



---

# ANNEX 1

## REPORT ON COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

---

### Água Doce Wind Power Generation Project (ADWPGP)

**Project No.** CDM.Val0242b

**Date:** 20/02/2006

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with sub-paragraphs 40 (b) and (c) of the CDM modalities and procedures, the project design document of a proposed CDM project activity shall be made publicly available and the DOE shall make invite comments on the validation requirements from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and make them publicly available. This report describes this process for this particular project.

## **2 PROJECT DETAILS**

### **2.1 Project title**

Água Doce Wind Power Generation Project (ADWPGP)

### **2.2 Description of how and when the PDD was made publicly available**

The Project Design Documents and its annexes were made publicly available from 21 Dec 05 until 19 Jan 06 on the website

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/view.html?ProjectId=8KK2B9JTXIHDET5O74W1W5DLCC3AX6&OE=SGS-UKL> and comments were invited through the UNFCCC CDM homepage.

## **3 COMMENTS RECEIVED**

### **3.1 Description of how comments were received and made publicly available**

Comments could be submitted through a web interface or by email or fax.

As per procedures on public availability of the CDM project design documents and for receiving comments as referred to in paragraphs 40b and 40c of the CDM modalities and procedures, any received comments are displayed from the end of the 30 days commenting period, at the website listed in section 2.2.

### **3.2 Compilation of all comments received**

No comments received.

## **4 EXPLANATION OF HOW COMMENTS HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT**

No comments received.



---

## ANNEX 2

# LIST OF DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

---

### Água Doce Wind Power Generation Project (ADWPGP)

**Project No.** CDM.Val0242b

**Date:** 20/02/2006

- /1/ Annex 1: Report on Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs
- /2/ Annex 2: Comprehensive list of documents attached
- /3/ Annex 3 List of persons interviewed
- /4/ Annex 4: Validation Protocol (UK.AU4.CDM.Val0242)
- /5/ Annex 5: Overview of findings (UK.Findings.CDM.VAL0242)
- /6/ Annex 6: Answers from local assessor
- /7/ Annex 7: Validation Report (UK.AR6.SSC.CDM.VAL0242)
- /8/ Annex 8: Modalities of communication
- /9/ Letter of Approval from the Government of Brazil



---

## ANNEX 3

Overview of documentation that has  
been reviewed and list of persons  
interviewed

---

# ÁGUA DOCE WIND POWER GENERATION PROJECT (ADWPGP)

**Project No.** CDM.Val0242b

**Date:** 20/02/2006

This document is an Annex to the validation report for CDM project activity registration. It gives overview of documentation that has been reviewed and names of persons that have been an interviewed as part of the validation.

#### List of documents reviewed

- /1/ Project Design Document, Água Doce Wind Power Generation Project (ADWPGP), version 1 (December, 2005) and version 2 (20<sup>th</sup> February, 2006).
- /2/ Simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for small scale CDM project activity: AMS ID – Grid connected renewable electricity generation, version 06, 30 September 2005.
- /3/ Letter of Approval Government of Brazil.

#### List of persons interviewed

	Name and position	Company name	Date interviewed
/1/	Daniel Salvatore Fernandes	Engineer/ CENAEEL	January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006 and February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2006
/2/	David Freire da Costa	Engineer/ Econergy	January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006 and February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2006
/3/	Robson Zanella Pieri	Technician/ Wobben	January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
/4/	Ilson Moreira Ferreira	Technician/ Wobben	January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006

## ANNEX 4 - Validation Protocol

This validation protocol is designed to ensure that the project meets the requirements for CDM projects that are detailed in paragraph 37 of the CDM modalities and procedures. Each requirement is covered in a separate table. The following requirements are discussed in this protocol:

Requirement	Description	
Participation requirements	The participation requirements as set out in Decision 17/CP7 need to be satisfied	Covered in table 1
Baseline and monitoring methodology	The baseline and monitoring methodology complies with the requirements pertaining to a methodology previously approved by the Executive Board	Baseline methodology is covered in table 2 Monitoring methodology is covered in table 4
Additionality	The project activity is expected to result in a reduction in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity	Covered in table 9
Monitoring plan	Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are in accordance with relevant decisions of the COP/MOP	Covered in table 9
Environmental impacts	Project participants have submitted to the designated operational entity documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;	Covered in table 9
Comments by local stakeholders	Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report to the designated	Covered in Table 7

Other requirements	operational entity on how due account was taken of any comments has been received; The project activity conforms to all other requirements for CDM project activities in relevant decisions by the COP/MOP and the Executive Board. Covered in Table 8
--------------------	---

Small sale projects and AR projects have specific requirements which are covered in Table 9-11. Small scale SSC projects have special requirements which might deviate from the requirements of other CDM projects. These requirements are tested in table 9. Please note that some questions in table 9 overlap with questions in the other tables. Where the questions in table 9 contradict or overlap questions elsewhere in the checklist, the questions in table 9 shall prevail. For the validation of small scale projects, assessor is required to address the questions in table 9 first before starting with the questions in the other tables.

Further remarks on the use of this document:

- text in *italic blue* is meant as guidance for the assessor
- MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

This protocol should be adapted as required. For example, if the project is not a small scale project or an AR project, some tables can be deleted.

**Table 1 Participation Requirements for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Project Activities (Ref PDD, Letters of Approval and UNFCCC website) All CDM project activities**

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
1.1 The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3 and be entered into voluntarily.	DR	PDD	No annex I in this project.	Ok	Ok

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
1.2 The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof, and be entered into voluntarily	DR	PDD	No Letter of approval by host country (Brazil) has been submitted to the validator.  The letter will be issued after delivering the validation report to Brazilian DNA.	Send the validation report to DNA.	
1.3 All Parties (listed in Section A3 of the PDD) have ratified the Kyoto protocol and are allowed to participate in CDM projects	DR	PDD	Yes, Brazil.  Ratification date: 23 Aug 02	Ok	Ok
1.4 The project results in reductions of GHG emissions or increases in sequestration when compared to the baseline; and the project can be reasonably shown to be different from the baseline scenario	DR	PDD	Yes. The project reduces GHG emissions through installation of a wind power plant.	Ok	Ok
1.5 Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days (45 days for AR projects), and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available	DR	UNFCCC site	Global stakeholder: 21 Dec 05 – 19 Jan 06 <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/view.html?ProjectId=8KK2B9JTXIHDET5O74W1W5DLCC3AX6&amp;OE=SGS-UKL">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/view.html?ProjectId=8KK2B9JTXIHDET5O74W1W5DLCC3AX6&amp;OE=SGS-UKL</a>	Ok	Ok. No comments received.
1.6 The project has correctly completed a Project Design Document, using the current version and exactly following the guidance	DR	PDD	Yes, CDM SSC-PDD (version 2).	Ok	Ok
1.7 The project shall not make use of Official Development Assistance (ODA), nor result in the diversion of such ODA	DR site visit/ linter	PDD	To be confirmed by local assessor.	Verify	The project does not make use of ODA, accordingly to the project's managers.

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
	view				
1.8 For AR projects, the host country shall have issued a communication providing a single definition of minimum tree cover, minimum land area value and minimum tree height. Has such a letter been issued and are the definitions consistently applied throughout the PDD?			N/A		
1.9 Does the project meet the additional requirements detailed in: Table 9 for SSC projects Table 10 for AR projects Table 11 for AR SSC projects	DR	PDD	Yes (see table 9)	Ok	Ok
1.10 Is the current version of the PDD complete and does it clearly reflect all the information presented during the validation assessment.	DR	PDD	To be confirmed by local assessor. Yes, verified during site visit.	Verify	Ok
1.11 Does the PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in an objective manner?	DR	PDD	To be confirmed by local assessor. What is the source/reference for the "Capacity factor" = 0,309 (see PDD, table E.2)? The information provided was accepted and the latest PDD presented clarification about the reference. NIR 3 was closed out.	NIR 3	Ok

**Table 2 Baseline methodology(ies) (Ref: PDD Section B and E and Annex 3 and AM) Normal CDM projects only – N/A**

**Table 3    Additionality (Ref: PDD Section B3 and AM) Normal CDM projects only – N/A**

**Table 4    Monitoring methodology (PDD Section D and AM) Normal CDM Projects only – N/A**

**Table 5    Monitoring plan (PDD Annex 4) Normal CDM Project activities only – N/A**

**Table 6    Environmental Impacts (Ref PDD Section F and relevant local legislation) Normal CDM Project Activities only – N/A**

**Table 7    Comments by local stakeholders (Ref PDD Section G) All CDM Project Activities**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1 Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	PDD	DR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes. As described in the PDD, the following stakeholders were consulted by letters:</li> <li>- <i>Prefeitura Municipal de Água Doce – SC</i> / Municipal Administration of Água Doce – SC;</li> <li>- <i>Câmara dos Vereadores de Água Doce – SC</i> / Municipality Chamber of Água Doce – SC;</li> <li>- <i>Fórum Brasileiro de ONGs</i> / Brazilian NGO Fórum;</li> <li>- <i>Ministério Público de Santa Catarina</i>;</li> <li>- <i>Fundação do Meio Ambiente – FATMA</i> / State Environmental agency;</li> <li>- <i>Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Água Doce – SC</i> / Union of rural workers</li> <li>- <i>Câmara de Dirigentes Lojistas de Água Doce – SC</i> / Commercial Chamber of of Água Doce – SC.</li> </ul>	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.2 Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	PDD	DR	Verify letters sent to stakeholders.	Verified	Ok, letters sent in local language.
7.3 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?	PDD	DR	Verify if the process is in compliance with Brazilian Resolution n° 1.  Letters were sent to stakeholders according Brazilian DNA resolution.	Verify	Ok
7.4 Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	PDD	DR	Yes, described in Section G.2 of PDD.  During the site visit, the letters/comments received from stakeholders were verified. The Brazilian NGOs Forum has sent a letter to CENAEEL dated 27 September 2005 and the Municipality has sent a letter to CENAEEL dated 24 October 2005.	Ok	Ok
7.5 Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD	DR	Yes, described in Section G.3 of PDD.  During the site visit, the responses sent to stakeholders were verified.	OK	Ok

**Table 8 Other requirements All CDM project activities**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>8.1 Project Design Document</b>					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.1.1 Editorial issues: does the project correctly apply the PDD template and has the document been completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.	PDD	DR	Yes (CDM-SSC-PDD, version 02).	Ok	Ok
8.1.2 Substantive issues: does the PDD address all the specific requirements under each header. If requirements are not applicable / not relevant, this must be stated and justified	PDD	DR	Yes.	Ok	Ok
<b>8.2 Technology to be employed</b>					
8.2.1 Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	PDD	DR	Yes.	Ok	Ok
8.2.2 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?	PDD	DR	Água Doce has 15 aero turbine with 600Kw each, total 9 MW installed capacity, manufactured by Enercon, Brazilian subsidiary of German turbine.	Ok	Ok
8.3 Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	PDD	DR	No.	Ok	Ok
8.2.4 Does the project require extensive initial training and	PDD	DR	Provide information about training. Training is not necessary. The project has one employee	NIR 1	NIR 1 has been closed out.

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?			and services are provided by other company (Wobben) that has experience in wind power generation.		Ok
<b>8.3 Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period</b> <i>It is assessed whether the temporal boundaries of the project are clearly defined.</i>					
8.3.1 Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	PDD	DR	Section C.1.1 – starting date 01/04/2004. Section C.1.2 – lifetime 20 years. There is a mistake in the PDD (Section A.4.3.1) related to the start date and end of the crediting period. The new version of the PDD was verified and was corrected. CAR 4 was closed out.	CAR 4	Ok
8.3.2 Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max. two x 7 years or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?	PDD	DR	Section C.2.1.2 – crediting period 7 years.	See 8.3.1	Ok
8.3.3 Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period	PDD	DR	No.	Ok	Ok

**Table 9 Additional requirements for SSC project activities only**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
SSC projects use the SSC PDD and simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies as detailed in Appendix B (to the Modalities and Procedures for Small scale CDM projects, Annex II to Decision 21/CP.8) Indicative simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for selected small scale CDM project activity categories					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
9.1 Does the project qualify as a small scale CDM project activity as defined in paragraph 6 (c) of decision 17/CP.7 on the modalities and procedures for the CDM?	PDD	DR	Yes, renewable energy generation for a grid with 9 MW. (less than 15MW limit for small scale projects)	Ok	Ok
9.2 The project conforms to one of the categories listed in Appendix B to Annex II to Decision 21/CP8	PDD	DR	Yes, ID – Grid connected renewable electricity generation.	Ok	Ok
9.3 The small scale project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project activity?	PDD	DR	<p>To be confirmed by local assessor.</p> <p>It is necessary clarification about the other CDM project near to ADWPGP that CENAEEL is responsible for, to explain that the project is not a debundled component of a larger activity.</p> <p>The auditors accepted the justification provided. In addition, the UNFCCC website was verified and does not show another registered project with the same characteristics. Therefore, this project is not considered a debundled component of a larger activity and NIR 2 was closed out.</p>	NIR 2	Ok
9.4 PDD has been prepared in accordance with appendix A of Annex II to Decision 21/CP8	PDD	DR	Yes, they use the version 02.	Ok	Ok
9.5 The project uses a simplified baseline and monitoring methodology specified in Appendix B. If not, they may propose changes to the meths or a new SSC project category	PDD	DR	Yes, Approved monitoring methodology: “Renewable Electricity Generation for a Grid”, Type I.D in Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small-Scale CDM project activities.	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
9.6 Are the emission reductions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD	DR	Yes.	Ok	Ok
9.7 Is there any bundling of SSC activities into one PDD? If so, does the monitoring plan consider sampling of activities? Refer to para 19 of Annex II. Also, note bundling provisions in SSC Briefing Note and SSC meths I C / I D and III D and Para 22e of Appendix B	PDD	DR	No.	Ok	Ok
9.8 Is EIA required by host party? If not, none is required irrespective of SHC. If yes, has one been performed consistent with local requirements?	PDD	DR	There is a mistake in the information provided in the PDD (Section F.1) regarding the environmental license. The document verified during the site visit was the "installation license". The PDD informs that the project "has already obtained an Operation License", which is not the same document under the environmental legal requirements. The new version of the PDD was verified and was corrected. CAR 5 was closed out. Verified Installation License LAI Number 0521/05, 06/07/2005 issued by FATMA, and Semi-Annual Technical Report, July 2005 issued by Maurique.	CAR 5	Ok
9.9 The project results in emission reductions that are additional in accordance with the following requirements: (para 26) The project is additional if emissions are reduced below those in the absence of the project	PDD	DR	The emissions are reduced below in the absence of the project. Simplified baseline was used. Barriers were listed in the PDD and will be verified by local assessor.	Verify	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>(Para 27) Simplified baseline can be used; if not, baseline proposed shall cover all gases, sectors and sources listed in Annex A to the KP</p> <p>Para 28) One or more barriers as detailed in attachment A to Appendix B to Annex II will be used to demonstrate that the project would not proceed without the CDM</p>					
<p>9.10 Leakage is calculated according to the provisions of the SSC methodologies in Appendix B (<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/pac/ssclistmeth.pdf">http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/pac/ssclistmeth.pdf</a>)</p>	PDD	DR	<p>According to the leakage paragraph of Approved Monitoring Methodology “Renewable Electricity Generation for a Grid”, Type I.D in Appendix B of the Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small-Scale CDM project activities, leakage is considered if: “the energy generating equipment is transferred from another activity or if the existing equipment is transferred to another activity”.</p> <p>Since none of the conditions above is applicable for ADEGP, there is no leakage to be considered in this project activity.</p>	Ok	Ok
<p>9.11 The project boundary shall be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the SSC meths in Appendix B</p>	PDD	DR	<p>The project boundary encompasses the wind farm and South-Southeast Brazilian grid.</p>	Ok	Ok
<p>9.12 The Monitoring plan shall be consistent with the requirements of the SSC methodology in Appendix B</p>	PDD	DR	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The monitoring plan attends the methodology</p>	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
and shall provide for the collection and archiving of data needed to determine project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage.			requirements.		
9.13 The monitoring plan shall present good monitoring practice appropriate to the circumstances of the project activity (para 33)	PDD	DR	Verify procedures. The monitoring plan is described in section D of the PDD.	Verify	Ok
9.14 If project activities are bundled, separate monitoring plan shall be prepared for each of the activities or an overall plan reflecting good monitoring practice will be prepared, consistent with the above requirements	PDD	DR	The project is not bundled.	Ok	Ok

**Table 10 Additional requirements for AR projects**

**Table 11 Additional requirements for SSC AR projects**

**Table 12 Additional information to be verified by local assessors / site visit**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Verify operation licence from ANEEL	DR	Site visit	Resolution: Number 675, 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2002; Number 263, 18 <sup>th</sup> July 2005; and Number 165, 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2005	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			issued by ANEEL.		
Verify copy of the letters sent to stakeholders an ARs. Verify if there was any answer.	DR	Site visi/ DR	Verified letters, ARs and answers.	Ok	Ok
Verify internal procedures to collect and archive data.	DR	Site visit/ DR	The procedure is described in section D of the PDD.	Ok	Ok
Verify PPA signed between CENAEEL and Eletrobras.	DR	Site visit	Verified the Purchase agreement between CENAEEL and Eletrobrás: Contrato de Compra e Venda de Energia Elétrica entre Eletrobrás e CENAEEL, 30th June 2004.	Ok	Ok

References consulted during Ground Truthing and brief summary of content / significance [please try to obtain a hard copy where ever possible]:

Ref no.	Title (full bibliographic reference if possible)	Brief note on content / significance	Hard copy (Y/n)
1	Licença Ambiental de Instalação – LAI N 0521/05, 6 <sup>th</sup> July 2005 issued by FATMA.	Instalation license.	Y
2	Contrato de Compra e Venda de Energia Elétrica entre Eletrobrás e CENAEEL, 30th June 2004.	Purchase agreement between CENAEEL and Eletrobrás.	Y
3	Resolution: Number 675, 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2002; Number 263, 18 <sup>th</sup> July 2005; and Number 165, 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2005 issued by ANEEL.	Authorization to produce energy.	Y
4	Contrato de Compromisso de Compra e Venda de Aerogeradores, equipamentos e materiais, para instalação	Contract for services, aero turbine and equipments for the wind power farm.	Y

	de Usina Eólica, between CENAEEL and Wobben, 7th July 2004.		
5	Parque Eólico Horizonte – Comunicação Social, 31 <sup>st</sup> January 2002.	Presentation about Wind Power Água Doce to the community that lives in the wind farm area.	Y
6	Projeto de implantação de sistema de medição de faturamento de energia elétrica de acessante de geração de acordo com o CCEE, 22/12/05 issued by Reativa.	Memorial that presents information and technical details for the energy measure system.	Y
7	Technical Report, July 2005 issued by Maurique.	Environmental assessment report.	Y

Individuals interviewed during Validation and Ground Truthing [name, position and contact details, plus a brief summary of points discussed]

Date met	Name	Position	Contact details	Brief note on subject of interview
January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006 and February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2006	Daniel Salvatore Fernandes	Engineer	CENAEEL <a href="mailto:Daniel@eolik.com.br">Daniel@eolik.com.br</a>	Technical issues, operational controls, management system.
January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006 and February 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2006	David Freire da Costa	Engineer	Econergy <a href="mailto:freire@econergy.com.br">freire@econergy.com.br</a>	Project baseline, PDD, monitoring plan.
January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006	Robson Zanella Pieri	Technician	Wobben	Operational controls.
January 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2006	Ilson Moreira Ferreira	Technician	Wobben	Operational controls.

- o0o -

## ANNEX 5 - FINDINGS OVERVIEW

### FINDINGS FROM VALIDATION ÁGUA DOCE WIND POWER GENERATION PROJECT (ADWPGP)

Each Table below represents a finding from the validation assessment. The findings are numbered consecutively, approximately in the order that they have been identified.

Description of table:

Type	Findings are either New Information Requests (NIR) or Corrective Action Requests (CAR). CARs are items that must be addressed before a project can receive a recommendation for registration. NIRs may lead to the raising of CARs. Observations are included at the end and may or may not be addressed. They are primarily to act as signposts for the verifying DOE.
Issue	Details the content of the finding
Ref	refers to the item number in the Validation Protocol
Response	Please insert response to finding, starting with the date of entry.

Rows for comments and further response will be appended to the table until the Findings has been addressed to the satisfaction of the Lead Assessor.

Please note that this is an open list and more findings may be added as validation progresses.

Date: 28/12/2005

Raised by: Fabian/Aurea

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
1	NIR	Provide more information about training.	8.2.4
Date: 03/02/2006 [Comments] This is not applicable.			
Date: 15/02/2006 [Acceptance and close out] It was verified that specific training to operate the wind farm is not necessary. The services and maintenance are provided by company that has experience in wind power generation; this company contracted persons that lives in the locality and proved the training. NIR 1 has been closed out.			

Date: 17/02/2006

Raised by: Aurea Nardelli

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
2	NIR	It is necessary clarification about the other CDM project near to ADWPGP that CENAEEL is responsible for, to explain that the project is not a debundled component of a larger activity	9.3
Date: 20/02/2006 The projects Horizonte and Água Doce had been created and executed at different times and conditions. The choice for the elaboration of two distinct projects, even so similar, if gave for the following factors: a) The projects of Horizonte and Água Doce have different chronograms. The project of Horizon had its beginning of operation in 2004, and Água Doce will starts in November of 2006. Soon, the period of credits to be considered for the projects is distinct;			

b) The energy PPA is distinct. The PPA of the project Horizon was a bilateral contract firm between CENAEEL and CELESC. The PPA of the project Água Doce was a contract firm between CENAEEL and ELETROBRÁS.

c) The project Horizonte uses the CELESC transmission line, while the project Água Doce uses the COPEL transmission line (another company).

d) The project Horizonte used proper capital of the CENAEEL to be constructed, while project Água Doce used part of the capital from CENAEEL and part by financing of BNDES and BRDE.

Date: 25/02/2006

[Acceptance and close out]: The auditors accepted the justification provided. In addition, the UNFCCC website was verified and does not show another registered project with the same characteristics. Therefore, this project is not considered a debundled component of a larger activity and NIR 2 was closed out.

Date: 17/02/2006

Raised by: Aurea Nardelli

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
3	NIR	What is the source/reference for the "Capacity factor" = 0,309 (see PDD, table E.2)?	1.11

Date: 20/02/2006

The Capacity Factor is provided by the industry of the turbines (Wobben); the following information was inserted in the revised PDD, under the table E.2 (PDD version 2, 20 February, 2006): "Data related with the value of the "Capacity Factor = 0,309" was provided by Wobben Wind Power, the Brazilian subsidiary of German turbine manufacturer Enercon."

Date: 25/02/2006

[Acceptance and close out]: The information provided was accepted and the latest PDD presented clarification about the reference. NIR 3 was closed out.

Date: 17/02/2006

Raised by: Aurea Nardelli

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
4	CAR	There is a mistake in the PDD (Section A.4.3.1) related to the start date and end of the crediting period.	8.3.1 and 8.3.2

Date: 20/02/2006

The PDD was revised to reflect the correct period and correct values for the credits (see tables in the sections A.4.3.1. and E.2, PDD version 2, issued on 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2006). The period will be from 30/11/2006 to 29/11/2013.

Date: 25/02/2006

[Acceptance and close out] The new version of the PDD was verified and was corrected. CAR 4 was closed out.

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
5	CAR	There is a mistake in the information provided in the PDD (Section F.1) regarding the environmental license. The document verified	9.8

		during the site visit was the “installation license”. The PDD informs that the project “has already obtained an Operation License”, which is not the same document under the environmental legal requirements.	
<p>Date: 20/02/2006</p> <p>The document is the “Installation License”, as copy provided during the site visit. The PDD was changed and the version 2 (issued on 20/02/2006) presents the correct information.</p>			
<p>Date: 25/02/2006</p> <p>[Acceptance and close out] The new version of the PDD was verified and was corrected. CAR 5 was closed out.</p>			

Observations:



## Annex 6 Local assessment checklist

### Água Doce Wind Power Generation Project (ADWPGP) (CDM.VAL0242b)

This checklist is designed to provide confirmation of in-country data and information provided in the Project Design Document. It serves as a “reality check” on the project. It is to be completed by SGS Brazil.

Issue	Findings	Source /Means of Verification	Further action / clarification / information required?
Verify operation licence from ANEEL	Resolution: Number 675, 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2002; Number 263, 18 <sup>th</sup> July 2005; and Number 165, 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2005 issued by ANEEL.	DR/Site visit	No
Verify copy of the letters sent to stakeholders and ARs. Verify if had any answer or not.	<p>Verified letters, ARs and answers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Prefeitura Municipal de Água Doce – SC / Municipal Administration of Água Doce – SC;</i></li> <li>- <i>Câmara dos Vereadores de Água Doce – SC / Municipality Chamber of Água Doce – SC;</i></li> <li>- <i>Fórum Brasileiro de ONGs /Brazilian NGO Fórum;</i></li> <li>- <i>Ministério Público de Santa Catarina;</i></li> <li>- <i>Fundação do Meio Ambiente – FATMA / State Environmental agency;</i></li> <li>- <i>Sindicato dos Trabalhadores Rurais de Água Doce – SC / Union of rural workers</i></li> <li>- <i>Câmara de Dirigentes Lojistas de Água Doce – SC / Comercial Chamber of of Água Doce – SC.</i></li> </ul> <p>Verified letter received from Brazilian NGO Fórum and the answer sent by CENAEEL.</p> <p>Verified letter received from Municipality administration with positive comments and requested more technical detailed information that depends on the validation process. CENAEEL will send more information after</p>	DR/Site visit	No

Issue	Findings	Source /Means of Verification	Further action / clarification / information required?
	validation.		
Verify internal procedures to collect and archive data.	The procedure is described in section D of the PDD.	DR/Site visit	No
Verify PPA signed between CENAEEL and Eletrobras.	Verified the Purchase agreement between CENAEEL and Eletrobrás: Contrato de Compra e Venda de Energia Elétrica entre Eletrobrás e CENAEEL, 30th June 2004.	DR/Site visit	No
Starting date, verify documents that prove start date of construction, conclusion, and operation.	Verified contract between CENAEEL and Wobben Windpower Indústria e Comércio, 7 July 2004, and service contract, 7 July 2004.	DR/Site visit	No
Verify installation license from ANEEL	Verified Installation License LAI Number 0521/05, 06/07/2005 issued by FATMA, and Semi-Annual Technical Report, July 2005 issued by Maurique.	DR/Site visit	No