

Exhibit 1

Examples of IFC natural gas power plant investments with non-credible and inadequate /unsupported alternatives analysis falling short of good international industry practice (GIIP) at the time of IFC Director approval as documented in the alternatives analysis provided in the Environmental Assessment Documents available via the IFC public Project Information and Data Portal within the ESRS tab for each project (no alternatives analysis for IFC natural gas project investments from 2012-present have been credible or adequate)

A.) Alternatives Analysis analyzed renewable options, but in a cursory non-credible fashion:

- **Central Termica de Temane in Mozambique, Project # 43099, approved 12/7/21:** Alternatives analysis briefly discusses and dismisses different types of renewable energy projects (solar, wind, hydro) and nuclear power as alternatives to the natural gas plant. However, the analysis of each renewable energy source is not credible because the short evaluations are cursory, do not contain supported analysis, and fail to give these options a hard look. Further, the alternatives analysis does not evaluate use of a mix of renewables or demand side options for power needs. GHG emissions from the various renewable alternatives v. the natural gas plant pursued are not provided or considered in the context of global warming impacts.
- **YEREVAN CGT in Armenia, Project # 39630, approved 6/3/19:** Alternatives analysis briefly discusses and dismisses different types of renewable energy projects (solar, wind, hydro, geothermal) and nuclear power as alternatives to the natural gas plant. However, the analysis of each renewable energy source is not credible because the short evaluations are cursory, do not contain supported analysis, and fail to give these options a hard look. Further, the alternatives analysis does not evaluate use of a mix of renewables or demand side options for power needs. GHG emissions from the various renewable alternatives v. the natural gas plant pursued are not provided or considered in the context of global warming impacts.
- **MYINGYAN in Myanmar, Project # 36627, approved 10/8/16:** Alternatives analysis briefly discusses and dismisses solar, wind, geothermal, and biomass renewable energy sources. The analysis of each renewable energy source is not credible because the short evaluations are cursory, do not contain supported analysis, and fail to give these options a hard look despite indications that pursuing some of these sources could be feasible. Further, the alternatives analysis does not evaluate use of a mix of renewables or demand side options for power needs. In addition, the analysis does not provide enough information to demonstrate whether a suitable hydro project could be pursued as a renewable energy option in lieu of the natural gas plant. GHG emissions from the various renewable alternatives v. the natural gas plant pursued are not provided or considered in the context of global warming impacts.

B.) Alternatives Analysis did not analyze renewable options (e.g. wind, solar), but only compared the difference in GHG emissions from natural gas plants and coal plants AND OR analyzed various configurations or technologies for natural gas plants:

- **Syrdarya CCGT in Uzbekistan, Project # 45205, approved 3/16/23:** EIA document acknowledges that in 2020, the Ministry of Energy of Uzbekistan launched the development of a national Low- Carbon Energy Strategy aimed at developing alternative energy sources, including solar, hydro and wind, to produce electricity with low-carbon emissions, and that renewables are to make up 25% of the country's energy yield by 2030. However, the alternatives analysis does not analyze renewable energy options, but only configurations of single vs. combined cycle natural gas plants with various technology options.
- **FCS RE CIPREL V in Cote D'Ivoire, Project # 39096, approved 10/20/21:** GHG alternatives analysis limited to comparison of various natural gas power plant configurations.
- **SM2PCL in Bangladesh, Project # 40178, approved 1/13/21:** alternatives analysis limited to project v. no project scenario.
- **RIAU PP in Indonesia, Project # 39879, approved 11/13/19:** GHG alternatives analysis limited to comparison of various natural gas power plant configurations, and comparison of GHG emissions from a coal power plant to natural gas power plant.
- **CELSE in Brazil, Project # 39652, approved 6/21/18:** GHG alternatives analysis limited to comparison of various natural gas power plant configurations and LNG operations options.
- **ACWA POWER ZARQA in Jordan, Project # 38207, approved 1/9/17:** Alternatives analysis is not GHG specific. Natural Gas plant configurations alternatives analyzed on basis of cooling arrangements.
- **ACWA KIRIKKALE in Turkiye, Project # 35395, approved 7/22/15:** GHG alternatives analysis limited to comparison of three natural gas power plant configurations with varying emissions.
- **Gama Energy in Turkiye, Project # 32258, approved 6/29/15:** GHG alternatives analysis for natural gas plant just compared a coal power plant to natural gas power plant.