



ANNEX 1

REPORT ON COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

USJ Açúcar e Álcool S/A – Usina São Francisco Cogeneration Project

Project No. CDM.Val0392

Date: 15/09/2006

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

USJ Açúcar e Álcool S/A – Usina São Francisco Cogeneration Project

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 08 February 2006 until 09 March 2006 on the website <http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/1UBO9CZM5QMS7BNWTEE1LM216ADH7N/view.html> 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 to the DOE during the 30 days commenting period.

4 EXPLANATION OF HOW COMMENTS HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

No comments received.



ANNEX 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS ATTACHED

USJ Açúcar e Álcool S/A – Usina São Francisco Cogeneration Project

Project No. CDM.Val0392

Date: 15/09/2006

- /1/ Annex 1: Report on Comments by Parties, Stakeholders and NGOs
- /2/ Annex 2: Comprehensive list of documents attached
- /3/ Annex 2: List of persons interviewed
- /4/ Annex 4: Validation Protocol (UK.AU4.CDM.VAL0392)
- /5/ Annex 5: Overview of findings (UK.Findings.CDM.VAL0392)
- /6/ Annex 6: Answers from local assessor
- /7/ Annex 7: Validation Report (UK.AR6.CDM.VAL0392)
- /8/ Annex 8: Modalities of communication



ANNEX 3

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

USJ AÇÚCAR E ÁLCOOL S/A – USINA
SÃO FRANCISCO COGENERATION
PROJECT

Project No. CDM.Val0392

Date: 15/09/2006

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, USJ Açúcar e Álcool S/A – Usina São Francisco Cogeneration Project, version 1 (03/02/2006); version 2 (07/03/2006); version 3 (13/03/2006); version 4 (18/07/2006); version 5 (06/09/2006).
- /2/ Consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from biomass residues – ACM0006, version 03, 19 May 2006.

List of persons interviewed

	Name and position	Company name	Date interviewed
/1/	Narciso Fernando Bertholdi/ Business Development Manager	USJ narciso@usj.com.br	02/03/2006
/2/	João Batista Saccomano /Project Manager	USJ jbsaccomano@usj.com.br	02/03/2006
/3/	José Ieda Neto /Industrial Manager	USJ jjedaneto@usj.com.br	02/03/2006
/4/	Mauricio F. de Oliveira /Production Manager	USJ mauricio@usj.com.br	02/03/2006
/5/	Ricardo Besen/Consultant	Ecoinvest rbesen@ecoinvestcarbon.com	02/03/2006

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 3
Monitoring plan	Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are in accordance with relevant decisions of the COP/MOP	Covered in table 5
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 6
Comments by local	Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a summary of	Covered in Table 7

stakeholders	the comments received has been provided, and a report to the designated operational entity on how due account was taken of any comments has been received;	
Other requirements	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
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 analysis of the validation report by 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	UNFCCC website	Yes, Brazil – date of ratification 23-august-2002.	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 activity will use renewable biomass for electricity generation (applying the ACM0006).	Ok	Ok
1.5 Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC	DR	CDM	Yes. The project is publicly	Verify	Ok

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
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		website	<p>available until 09-mar-2006.</p> <p>Public available : http://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/Validation/DB/1UBO9CZM5QMS7BNWTEE1LM216ADH7N/view.html</p> <p>No comments were received.</p>		
1.6 The project has correctly completed a Project Design Document, using the current version and exactly following the guidance	DR	PDD	Yes. The Version 2 (July,2004) is used.	OK	Ok
1.7 The project shall not make use of Official Development Assistance (ODA), nor result in the diversion of such ODA	DR	PDD	<p>No ODA have been provided for this project.</p> <p>The Project is financed by BNDES - Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social. (Brazilian Development Bank)</p>	Verify	Ok
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		

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
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			N/A		
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	Yes.	Ok	Ok
1.11 Does the PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in an objective manner?	DR	PDD	Section B.3 of the PDD, investment barrier mention that a PPA (Power Purchase Agreement) was signed, but no PPA has been signed until now. The project starts to prepare a contract to sell the energy that will be produced. Investment barrier in section B.3 of the PDD was updated to clarify this information. NIR 6 was closed out.	NIR 6	Ok

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

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
2.1 Does the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the methodology	PDD ACM 0006	DR	<p>ACM0006 is applied (“Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from biomass residues”).</p> <p>ACM0006 is applicable to grid-connected and biomass residue fired electricity generation project activities, including cogeneration plants.</p> <p>The project meets the applicability criteria listed in the methodology. It is a “Greenfield” power project: is a new biomass power generation plant at a site where currently no power generation occurs; the primary fuel in the project plant is a biomass consisting of sugar cane bagasse; the implementation of the project shall not result in an increase of the</p>	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>processing capacity of raw input or other substantial changes in the process; the bagasse will be stored for less than one year (from November to April).</p> <p>The biomass used in this project is not transformed in any way before being used as a fuel.</p> <p>The power generated by the project plant would in the absence of the project activity be purchased from the grid.</p>		
2.2 Is the project boundary consistent with the approved methodology	PDD ACM 0006	DR	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The project boundary encompasses the physical, geographical site of the bagasse power generation source, represented by the sugarcane mills, sugarcane plantation, the region located close to the power plant and the interconnected grid.</p>	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
2.3 Are the baseline emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD ACM 0006	DR	Yes	Verify	Ok
2.4 Are the project emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD ACM 0006	DR	Project emissions will be = 0	Ok	Ok
2.5 Is the leakage of the project activity determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD ACM 0006	DR	No leakage was considered.	Ok	Ok
2.6 Are the emission reductions determined in accordance with the methodology described	PDD ACM 0006	DR	Yes.	Ok	Ok

Table 3 Additionality (Ref: PDD Section B3 and AM) Normal CDM projects only

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.1 Does the PDD follow all the steps required in the methodology to determine the additionality	PDD /AM	DR	Yes.	Ok	Ok
3.2 Is the discussion on the additionality clear and have all assumptions been supported by transparent and documented evidence	PDD /AM	DR	Verified during site visit that some information listed in section B.3 of the PDD, investment barrier, are not applicable. To correct information about	NIR 6	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			PPA and Proinfa. Investment barrier in section B.3 of the PDD was updated to clarify this information. NIR 6 was closed out.		
3.3 Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	PDD /AM	DR	Yes	Ok	Ok
3.4 Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario	PDD /AM	DR	Yes. It was verified that the main activity to the project is to continue investing on sugar and ethanol, and some barriers were presented (especially investment barrier), this barrier demonstrates that CDM incentives play an important role.	Ok	Ok

Table 4 Monitoring methodology (PDD Section D and AM) Normal CDM projects only

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.1 Does the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the monitoring methodology	PDD /AM	DR	Yes	Ok	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.2 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the baseline emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD /AM	DR	Yes. Section D.2.1.3 of the PDD.	Verify	Ok
4.3 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the project emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD /AM	DR	The project emissions are zero.	Ok	Ok
4.4 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the leakage as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD /AM	DR	Leakage is not applicable.	Ok	Ok
4.5 Does the PDD provide for Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD /AM	DR	Yes.	Ok	Ok

Table 5 Monitoring plan (PDD Annex 4) Normal CDM projects only

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
5.1 Monitoring of Sustainable Development Indicators/ Environmental Impacts	PDD	DR	No monitoring of sustainable development indicator in Annex 4 of the PDD. Section F mentions that the project needs to control some environmental aspect to	CAR 1	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			obtain the license, some aspects can be used in the monitoring plan. The project will monitor some environmental and social aspects; Annex 4 of the PDD was updated. CAR 1 was closed out.		
5.1.1 Does the monitoring plan provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?	PDD	DR	No, see above	See 5.1	Ok CAR 1 was closed out
5.1.2 Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?	PDD	DR	No, see above	See 5.1	Ok CAR 1 was closed out
5.1.3 Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?	PDD	DR	No, see above	See 5.1	Ok CAR 1 was closed out
5.1.4 Are the sustainable development indicators in line with stated national priorities in the	PDD	DR	No, see above	See 5.1	Ok CAR 1 was closed out

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Host Country?					
5.2 Project Management Planning					
5.2.1 Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?	PDD	DR, I	Yes.	Ok	Ok
5.2.2 Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?	PDD	DR, I	Yes. The project sponsor is responsible for registration, monitoring and measurement.	Ok	Ok
5.2.3 Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?	PDD	DR, I	No. There are no comments about training. The project is part of the regularly activities of Usina São Francisco, no specific training is necessary. NIR 2 was closed out.	NIR 2	Ok
5.2.4 Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions?	PDD	DR, I	No. There are no comments about these questions. Verified that there is no unintended emissions, the bagasse that will be stored is just to start plant operations, maximum 5% and for less than 1 year.	CAR 3	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			CAR 3 was closed out.		
5.2.5 Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?	PDD	DR	No. The calibration will be done according to internal procedures of Usina São Francisco and the regulations of CCEE. Monitoring plan was updated in the PDD to include this information. CAR 4 was closed out.	CAR 4	Ok
5.2.6 Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?	PDD /AM	DR, I	No. The maintenance and installation of monitoring equipment will be done according to the internal procedures of Usina São Francisco. CAR 5 was closed out.	CAR 5	Ok
5.2.7 Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?	PDD /AM	DR, I	Yes. PDD section D.2.1.3. To be confirmed by local assessor. It was verified during site visit that Usina São Francisco staff is responsible for monitoring,	Verify	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			measurements and reporting.		
5.2.8 Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)	PDD	DR	Yes. To be confirmed by local assessor. The monitoring plan, for emissions reductions is based on monitoring the amount of electricity supplied to the grid and the reliability of this parameter is assured through second-party.	Verify	Ok
5.2.9 Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?	PDD	DR	The project is under construction and the procedure will be established.	Verify	Ok
5.2.10 Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?	PDD /AM	DR	Yes.	Verify	Ok
5.2.11 Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?	PDD /AM	DR	The project is under construction and the procedure will be established.	Verify	Ok
5.2.12 Are procedures identified for project performance reviews	PDD /AM	DR	The project is under construction and the procedure will be	Verify	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?			established.		
5.2.13 Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?	PDD /AM	DR	The project is under construction and the procedure will be established.	Verify	Ok

Table 6 Environmental Impacts (Ref PDD Section F and relevant local legislation) Normal CDM projects only

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
6.1 Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	PDD	DR	Yes. There are environmental licenses issued by the state environmental agency (LI 369/2005, 07/06/2006, Usina São Francisco – Cogeneration activity, 96MW). See list of documents consulted.	Verify	Ok
6.2 Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?	PDD /AM	DR	Verify license. To be confirmed by local assessor. License was verified during site visit. See list of documents consulted.	Verify	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
6.3 Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	PDD /AM	DR	No.	Ok	Ok
6.4 Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	PDD /AM	DR	To be confirmed by local assessor. Yes.	Verify	Ok
6.5 Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?	PDD /AM	DR	No environmental impact detected.	Ok	Ok
6.6 Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	PDD /AM	DR	Yes. The project has the Installation license.	Verify	Ok

Table 7 Comments by local stakeholders (Ref PDD Section G) All CDM projects activities

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1 Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	PDD	DR	Yes, see PDD section G.1	Ok	Ok
7.2 Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	PDD, letters	DR, I	Verify by local assessor. During site visit, it was verified that letters were sent to local stakeholders.	Verify	OK
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	PDD	DR	To be confirmed by local assessor. The stakeholder consultation was processed according	Verify	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
regulations/laws?			Brazilian DNA requirement. Letters were sent in February/2006 to: The municipality mayor house of Quirinópolis; The municipality chamber of Quirinópolis; The local attorneys' office of the State of Goiás; The Brazilian NGO Forum; The state environmental agency of Goiás; The municipality's environmental authority of Quirinópolis; The Rural Workers' Union of Quirinópolis.		
7.4 Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?	PDD/AM	DR	No comments received.	Ok	Ok
7.5 Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD/AM	DR	No comments received.	Ok	Ok

Table 8 Other requirements. All CDM project activities

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.1 Project Design Document					

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, no changes have been observed.	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
8.2 Technology to be employed					
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	Yes. The technology employed is probably the most known option for simultaneous power and heat generation from biomass.	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

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.2.4 Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?	PDD	DR, I,	There are no comments about training requirement. To be confirmed by local assessor. No specific training is necessary; the project is part of the USJ operational daily activities.	Verify	Ok
8.3 Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period					
8.3.1 Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?	PDD	DR	Starting date 01/04/2007. Lifetime – 25 years. See PDD, section C.1; C.2.	Ok	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	Renewable crediting period 7 years.	Ok	Ok
8.3.3 Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period	PDD	DR	Yes, expected operational lifetime of the project activity is 25 years	Ok	Ok

Table 9 Additional requirements for SSC projects - NA

Table 10 Additional requirements for AR projects - NA

Table 11 Additional requirements for SSC AR projects - NA

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

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Verify ANEEL license.	Site visit	DR	<p>Verified “Aviso de Adjudicação” nº 002/2005-ANEEL, December 2005.</p> <p>Verified ANEEL Resolution 359 of 14/11/2005, this authorization was canceled in order to be substituted to one that authorizes Usina São Francisco to operate with an installed capacity of 96 MW (on going process).</p>	Ok	<p>Observation 1: ANEEL will issue a Resolution authorizing Usina São Francisco to operate with an installed capacity of 96MW before the project start and this Resolution needs to be available in the verification assessment.</p>

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Verify project like described in the PDD.	Site visit	DR/ site visit	Verified that the project is in construction. Verified some equipments and the site plant. Verified the turbine (45 MW.)	Ok	Ok
Verify document to sell energy.	Site visit	DR	“Leilão de Energia Nova”, 16/12/2005. The project will commercialize the generated energy in the CCEE.	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	Plant of the project, September 2004	The plant will start operation in June 2006. The plant shows the extraction, boiler, energy generation, energy sub-station.	N
2	EIA – USJ Açúcar e Alcool S/A, Estudo de impacto ambiental, October 2004 by DBO Engenharia.	Environmental Impact Assessment.	Y
3	Installation license number 369/2005, 07/06/2006 issued by Agência Ambiental de Goiás.	Environmental license	Y
4	OPTG – Modelo de Cálculo de Preço	Internal rate of return with carbon	Y

	de Energia Nova	credits and without carbon credits.	
--	-----------------	-------------------------------------	--

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
02/03/2006	Narciso Fernando Bertholdi	Business Development Manager	narciso@usj.com.br	Project responsibility
02/03/2006	João Batista Saccomano	Project Manager	jbsaccomano@usj.com.br	Technical issues
02/03/2006	José Ieda Neto	Industrial Manager	jiedaneto@ush.com.br	Technical issues and operational issues
02/03/2006	Mauricio F. de Oliveira	Production Manager	mauricio@usj.com.br	Operational issues
02/03/2006	Ricardo Besen	Consultant	rbesen@ecoinvestcarbon.com	PDD developing, monitoring plan, baseline.

- o0o -



Annex 6 Local assessment checklist

USJ Açúcar e Alcool S/A – Usina São Francisco Cogeneration Project. CDM.Val0392

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 ANEEL (Brazilian Electricity Regulatory Agency) license.	Verified “Aviso de Adjudicação” nº 002/2005-ANEEL, December 2005. Contracting energy for new projects with posterior concession and authorization. Verified ANEEL Resolution 359 of 14/11/2005, this authorization was canceled in order to be substituted to one that authorizes Usina São Francisco to operate with an installed capacity of 96 MW (on going process).	Site visit/DR	Observation 1: ANEEL will issue a Resolution authorizing Usina São Francisco to operate with an installed capacity of 96MW before the project start and this Resolution needs to be available in the verification assessment.
Verify project like described in the PDD.	Verified that the project is in construction. Verified some equipment and the site plant. Verified the turbine (45 MW).	Site visit/DR	No
Verify document to sell energy.	“Leilão de Energia Nova”, 16/12/2005. The project will commercialize the generated energy in the CCEE – Câmara de Comercialização de Energia Elétrica (Brazilian Electric Energy Market Chamber).	Site visit/DR	No