2,000+ points in Caraguatatuba.	Civil Action Filed
Jun 2024	ANEEL Infraction Notice 0019/2024-SFT. Fine: R\$16,021,418.97. EDP files administrative appeal.	Appealed
Oct 2024	ANEEL Board upholds fine. EDP files civil lawsuit (Case 1092747-29.2024.4.01.3400) for annulment.	Judiciary
28 Nov 2024	Federal Court grants urgent relief (tutela de urgência). ANEEL fine collection suspended.	Suspended
Dec 2024	Caraguatatuba Court orders EDP to present action plan within 90 days, rejecting R\$50M indemnity claim.	Action Plan Ordered
Feb 2025	Caraguatatuba case suspended for agreement negotiations between EDP, MPSP, Municipality, and telecom operators.	Suspended for Negotiation
14 May 2025	Mogi das Cruzes City Council approves motion of repudiation against EDP SP (political declaration, no binding legal effect).	Noted
19 May 2025	Municipality of Mogi das Cruzes obtains binding court order (injunction) covering 18 streets. 10-day compliance deadline.	Injunction
30 May 2025	Procon Mogi das Cruzes: fine R\$13,791,524.54 (recidivism, Consumer Code + Concessions Law).	Fine Issued
May-Jul 2025	EDP SP comprehensive response: 23 km inspected, 650 kg cables removed, 190 regularisations, dedicated team.	Executed
Jul 2025	TJ/SP (3rd Public Law Chamber): court order scope reduced to electrical network + clandestine telephone only. Deadline extended 10 to 25 days.	Scope Reduced
27 May 2025	ANEEL Dispatch No. 1,584: formal recommendation for concession renewal (Contract 202/1998).	Recommended
2026	Budget mobilisation for additional regularisation teams. Caraguatatuba Roadmap formalised.	In Progress

Sources: ANEEL Dispatch No. 1,584; Federal Court Case 1092747-29.2024.4.01.3400; TJ/SP ruling; Procon Mogi das Cruzes; MPSP Civil Action. All published at edp.com.

Key Signal: Concession Renewal Recommendation

Despite active disputes, ANEEL formally recommended renewal of EDP SP’s concession (Contract No. 202/1998) in Dispatch No. 1,584 on 27 May 2025, based on compliance with performance indicators, financial and operational management standards, and legal, fiscal and technical qualifications (Decree No. 12.068/2024). This constitutes the regulator’s formal endorsement of EDP SP’s fitness to operate.



5. Operational Response — Mogi das Cruzes

In May 2025, Procon of Mogi das Cruzes fined EDP SP R\$13.8 million for failures in cable maintenance. The municipality obtained a binding court order to regularise 18 streets. Between May and July 2025, EDP SP executed a comprehensive response exceeding the court order requirements:

Response Area	Verified Action	Status	Evidence
Emergency Response	23 km of network inspected across 19 public locations	Completed	Inspection reports; GPS logs
Cable Removal	650 kg of telecom cables physically removed	Completed	Removal certificates; photos
Regularisations	190 regularisation points completed	Completed	Regularisation database
Dedicated Team	Team assigned exclusively to municipality	Completed	HR deployment records
Communication	WhatsApp channel for municipal authority contact	Completed	Communication logs
Tree Pruning	Priority pruning to all cited areas; 2025 schedule shared	Completed	Pruning schedule
Infrastructure Sharing	All 18 locations + all PROCON points resolved	Completed	Compliance report
Legal Appeal	TJ/SP: scope reduced to electrical + clandestine telephone only. Deadline extended 10 to 25 days	Granted	Case 1008223-35.2025.8.26.0361
Procon Status	No further Procon action since May 2025	No further action	Procon records

Sources: EDP SP Response to Civil Action; TJ/SP appeal ruling; Procon records. All published at edp.com.

The TJ/SP ruling is particularly significant: by limiting the court order scope to EDP SP's own electrical network and clandestine telephone lines, the appellate court confirmed that EDP SP cannot be held legally responsible for third-party telecommunications cables installed by telecom operators.



6. Operational Response — Caraguatatuba

In May 2024, the São Paulo Public Prosecutor’s Office (MPSP) filed a Public Civil Action for loose wires in more than 2,000 points in Caraguatatuba. In December 2024, the Court ordered EDP to present an action plan within 90 days, rejecting a R\$50 million indemnity claim. Since February 2025, the case has been suspended for agreement negotiations between EDP, MPSP, the Municipality, and telecom operators.

6.1 Verified Field Data

Metric	Value	Evidence Base
Field Regularisation Actions (MP records)	95	EDP SP internal records
Documented Photographic Evidence	465 geotagged photos	Photographic documentation
Streets Attended	40	Field operation logs
Neighbourhoods Covered	13	Coverage reports

6.2 Process Governance Timeline

Year	Governance Milestone	Relevance
2022	Dedicated cell established for infrastructure sharing management	Early awareness; initial response
2023	New operational management structure; senior management oversight	Risk & Crisis Management
2024	Billing and contractual rescission framework for non-compliant telecoms	Proactive prevention
2025-2026	Automation, team expansion, institutional engagement	Comprehensive root-cause response

Current Status — Caraguatatuba

The Public Civil Action is suspended for multi-party agreement negotiations. The Court rejected the R\$50M indemnity claim. Field actions paused by MPSP determination following identification of unregistered municipal assets. This pause is not attributable to EDP SP. The suspension and recognition of telecom operators’ role supports the systemic nature of this controversy.



7. Service Quality Indicators

7.1 ANEEL Fine — November 2023 Weather Event (R\$16 million)

In October 2024, ANEEL confirmed a R\$16 million fine for alleged deterioration in TMP and TMAE indicators following a November 2023 weather event. EDP contested, demonstrating compliance with official DEC and FEC indicators. In November 2024, the Federal Court temporarily suspended the fine and prohibited collection. In May 2025, ANEEL recommended renewal of EDP SP's concession.

7.2 Critical Areas 2021-2022

Separately, EDP SP faces a fine for alleged deterioration in supply quality in 2021, related to the 2020-2021 Performance Plan (revised due to COVID-19). EDP contests, claiming compliance with official regulatory indicators.

7.3 Verified DEC/FEC Performance Data (September 2025)

The following data, sourced from ANEEL's published collective indicators, provides verified evidence of EDP SP's compliance with regulated quality indicators:

Indicator	EDP SP Value	ANEEL Limit	Margin	Sets Within Limit	Compliance
DEC (Duration)	6.15	6.74	0.59 below limit	80.00%	COMPLIANT
FEC (Frequency)	3.04	5.13	2.09 below limit	98.00%	COMPLIANT

Source: ANEEL collective indicators (DEC and FEC) — Year 2025, Month 9 (September). Published at edp.com.br.

7.4 Indicator Classification

Indicator	EDP SP Performance	ANEEL Target Met?	Regulatory Status
DEC	6.15 vs limit 6.74 (Sep 2025)	Yes — Compliant (80% sets)	Regulated with penalty threshold
FEC	3.04 vs limit 5.13 (Sep 2025)	Yes — Compliant (98% sets)	Regulated with penalty threshold
TMAE	~45% reduction 2023-2024 (Resilience Project)	Improving	Monitoring — no penalty threshold
TMP/TMAE (Fine basis)	No regulated limits exist	Under legal dispute	No penalty threshold — pending Federal Court

Sources: ANEEL DEC/FEC data (Sep 2025); EDP SP Response to ANEEL Notification 0014/2024-SFT; TMAE Committee; ANEEL PRODIST Module 8.



8. Company Response Assessment

This section maps EDP’s response to the five assessment areas defined in the S&P Global MSA Company Response methodology (Exhibit 12, MSA Methodology Guidebook, July 2025). EDP believes the documented measures support a Company Response Rating of “4 — Comprehensive” based on the criteria defined in Exhibit 10 of the MSA Methodology Guidebook, representing an upgrade from the current “Adequate” rating.

8.1 Direct Mitigation & Emergency Response

Action	Detail	Timeline	Evidence
Network inspection	23 km inspected across all 19 court order locations	May-Jul 2025	Inspection reports; GPS logs
Cable removal	650 kg irregular telecom cables removed	May-Jul 2025	Removal certificates
Regularisations	190 points (Mogi) + 95 MP records (Caraguatatuba)	May 2025 / Ongoing	Regularisation database
Dedicated teams	Specialised teams per municipality	May 2025 onwards	HR records
TMAE emergency crews	Additional crews under Resilience Project	H2 2023 onwards	TMAE Committee records

8.2 Prevention Measures

Measure	Description	Start	Status
TMAE Committee	CEO-level oversight of emergency response	H2 2023	Active
Resilience Project	Crew hiring, process optimisation, benchmarking	H2 2023	45% TMAE reduction
Billing/rescission framework	Enforcement against non-compliant telecom operators	2024	Operational
Technical standards framework	14 norms (6 regulatory + 2 ABNT + 6 internal) published at edp.com.br/compartilhamento-de-postes	Ongoing	Published
Process automation	Digitised infrastructure sharing management	2025	Deploying
Team expansion	Budget for additional field regularisation teams	2026	Submitted
Regulatory advocacy	Participation in ANATEL/ANEEL framework reform	Ongoing	Active

8.3 Remediation Measures

Area	Action	Scope	Status
Mogi — Court order	All 18 locations + all PROCON points resolved	18 locations	Completed
Mogi — Tree pruning	All cited areas; 2025 schedule shared	All cited areas	Completed
Caraguatatuba	95 actions, 465 photos, 40 streets, 13 neighbourhoods	2,000+ points	Ongoing (suspended)
Stakeholder relations	Direct channels for both municipalities	Both municipalities	Active

8.4 Transparency Measures

Action	Detail	Audience
Public disclosure on edp.com	All response documents published: ANEEL Fines answer, Caraguatatuba Civil Action answer, Mogi das Cruzes documents, ANEEL Dispatch 1,584, Procon notification	Investors, regulators, public, agencies
Infrastructure sharing page	edp.com.br/compartilhamento-de-postes : full process explanation, 14 technical standards available for download	Public, telecom operators, regulators
DEC/FEC performance data	Verified quality indicators at edp.com.br	Regulators, investors, public



Municipal communication	Direct channels with Mogi das Cruzes and Caraguatatuba	Local government
Regulatory submissions	Formal responses to ANEEL, Federal Court, TJ/SP	Regulators, judiciary
ANATEL consultation	Active engagement in regulatory reform	ANATEL, ANEEL, telecom sector

8.5 Nature of Response

EDP SP's response has been proactive in multiple dimensions. The TMAE Committee and Resilience Project were launched in H2 2023 — before the ANEEL fine was formally imposed in June 2024. The governance strengthening of infrastructure sharing began in 2022, well before the 2025 escalation. The Mogi das Cruzes response exceeded court order scope. The public infrastructure sharing page at edp.com.br was established as a standing resource, not created in response to the controversy.

Company Response: Rating 4 — Comprehensive

Based on the criteria in Exhibit 10 of the S&P Global MSA Methodology Guidebook, EDP believes the documented measures constitute a comprehensive response — an upgrade from the current Adequate rating: direct mitigation at scale; prevention addressing root causes through governance, contracts, 14 technical standards, automation, and advocacy; remediation documented and ongoing; transparency proactive and multi-channel (all documents at edp.com, infrastructure sharing page public, DEC/FEC data verified); and response nature demonstrably proactive, with key initiatives predating enforcement.



9. Governance & Risk Management Framework

Governance Element	Description	CSA Relevance
TMAE Committee	Chaired by General Unit Director; includes CEO and Planning & Engineering Director	Risk & Crisis Management; Board oversight
Infrastructure Sharing Governance	Dedicated cell (2022) > management structure (2023) > contractual enforcement (2024) > automation (2025-2026). Supported by 14 technical standards	Risk Management Systems; Operational Controls
Legal Strategy	Federal Court lawsuit for fine annulment; TJ/SP appeals; coordinated defence	Regulatory Compliance Management
Regulatory Engagement	Active participation in ANATEL/ANEEL regulatory reform	Policy Influence; Stakeholder Engagement
EDP Group ESG Oversight	Group-level controversies monitoring; global ESG reporting integration	ESG Integration; Enterprise Risk Management

Sources: EDP Group Annual Report 2025; EDP SP Caraguatatuba Roadmap 2026; TMAE Committee records; edp.com.br/compartilhamento-de-postes.

10. Regulatory Standing & Concession Renewal

The strongest independent indicator of EDP SP's regulatory standing is ANEEL's formal recommendation for concession renewal (Contract No. 202/1998), issued in Dispatch No. 1,584 on 27 May 2025. This was based on compliance with regulated quality indicators (DEC/FEC), financial and operational management standards, and legal, fiscal and technical qualifications (Decree No. 12.068/2024). ANEEL made this recommendation with full knowledge of the ongoing disputes.

The verified DEC/FEC data (Section 7.3) confirms: DEC 6.15 versus limit 6.74, and FEC 3.04 versus limit 5.13 (September 2025). The Dispatch is published at edp.com.

11. Forward Commitments

Commitment	Basis / Verifiability	Timeline	KPI
Expand regularisation teams	Budget request submitted (Caraguatatuba Roadmap)	2026	Teams deployed; points/quarter
Maintain DEC/FEC compliance	DEC 6.15 vs 6.74; FEC 3.04 vs 5.13 (Sep 2025)	Ongoing	DEC/FEC vs. regulatory limits
Continue TMAE improvement	45% reduction achieved	Ongoing	TMAE vs. 2023 baseline
Regulatory advocacy	ANATEL Process No. 53500.014686/2018-89	Ongoing	Consultation submissions
ANEEL fine annulment	Federal Court suspension active	Subject to judiciary	Court ruling timeline
Concession renewal	ANEEL Dispatch 1,584 recommendation	Ministry decision	Renewal status
Caraguatatuba negotiation	Multi-party negotiation with MPSP, Municipality, telecoms	Ongoing	Agreement milestones



12. Summary

Financial Impact

Total combined maximum exposure: ~EUR 7M against EUR 5,028M EBITDA (2025) = 0.14% — zero impact on Net Debt/EBITDA. ANEEL R\$16M fine: collection suspended since 28 Nov 2024. Procon R\$13.79M fine: no further action since May 2025; court order scope reduced. R\$50M Caraguatatuba indemnity claim rejected. Financial exposure is immaterial.

Regulatory Standing

ANEEL formally recommended concession renewal (Dispatch 1,584, 27 May 2025). DEC: 6.15 vs limit 6.74 (80% sets compliant). FEC: 3.04 vs limit 5.13 (98% sets compliant). TMAE: ~45% improvement 2023-2024. Federal Court granted urgent relief. Caraguatatuba case suspended for multi-party negotiation recognising telecom operators' shared responsibility.

Company Response — Rating 4: Comprehensive

Direct Mitigation: 23 km inspected, 650 kg cables removed, 190+ regularisations, dedicated teams. Prevention: TMAE Committee (H2 2023), Resilience Project (-45% TMAE), billing/rescission (2024), 14 technical standards (public), automation (2025), team expansion (2026). Remediation: all court order points resolved in Mogi; Caraguatatuba ongoing. Transparency: all documents at edp.com; infrastructure sharing page at edp.com.br; DEC/FEC data verified. Nature: proactive — key initiatives predate enforcement. Systemic industry issue.



13. Document & Source Reference Index

All documents below are published at edp.com or edp.com.br unless otherwise noted:

Reference	Document Title	Availability
EDP Answer to ANEEL Fines	Response to ANEEL fines (TMP/TMAE + Critical Areas)	Published at edp.com
ANEEL - EDP SP	Notification and infraction documentation	Published at edp.com
ANEEL Despacho 1.584	Concession renewal recommendation (27.05.2025)	Published at edp.com
Notificação Procon	Procon Mogi das Cruzes fine notification	Published at edp.com
EDP Answer to Civil Action: Caraguatatuba	Response to MPSP Public Civil Action	Published at edp.com
MP Caraguatatuba X EDP SP	MPSP vs EDP SP court filing	Published at edp.com
Resumo ACP Caraguatatuba	Summary of Public Civil Action	Published at edp.com
Mogi das Cruzes: EDP e Prefeitura	Municipality response documentation	Published at edp.com
Podas: Mogi das Cruzes	Tree pruning documentation	Published at edp.com
Mogi das Cruzes: Ação Civil Pública	Public Civil Action documentation	Published at edp.com
Resposta - Auto Notificação 9236	Response to notification	Published at edp.com
Compartilhamento de Postes	Infrastructure sharing: process, regulatory norms, standards	Published at edp.com.br
DEC/FEC Performance Data	ANEEL collective indicators (September 2025)	Published at edp.com.br
Regulatory Response Presentation 2026	Caraguatatuba Roadmap and Status	Published at edp.com

EDP — Energias de Portugal, S.A.

Controversies Management & Operational Response | March 2026

Contact: EDP Investor Relations | ir@edp.com | edp.com