Determination Report

Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH

DETERMINATION OF THE JI-PROJECT TRACK 1:
WINDPARK CASIMCEA

REPORT NO. 600500478

05 January 2011

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY

Industrie Service

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Revision Date	Certificate No.
600500478	19-10-2010	4	05-01-2011	-

Subject: Determination of the JI track 1 Project Windpark Casimcea

Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit:

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Certification Body "climate and energy"
Westendstr. 199
80686 Munich
Germany

Project Participant(s):

SC Alpha Wind SRL
General Constantin Budisteanu Street, no. 16
Ground floor, Room 3
Bucharest, District 1, Romania

SC CAS Regenerabile SRL
31-33 B-dul Carol I, C3, 5th floor
Bucharest, Sector 2, OP37-CP84
Romania

Verbund Austrian Renewable Power GmbH
Schottengasse 4
Vienna, 1010
Austria

Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH
(the client who ordered determination)
Obere Donaustraße 12/28
Vienna, 1020
Austria

Project Site(s):

Town Casimcea, Tulcea district in Romania

GPS coordinates:

N 44.738028°, E 28.291454°
(N 44° 44' 17"; E 28° 17' 29")

Project Title: Windpark Casimcea

Applied Methodology / Version: ACM0002 / Version 11

Scope(s): 1
Technical Area(s): 1.1

First PDD Version (GSP):

Date of issuance: 15-07-2010
Version No.: 01
Starting Date of GSP 06-08-2010

Final PDD version:

Date of issuance: 27-12-2010
Version No.: 04

Estimated Annual Emission Reduction: 332 968 tCO_2e (crediting period from 01.01.2012 to 31.12.2012)

Assessment Team Leader:
Robert Mitterwallner

Determiner:
Madis Maddison

Expert:
Constantin Zaharia

Trainees:
Nevena Pingarova
Sebastian Randig

Technical Reviewer:
Thomas Kleiser

Responsible Certification Body Members:
Thomas Kleiser

Industrie Service

Summary of the Determination Opinion:

☒ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence for the determination of the project's fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project generally meets all national guidelines and procedures of the host country Romania for JI track 1 (http://ji.unfccc.int/JI_Parties/PartiesList.html#Romania; *www.mmediu.ro*) as well as the specific requirements of the LoE of the DFP of Romania. Hence TÜV SÜD is recommending the project for registration by the DFP of Romania if letters of approval of all Parties involved will be available.

☐ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the DFP of Romania and will inform the project participants and the DFP of Romania on this decision

Abbreviations

ACM	Approved Consolidated Methodology
AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
BM	Build Margin
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CM	Combined Margin
CMP	Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
CR / CL	Clarification Request
DFP	Designated Focal Point
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual
EF	Emission Factor
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission Reduction
FAR	Forward Action Request
FSR	Feasibility Study Report
GHG	Greenhouse Gas(es)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRL	Information Reference List
IRR	Internal Rate of Return
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LoA	Letter of Approval
LoE	Letter of Endorsement
MP	Monitoring Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OM	Operational Margin
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WP	Windpark

Industrie Service

Table of Contents Page

Industrie Service

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The company Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH has commissioned TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH to conduct a determination of the 'Windpark Casimcea" project' in Romania with regard to the relevant requirements for JI project activities. The determination serves as a conformity test of the project design and is a requirement for all JI projects. In particular, the project baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Determination is considered necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of emission reductions (in particular ERUs - in the first commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol).

UNFCCC criteria refer to the Kyoto Protocol Article 6 criteria and the Guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol as agreed in the Marrakech Accords.

The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests with the national authorities and the Parties involved.

The project addressed in this determination report has been submitted under the following project title:

Windpark Casimcea

1.2 Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of JI project activities, the scope is set by:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 6 and
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the JI, in particular the annex to decision 9/CMP.1 (referred to as JI Guidelines)
- Decisions and specific guidance outlined by the JISC which are published on the UNFCCC webpage
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (JI-PDD)
- Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual (DVM)
- Baselines and monitoring methodologies (including GHG inventories)
- Management systems and auditing methods
- Environmental issues relevant to the applicable sectoral scope
- Applicable environmental and social impacts
- Sector specific technologies and their applications
- Current technical and operational knowledge of the specific sectoral scope and information on best practice

The determination process is not meant to provide any form of consulting for the project participant (PP). However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective actions, and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

Once TÜV SÜD receives the PDD, it is made publicly available on TÜV SÜD's website, which initiates a 30 day global stakeholder consultation process (GSP). In special circumstances, such as when a project design changes, the GSP may need to be repeated. Information on the PDDs is presented on page 1 of this report.

The purpose of a determination is to demonstrate compliance or non-compliance of the project with all stated and valid JI requirements. Additionally, the purpose of a determination is to enable the registration of a JI project, which is only a part of the JI project cycle. Therefore, TÜV SÜD cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made, or not made, based on the determination opinion that go beyond this purpose.

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment is based on the "Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual" version 01 and is conducted using standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the project participants. Before the assessment begins, members of the team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience for evaluating the JI project activity are appointed. Once the project is made available for the stakeholder consultation process, members of the team carry out the desk review, follow-up actions, resolution of issues identified, and the preparation of the determination report. The prepared determination report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control by the CB "climate and energy" before being submitted to the national authorities in charge.

In order to ensure transparency, assumptions must be clear and stated explicitly and background material must also be referenced. TÜV SÜD has developed a methodology-specific protocol customized for the project. The protocol demonstrates, in a transparent manner, the project criteria (requirements), discussion on each criterion by the assessment team, and the results from auditing the identified criteria.

The determination protocol serves the following purposes:

- To organize the details and provision of clarifications on the requirements of which a JI project is expected to meet
- To elucidate how a particular requirement has been audited as well as to document the results of the determination and any adjustments made to the project design document.

The determination protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the tables below.

Determination Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project Activity and PDD				
Checklist Topic / Question	**Reference**	**Comments**	**PDD in GSP**	**Final PDD**
The checklist is organised in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then subdivided. The lowest level	*The section gives reference to documents in which the answer to the checklist question or item is found in*	*The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklists are ap-*	*The section is used to present conclusions based on the assessment of the first PDD version. The PDD is either acceptable based on evidence provided (☑) or a* ***Corrective Action Request (CAR)*** *is issued due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below).* ***Clarification Request (CR)***	*Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version and further documents including assump-*

constitutes a checklist question / criterion.	*case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.*	*plied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any **Request** has to be substantiated within this column.*	*is used when the determination team has identified a need for further clarification. **Forward Action Request** is issued to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification.*	*tions presented in the documentation.*

Determination Protocol Table 2: Compilation and Resolutions of CARs, CRs and FARs			
Clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	**Ref. to table 1**	**Summary of project owner response**	**Validation team conclusion**
Corrective Action, Clarification or Forward Action Requests.	*Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1*	*The responses given by the client or other project participants during communication with the validation team.*	*Final conclusions and relevant references.*

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in Table 3.

Determination Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests		
Clarifications and corrective action requests	**Id. of CAR/CR**	**Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial**
Referenced request if final conclusions from table 2 resulted in a denial.	*Identifier of the Request.*	*Detailed explanation of why the project is considered non-compliant with a criterion and a clear reference to the criterion*

The completed determination protocol is enclosed in Annex 1.

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment, TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body “climate and energy”.

The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body (CB) to assure that the required skills are covered by the team. The CB TÜV SÜD operates four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Determiner (D)
- Trainee (T)
- Experts (E)

It is required that the sectoral scope(s) and the technical area(s) linked to the methodology and project have to be covered by the assessment team.

Assessment Team:

Name	Qualification	Coverage of scope	Coverage of technical area	Host country experience
Robert Mitterwallner	**ATL**	☑	☑	☑
Madis Maddison	Determiner	☑	☑	☑
Constantin Zaharia	Expert	☐	☐	☑
Nevena Pingarova	Trainee	☑	☐	☐
Sebastian Randig	Trainee	☑	☑	☐

Robert Mitterwallner is located at TUV SÜD Industrie Service in Munich since 1990 and has a background as auditor for environmental management systems, as expert in environmental permit procedures for industrial plants and as expert for environmental impact studies assessment. He has received training in the JI determination/verification and CDM validation/verification process and applied successfully as GHG Determiner, GHG Validator, GHG Verifier as well as Assessment Team Leader for climate change projects, among others, in the scope energy industries, e.g. wind farms. Moreover, he has been appointed as Auditor for Renewable Energy Certification.

Madis Maddison is specialized in auditing of greenhouse gas emission reduction projects. This experience he has gained (in co-operation with TÜV SÜD Industrie Service) in determination and verification of Joint Implementation (JI) projects in Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria. He has received training in the JI determination as well as CDM validation and verification process and applied successfully as GHG Auditor.

Constantin Zaharia is environmental engineer and is working as GHG Verifier in the Carbon Management Service Department of TÜD SÜD Industry Service GmbH, Germany. He has several years of experience in JI projects. He covered together with other team members the country expertise and the knowledge of Romanian language as well as all respective national (environmental) laws.

Nevena Pingarova is appointed as Financial Expert and an auditor trainee for greenhouse gas emissions at Carbon Management Service Department in TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH. She has a Master's degree in Forecasting and Planning of Economic Systems from the University of World and National Economy, Sofia. Prior to joining TÜV SÜD Nevena Pingarova has 5 years' experience as a JI project developer.

Sebastian Randig is a GHG auditor for environmental management systems at the "Carbon Management Service" in the head office of TÜV Industrie Service GmbH, Germany and Assessment team leader in CDM. He holds a M.Sc. degree in Renewable Energy and has gathered experience in planning and installing renewable energy installations before joining TÜV SÜD. Sebastian Randig has received training in the CDM validation process and participated in several CDM project assessments. He is a trainee in JI.

2.2 Review of Documents

As mentioned in section 1.2 the audit team has been provided with a PDD (version 1, dated 15.07. 2010). It served as the basis for the public stakeholder process (from August 06 to September 04, 2010) and the assessment presented herewith. The document was published on the TÜV SÜD website www.netinform.net. The document was thoroughly reviewed and a first determination protocol (version 1) was sent back, including 11 CARs and 3 CRs.

A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

As part of the JI track-1-determination, TÜV SÜD performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information.

Persons Interviewed:

Name	Organisation	Position
Andrei Rapeanu	IMA Partners	Project manager
Oliver Percl	Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH	Project Development specialist
Ivan Matovina	Verbund-Austrian Renewable Power GmbH	Project Development specialist
Mark Suer	SC Alpha Wind SRL	Managing Director
Marius Iliev	SC Alpha Wind SRL	Managing Director
Teodor-Ovidiu Pop	Verbund-Austrian Renewable Power GmbH, Romania	General Manager
Miriana Roman	Ministry of Environment Romania	Department Manager
Florentina Manea	Ministry of Environment Romania	Department Director
Alexandra Mische	Ministry of Environment Romania	
Marian Puijor	Casimcea Municipality	Vice Mayor

2.4 Cross-check

During the determination process, the team makes reference to the available information related to similar projects or technologies as the proposed JI Track-1 project activity. The documentation has also been reviewed against the approved methodology(s) applied with several adjustments to confirm the appropriateness of formulae and correctness of calculations.

2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination is to resolve the requests for corrective actions, clarifications, and any other outstanding issues which need to be clarified for TÜV SÜD`s conclusion on the project design. The CARs and CRs raised by TÜV SÜD are resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the determination process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are documented in more detail in the determination protocol in Annex 1.

The final PDD version 4 from 27 December 2010 serves as the basis for the final assessment presented.

2.6 Internal Quality Control

Internal quality control is the final step of the validation process and is conducted by the CB “climate and energy”. The CB checks the final documentation, which includes the validation report and annexes. Technical Reviewers appointed by the CB carry out corresponding review work. The completion of the quality control indicates that each report submitted has been approved either by the head of the CB or the deputy. In projects where either the Head of the CB or his/her deputy is part of the assessment team, the approval is given by the one not serving on the project team. After confirma-

tion by the PP, the determination opinion and relevant documents are submitted to the Designated National Focal Point of the host country.

3 SUMMARY

The assessment work and the main results are described below in accordance with the DVM reporting requirements (approved at JISC 19th meeting, December 2009 – IRL51). The referenced documents, indicated in this section and Annex 1, are stated in Annex 2.

3.1 Approval

The Project participants are SC Alpha Wind SRL, Romania; SC CAS Regenerabile SRL, Romania; Verbund Austrian Renewable Power GmbH, Austria and Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH, Austria. Neither of the Parties (Romania / Austria) wishes to be considered as Project Participant. The host Party Romania meets the requirements to participate in the JI.

The Romanian DFP has issued a LoE (IRL7) in 08.03.2010 indicating that the DFP does not have any fundamental objections to this particular project. TÜV SÜD has received the letter from the project proponents directly and considers the provided letter as authentic. Furthermore, after review of the provided LoE, TÜV SÜD confirms that the letter refer to the precise proposed JI project activity title in line with the title in the PDD "Windpark Casimcea".

Project proponents are going to apply for a LoA from the Host country after receiving this final determination report from TÜV SÜD as according to JI Track 1 procedure final AIE's determination opinion is needed for a successful official approval by Romanian DFP. http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/AWBVICCKC5KW215L28BETVJZ1YHUN6

The investor party in this project is Austria. Austria has indicated officially it's DFP- Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management Division V/4 Air, Soil and Climate Change

Austria has officially published its national guidelines and procedures for the approval of JI projects (Directive for the Austrian JI/CDM Programme). Romania has published National procedure for using Joint Implementation (JI) mechanism under Track 1 (National JI Track 1 Procedure). Both these documents are currently available on JI- SC website. (http://ji.unfccc.int/JI_Parties/index.html R)

3.2 Participation

Neither of the Parties (Romania / Austria) wishes to be considered as Project Participant.

3.3 Project design document

The PDD is compliant with relevant form and guidance as provided by the UNFCCC JISC. TÜV SÜD concludes that the guidelines for the completion of the PDD in their most recent version have been followed. Relevant information has been provided by the participants in the applying PDD sections. Completeness was assessed through the checklist included to annex 1 of this report.

3.4 Project description

The following description of the project as per PDD could be verified during the on-site mission:

The purpose of the project is the generation of green electricity through the construction of wind power turbines with a total capacity of max. 200.9 MW. The wind park will be located west-northwest from the town Casimcea, Tulcea district in Romania. The expected net annual generation of the project activity is approximately 563 GWh. By replacing fossil fuel based power generation of the national Romanian electricity grid estimated 518,955 tCO2 will be reduced annually. The project is

being developed by two Romanian companies co-owners: S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. and SC CAS Regenerabile SRL.

In order to implement the project, 43 turbines with a capacity of 2.3 MW (Enercon E-82 E2) will be installed in two clusters North 1 and South 2; and 34 turbines with a capacity of 3 MW (Enercon E-101) will be installed in two North 2 and South 1. The last phase of installation of turbines is expected to be finalized in January 2013. As for the final PDD, an installed total power of 128,9 MW is estimated until end of 2012, which is the end of the crediting period.

The information presented in the PDD on the technical design is consistent with the actual planning and implementation of the project activity as confirmed by:

- Review of data and information (see annex 2) using sectoral knowledge and expertise of the assessment team, cross check of the same with other sources available in the respective technical literature, official publications, etc.
- The on-site visit has been performed and relevant stakeholders and personnel with knowledge of the project were interviewed, in case of doubt further cross checks through additional interviews have been done.
- Finally information related to similar technologies or projects as the JI project activity have been used if available to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the project description.

In light of the above, TÜV SÜD confirms that the project description as included to the PDD is sufficiently accurate and complete in order to comply with the requirements of the JI Track-1.

3.5 Baseline and monitoring methodology

3.5.1 Selected methodology approach

The CDM methodology ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” Version 11 is applied. The project is in compliance with applicability condition as listed in the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology.
The assessment was carried out in depth for each applicability criteria and included among others the compliance check of the local project setting with the applicability conditions in regard to baseline setting and eligible project measures.
TÜV SÜD confirms that the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity.
Emission sources which are not addressed by the applied methodology and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reduction have not been identified.

3.5.2 Baseline setting

The applicable CDM methodology refers to the procedure for identification of the baseline scenario de-scribed the latest version of the approved methodology ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”. This procedure is applied in the PDD and provides for a step-wise approach to identify the baseline scenario. Furthermore the last version of the “Combined Tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” was used, too.

The list of plausible alternative scenarios to the project activity is complete and no reasonable alternative scenarios have been excluded.

3.5.3 Project boundary

The project boundary was assessed in the context of physical site inspection, interviews and based on the secondary evidence received on the design of the project.

The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the Romanian national electricity grid where project power plant is connected to.

The project boundary has been validated during the determination process using standard audit techniques. For further details on TÜV SÜD observations on-site please refer to the Annex 1 and Annex 2 and other documents collected during the on-site mission performed by the responsible AIE.

Hence, TÜV SÜD confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases as documented in the PDD are justified for the project activity.

3.5.4 Baseline identification

The baseline scenario is the following: electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM) calculations.

The information presented in the PDD has been validated by a first document review of all the data. Further confirmation was based on the information acquired during on-site visit. And a final cross check of the information was conducted with the following documents: IRL 49 and 50.

Transparent and documented evidences were provided to the assessment team within on-site visit. Based on conservative interpretation of collected audit evidences, TÜV SÜD considers that the identified baseline scenario is reasonable.

TÜV SÜD confirms that all relevant JI requirements, including relevant national and / or sectoral policies and circumstances, have been identified correctly taken into account in the definition of the baseline scenario.

A verifiable description of the baseline scenario has been included to the PDD.

In conclusion TÜV SÜD confirms that:

1. All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
2. All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;
3. Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
4. Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD;
5. The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed JI project activity.

3.5.5 Algorithm and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions

3.5.5.1 Baseline Emissions

TÜV SÜD has assessed the calculations of project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage and emission reductions. Corresponding calculations were carried out based on calculation spreadsheets as presented via Emissions reductions calculation sheet (IRL6). The parameters and equations presented in the PDD and further documentation have been compared with the information

and requirements presented in the methodology and respective tools. The equation comparison has been made explicitly following all the formulae presented in the calculation files.

Conforming to applicable CDM methodology ACM0002 Version 11, the baseline emissions to be included in the boundary of the proposed project are CO2 emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants that are displaced due to the project activity.

An ex-ante CO2 grid emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$ = 0.9215 tCO2/MWh) provided by the Romanian Energy Regulatory Authority - ANRE through the Romanian Designated Focal Point for Joint Implementation is used.

The information presented in the PDD has been validated by comparing the grid emission factor to factor already calculated and used in an approved and registered JI project Timisoara Combined Heat and Power Rehabilitation for CET SUD Location (reg no: RO1000021) 1.01 tCO2/MWh (IRL 49, 50 and 51). The reference project is replacing the power in Romanian national grid as Casimcea WP, the baseline is set ex-ante for the time period up-to 2012 as well. EF used for this project is more conservative than the referenced one, therefore it is acceptable.

Detailed information on the verification of the parameters used in the equations can be found in the annex 1.

3.5.5.2 Project emissions

Conforming to applicable CDM methodology ACM0002 Version 11 and since the proposed project activity is neither a geothermal nor a hydro power plant nor does it consume fossil fuels no project emissions occur within the project boundary.

3.5.5.3 Leakage

According to the used methodology (ACM0002 / Version 11) no leakage emissions are considered. The main emissions potentially giving rise to leakage in the context of electric sector projects are emissions arising due to activities such as power plant construction and upstream emissions from fossil fuel use (e.g. extraction, processing, transport). These emissions sources are neglected.

3.5.5.4 Emission Reductions

According to final PDD emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$ER_y = BE_y$, where:

ER_y	Emission reductions in year y (t CO_2e/yr)
BE_y	Baseline emissions in year y (t CO_2e/yr)

In summary, the calculation of the baseline emissions and the emission reductions, respectively, can be considered as correct. The baseline emissions are calculated in the PDD in transparent manner and using conservative assumptions.

The PDD also shows emission reductions for the years beyond 2012. An extended crediting period beyond the first commitment period is subject to the host country´s approval.

Therefore based on the calculations in the project documentation it is expected that the project activity will lead to a reduction of GHG emissions of 332 968 t / CO_2e in the year 2012.

3.6 Additionality

The barrier and common practice analysis has been used for demonstrating additionality according to the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” (Version 05.2).

The approach used in the PDD has been assessed based on a document review and interviews on-site with plant representatives. Furthermore some documents have been reviewed on-site (for de-

tails see annex 2). All audit evidences have been checked using sectoral knowledge and expertise as well as public available information published in the internet and technical literature.

Based on this determination steps, the AIE can confirm that the documentation assessed is appropriate for this project.

3.6.1 Starting date, crediting period and prior consideration of carbon finance

Timeline of Project Activity

Activity	Document	Auditor conclusion
November 26th 2008 Foundation of Joint Venture S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. between Verbund-Austrian Renewable Power GmbH and ASTROPOINT Ltd to jointly develop and operate a 150 MW wind park near to the town Casimcea in the Tulcea district.	Foundation contract (IRL15)	This contract (point F) already explicitly mentions the intention to use the Joint Implementation mechanism for sourcing additional funds for the project. Hence the prior consideration of carbon finance is proved.
August 26th 2009 Submission of documentation to the DFP for JI in order to apply for the Letter of Endorsement (LoE) within the Romanian JI approval procedure.	Project Idea Note (PIN) (IRL41)	PP applies for approval as JI by Romanian DFP.
December 3rd 2009 Meeting of Romanian JI committee; Approval for issuance of LoE	LoE issued 08.03.2010 by Romanian DFP (IRL7)	Project was approved by Romanian DFP.
29.06.2010 Purchase of turbines from “Rahnenvereinberung” ENERCON.	Purchase Contract for the turbines (IRL13).	The fact that there is a lag with the implementation (project activities start after issuance the LoE), shows that PP made real investment (start) only after they were sure about JI endorsement.
31.12.2011 Starting date of the crediting period	PDD	The putting into operation of the main transformer and first wind turbines – start of operation.
31.12.2012 End date of the crediting period	PDD	The PDD also shows emission reductions for the years beyond 2012. An extended crediting period beyond the first commitment period is subject to the host country´s approval.

3.6.2 Identifications of alternatives

There are two alternatives among 4 alternatives to the project activity which are consistent with mandatory laws and regulations:

- Alternative 1: The proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a JI project activity and
- Alternative 4: Continuation of the current situation Electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the Romanian national grid

3.6.3 Investment analysis

No investment analysis has been applied.

3.6.4 Barrier analysis

Investment barriers and barriers due to prevailing practice are discussed.

It is clearly shown that the investment barrier is the fact that there is no private capital available from domestic or international capital markets due to risks associated with investment in Romania associated with the global economic crisis. This is the investment barrier preventing implementation of project activity without JI revenues. Documents from reliable sources are used to cross-check this information, inter alia National Bank of Romania (IRL 43) and Petrolplaza Online Portal for the Retail Petroleum Equipment Industry (IRL 44).

There is also a barrier due to prevailing practice as there are no similar wind park activities operational in Romania.

While alternative 1 “The proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a JI project activity” is prevented by the barriers, alternative 4 “Continuation of the current situation Electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the Romanian national grid” would not be prevented.

3.6.5 Common practice analysis

There are no other similar activities to the proposed project activity that are operational. As of 2009 there is an installed wind power capacity of only 14 MW in Romania. It was cross-checked from the document “Cumulative installed capacity per EU Member State 1998 - 2009 (MW)” available on The European Wind Energy Association web-site (IRL 45).

Based on the publicly available information (CEZ WIND PROJECT IN ROMANIA, Fantanele & Cogealac (Presentation by Adrian Borotea – IRL 46) similar wind power project activities (Fantanele WP and Cogealac WP) are under construction. Cogealac WP is developed as JI project.

We can confirm by local and sectoral expertise that Fantanele WP is under construction and close to start fully operation without applying for JI registration. However Fantanele WP has got special support and favourable terms for financing as it was cross-checked from the following documents:

- CEZ WIND PROJECT IN ROMANIA, Fantanele & Cogealac (Presentation by Adrian Borotea – IRL 46;
- News release, EIB loan to Fantanele Windfarm, http://www.eib.org/projects/pipeline/2007/20070524.htm - IRL 47;
- News release, CEZ Group loan with cover of German Export Credit Agency Hermes – IRL 48.

Thus due to the fact that favourable financing terms alleviate the financial risks it cannot be considered as project which faces similar risks and thus is excluded from the common practice analysis.

3.7 Monitoring plan

The assessment team has checked all the parameters presented in the MP against the requirements of the methodology. The monitoring plan (MP) presented in the PDD complies with the requirements of the methodology.

The monitoring approach is based onto the approved monitoring methodology ACM0002 (version 11). It is described in section D of the PDD. There the monitoring tasks and the monitoring responsibilities are clearly defined. Monitoring is simplified by the fact that there are no project specific emissions. To calculate the achieved emission reductions, only the net electricity production of the wind farm has to be measured. This includes back-up energy. The quality of the data as well as their collection and archiving is defined in the monitoring plan.

The quality assurance procedures have been audited by the assessment team through document review and interviews with the relevant personnel; this information together with a physical inspection allows the assessment team to confirm that the proposed MP is feasible within the project design. The major parameters to be monitored have been discussed with the PPs especially regarding the location of the meters, the data management, and in general the quality assurance and quality control procedures to be implemented in the context of the project.

All the audit evidences proving the appropriateness of monitoring provisions undertaken by the PPs were provided to the AIE and have been considered as sufficient. For details please refer to Annex 2 of this report.

Hence, it is expected that the PPs will be able to implement the monitoring plan and the emission reductions achieved can be reported ex-post and verified.

3.8 Local stakeholder consultation

The project has passed environmental approval following a two-step procedure. The first step was the Land use planning and the second step was the Environmental approval. At both stages a public hearing is required, where stakeholders can give comments.

The assessment team has checked the documents (announcements in local newspaper (IRLs 18, 19 and 20) and minutes of the stakeholder meetings (IRLs 21, 22, 23 and 24)) that these procedures were followed. No comments were received. The same was confirmed during the interview in the Casimcea Municipality.

Additionally to these public hearings the PDD was published on the website of the Romanian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

3.9 Environmental impacts

A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out for all four clusters of the project activity. EIA Reports (IRLs 25, 26, 27 and 28) were presented to the assessment team. It can be confirmed that environmental issues have been addressed properly. TÜV SÜD host country expert assessment team members are familiar with local laws and regulations the project complies with environmental legislation in Romania.

Clusters Nord 1 and South 2 have received Environmental Approvals from Romanian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (IRLs 34 and 35).

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

TÜV SÜD published the project documents on the UNFCCC website and invited comments by affected Parties, stakeholders, and non-governmental organisations during a 30 day period.

All key information gathered is presented in the table bellow

GSP Comments

website: http://www.netinform.net/KE/Wegweiser/Guide22.aspx?ID=7006&Ebene1_ID=50&Ebene2_ID=2337&mode=5	
Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process: 2010-08-06	
Comment submitted by: None	**Issues raised:** -
Response by TÜV SÜD: -	

No comments have been received.

Industrie Service

5 DETERMINATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a determination of the following proposed JI project activity:

"Windpark Casimcea" in Romania.

Standard auditing techniques have been used for the determination of the project. Methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project have been prepared to carry out the audit and present the outcome in a transparent and comprehensive manner.

The review of the project design documentation, the subsequent follow-up interviews and the further cross check of references have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria in the protocol. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI as well as all the requirements set by host country (Romania) for approving projects under JI – Track 1. Hence, TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for further approval and registration by the DFP of the host country.

By building a wind farm with state of the art wind turbines and thereby displacing fossil fuel based electricity in principal with electricity generated from a renewable source the project results in reductions of CO_2 emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. An analysis of the investment, prevailing practice barrier and common practice barriers demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

Additionally the assessment team reviewed the estimation of the projected emission reductions. We can confirm that the indicated emission reductions for the year 2012 of 332 968 tonnes CO_2e, represent a reasonable estimation using the assumptions given by the project documents. We also confirm that project emissions and project leakage will be zero for any year.

The determination is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The determination has been performed following the JI requirements. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the JI Track-1 project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the determination opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

Munich, 05-01-2011

Thomas Kleiser
Certification Body "climate and energy"
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Munich, 05-01-2011

Robert Mitterwallner
Assessment Team Leader

Industrie Service

Annex 1: Determination Protocol

Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	PDD in GSP	Final PDD
A. General description of the project				
A.1. Title of the project activity:				
A.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique JI activity?	5	Yes, There are no other wind parks in the area with the same name.	☑	☑
A.1.2. Are there an indication of a revision number and the date of the revision?	2, 5	Yes: PDD Ver. no. 01, 15/07/2010.	☑	☑
A.1.3. Is this in consistency with the time line of the project's history?	5	Yes, see A.4.2.10	☑	☑
A.2. Description of the project activity:				
A.2.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
A.2.2. What proofs are available evidencing that information provided in the description is in compliance with actual situation or planning?	29, 30, 31, 32	Framework agreement for delivery of generators for all clusters with Enercon. Land purchase and lease contracts. The following Design documents are available: • Land Use Planning Reports for all clusters • Basic design for all lots • Preliminary designs for N1 and S2: o Access roads o Foundations o Electrical equipment and cables • Technical designs for transformer 400/110 kV There are no building permits acquired yet.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	PDD in GSP	Final PDD
A.2.3.	Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
A.2.4.	Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	5, 6	Yes. The forecasted net average annual emission reduction of 560,124 tCO_2 is also used in technical design documents.	☑	☑
A.3.	**Project participants:**				
A.3.1.	Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	5	Yes. The Parties are: • SC Alpha Wind SRL, Romania • SC CAS Regenerabile SRL, Romania • Verbund Austrian Renewable Power GmbH, Austria • Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH, Austria. Neither of the Parties wishes to be considered as Project Participant. **Corrective Action Request #1.** Indicate which of the Parties involved is a host Party	Corrective Action Re-Request #1	☑
A.3.2.	Is the participation of all listed entities or Parties confirmed by each of them?	5	Yes, Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH ordered TÜV SÜD to determine the project. See also Corrective Action Request #7.	Corrective Action Re-Request #7	☑
A.3.3.	Is all information provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 1)?	5	Yes, the same parties are mentioned in Annex 1.	☑	☑

A.4. Technical description of the project activity:					
A.4.1. *Location of the project activity:*					
A.4.1.1.	Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	5	Yes, West North West of Casimcea reaching towards the main road DN 22A; The turbines will be placed in 4 clusters North 1, North 2, South 1 and South 2 around this area. Coordinates: E 28°14´16,65´´ and N 44° 47´31,65´´ define the intersection between borders N1, N2 and main road DN 22A. GPS coordinates of the main transformer site were verified on site: E 28.2429° and N 44.7964° **Corrective Action Request #2.** Indicate the location of the project on the map of Romania. **Corrective Action Request #3.** Indicate the GPS coordinates of the central point of the wind farm.	Corrective Action Request #2	☑
A.4.1.2.	How is it ensured, that the project proponents can implement the project at this site (ownership, licenses, contracts etc.)?	7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	See comment to A.2.2.	☑	☑

A.4.2.	*Technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project activity:*				
A.4.2.1.	To which category(ies) is the project activity belonging to? Is it correctly identified and indicated?	36, 37, 38	The total installed capacity of the Windpark will be 210 MW. The electricity will be fed into the grid at a new 400/110kV transformer station situated west of the village Rahman, which will be built by the project proponents. The wind turbines will be located in four clusters: • In clusters North 1 (21) and South 2 (22) a total of 43 ENERCON E-82 E2 wind turbines (Hub height 78-138 m and rotor diameter 82 m) with a capacity of 2.3 MW per turbine will be installed. • In clusters North 2 (20) and South 1 (14) a total of 34: ENERCON E-101 wind turbines (Hub height 99-135.4 m and rotor diameter 101 m) with a capacity of 3.0 MW per turbine or There also will be installed: • Four transformers 30/110 kV for each cluster • One 110/400 kV transformer substation • commercial power meters on the 400 kV side, which will belong to the grid operator (OMEPA). **Corrective Action Request #4.** Add the description of metering of separate Wind Parks to PDD A back-up supply line is foreseen, which will be metered separately. **Corrective Action Request #5.** Add metering of back-up supply to Monitoring Plan. The project belongs to the sectoral scope 1 – energy industry. The renewable electricity produced by the wind power plant will displace carbon intensive electricity produced from fossil fuel sources in the Romanian grid.	Corrective Action Request #4 Corrective Action Request #5	☑

A.4.2.2.	Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	36, 37, 38	Yes. The project reflects a professional standard scale wind park as it can be found in many European countries. See also A.4.2.6 and A.4.2.7.	☑	☑
A.4.2.3.	Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?	36, 37, 38	Yes. Described Project will generate electricity using wind energy, therefore it will reduce emission of GHG into atmosphere.	☑	☑
A.4.2.4.	Is the technology implemented by the project activity environmentally safe?	25, 26, 27, 28	Yes. Applied technology does not has any noteworthy negative impact on the environment.	☑	☑
A.4.2.5.	Is all information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?	36, 37, 38	Yes, see comment to A.2.2		☑
A.4.2.6.	Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	36, 37, 38	Yes. The planned wind turbines are modern state-of-the-art turbines.	☑	☑
A.4.2.7.	Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	36, 37, 38	It is not likely that the project technology will be substituted by a more efficient technology.	☑	☑
A.4.2.8.	Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	13	There will be an O&M agreement with Enercon for 15 years. Little training will be needed for project owners. **Corrective Action Request #6.** Include description of training needs and personnel training plan to PDD	Corrective Action Re-Request #6	☑
A.4.2.9.	Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs? Explanation how the needs for training	13	See 0.	0	☑

	and maintenance are covered? Are there any evidences for them (Contracts, Manuals...)?				
A.4.2.10.	Is a schedule available on the implementation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	39, 40	Yes. Implementation time schedule is provided, according to which start of operation is foreseen in January 2012. The delivery contract with Enercon includes also construction of foundations and erection of towers. Tender for central transformer 110/400 kV is undergoing, tenders will come in September 2010. Tenders for construction of access roads and electrical works are under preparation. **Clarification Request #1.** Present the detail time schedule for construction. The risks will be: • Environmental permit for clusters North 2 and South 1. • Delays in supply schedule of turbines. • Delays in design and construction works.	Clarification Request #1	☑

A.4.3. *Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed project activity, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project activity, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances:*				
A.4.3.1. Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
A.4.3.2. Are the figures provided consistent with other data presented by the PDD?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
A.4.3.3. Is the information provided on public funding provided in compliance with the actual situation or planning as available by the project participants?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
A.4.3.4. Is all information provided consistent with the details given in remaining chapters of the PDD (in particular annex 2)?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
A.5. Project approval by the Parties involved:				
Open issues related to the approval of the Parties involved are covered in a separate “completeness checklist” **Corrective Action Request #7.** Written project approvals by the Parties involved should be attached to PDD and sent to Audit team for the review.				
B. Baseline				
B.1. Description and justification of the baseline chosen				
B.1.1. Are reference number, version number, and title of the baseline and monitoring methodology clearly indicated?	5	The reference number and version number are identified as “CDM methodology ACM0002/Version 11”	☑	☑

B.1.2.	Is the applied version the most recent one or still applicable?	5	Yes, version 11 of ACM0002 is the most recent one.	☑	☑
B.1.3.	Is the methodology sufficiently described?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
B.1.4.	Is the applied methodology considered being the most appropriate one?	5	Yes, the methodology is the most appropriate as the project activity is the installation of a wind power plant.	☑	☑
B.1.5.	Can the geographic and system boundaries for the relevant distribution channel clearly be identified?	5	Yes. The geographic and system boundaries are limited to Romanian national electricity distribution grid.	☑	☑
B.2. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the project activity					
Description of how the baseline scenario is identified and description of the identified baseline scenario					
B.2.1.	Has JI been considered before the starting date of the project activity and which evidence has been delivered?	7, 41	Yes, LoE was issued at 08.03.2101 and PIN was issued at 19.08.2009.	☑	☑
B.2.2.	Is a description of the baseline scenario, (b) a description of the project scenario, and (c) an analysis showing why the emissions in the baseline scenario would likely exceed the emissions in the project scenario.	5	Yes, the additionality of the project is demonstrated by using the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 05.2), approved by the CDM Executive Board, required in the consolidated methodology ACM0002/Version 11.	☑	☑
B.2.3.	Have all technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives to the project activity been identified and discussed by the PDD?	5	Yes, four alternatives are discussed: Alternative 1: The proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a JI project activity. Alternative 2: A thermal power plant with comparable capacity or electricity generation;	☑	☑

		Alternative 3: Other renewable energy with comparable capacity or electricity generation. Alternative 4: Continuation of the current situation Electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the the Romanian national grid.		
B.2.4. Does the project identify correctly and excludes those options not in line with regulatory or legal requirements?	5	Yes, only alternatives 1 and 4 are in compliance with all mandatory applicable legal and regulatory requirements in Romania. However see the Corrective Action Request #8 below.	☑	☑
B.2.5. Have applicable regulatory or legal requirements been identified?	5	No. **Corrective Action Request #8.** List the applicable regulatory or legal requirements/documents. Add a discussion how alternatives are in compliance with before mentioned requirements.	Corrective Action Re-Request #8	☑
B.2.6. In case of applying step 2 of the additionality tool: Is the analysis method appropriately identified (step 2a)?	5	N/A, step 2 is not applied.	☑	☑
B.2.7. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent alternatives to occur?	5	Yes, the following barriers are discussed: • Investment barriers • Barriers due to prevailing practice **Clarification Request #2.** Provide copy of the letter from bank refusing financing of the Windpark.	Clarification Request #2	☑
B.2.8. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?	42, 43, 44, 45	Yes following evidence documents are referred: • KSV1870: Country Report for Investors and Exporters, Romania July 2009 • National Bank of Romania, Inflation Report May 2010 • Romania: Green energy obstacle due for lift by mid-year (Petrolplaza, Online Portal for the Retail Petroleum Equipment In-	☑	☑

		dustry) • Cumulative installed capacity per EU Member State 1998 - 2009 (MW)		
B.2.9. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is it transparently shown that at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified barriers?	42, 43, 44	Yes, While alternative 1 is prevented by the barriers, alternative 4 would not be prevented.	☑	☑
B.2.10. Have other activities in the host country / region similar to the project activity been identified and are these activities appropriately analyzed by the PDD (step 4a)?	45	No, There are no other similar activities to the proposed project activity that are operational. There is Funtenele Wind Park under development with-out JI, however there are no activities undergoing as it is experiencing financial difficulties. **Corrective Action Request #9.** According to the most recent available information of the audit team that other similar sized projects are at least in construction (Fantanele), the following statement of the PDD, page 13 has to be revised taking into account the discussion of common practice, JI application of similar sized plants and first of its kind: "There is no other wind park of this size operational in Romania. As of 2009 there is an installed wind power capacity of 14MW in Romania. See http://www.ewea.org/index.php?id=1486 (accessed on 12/07/2010). The proposed project activity can therefore be classified as first of its kind."	☑	☑
B.2.11. If similar activities are occurring: Is it demonstrated that in spite these similarities the project activity would not be implemented without the JI (step 4b)?	45	See comment above.	☑	☑

Industrie Service

B.3. Description of how the definition of the project boundary is applied to the project:				
B.3.1. Do the spatial and technological boundaries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by the PDD?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
Description of the sources and gases included in the project boundary (Fill in the required amount of sub checklists for sources and gases as given by the methodology applied and comment at least every line answered with "No")				
B.3.2. Sources: Emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants of any connected electricity system Gas(es): CO_2 Type: baseline emissions	5	Boundary checklist / Yes / No Source and gas(es) discussed by the PDD? Yes Inclusion / exclusion justified? Yes Explanation / Justification sufficient? Yes Consistency with monitoring plan? Yes	☑	☑
B.4. Further baseline information, including the date of baseline setting and the name(s) of the person(s)/entity(ies) setting the baseline Emissions reductions				
B.4.1. Is there any indication of a date when determining the baseline?	5	The baseline setting is dated to 15/07/2010 by Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH, Clemens Plöchl and Oliver Percl.	☑	☑
B.4.2. Is this in consistency with the time line of the PDD history?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
B.4.3. Is information of the person(s) / entity(ies) responsible for the application of the baseline methodology provided in consistency with the actual situation?	5	Ex-ante CO_2 grid emission factor (0.9215 tCO_2/MWh) provided by the Romanian Designated Focal Point for Joint Implementation The figure 0.9215 is more conservative than EF for Romanian NG calculated for already registered project Timisoara Combined Heat and Power Rehabilitation for CET SUD Location (reg no: RO1000021) 1.01 tCO_2/MWh. Therefore this EF is accepted by the audit team.	☑	☑
B.4.4. Is information provided whether this person / entity is also a project participant?	5	Yes, Romanian Designated Focal Point is not considered as the project participant.	☑	☑

C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period				
C.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	5	Yes, expected operational lifetime of the project is 20 years 0 months from the start of operation of wind turbines in January 2011. See also comment to A.4.2.10. Project starting date is indicated as 01/12/2010. **Corrective Action Request #10.** The starting date of the project is the signature of the purchase contract for the turbines which was 29.06.2010. Correct the table on page 3 and chapter C.1.	Corrective Action Re-Request #10	☑
C.2. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (crediting period between 2008 and 2012)?	5	Yes, the length of crediting period is 10 years and 0 months.	☑	☑
D. Monitoring plan				
D.1. Description of monitoring plan chosen:				
Is the applied methodology considered being the most appropriate one?	5	Yes, the methodology applied for the project is following the approved consolidated baseline and monitoring CDM methodology ACM0002 / Version 11 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources". This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable power generation project activities that involve electricity capacity additions.	☑	☑

Industrie Service

D.1.1. *Monitoring of the emissions in the project scenario and the baseline scenario:*				
In the following "data checklists" are shown for all data which are fixed at determination time, and "monitoring checklists" for all data which have to be monitored during the life-time of the project.				
D.1.1.1 Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the **project** and how these data will be archived				
D 111.1: to be defined following the project specific or approved methodology	5	N/A	☑	☑
Is the list of parameters presented by chapter D.1.1.1 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	5	N/A	☑	☑
D.1.1.2 Description of formula used to estimate emissions from the project				
Are formulae required for the estimation of project emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	5	N/A	☑	☑
D.1.1.3 Data to be collected in order to determine the **baseline** emissions within the project boundary how these data will archived				
Fill in the required amount of sub checklists for fixed data parameter and comment any line answered with "No"				
D 111.1: to be defined following the project specific or approved methodology $EG_{PJ,}y$ – net amount of electricity supplied into the grid	38	Data Checklist / Yes / No Data unit correctly expressed? Yes Appropriate description? Yes Source clearly referenced? Yes Correct value provided? N/A Has this value been verified? N/A Choice of data correctly justified? Yes Measurement method correctly described? No QA/QC procedures described? Yes	Corrective Action Re-Request #11	☑

		QA/QC procedures appropriate? — Yes For metering: accuracy category A, measurement accuracy 0.2s class and uncertainty xx are required by the Grid Connection Agreement. **Corrective Action Request #11.** Add the explanation that the NET electricity generation is the difference between produced and consumed energy. See also Corrective Action Request #4 and Corrective Action Request #5 **Forward Action Request#1.** Copies of the el. meter calibration certificates (or letter of confirmation of calibration) and protocol shall be presented to the audit team during the initial verification.	For-ward Action Re-quest# 1	
Is the list of parameters presented by chapter D.1.1.1 considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	38	Yes. The net amount of electricity supplied into the grid will be monitored and emissions factor is fixed for the crediting period.	☑	☑
D.1.1.4 Description of formula used to estimate baseline emissions				
Are formulae required for the estimation of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
D.1.3 *Treatment of leakage in the monitoring plan:*				
Is it explained how the procedures provided by the methodology are applied by the proposed project activity?	5	Yes. No leakages are to be considered in case of windpark project according to ACM0002 methodology	☑	☑
D.1.3.1 Data to be collected in order to determine the **leakage** emissions outside the project boundary				
Fill in the required amount of sub checklists for fixed data parameter and comment any line answered with “No” N/A				

D.2. Quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) procedures undertaken for data monitored:				
This aspect is covered for the relevant data in section D.1.1.1, D.1.1.3 and D.1.3.1				
D.3. Please describe the operational and management structure that the project operator will apply in implementing the monitoring plan:				
D.3.1. Is the operational and management structure clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation? Explanation of management structure and responsibilities.	5	Yes. In order to obtain reliable monitoring data, the project proponents will establish a monitoring management framework prior to the starting of the crediting period. Clear responsibilities will be assigned to all staff involved in the JI project. One individual will be appointed who has the overall responsibilities for the monitoring of the project, other staff will be responsible for the data recording, data collecting, data archiving and emission reductions calculation	☑	☑
D.3.2. Are responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly provided?	5	Yes, see above.	☑	☑
D.3.3. Does the monitoring plan provide current good monitoring practice?	5	Mainly yes. See also Corrective Action Request #4 and Corrective Action Request #5	Corrective Action Request #4 Corrective Action Request #5	☑

D.3.4. Does annex 3 provide useful information enabling a better understanding of the envisioned monitoring provisions?	5	Yes. However see Corrective Action Request #4 and Corrective Action Request #5.	Corrective Action Re-Request #4 Corrective Action Re-Request #5	☑
D.4. Name of person(s)/entity(ies) establishing the monitoring plan:				
D.4.1. D.4.1 Is information of the person(s) / entity(ies) responsible for the monitoring methodology provided in consistency with the actual situation?	5	Yes. Clemens Plöchl and Oliver Percl from Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH are responsible for the monitoring methodology provided.	☑	☑
D.4.2. D.4.2 Is information provided whether this person / entity is also a project participant?	5	Yes, Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH is considered a project participant.	☑	☑
E. Estimation of greenhouse gas emission reductions				
E.1. Estimated project emissions and formulae used in the estimation				
E.1.1. Are formulae required for the estimation of project emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	5	Yes. The wind park project does not produce any measurable emissions of greenhouse gases in case the life cycle analysis is not taken into consideration. Therefore no formulae are required.	☑	☑
E.2. Estimated leakage and formulae used in the estimation, if applicable:				
E.2.1. Are formulae required for the estimation of leakage emissions correctly presented, enabling	5	Yes. Not applicable as no leakage estimate is required in	☑	☑

a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?		ACM0002 / Version 11 for wind power		
E.2.2. Why are the leakage emissions not constant over the years?	5	N/A, see comment above.	☑	☑
E.3. The sum of E.1. and E.2.:				
E.3.1. Is the data provided under this section in consistency with data as presented by other chapters of the PDD?	5	Yes. The sum of leakage and project emissions is estimated to be zero.	☑	☑
E.4. Estimated baseline emissions and formulae used in the estimation:				
Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions				
E.4.1. Is the projection based on the same procedures as used for later monitoring?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
E.4.2. Is the data provided under this section in consistency with data as presented by other chapters of the PDD?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
E.4.3. Are formulae required for the estimation of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
E.5. Difference between E.4. and E.3 representing the emission reductions of the project:				
E.5.1. Are formulae required for the determination of emission reductions correctly presented?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
E.6. Table providing values obtained when applying formulae above:				
E.6.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
E.6.2. Is the form/table required for the indication of	5	Yes.	☑	☑

	projected emission reductions correctly applied?				
E.6.3.	Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project's implementation and the indicated crediting period?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
E.6.4.	Is the data provided under this section in consistency with data as presented by other chapters of the PDD?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
F. Environmental impacts					
F.1.	**Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party:**				
F.1.1.	Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	5	No. **Corrective Action Request #12.** Add the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity.	Corrective Action Re-Request #12	☑
F.1.2.	Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?	25, 26, 27, 28	Yes, EIA is required. EIA for clusters N1 and S2 has been approved. EIA reports for clusters N2 and S1 are under approval. **Clarification Request #3.** Present EIA reports for clusters N2 and S1.	Clarification Request #3	☑
F.1.3.	Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	25, 26, 27, 28	Not clear. See Corrective Action Request #12.	Corrective Action Re-Request #12	☑

F.1.4. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	5	No. **Corrective Action Request #13.** Present a short discussion on transboundary environmental impacts of the project.	☑	☑
F.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, provision of conclusions and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party:				
F.2.1. Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?	5	Not clear. See Corrective Action Request #12	Corrective Action Re-Request #12	☑
F.2.2. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	5	Yes, EIAs for N1 and S2 are approved.	☑	☑
G. Stakeholders' comments				
G.1. Information on stakeholders' comments on the project, as appropriate:				
G.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	21, 22, 23, 24	Yes. **Corrective Action Request #14.** Add description how the public was informed and consulted during Land Use Planning Process and EIA process.	Corrective Action Re-Request #14	☑
G.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?"	18, 19, 20	The newspaper of Tulcea county "Delta" was used to publish invitations for public consultation for Land Use planning and EIA. The information was also made publicly available in the offices of Casimcea Municipality and regional Environmental Protection Agency. It was verified on site. See also Corrective Action Request #14.	Corrective Action Re-Request #14	☑

G.1.3. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	5	Yes, it was verified on site. However see Corrective Action Request #14.	Corrective Action Re-Request #14	☑
G.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process described in a complete and transparent manner?	5	Yes, it was verified on site. However see Corrective Action Request #14.	Corrective Action Re-Request #14	☑
G.1.5. Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided? (participant list, minutes of meeting)	21, 22, 23, 24	Yes, it was verified on site. However see Corrective Action Request #14.	Corrective Action Re-Request #14	☑
G.1.6. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	5	Yes, it was verified on site. However see Corrective Action Request #14.	Corrective Action Re-Request #14	☑

H. Annexes 1 – 3				
Annex 1: Contact Information				
1. Is the information provided in consistency with the one given under section A.3?	5	Yes.	☑	☑

2. Is information on all private participants and directly involved Parties presented?	5	Yes.	☑	☑
Annex 2: Baseline study				
1. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this information in consistency with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	5	N/A. Additional background information on baseline data is not provided.	☑	☑
2. Is the data provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the determination team?	5	N/A	☑	☑
3. Does the additional information substantiate statements given in other sections of the PDD?	5	N/A	☑	☑
Annex 3: Monitoring information				
4. If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this information in consistency with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	4	N/A. Additional background information on monitoring is not provided. **Forward Action Request#2.** Elaborated Monitoring Manual shall be compiled before the operation of the Windpark and presented to the initial verification audit.	Forward Action Request# 2	☑
5. Is the information provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the determination team?	4	N/A	☑	☑
6. Do the additional information / procedures substantiate statements given in other sections of the PDD?	4	N/A	☑	☑

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to table 1	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
Corrective Action Request #1 Indicate which of the Parties involved is a host Party	A.3.1	Romania as host Party has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD	Romania is indicated as host party. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #2 Indicate the location of the project on the map of Romania.	A.4.1.1	The location of the project has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD	The map of Romania is included into location map on page 5. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #3 Indicate the GPS coordinates of the central point of the wind farm.	A.4.1.1	The GPS coordinates for the central points of each cluster have been included in the revised version 3 of the PDD.	The GPS coordinates are included into chapter A.4.1.4 in PDD. They represent the central points of each cluster. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #4 Add the description of metering of separate Wind Parks to PDD	A.4.2.1	A description of metering of separate wind parks of the project activity has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD	The sufficient explanation is added to the chapter D3. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #5 Add metering of back-up supply to Monitoring Plan.	A.4.2.1	A description of metering of the backup supply has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD	The sufficient description and net calculation formulae are added to the chapter D3. The issue is closed. ☑

Corrective Action Request #6 Include description of training needs and personnel training plan to PDD	A.4.2.8	A description of training needs and personnel training has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD	The reference to the O&M agreement with the technology provider is included. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #7 Written project approvals by the Parties involved should be attached to PDD and sent to Audit team for the review.	A.5	As per the Romanian *„National procedure for using Joint Implementation (JI) mechanism under Track I"* the it reads: *MESD requires the submission of the letter of approval (LoA) from the investing country (Party to the Kyoto Protocol which has signed a MoU with Romania) only at a later stage of the procedure in order to provide the necessary flexibility to the project participants in finding the best buyer for the ERUs. This letter of approval should be submitted at the latest, in the same time with the request of the PFP for issuance and transfer of ERU*. In regard to the Romanian LoA it says: *PFP submits MESD the draft determination report prepared by the AIE as soon as it is technically possible, together with the official request of the project participants for LoA issuance. The draft determination report shall be updated in order to include the results of the public consultation, and all the comments, observations and/or answers previously sent by MESD. The only outstanding issue accepted in the draft determination report is the lack of LoA issued by Romania*.	The issue is closed now, however LoA issued by Romania shall be presented to AIE before the issuance of final Determination Report. ☑

Corrective Action Request #8 List the applicable regulatory or legal requirements/documents. Add a discussion how alternatives are in compliance with before mentioned requirements.	B.2.5	This has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD.	The list of applicable laws and other regulatory documents is given in chapter B.2. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #9 According to the most recent available information of the audit team that other similar sized projects are at least in construction (Fantanele), the following statement of the PDD, page 13 has to be revised taking into account the discussion of common practice, JI application of similar sized plants and first of its kind: "There is no other wind park of this size operational in Romania. As of 2009 there is an installed wind power capacity of 14MW in Romania. See http://www.ewea.org/index.php?id=1486 (accessed on 12/07/2010). The proposed project activity can therefore be classified as first of its kind."	B.2.10	This has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD.	According to the publicly available information, the operational wind power plant capacity in Romania is 14 MW. Based on the publicly available information , similar wind power project activities (Fantanele WP and Cogealac WP) are under construction or not operational. Cogealac WP is developed as JI project. Fantanele WP is under construction without JI registration. However Fantanele WP has got special support and favorable terms for financing and thus it cannot be considered as project which faces similar risks and thus is excluded from the common practice analysis. The issue is closed. ☑

Corrective Action Request #10 The starting date of the project is the signature of the purchase contract for the turbines which was 29.06.2010. Correct the table on page 3 and chapter C.1.	C.1	The starting date has been changed to 29.06.2010. This has been changed in the revised version 3 of the PDD both on page 3 and in chapter C.1.	The starting date of the project is now 29/06/2010 which represent the signing of the purchase contract for the turbines. The issue is closed. ☑ .
Corrective Action Request #11 Add the explanation that the NET electricity generation is the difference between produced and consumed energy.	D.1.1	This has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD.	The sufficient description and net calculation formulae are added to the chapter D3. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #12 Add the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity.	F.1.1	This has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD.	The detail analysis of the environmental impacts is added to the chapter F.2. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #13 Present a short discussion on transboundary environmental impacts of the project.	F.1.4	This has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD.	Text explaining that no transboundary impacts were identified is included into chapter F.2. The issue is closed. ☑
Corrective Action Request #14 Add description how the public was informed and consulted during Land Use Planning Process and EIA process.	G.1.1	This has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD.	The sufficient explanation is added to the chapter G.1. The issue is closed. ☑

Clarification Request #1 Present the detail time schedule for construction.	A.4.2.10	A detailed time schedule for construction of clusters North 1 and South 2 (in referenced evidence named CAS) is attached to these responses as Ev1-FirstDet (Evidence No. 1 after first determination protocol) For clusters North 2 and South 1 there is no detailed construction schedule available yet	A detailed time schedule is provided showing the finalization of construction works for clusters N2 and S1 for January 2012. It is consistent with other chapters of PDD. The issue is closed. ☑
Clarification Request #2 Provide copy of the letter from bank refusing financing of the Windpark.	B.2.7	As discussed during the site visit a short explanation has been included in the revised version 2 of the PDD showing that the project proponents had contacts with banks which were indicating unfavorable terms for financing the project activity.	The explanation is credible. The overall tendency in Romania and other Eastern-European countries is similar and obvious. The issue is closed. ☑
Clarification Request #3 Present EIA reports for clusters N2 and S1.	F.1.2	At the time of finalizing these responses to the AIE the EIA reports for clusters N2 and S1 have not been issued yet. This is expected within the next two weeks.	The EIA reports for clusters N2 and S1 were presented at 21.09.2010. The issue is closed. ☑
Forward Action Request#1 Copies of the el. meter calibration certificates (or letter of confirmation of calibration) and protocol shall be presented to the audit team during the initial verification.	D.1.1		Will be checked during first initial verification.
Forward Action Request#2 Elaborated Monitoring Manual shall be compiled before the operation of the Windpark and presented to the initial verification audit.	H.4		Will be checked during first initial verification.

Table 3 Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests (in case of denials)

Clarifications and / or corrective action requests by determination team	Id. of CAR/CR	Explanation of Conclusion for Denial
-	-	-

Industrie Service

Annex 2: Information Reference List

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date(dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
1.	12/08/2010	On-site interviews conducted by TÜV SÜD. **Validation Team:** Madis Maddison – JI Auditor Constantin Zaharia - trainee **Interviewed Persons:** Andrei Rapeanu IMA Partners Oliver Percl Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH Ivan Matovina Verbund-Austrian Renewable Power GmbH Mark Suer SC Alpha Wind SRL Marius Iliev SC Alpha Wind SRL Teodor-Ovidiu Pop Verbund-Austrian Renewable Power GmbH, Romania Miriana Roman Ministry of Environment Romania Florentina Manea Ministry of Environment Romania Alexandra Mische Ministry of Environment Romania Marian Puijor Casimcea Municipality, vice mayor	TÜV SÜD	
2.	16/07/2010	PDD Version 1	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L.	
3.	16/07/2010	Excel file "JI_PDD_CasimceaWindpark-ER-Calculations_20100715_Ver1.xls"	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L.	ER calculation workbook
4.	16/07/2010	Monitoring Plan	Energy Changes Projektentwicklung GmbH	Monitoring Plan
5.	27/12/2010	PDD Version 4	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L.	Final PDD version
6.	25/08/2010	Excel file "JI_PDD_CasimceaWindpark-ER-Calculations_20100825_Ver2.xls"	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L.	ER calculation workbook

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date(dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
7.	08/03/2010	Letter of Endorsement no: 1751/L.B.; Casimcea – Alpha Wind Farm	Ministry of Environment and Forests, Romania	LoE
8.	15/09/2009	Selling Contract No. 1031, between CAS & Iliev Marius	Casimcea Municipality	For a part of the land of S2
9.	15/09/2009	Leasing/Ceseing Contract No. 1033. Between CAS & Winstar	Casimcea Municipality	For the rest of the land of S2
10.	03/12/2008	Selling Contract No. 848, between Aplha & Winstar	Casimcea Municipality	For a part of the land of S1, N1, N2
11.	15/09/2009	Selling Contract No. 1032, between Aplha & Winstar	Casimcea Municipality	For the rest of the land of S1, N1, N2
12.	27.05.2010	Urban Plan for N1 and S2	Casimcea Municipality	Land Use Planning
13.	29.06.2010	"Rahnenvereinberung" ENERCON. Contract for the turbines overall capacity 500 MW. Annex 2: type of turbines and transformers. Life time 25 years	Enercon/Alpha	
14.	04.08.2010	Micrositing Report No. WE-GA 2904-Rev. 0, for N1 and N2.	Energiewerkstatt	
15.	26.11.2008	Foundation contract of Joint Venture S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. be-tween Verbund-Austrian Re-newable Power GmbH and ASTROPOINT Ltd	Astropoint Limited, Winstar Trading InlemationalsRL, Marlus Iliev and VERBUND Austrian Renewable Power GmbH	Early JI consideration.
16.	10.12.2009	Connection Agreement No. 23/25697 for 50 MW	Transelectrica	
17.	10.12.2009	Connection Agreement No. 24125701 for 150 MW	Transelectrica	
18.	17.02.2010	Public Announcement for EIA – North 2, North 3	Newspaper Delta	Local stakeholder consultation process

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date(dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
19.	12.02.2010	Public Announcement for PUZ – North 1, North 2, North 3, South 1, South 3	Newspaper Delta	Local stakeholder consultation process
20.	15.02.2010	Public Announcement for PUZ – North 1, South 1, South 3	Newspaper Delta	Local stakeholder consultation process
21.	30.03.2010	Statement No. 3008 for Stakeholder meeting for EIA South (?).	EPA Tulcea	Local stakeholder consultation process
22.	20.04.2010	Statement No. 3687 for Stakeholder meeting for EIA North 1.	EPA Tulcea	Local stakeholder consultation process
23.	12.03.2010	Statement No. 1513 for Stakeholder meeting for EIA South 2.	EPA Galati	Local stakeholder consultation process
24.	06.04.2010	Statement No. 1467 for Stakeholder meeting for PUZ North 1.	Casimcea Municipality	Local stakeholder consultation process
25.	2010	EIA Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster Nord 1	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
26.	2010	EIA Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster South 2	S.C. CAS Regenerabile S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
27.	2010	EIA Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster Nord 2	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
28.	2010	EIA Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster South 1	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
29.	2010	Land Use Planning Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster Nord 1	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date(dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
30.	2010	Land Use Planning Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster South 2	S.C. CAS Regenerabile S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
31.	2010	Land Use Planning Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster Nord 2	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
32.	2010	Land Use Planning Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster Nord 1	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
33.	2010	Land Use Planning Report Casimcea Windpark, cluster South 1	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L. Petrescu Traian	
34.	08/06/2010	Environmental Approval no: 2389 for Casimcea WP cluster Nord 1	Tulcea Environmental Protection Agency	
35.	08/06/2010	Environmental Approval no: 2390 for Casimcea WP cluster South 2	Tulcea Environmental Protection Agency	
36.	11/08/2010	Electrical scheme of the Casimcea WP	VERBUND Austrian Renewable Power GmbH	
37.	11/08/2010	ENERCON wind turbines, product overview	Enercon GmbH	Technical data of the equipment to be installed
38.	11/08/2010	Metering scheme	VERBUND Austrian Renewable Power GmbH	Monitoring; location of the meters
39.	13/09/2010	Project implementation timeline	VERBUND Austrian Renewable Power GmbH	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date(dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
40.	13/09/2010	Ev1-FirstDet2010.08.18_Bauzeitplan_N1 (MS Project file)	VERBUND Austrian Renewable Power GmbH	WP Installation schedule
41.	19/08/2010	Project Idea Note	S.C. Alpha Wind S.R.L.	PIN
42.		Country Report for Investors and Exporters, Romania July 2009	KSV1870	Barrier analysis
43.	05/2010	Inflation Report	National Bank of Romania	Barrier analysis
44.		Romania: Green energy obstacle due for lift by mid-year	Petrolplaza, Online Portal for the Retail Petroleum Equipment Industry	Barrier analysis
45.		Cumulative installed capacity per EU Member State 1998 - 2009 (MW)	The European Wind Energy Association	Common Practice Analysis
46.	14/05/2010	CEZ WIND PROJECT IN ROMANIA, Fantanele & Cogealac (Presentation)	ADRIAN BOROTEA CORPORATE AFFAIRS DIRECTOR - CEZ ROMANIA	ENERGY FORUM 2010 Central & SouthEastern Europe, Bucharest
47.	18/05/2009	News release, EIB loan to Fantanele Windfarm, http://www.eib.org/projects/pipeline/2007/20070524.htm	European Investment Bank	
48.	06/07/2009	News release, CEZ Group loan with cover of German Export Credit Agency Hermes	CEZ Group	
49.	10/2006	TIMISOARA COMBINED HEAT AND POWER REHABILITATION FOR CET SUD LOCATION, PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT (PDD), Version 02, October 2006	SC Colterm SA, SC ENINVEST SA	EF cross-check
50.	01/2006	TIMISOARA COMBINED HEAT AND POWER REHABILITATION FOR CET SUB LOCATION, BASELINE STUDY	SC Colterm SA, SC ENINVEST SA	EF cross-check

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date(dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author/Editor/ Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
51.	12/2009	JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee Nineteenth meeting Report - Annex 4	