



**CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM
PROJECT CONCEPT DOCUMENT (CDM-PDD)
Version 02 - effective: 1 July 2004)**

CONTENTS

- A. General description of project activity
- B. Application of a baseline methodology
- C. Duration of the project activity / Crediting period
- D. Application of a monitoring methodology and plan
- E. Estimation of GHG emissions by sources
- F. Environmental impacts
- G. Stakeholders' comments

Annexes

- Annex 1: Contact information on participants in the project activity
- Annex 2: Information regarding public funding
- Annex 3: Baseline information
- Annex 4: Monitoring plan
- Annex 5: Bibliography
- Annex 6: Stakeholders

**SECTION A General description of project activity****A.1. Title of the project activity**

Project title: PARAÍSO SMALL HYDROPOWER PLANT – PCH PARAÍSO

PDD version number: Document version 002

Document date: 11/10/2006

A.2. Description of the project activity

Energias do Brasil is the holding company composed of subsidiary companies that, generates, distributes and sells electricity in Brazil. In 2005 it distributed around 23,1 TWh of electricity for approximately 9,6 million residential, commercial and industrial costumers.

Its subsidiaries for distribution are: Banderirantes Energia in São Paulo, Escelsa in Espirito Santo and Enersul in Mato Grosso do Sul. Enertrade is responsible for electric power commercialization for Energias do Brasil. For last, for generation it is represented by the following companies: Energest, CESA, Costa Rica, Pantanal Energética, EDP Lageado, and Enerpeixe.

Energias do Brasil is controlled by the EDP Group, company leader in production and distribution of electrical power in Portugal. The EDP Group presents unquestionable international sustainability standards, and since 1997 it has been closely following the evolution of the Kyoto Protocol. Its operations in Brazil, in a similar matter, have adopted high sustainability standards, as well as, the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol guidelines.

The installation of Small Hydropower Plants is the direct proof that Energias do Brasil is committed to the environment and sustainable practice. Through the generation of electricity utilizing clean renewable sources, and in compliance with all environmental regulations, Energias do Brasil is a reference on how one can expand generation capacity in a sustainable way.

In this context we would like to present the project activity PCH Paraíso. PCH Paraíso is a small Hydropower Plant of 21 MW installed capacity, located in the city of Costa Rica in the State of Mato Grosso do Sul. PCH Paraíso utilizes the Paraíso river Hydropower potential to generate electricity.

PCH Paraíso has the objective to generate electricity to supply the country's economic growth demands for energy, through the use of sustainable renewable sources, such Hydropower Plants generation.

This renewable source of electricity generation has an important contribution to the overall reduction of CO₂ emissions. Although most of the electricity generated in Brazil is by Hydropower Plants, the country's electricity matrix expansion is moving towards a larger participation of thermo power generation. Furthermore, the government has the intention to increase thermo power generation installed capacity by 15%.

In the absence of this project, the tendency shows that fossil fuel intensive energy generation sources would be used instead. Therefore, this project contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.



All the social and environmental benefits requested to the project implementation were done. A run-of-river project presents low environmental impact. The expansion of the generation capacity in a sustainable way will develop a better infra-structure, increase the employment rates in the region and increase the tax income. And will be created an entity to manage the income from the sales of the CER's, which will be responsible to allocate this resources on social and environmental projects.

A.3. Project participants**Table 01 – Party(ies) and private/public entities involved in the activity**

Name of Party involved (*) (host) indicates a host Party)	Private and/or public entity(ies) project participants (*) (as applicable)	Kindly indicate if the Party involved wishes to be considered as project participant (Yes/No)
Brazil	Energias do Brasil S/A	NO
(*) In accordance with the CDM modalities and procedures, at the time of making the CDM-PDD public at the stage of validation, a Party involved may not have provided its approval. At the time of requesting registration, the approval by the Party(ies) involved is required.		

A.4. Technical description of the project activity

In agreement with the definition of the Brazilian Electricity Regulatory Agency (ANEEL), resolution no.652, dated of December 9, 2003, small Hydropower Plant in Brazil should have installed capacity larger than 1 MW and less than 30 MW, and should have a reservoir area less than 3 km². According to Eletrobrás (1999), run-of-river projects are defined as: “a project were the rivers dry season flow rate is the same or higher than the minimum require for the turbines.”

A low-level diversion dam raises the water level in the river sufficiently to enable an intake structure to be located on the side of the river. The intake consists of a trash screen and a submerged opening with an intake gate. Water from the intake is normally taken through a pipe (called a penstock) downhill to a power station constructed downstream of the intake and at as low a level as possible to gain the maximum head on the turbine. The technology employed at PCH Paraíso Project is well known established technology in the industry.

The Francis turbine is the most widely used among water turbines. This turbine is a type of hydraulic reactor turbine in which the water flow exists the turbine blades in the radial direction. Francis turbines are common in power generation and are used in applications where high flow rates are available at medium hydraulic head. Water enters the turbine through a volute casing and is directed onto the blades by wicket gates. The low momentum water then exists the turbine through a draft tube. In the model, water flow is supplied by a variable speed centrifugal pump. A load is applied to the turbine by means of a magnetic brake, and torque is measured by observing the deflection of calibrated springs. The performance is calculated by comparing the output to the energy supplied. A run-of-river project presents low environmental impact.



Table 02 – Technical Information

Table 02 – Technical Information											
Small Hydropower Plant – PCH Paraíso											
Location											
River:		Paraíso		Basin:		Paraná		State:		MS	
Lat		18 ⁰ 37'S		Long:		52 ⁰ 55'W		Country:		Costa Rica	
Monthly Average Flow (m³/s) - Period											
Jan	Feb	Mar	Abr	May	Jun	Jul	Ago	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
22,9	25,8	24,7	20,6	18,0	17,1	16,0	15,4	15,2	15,8	16,9	19,9
Reservoir											
Area						Other information					
No N.A. Max. Normal:				1,205 km²		Flow type:		Run-of-rive			
No N.A. Min. Normal:				1,127 km²		Time needed for reservoir formation:		8 days			
Turbines											
Type:			Francis Simple Horizontal axel			Flow:			14,20 m³/s		
Potency Unit. Nominal:			10,80 MW			Maximum Head:			85,20 m		
No of generating units:			2			Maximum Performance:			93,37%		
Rotation:			514,3 rpm								
Energy Studies											
Maximum Gross Fall:			89,07			Potency of the Plant:			21 MW		
Normal Net Fall:			85,77								

A.4.1. Location of the project activity**A.4.1.1. Host Party(ies)**

Brazil

A.4.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.

Mato Grosso do Sul – Brazilian Midwest region.

A.4.1.3. City/Town/Community etc.

Costa Rica

A.4.1.4. Detail of physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity

PCH Paraíso is located in the river Paraíso, in the boundary of Costa Rica and Chapadão do Sul municipalities, in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul. The dam is located approximately 277 km from Campo Grande, the main city of the State of Mato Grosso do Sul. The main access to the dam's reservoir is by BR-163 and MS-349/BR-060 highway.



The approximate geographical coordinates are: latitude 19° 03' south and longitude 52° 59' west. The urban nucleus of the municipalities of Costa Rica and Chapadão do Sul, and Paraíso district, are approximately 70 km, 60 km and 2,2 km, to the dam's reservoir. According to the IBGE 2000 census, the total population that lives in the surroundings of this reservoir are 27.146 inhabitants, where 15.488 are from Costa Rica, 11.658 from Chapadão do Sul and 1.773 from Paraíso.

Localization map:




Figure 01 – Localization Map

A.4.2. Category(ies) of project activity

The project activity fits the **sector 1** with the **sector category: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)**.

This project category is the generation of renewable energy, where energy is dispatched to the an Interconnected National Grid – ING.

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.



This project consists in the installation of a Small Hydropower Plant with a reservoir of approximately 1,2 km².

A.4.3. Technology to be employed by the project activity

The Francis turbine is the most widely used among water turbines. This turbine is a type of hydraulic reactor turbine in which the water flow exists the turbine blades in the radial direction. Francis turbines are common in power generation and are used in applications where high flow rates are available at medium hydraulic head. Water enters the turbine through a volute casing and is directed onto the blades by wicket gates. The low momentum water then exists the turbine through a draft tube. In the model, water flow is supplied by a variable speed centrifugal pump. A load is applied to the turbine by means of a magnetic brake, and torque is measured by observing the deflection of calibrated springs. The performance is calculated by comparing the output to the energy supplied. A run-of-river project presents low environmental impact.

Training and maintenance of the project were done due the following classes:

- Security course about installations and services with electricity (40 hours)
- Electric protection in generating units (24 hours);
- Installation, operation and maintenance of vertical bomb (16 hours)
- Operation of hydraulic turbines and regulators of speed (32 hours)
- CIPA course (20 hours)
- Maintenance of centrifugals bombs (24 hours)
- Operation training for operators of plants and substations (24 hours)
- Management introduction for the total quality (8 hours)

A.4.4. Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHGs) by sources are to be reduced by the proposed CDM project activity, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project activity, taking into account national and/or sector policies and circumstances

The electric sector in Brazil has been supplied traditionally by 88% great Hydropower Plants, 8% Thermal, 1% small Hydropower Plants and 3% Nuclear (Executive Summary of the Electric Expansion Scenario 2003/2012, CCPE, Ministry of Mines and Energy). Although the country still possesses a great hydropower potential unexplored, most of them are located in the Amazon region, where the environmental restrictions imposes severe limits for energy exploration [MME - I Glide Decenal 2003-12]. Furthermore, those energy sources are very distant of the main consumption centers, which are located in the southeast areas of the country.

In the end of 1990, a strong growth of the demand for energy in contrast to a small increase of installed capacity caused an energy crisis in the turn of 2001/2002 year. One of the government solutions to this problem was to give a larger flexibility to the legislation favoring small independent producers of energy. Furthermore, the possible eligibility of Clean Development Mechanism based on the Protocol of Kyoto brought incentives for the development of small central Hydropower Plants projects, such as PCH Paraíso.



PCH Paraíso, a greenhouse gas (GHG) free power generation project, will result in GHG emission reductions as the result of the displacement of the generation from fossil-fuel thermo power plants that would have otherwise delivered to the ING.

Kartha et al. (2002) stated that, “the crux of the baseline challenge for electricity projects clearly resides in determining the ‘avoided generation’, or what would have happened without the CDM or other GHG-mitigation project. The fundamental question is whether the avoided generation is on the ‘build margin’ (i.e. replacing a facility that would have otherwise been build) and/or ‘operation margin’ (i.e. affecting the operation of current and/or future power plants).”

For PCH Paraíso, the baseline emission factor is calculated as a combined margin, consisting of the operating margin and the build margin. For the purpose of determining the build margin and the operating margin emission factor, a electricity system project is defined by the spatial extent of the power plants that can be dispatched without significant transmission constraints. Similarly a connected electricity system is defined as one that is connected by transmission lines to the project and in which power plants can dispatch electricity without significant transmissions constraints.

In this context, we adopted the suggested methodological model by UNFCCC - (United Nations Framework for Conventions on Climate Change), ACM0002. This methodology is applicable for renewable energy generation projects that are interconnected to a national grid, which are under the condition that the additional electric capacity is increase by a small Hydropower Plant, run-of-river, such as PCH Paraíso.

The development of the project activity PCH Paraíso is an initiative for the energy supply side for the ING. The Brazilian energy matrix tends to become more fossil fuel intensive in the near future, due to the Brazilian Government’s Strategic Plan to diversify the energy supply sources in Brazil. Therefore in the case this initiate was not implemented, it would probably been replaced by a greenhouse gas emission power generation plant, such as a Thermal Electric Plant.

A.4.4.1. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period

Table 03 – Estimated amount of emission reductions

Year	Annual estimation of emission reductions in tonnes of CO₂e
2007	29.703
2008	29.703
2009	29.703
2010	29.703
2011	29.703
2012	29.703
2013	29.703
2014	29.703
2015	29.703
2016	29.703
2017	29.703
Total estimated reductions (tonnes of CO₂e)	326.733
Total number of crediting years	10
Annual average over the crediting period	29.703



of estimated reductions (tonnes of CO₂e)

Conversion Rate: 0,2647 tCO₂MWh

* Production Electric Power from PCH started in December 2003

The project participant, Energias do Brasil, does not wish to have the crediting period starting prior to the registration of their project activity.

A.4.5. Public funding of the project activity.

There is no public funding involved in this project. The project is being financed by the BNDES – National Bank for Social and Economic Development.

SECTION B. Application of a baseline methodology

B.1. Title and reference of the approved baseline methodology applied to the project activity.

Approval and consolidated baseline methodology ACM0002 – version 06 – 19 may 2006

"Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources".

B.1.1. Justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity.

The chosen methodology is applicable to the project activity because it is a grid-connected electricity generation from a renewable source, where the renewable source is the small Hydropower generation run-of-river connected to the Interconnect National Grid – ING.

Although Brazil has a vast potential for hydropower generation, the government's intention in diversifying the supply of energy in Brazil has shifted the energy matrix towards a more fossil fuel intensive power generation, constructing fossil fuel thermo power plants.

PCH Paraíso does not require an extensive reservoir. It is limited to a lake of approximately 1,2 km². This qualifies PCH Paraíso to fit in the ACM0002 methodological framework.

It is important to mention the following points:

- . In the project activity, there is no fossil fuel substitution in the project site;
- . The characteristics of the system in which PCH Paraíso is connected are clear and easily identified.

The methodology used for the calculation of the emission factor is ACM0002.

According to the version 06 of ACM0002 methodology, new hydro electric power projects with reservoirs having power densities (installed power generation capacity divided by the surface at full reservoir level) greater than 4 W/m². If power density of project is greater than 4 W/m² and less than or equal 10 W/m², is necessary the calculation of the emissions from reservoir expressed as tCO₂e/year. If power density of the project is greater than 10 W/m² the emission from the reservoir is considered zero.

$$PE_y = 0$$

Where:



PE_y are the emission from reservoir expressed as $tCO_2e/year$.

The installed power of PCH Paraíso is 21 MW and the the surface at full reservoir level is 1,2 km². So the power density of the project activity is 17,5 W/m².

B.2. Description of how the methodology is applied in the context of the project activity

The implementation of the activity of the project PCH Paraíso is an initiative on the energy supply side. In the case this initiative was not implemented, the Brazilian energy matrix tendencies shows that it would have been replaced by a possible GHG emission electricity generation source, such as a thermo electric plant instead. Therefore PCH Paraíso contributes on shifting the country energy matrix to a cleaner one.

The methodology "ACM0002" (2006), grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, uses the derived margins that have been applied in the context of the activity of the project, through the determination of the emission factor to the subsystem South/Southeast/Midwest of the Brazilian Interconnected Grid (connected electric system for transmission lines to the electric system of the project, in which plants can be dispatched without significant restrictions in the transmission).

B.3. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity

As mentioned previously, the construction of the baseline is based on the presumptions that upon the list of opportunities encountered, the natural tendency is that the Brazilian energy matrix tends to shift towards GHG intensive energy generation sources.

The calculation of the GHG energy emission reduction benefits will be done utilizing MWh of generated energy multiplied by the emission factor of the South/Southeast/midwest subsystem (SSMW).

Step 0. Preliminary screening based on the starting date of the project activity

Energest is a company that is part of Energias do Brasil that has as its largest stockholder EDP – Energias de Portugal, a company located in Portugal.

Energias do Brasil has in its energy generation department, an environmental and sustainability group that analysis all projects through Clean Development Mechanism parameters.

In January 2003, Energias de Portugal Brasil- EDP, today Energias do Brasil, started activities in a work group related to Clean Development Mechanism – CDM with Energest, Enertrade and distributors in Brasil.

These work group among other projects defined the revindication of Certified Emission Reduction – CER's by the energy production of Small Hydropower Plan in Brasil one of there aims.

The project participant, Energias do Brasil, does not wish to have the crediting period starting prior to the registration of their project activity.

**Step 1. Identification of alternatives to the project activity consistent with current laws and regulations****Sub-step 1a. Define alternatives to the project activity:**

Even though the current energy supply matrix in the country is highly based on renewable energy sources, in specific hydropower plants, there is an apparent indication that the percentage of thermal electric plants will increase in the next years. This will make the energy supply system more intensive towards fossil fuel energy source utilization.

This implication is based on a series of facts:

- The necessity to expand the generation and transmission to cope with the future demands, will promote the need in investments for the next 8 years on the order of US\$ 34 billion (source: CCPE). This represents R\$ 11 billion per year, only to address the planned infra-structure.
- The energy crisis of 2001 has caused great political scars that no government would ever want to face again. The government will increase investments in the energy sector, even though it is considered less priority than other sectors, such as the social arena.
- The necessity to expand the energy generation structure in the country in the short run, can be easily achieved through the implantation of thermal energy plants, due to the following:
 - ✓ It takes less time to be built;
 - ✓ The thermal energy technology is better known among the investors (“players”) due to their past experiences applied in their countries of origin, and therefore preferred;
 - ✓ Petrobras – Brazilian Petroleum Company will provide support to most of the investment in this sector, since their strategic plan is to expand natural gas exploration and utilization;
 - ✓ In order to recuperate and regulate the Brazilian water reservoirs capacities, the plan to revitalize the electric sector indicates that it will be achieved through the acquisition of thermal power as an alternative solution.

It is also important to mention the information displayed in the Electric Energy Crisis Management Chamber “Câmara de Gestão da Crise de Energia Elétrica (CGE)”, in the document entitled: “Electric energy supply increase strategy strategic program”, published in May of 2002.

In this document there is a detailed plan about the expansion strategy program. Besides expansion in generation, the CGE has also been prioritizing and facilitating investments in transmission and transformation, as follows:

Table 04 – Electric energy supply increase strategy strategic program



PROJECT TYPE (Unit)	SUPPLY EXPANSION (2001 - 2004)				
	2001 Accomplished	2002	2003	2004	Total
HYDROPOWER (24)	1.397	3.045	2.463	3.122	10.027
(*) THERMALELETRIC (40)	1.354	2.829	4.342	916	9.441
TERMALELECTRIC MITIGATORY (53)	-	2.163	-	-	2.163
IMPORTATION (5)	98	1.188	400	800	2.486
SMALL HYDROPOWER (29)	66	170	145	-	381
COGERATION (17)	125	162	500	-	787
EOLIC (42)	2	261	394	393	1.050
TOTAL (MW)	3.042	9.808	8.244	5.231	26.325
TRANSMISSION LINES - km (26)	505	1.037	4.383	3.348	9.273
SUB-STATIONS (MVA)		3.347	4.450	1.050	8.847

* Consider a 30% reduction on not accomplishing the planned program

Source: Electric energy supply increase strategy strategic program 2001 – 2004 “Programa Estratégico de Aumento da Oferta 2001 – 2004”

In the planned expansion program, there is a significant portion of thermo power plants that will be added to the Interconnected Nation Grid on a precaution basis. This is the acquired energy through the Brazilian Commerce of Emergency Energy “Comercializadora Brasileira de Energia Emergencial (CBEE)” that represents an addition of 2.153MW during the period of 2002/2004, viewed as a precaution.

In summary, the Brazilian generation expansion during 2001 to 2004, considered only the more consolidated projects, ending up with a total of 26.325MW (Strategic Program + Precaution Purchases), in which 11.594MW came from thermo power generation.

In other words, it is possible to assume that from 2001 up to 2004, 44% of the total electric generation expansion occurred through the use of thermal generation.

Sub-step 1b. Enforcement of applicable laws and regulations:

The project is in conformity with all existing Brazilian legislations and regulations that are applicable to the nature of its operations, as well as, to the region where it is installed.

Step 2. Investment analysis

Since the chosen alternative was the Barrier Analysis (Step 3), this step is not considered.

Step 3. Barrier analysis

The barriers considered are the following:

- Lack of investment sources to finance the private sector in the country, and high costs on available alternatives;



- Energy sector regulation impact, once the sector is still driven by regulator institution. The creation of PROINFA indicates that without this specific support, there would not have been implementations of renewable energy projects.
- If projects do not have access to the benefits and incentives of the PROINFA program, it is implied that they will be competing with other market opportunities.

To support the barrier analysis a brief overview of the Brazilian electricity market in the last years is first presented.

Until the beginning of the 1990 as the energy sector was composed almost exclusively of state-owned companies. From 1995 on, due to the increase on international interest rates and the lack of investment capacity of the government, the government was forced to look for alternatives. The solution was to initiate a privatization process and the deregulation of the market.

The four pillars of the privatization process initiated in 1995 were:

- Building a fair competition environment, with the gradual elimination of the captive consumer. The option to choose an electricity service supplier began in 1998 for the largest consumers.
- Dismantling of the state monopolies, separating and privatizing the activities of generation, transmission and distribution;
- Allowing free access to the transmission lines, and;
- Placing the operation and planning responsibilities to the private sector.

Three government entities were created: the Electricity Regulatory Agency (ANEEL), to set up to develop the legislation and to regulate the market; the National Electric System Operator (ONS), to supervise and control the generation, transmission and operation; and the Wholesale Electricity Market (MAE), to define rules and commercial procedures of the short-term market.

At the end of 2000, five years after the beginning of the privatization process, the results were still modest (Figure 02). Despite high expectations, investments in new generation did not follow the increase in consumption.




Figure 02 – Participation of private capital in the Brazilian electricity market in December 2000
(Source BNDES, 2000).

The decoupling of GDP (average of 2% increase in the period of 1980 to 2000) from electricity consumption (average of 5% increase in the same period) is well known in developing countries, mainly due to the expansion of supply services to new areas and the growing infrastructure. The necessary measures to prevent bottlenecks in services were taken. These include an increase of generation capacity higher than GDP growth rates and strong investments in energy efficiency. In the Brazilian case, the increase in the installed generation capacity (average of 4% in the same period) did not follow the growth of consumption as can be seen in Figure 03.




Figure 03 – Cumulated variation of GDP, electricity supply (installed capacity) and demand (consumption) (Source: Eletrobrás, <http://www.eletrobras.gov.br>;

Without new installed capacity, the only alternatives were energy efficiency improvements or higher capacity utilization (capacity factor).

Regarding energy efficiency, the government established in 1985 PROCEL (the National Electricity Conservation Program). Although the program achieved considerable results, it was not able to alone balance the increase in demand.

The remaining alternative, to increase the capacity factor of the older plants, was the most widely used, as can be seen in Figure 04. To understand if such increase in capacity factor brought positive or negative consequences one needs to analyze the availability and price of fuel. In the Brazilian electricity model the primary energy source is the water accumulated in the reservoirs.




Figure 04 – Evolution of the rate of generated energy to installed capacity (Source: Eletrobrás, <http://www.eletrobras.gov.br/>).




Figure 05 – Evolution of the water stored capacity for the Southeast/Midwest (SE-MW) and Northeast (NE) interconnected subsystems and intensity of precipitation in the rainy season (ENA) in the southeast region compared to historic average (Source: ONS, <http://www.ons.org.br/>).

Figure 05 shows what happened to the levels of “stored energy” in reservoirs from January 1997 to January 2002. It can be seen that reservoirs which were planned to withstand 5 years of less-than-average rainy seasons, almost collapsed after a single season of low rainfall (2000/2001 experienced 74% of the historical average rain. This situation depicts a very intensive use of the country’s water resources to support the increase in demand without increase of installed capacity. Under the situation described there was still no long-term solution for the problems that finally caused shortage and rationing in 2001.

Aware of the difficulties since the end of the 1990’s, the Brazilian government signaled that it was strategically important for the country to increase thermoelectric generation and consequently be less



dependent on Hydropower Plants. With that in mind the federal government launched at the beginning of the year of 2000 the Thermoelectric Priority Plan (PPT, “Plano Prioritário de Termelétricas”, Federal Decree 3,371 of February 24th, 2000, and Ministry of Mines and Energy Directive 43 February 25th, 2000), originally planning the construction of 47 thermo plants using Bolivian natural gas, totaling 17,500 MW of new installed capacity to be completed by December 2003. During 2001 and the beginning of 2002 the plan was reduced to 40 plants and 13,637 MW to be installed by December 2004 (Federal Law 10,438 of April 26th, 2002, Article 29). As of December 2004, only 20 plants totaling around 9,700 MW were operational.

During the rationing of 2001 the government also launched the Emergency Energy Program with the short-term goal of building 58 small to medium thermal power plants until the end of 2002 (using mainly diesel oil, 76,9%, and residual fuel oil, 21,1%), totaling 2,150 MW power capacity (CGE-CBEE, 2002).

It is clear that Hydropowerity is and will continue to be the main source for the electricity base load in Brazil. However, most if not all-water resources in the South and Southeast of the country have been exploited, and most of the remaining reserves are located in the Amazon basin, far from the industrial and population centers (OECD, 2001). Clearly, new additions to Brazil’s electric power sector are shifting form Hydropower Plants to natural gas Plants (Shaeffer et al., 2000). With discoveries of vast reserves of natural gas in the Santos Basin in 2003 (Figure 06) the policy of using natural gas to generate electricity remains a possibility and will continue to have interest from private-sector investments in the Brazilian energy sector.




Figure 06 – Evolution of the Brazilian natural gas proved reserves (Source: Petrobras, <http://www.petrobras.com.br/>).

In power since January 2003, the newly elected government decided to fully review the electricity market institutional framework. A new model for the electricity sector was approved by Congress in March 2004. The new regulatory framework for the electricity sector has the following key features (OECD, 2005):

- Electricity demand and supply will be coordinated through a “Pool.” Demand will be estimated by the distribution companies, which will have to contract 100% of their projected electricity demand over the following 3 to 5 years. These projections will be submitted to a new institution called Energy Planning Company (Empresa de Planejamento Energético, EPE), which will estimate the required expansion in supply capacity to be sold to the distribution companies through the Pool. The price at which electricity will be traded through the Pool is an average of all long-term contracted prices and will be the same for all distribution companies.



- In parallel to the “regulated” long-term Pool contracts, there will be a “free” market. Although in the future, large consumers (above 10 MW) will be required to give distribution companies a 3-year notice if they wish to switch from the Pool to the free market and a 5-year notice for those moving in the opposite direction a transition period is envisaged during which these conditions will be made more flexible. If actual demand turns out to be higher than projected, distribution companies will have to buy electricity in the free market. In the opposite case, they will sell the excess supply in the free market. Distribution companies will be able to pass on to end consumers the difference between the costs of electricity purchased in the free market and through the Pool if the distribution between projected and actual demand is below 5%. If it is above this threshold, the distribution company will bear the excess costs.
- The government opted for a more centralized institutional set-up, reinforcing the role of the Ministry of Mines and Energy in long-term planning. EPE will submit to the Ministry its desired technological portfolio and a list of strategic and non-strategic projects. In turn, the Ministry will submit this list of projects to the National Energy Policy Council (Conselho Nacional de Política Energética, CNPE). Once approved by CNPE, the strategic projects will be auctioned on a priority basis through the Pool. Companies can replace the non-strategic projects proposed by EPE, if their proposal offers the same capacity for a lower tariff. Another new institution is a committee, Power Monitoring Committee (Comitê de monitoramento do Setor Elétrico, CMSE), which will monitor trends in power supply and demand. If any problem is identified, CMSE will propose corrective measures to avoid energy shortages, such as special price conditions for new projects and reserve of generation capacity. The Ministry of Mines and Energy will host and chair this committee. No major further privatizations are expected in the sector.

Although the new model reduces market risk, its ability to encourage private investment in the electricity sector will depend on how the new regulatory framework is implemented. Several challenges are noteworthy in this regard. First, the risk of regulatory failure that might arise due to the fact that the government will have a considerable role to play in long-term planning should be avoided by preventing from political interference. Second, rules will need to be designed for the transition from the current to the new model to allow current investments to be rewarded adequately. Third, because of its small size, price volatility may increase in the short-term electricity market, in turn bringing about higher investment risk, albeit this risk will be attenuated by the role of large consumers. The high share of hydropower in Brazil’s energy mix and uncertainty over rainfall also contribute to higher volatility of the short-term electricity market. Fourth, although the new model will require total separation between generation and distribution, regulations for unbundling of vertically-integrated companies still have to be defined. Distribution companies are currently allowed to buy up to 30% of their electricity from their own subsidiaries (self-dealing). Finally the government’s policy for the natural gas sector needs to be defined within a specific sector framework.

Sub-step 3a. Identify barriers that would prevent the implementation of type of the proposed project activity

In order to analyze accurately the investment environment in Brazil, the Brazilian Prime Rate, known, as SELIC rate, as well as the CDI – Inter-bank Deposit Certificate, which is the measure of value in the short-term credit market, need to be taken into account. Real interest rates have been extraordinarily high since the Real plan stabilized inflation in 1994.

As a consequence of the long period of inflation, the Brazilian currency experienced a strong devaluation, effectively precluding commercial banks from providing any long-term debt operation. The lack of a long-term debt market has caused a severe negative impact on the financing of energy projects in Brazil.



Interest rates for local currency financing are significantly higher than for US Dollar financing. The National Development Bank – BNDES is the only supplier of long-term loans. Debt funding operations from BNDES are made primarily through commercial banks. As the credit market is dominated by shorter maturities (90-days to 01-year) there are rare long-term credit lines being made available except for the strongest corporate borrowers and for special government initiatives. Credit is restricted to the short-term in Brazil or the long-term in dollars offshore.

Financial domestic markets with a maturity of greater than 1 year are practically non-existent in Brazil. Experience has shown that in moments of financial stress the duration of savings instruments have contracted to levels close to one day with a massive concentration in overnight banking deposits. Savers do not hold long-term financial contracts due to the inability to price-in the uncertainty involved in the preservation of purchasing power value (Arida et al., 2004). Also, the capital market is not well developed in the country to provide stock market public funding.

The lack of a local long-term market results not from a disinterest of financial investment opportunities, but from the reluctance of creditors and savers to lengthen the horizon of their placements. It has made savers look for the most liquid investment and place their money in short-term government bonds instead of investing in long-term opportunities that could finance infrastructure projects.

The most liquid government bond is the LFT (floating rate bonds based on the daily Central Bank reference rate). As of January 2004, 51,1% of the domestic federal debt was in LFTs and had a duration of one day. This bond rate is almost the same as the CDI – Interbank Deposit Certificate rate that is influenced by the SELIC rate, defined by COPOM.

The SELIC Rate has been oscillating since 1996 from a minimum of 15% p.a. in January 2001 to a maximum of 45% p.a. in March 1999 (Figure 07).




Figure 07 – SELIC rate evolution 1996 to 2004 (Source: Banco Central do Brasil)



The project activity proposal for small Hydropower Plant is under development based on *project finance*. To finance construction, project sponsors took advantage of the financing lines of BNDES. This financial support covers in average 70% of the costs of the project with a TJLP tax rate of 9% (according to the cash flow information of the project) plus an additional 4.5-5% spread risk rate for a term of 10 years and 2 years grace period.

The project was set up with an expected financial IRR (Internal Rate of Return) of approximately 15,77% per year, without the benefit of the CER revenues. This project IRR is below to the SELIC rate, set on the year that the project was financed, which was 18,11%. It is important to observe that the investment in the project is risky compared to the Brazilian government bonds at the time.

If one hypothetically considered the CERs as a revenue input to calculate the projects' IRR, one would noticed that it would increase the IRR from 15,77% to 16,72 %. This increase would not have justified the risk that the investor undertook on undergoing this project.

Besides a greater IRR on the project, the CERs can bring other additional benefits. Since the largest stockholder of this project is a European firm (Energias de Portugal), this project allows the firm to apply its environmental and sustainable strategy abroad. This is an important driver for investors from foreign companies when investing in renewable energy in developing countries.

The generation of credits to European firms is important, but as presented in this report, it does not have a financial relevancy. Furthermore, the gain from the commercialization of the CDMs will be invested in environmental and social activities utilizing a fund that is being developed by Energias do Brasil to apply their sustainability strategic plans.

Through this analysis presented, one can notice that there are a series of barriers to projects in this field, and the CERs become an important driver to the firm in selecting their projects.

Project Financial Analysis

The high guarantees to finance an energy project in Brazil is a barrier to the development of new projects in this sector. Insurance, financial guarantees, financial advisors, are requirements that raise the costs of these projects and a feasibility barrier to the financing of these projects.

Another financial barrier is the contract for buying and selling electrical energy. These contracts are required to obtain long-term financing from banks. The lack of adequate commercial agreements for buyers of energy influences directly in the negotiation process between banks and the project developer. Since the majority of Brazilian concessionaries does not have a satisfactory credit history, it becomes a barrier for long-term financing processes.

Due to the lack of success in the series of programs and incentives that was created in the past years, one can conclude the difficulties and existing barriers to implement small Hydropower Plant projects in Brazil. The first incentive program was called PCH-COM structured between 2000/2001. In February of 2001 the tariff was planned to be around R\$ 67,00/MWh, which price was the reference to the “font for competitive energy”, or the average additional costs to the energy generated regularly. But the market reference font for small Hydropower Plant energy price was around R\$ 80,00/MWh.



Even though the tariff was low, the incentives were based on the guarantees of the contracts for buying and selling electrical energy and special financial sources. The program was not successful due to the special guarantees and some contract clauses. Furthermore, this program was not considered to be a project finance type, therefore the direct guarantees had to be provided from the developer besides the project itself. In April of 2002, the PROINFA law was created to bring incentives to the sector. During the first public hearing of PROINFA in the beginning of 2003, the small Hydropower Plant tariff was planned to be around R\$ 125,09/MWh (based in June of 2003, and to be utilized by the IGP-M Inflation Index). But in the 30th of March of 2004, the Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME) edited a Amendment no. 45, that defined the tariff to be R\$ 117,02/MWh (based in March of 2004, and to be adjusted by the IGP-M), that would then be around R\$ 132/MW in June of 2005. In 2005, the BNDES presented its final position on their lines of incentives for financing through the PROINFA, which is different for what was considered at first to the program and considered insufficient. This means that for the last 5 years, the government had to present one new proposal (or incentive) every year, to call the attention of the developers to invest in the small Hydropower Plants sector.

Lack of Infrastructure

The region where the project is located is isolated. There is a lack of infrastructure, such as, highways, roads, communication and transportation. The project developers had to implement these types of installations before the project started. Besides all these elements, there were no qualified professionals in this region as well.

Institutional Barriers

As described above, since 1995 the electric market policies have been in a permanent change in Brazil.

An excessive number of laws and norms were created in an attempt to organize and to provide incentives to the energy sector. The results from this regulatory instability were in adverse from what it was originally intended. During the period of energy rationalization, the prices of electricity surpassed R\$ 600/MWh (around US\$ 200/MWh) and the marginal price projected to the new energy reached levels of R\$ 120 to R\$ 150/MWh (around US\$ 45). In the middle of 2004, the average electricity price was lower than R\$ 50/MWh (around US\$ 20/MWh). This relative high electricity price volatility in Brazil, even though during a short period of time, helped to make the market harder to be analyzed by the developers.

National Electric Energy Agency (ANEEL - Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica - www.aneel.gov.br)

Sub-step 3b. Show that the identified barriers would not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives:

As described above, the main alternative to the project activity is to continue the status quo. Implementing the project activity without the CDM incentive is not a feasible alternative. Possible project sponsors would certainly prefer to invest their resources in different financial market investments. Therefore the barriers above have not affected the investment in other opportunities. To the contrary Brazilian interest rates, which represent a barrier for the project activity, is an interesting investment alternative.

Step 4. Common practice analysis:



One of the points to be considered when analyzing a Hydropower Plant project investment in the period (2001-2005) was the possibility to participate in the PROINFA Federal Government Program. Although some projects started construction independently from PROINFA, the program was considered one of the more viable financing alternatives for these projects, which would provide long-term contracts for buy and sell energy and special financial conditions. The Activity Project PCH Paraíso was eligible to participation in the Program, but addressed the market risks in its own structuring way instead.

Both processes of negotiating a contract to buy and sell energy with utility companies and obtaining funding from BNDES have proved to be very cumbersome. BNDES also requires excessive guarantees in order to provide financing. Other risks and barriers are related to the operational and technical issues associated with Hydropower Plants, including their capability to comply with the contracts to buy and sell energy and the potential non-performance penalties.

Regardless of the risks and barriers mentioned above, the main reason for the reduced number of similar project activities is the financial burden. Project feasibility requires a contract to buy and sell energy with a utility company, but the utilities do not have the incentives or motivation to buy electricity directly from independent power producers.

Due to the reason mentioned above, only 1,3% of installed capacity came from small Hydropower Plants (1,2 GW from a total of 88,7 GW). Furthermore, from the 6.934 MW built in the country, only 403 MW are small Hydropower Plants. In 2004, there were only 9 small Hydropower Plant projects, a total of only 5,22 MW, that were authorized by the regulatory agency. There are a lot of other projects that are still in development, waiting for better investment opportunities. The majority of developers that financed their projects outside the PROINFA, considered CDM as a decisive factor. To our knowledge, the majority of similar projects in development in the country participates in the PROINFA program, and the ones that do not, considers CDM in their analysis. National Electric System Operator (**ONS – Operador Nacional do Sistema - www.ons.org.br**)

Furthermore, the Brazilian government declared that the projects in the PROINFA will also be eligible to participate in CDM. The legislation that created the PROINFA took in consideration the possible CDM revenues into account.

The incentives are still not in place, and the existing ones are towards the rapid installation of fossil fuel thermoelectric plants. The energy sector suffered for more than a year (2003-2004) of the lack of regulations, and even today the legislation is not clear to investors and developers. Financing and financial guarantees are both a barrier for investments in renewable energy projects in the country. The high cost of capital in Brazil is a barrier to the project to be developed.

Step 5. Impact of CDM registration

In accordance to Brazilian legislation, small Hydropower Plants are plants with installed capacity of more than 1 MW and up to 30 MW and with a reservoir area less than 3 km². In general, they are Hydropower Plants with run-of-river Hydropower Plants with low environmental impact.

This project activity is not the business-as-usual scenario in the country where large Hydropower Plants and natural gas thermo power projects represent the majority of recently installed capacity. With the financial benefit derived from the CDM, it is anticipated that other project developers will benefit from this new source of revenue.



CDM has made it possible for some investors to set up their Hydropower Plants and sell their electricity to the grid. The registration of the proposed project activity will have a strong impact in paving the way for similar projects to be implemented in Brazil.

In the particular case of the PCH Paraíso, the activity registration of this project will promote the creation of a fund for investments in sustainability projects by Energias do Brasil. This fund will finance social and environmental projects through the use of the revenue from the CERs.

B.4. Description of how the definition of the project boundary related to the baseline methodology selected is applied to the project activity.

Brazil in most part of its territory, utilizes an integrated and centralized electric grid. This grid is subdivided in two areas, the sub-system of the South/Southeast/Midwest and the North-northeast system, due to the restrictions of the transmission lines that hinder the communication of those areas. PCH Paraíso is allocated in the Midwest region of the country, and therefore the boundary of the project is limited to the South/Southeast/Midwest region. Therefore, all the sources of emission reduction associated with this project are defined in this region.

B.5. Details of the establishment of the baseline

The baseline for the calculation of the emission factor for the integrated nation grid South/Southeast/Midwest region was developed following the parameters of ACM0002.

The information determining the baseline is as follows:

- ✓ The electricity system in Brazil has been historically divided into two subsystems: Norte/Northeast and South/Southeast/Midwest. This configuration is a reflection of the historical physical evolution of these systems that were naturally developed close to the great consuming centers of the country.

The evolution of both systems has shown that the integration of these systems was a natural tendency to the Brazilian electric grid. In 1998, the Brazilian government announced the first part of this connection through the interconnection between the lines of North/Northeast with the South/Southeast/Midwest lines. With investments around US\$ 700 million, the connection had as its main objective to help solve the electric power problems of the country. In this new scenario the South/Southeast/Midwest was able to supply energy to the North/Northeast and vice-versa.

B. 5.1. Date of completion of the final text of this baseline section (MM/DD/YYYY)

03/31/2006.

B. 5. 2. Name of the person/entity determining the baseline

Corporate Name:	Energias do Brasil
Address:	Rua Bandeira Paulista, 530
Zip code / City:	04.532-001 – São Paulo – SP
Country:	Brazil
Contact person:	José Lopes Alves
Position:	Director
Telephone:	+55 11 2185 5993



Fax: +55 11 2185 5974
E-mail: jose.lopesalves@energiasdobrasil.com.br

Corporate Name: PricewaterhouseCoopers
Address: Av. Francisco Matarazzo, 1400 - Torre Torino
Zip code / City: 05.001-903 – São Paulo – SP
Country: Brazil
Contact person: Ernesto Cavasin Neto
Position: Consultant
Telephone: +55 11 3674 2000
Fax: +55 11 3674 2000
E-mail: ernesto.cavasin@br.pwc.com

B. 6. Boundaries of the Project

Brazil is a large country and is divided in five macro-geographical regions, North, Northeast, Southeast, South and Midwest. The majority of the population is concentrated in the regions South, Southeast and Northeast regions. Thus the energy generation and, consequently, the transmission are concentrated in three subsystems. The energy expansion has concentrated in two specific areas:

- ✓ North-Northeast: The electricity for this region is basically supplied by the São Francisco River. There are seven Hydropower Plants on the river with total installed capacity of approximately 10.5 GW. Eighty percent of the Northern region is supplied by diesel fueled power plants;
- ✓ South/Southeast/Midwest: The majority of the electricity generated in the country is concentrated in this subsystem. These regions also concentrate 70% of the GDP generation in Brazil. There are more than 50 Hydropower Plants generating electricity for this subsystem.

The actions to be implanted in the presented project will occur in the Paraíso river, in the municipal district of Costa Rica, state of Mato Grosso do Sul, Midwest region of the country. This project is based in energy displacement from a renewable energy source to the Interconnected National Grid, that has a tendency of a more fossil fuel intensive composition. The boundary of this project is limited to the South/Southeast/Midwest region of the country.

**SECTION C. Duration of the project activity / Crediting period****C.1. Duration of the project activity****C.1.1. Starting date of project activity (month/day/year)**

12/01/2003

C.1.2. Expected operational lifetime of project activity

30year-0m

C.2. Choice of the crediting period and related information**C.2.1. Renewable crediting period****C.2.1.1. Starting date of the first crediting period**

N/A

C.2.1.2. Length of the first crediting period

N/A

C.2.2. Fixed crediting period

10 year-0m

C.2.2.1. Starting Date (month /day / year)

The Small Hydropower started your operation in 12/01/2003.
The credit period will begin after the registration, what is expected to January 2007.

C.2.2.2. Length

7 year after the registration of the project activity.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

SECTION D. Application of monitoring methodology and plan

D.1. Name and reference of approved monitoring methodology applied to the project activity

Approved and consolidated monitoring methodology ACM0002 – version 06 – 19 may 2006 – “Consolidated monitoring methodology for the estimation of net emission grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”.

D.2. Justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity

This monitoring methodology shall be used in conjunction with the approved baseline methodology ACM0002 (“Consolidated monitoring methodology for the estimation of net emission grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”) and its applies to electricity capacity additions. The methodology is applicable to the activity of the project. It consists of using measuring equipments projected directionally the energy generated by the unit.

The energy measurement is fundamental to verify and monitor the GHG emission reductions. The Monitoring of emissions generated by the project activity in a straightforward manner, by applying the baseline emission factor.

D.2.1. Option 1: Monitoring of the emissions in the project scenario and the baseline scenario

Based on the Hydropower Plants, the project emissions (EP_y) are zero (0), therefore table D.2.1.1 below is empty. Emissions generated by the project activity in a straightforward manner, applying the baseline emission factor.

D.2.1.1. Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project activity and how this data is collected

ID Number	Data Type	Data Variable	Data Unit	Measure (m), calculated (c), or estimated (e)	For how which baseline method(s) must this element be included	Recording Frequency	Proportion of Data to be monitored	How to be collected (elec)		

Coming emissions of the activity of the Project don't exist.

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

D.2.1.2. Description of formulae used to estimate project emissions (for each gas, source, formulae/alg

Based on the Hydropower Plant technology, the project (*EP*_y) are zero (0), therefore no formula for calculation

D.2.1.3. Relevant data necessary for determining the baseline of anthropogenic emissions by sources of and how such data will be collected and archived

ID Number	Data Type	Data Variable	Data Unit	Measure (m), calculated (c), or estimated (e)	For how which baseline method(s) must this element be included	Recording Frequency	Proportion of Data to be monitored	How c ar (elect		
1.EG _y	Generation of electricity of the project dispatched in the grid	Measured energy connected at the grid and receipt of sales	MWh	M		Measureme nt of 15 minutes and monthly recording	100%	El		
2.EF _y	Emission Factor	Factor of emissions of CO2 of the grid	tCO2/ MWh	C	Simple OM / BM	Annual	100%	El		
3.EF _{OM, y}	Emission Factor	Factor of emission of CO2 of the operational margin of NIS	tCO2/ MWh	C	Simple OM	Annual	100%	El		

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

ID Number	Data Type	Data Variable	Data Unit	Measure (m), calculated (c), or estimated (e)	For how which baseline method(s) must this element be included	Recording Frequency	Proportion of Data to be monitored	How (elect		
4.EF _{BM,y}	Emission Factor	Factor of emission of CO ₂ of the operational margin of SIN	tCO ₂ /MWh	C	BM	Annual	100%	El		
10.λ _y	Emission Factor	Fraction of time in that the central of low cost/inflexible operate in the margin.	tCO ₂ /MWh	C	BM	Annual	100%	Elec		

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.

**D.2.1.4. Description of formulae used to estimate baseline emissions (for each gas, source, formulae/algorithms)**

In agreement with the selected approved methodology (ACM0002, 2006), the factor of emission of the baseline that the combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of the operation margin (OM) and the factor of determining the construction margin and the factor of emission of the operation margin, a project of electric of the plant that can be dispatched without significant problems. Likely a connected electric system is defined a transmission lines for the electric system of the project and in which the plants can be sent without significant p Of ACM0002 (2006), the factor of emission of the baseline (EFy) is calculated as the combined margin (CM), c factors of the operation margins (OM) and construction (BM) in agreement with the three following steps:

STEP 1 – Calculation of the factor(s) of emission of the operation margin, based on one of the following methods:

- Margin of Simple Operation
- Margin of simple adjusted operation
- Send analysis of data of the operation margin
- Average of the operation margin

The second alternative, margin of simple adjusted operation will be used.

The factor of emission of the margin of simple adjusted operation (EFOM,adjusted,y in tCO2/MWh) is a variation of the one where the sources of energy (including import) are separate in sources of energy of low-cost/must-run (EFOM,simple,y in tCO2/MWh) as follows:

$$EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, y} = (1 - \lambda_y) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,y}} + \lambda_y \frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{k,y}} \quad (tCO_2e/GWh)$$

STEP 2 – Calculation of the factor of emission of the construction margin (EFBM,y) is considered medium generation (tCO2e/MWh) of a sample of plants m, as it proceeds:

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

$$\frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{k,y}} = 0 \text{ (tCO}_2\text{/GWh)}$$

Where $F_{i,m,y}$, $COEF_{i,m}$ and $GEN_{m,y}$ are similar to the variables described for the simple method OM (ACM0 2006) for plants m, with base in the available most recent information on the plants already built. The sample group

- ✓ Five plants that were built recently, or
- ✓ The additional capacity of the plants in the electric system that understands 20% of the generation system

Participants of the project should use of the two options that the sample group understands the largest annual generation

STEP 3 – Calculation of the factor of emission of the base line EF, as it weighted average of the factor of the reference factor of the construction margin ($EF_{BM,y}$):

$$EF_y = w_{OM} \cdot EF_{OM,y} + w_{BM} \cdot EF_{BM,y}$$

Where the weights are w_{OM} and w_{BM} , for cessation, they are 50% (i.e., $w_{OM} = w_{BM} = 0,5$). Alternative Weights justifying the alternative weights presented.

D.2.2. Option 2: Direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project activity (values should be

Option 2 is not applicable.

D.2.2.1 Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project activity, and how this data

Not applicable.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

D.2.2.2. Description of formulae used to calculate project emissions (for each gas, source, formulae/alg

The project doesn't present emissions. Not applicable.

D.2.3. Treatment of leakages in the monitoring plan

D.2.3.1. If applicable, please describe data and information to be collected to enable monitoring leak

ID Number (Please use numbers that have reference to table D.3)	Data Type	Data variable	Data Unit	Measure (m), calculated (c), or estimated (e)	For how which baseline method(s) must this element be included	Recording Frequency	Proportion of Data to be monitored	E (ele		

Not Applicable.

D.2.3.2. Description of formulae used to estimate leakage (for each gas, source, formulae/algorithm, en

Not Applicable.

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

D.2.4. Description of formulae used to estimate emission reduction for the project activity (for each g emissions in units of CO₂ equivalent)

The baseline emissions for the South/Southeast/Midwest Interconnected National Grid will be proportional to the Paraiso project during its useful life. Therefore we can affirm that the baseline emissions (BE_{electricity,y}) are calculated as the ING SSEMW Emission Factor (EF_{electricity,2002-2004}) by the electric power generated by the project activity.

$$BE_{electricity,y} = EF_{electricity,2002-2004} \times EG_y$$

D.3. Quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) procedures being undertaken for data monitoring

Data	Uncertainty level of data (high/medium/low)	Are QA/QC procedures planned for these data?	Outline explanations if data are not being planned
1	Low	Yes	This data will be used for electricity generation.
2,3 e 4	Low	No	This data is calculated using standard procedures.
10	Low	No	This data will be used for baseline emission obtained through

The main meter is the Electricity Dispatch Control System, installed in the Small Hydro Power Plant, which measures the electricity dispatched to the PCH Paraíso and to the ING (Interconnected National Grid) in MWh (Wattmeter). This information is provided to the Electric System Operator (ONS – Operador Nacional do Sistema).

D.4. Please describe the operational and management structure the project operator will implement to monitor emission reductions and any leakage effect generated by the project activity

The responsible for monitoring the baseline indicators is Energias do Brasil.

Emission and any leakage effect generated by the project activity are not applicable.

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.



PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM PDD) - Version 02

CDM – Executive Board

D.5. Name of the person/entity determining the monitoring methodology

The responsible for the project management as well as for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting
The monitoring personnel is trained according to the monitoring National Electric System Operator (ONS – Op
All the generation data are stored in that procedures way.
The equipments of monitoring are calibrated and are frequently inspected according to the National Electric Sy:

Corporate Name: Energias do Brasil
Address: Rua Bandeira Paulista, 530
Zip code / City: 04.532-001 – São Paulo – SP
Country: Brazil
Contact person: José Lopes Alves
Position: Director
Telephone: +55 11 2185 5993
Fax: +55 11 2185 5974
E-mail: jose.lopesalves@energiasdobrasil.com.br

Corporate Name: PricewaterhouseCoopers
Address: Av. Francisco Matarazzo, 1400 - Torre Torino
Zip code / City: 05.001-903 – São Paulo – SP
Country: Brazil
Contact person: Ernesto Cavasin Neto
Position: Consultant
Telephone: +55 11 3674 2000
Fax: +55 11 3674 2000
E-mail: ernesto.cavasin@br.pwc.com

This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.

**SEÇÃO E. Estimation of GHG emissions by sources**

E.1. Description of the formula used to estimate the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases to the baseline (for each gas, source, formula / algorithm, emissions in equivalent units of CO₂) estimate of GHG emissions by sources

The project scenario follows the same logic, as established to the construction of the baseline scenario.

Power generation from Small Hydropower Plant does not need complementary fossil fuels, so that the calculation of Project Emissions by Year (PE_{year}) as described in the baseline methodology of ACM0002 – version 6 – 19 may 2006 – is not necessary for this project.

Therefore the formula to calculate the reduction of GHG emissions for this project is simplified; containing just the amount of electric power generated by the project (MWh) multiplied by the emission factor of the Interconnected National Grid in the sub-system SSEMW, as presented by the formula below:

$$BE_{\text{electricity, year}} = EG_{\text{year}} \times EF_{\text{electricity, year}}$$

Where:

BE_{electricity, year} = Displacement of baseline emissions

EG_{year} = Amount of electric power produced by the Small Hydropower Plant

EF_{electricity, year} = CO₂ emission rate by ING sub-system SSENW

The calculation of emissions reductions is made by the formula:

$$ER_{\text{year}} = BE_{\text{electricity, year}} - PE_{\text{year}}$$

Where:

ER_{year} = Reduction of emissions in a year with the project activity

PE_{year} = Project emissions in a defined year

As it was previously demonstrated PE_{year} is zero (0), it is possible to infer that emissions reduced by the project activity in a year correspond to the displacement of baseline emissions, therefore:

$$ER_{\text{year}} = BE_{\text{electricity, year}}$$

E.2. Description of the formulas used to estimate the escapes, defined as: the liquid change of the emissions anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that occurs outside the limits of the project and that is measurable and attributable to the project activity (for each gas, source, formula / algorithm, emissions in equivalent units of CO₂)

As previously stated, no significant leakage is expected in this project.

**E.3. The sum of E.1 and E.2 represents the project activity emissions:**

Not Applicable.

E.4. Description of the formula used to estimate the anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases of the baseline (for each gas, source, formula / algorithm, emissions in equivalent units of CO₂)

The baseline calculations were done based on “option 2” of the approved and consolidated methodology ACM0002, i.e. “*If baseline scenario is grid power imports*”.

Therefore, the emission factor for the grid is calculated according to approved and consolidated methodology ACM0002.

Baseline methodology determines CO₂ emission factor for ING-SSEMW, which the project is connected.

The chosen method to calculate the operational margin (OM) for the baseline emission factor is option (b) “*Simple Adjusted OM*”, since option (c), “*Dispatch Data Analysis OM*”, that could also be a way to determine the factor, has barriers for collection and validation of the necessary data.

For calculating the operational margin (OM) it was required to obtain with National System Operator (NSO) information on ING daily power dispatch. This kind of information is not regularly provided by NSO, and direct contact with the entity was required for such purpose. Information as received includes the years 2002, 2003, and 2004, and presently are the latest available at this stage.

Calculation of the emission factor of simple adjusted operational margin (OM)

References for variables as mentioned below can be found in the text of the methodology as used.

According to the methodology, it is required to determine the simple adjusted operational margin emission factor (EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, y}). For such purpose the equation below will be used:

$$EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, y} = (1 - \lambda_y) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,y}} + \lambda_y \frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{k,y}} \text{ (tCO}_2\text{e/GWh)}$$

According to the Brazilian electrical sector regulations, it is assumed that all low operating costs (Hydropower Plants) are mandatory dispatched to the ING, where nuclear plants produce no emissions.

$$\frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{k,y}} = 0 \text{ (tCO}_2\text{e/GWh)}$$



It was submitted to the DOE all the information given in by NSO, as well as all the tables used for the calculations of the emission factor.

The Lambda Factor was calculated according to all requirements as indicated in the methodology used.

Year	Lambda
2002	0,5053
2003	0,5312
2004	0,5041

It was also necessary to consider electric power generated by ING-SSEMW each year.

Year	Electric load(MWh)
2002	275.402.896
2003	288.493.929
2004	297.879.874

The operational factor of the operational margin of each year can be determined as follows:

$$EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, 2002} = (1 - \lambda_{2002}) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,2002} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,2002}} \therefore EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, 2002} = 0,4229 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

$$EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, 2003} = (1 - \lambda_{2003}) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,2003} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,2003}} \therefore EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, 2003} = 0,4417 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

$$EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, 2004} = (1 - \lambda_{2004}) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,2004} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,2004}} \therefore EF_{OM, simple_adjusted, 2004} = 0,4346 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

Finally, calculated the average of the three years, determining $EF_{OM, simple_adjusted}$

$$EF_{OM, simple_adjusted\ 2002_2004} = 0,4332 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

According to the methodology used, it must be calculated the building margin (BM) emission factor, to be determined by the formula as follows:

$$EF_{BM, y} = \frac{\sum_{i,m} F_{i,m,y} \cdot COEF_{i,m}}{\sum_m GEN_{m,y}}$$



In this case, according to the methodology, generation of electric power is 20% of the total generated in the most recent year, i.e., 2004, as well as the 5 most recently built generating plants less 20%. By calculating it will be found:

$$EF_{BM,2004} = 0,0962 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

Finally, ING-SSEMW baseline emission factor is calculated as the arithmetic average of operational margin (OM) and building margin (BM), therefore:

$$EF_{electricity,2002-2004} = 0,5 * 0,4332 + 0,5 * 0,0962 = 0,2647 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

Emissions in ING-SSEMW baseline will be proportional to power generated by the project activity as presented above in this document during its lifetime, therefore it can be stated that baseline emissions ($BE_{electricity,y}$) are calculated by multiplying the emission rate of NIS-SSEMW baseline ($EF_{electricity,2002-2004}$) by the electric power generated by the project activity .

$$BE_{electricity,y} = EF_{electricity,2002-2004} \times EG_y$$

Baseline emissions will therefore be calculated according to the formula:

$$BE_{electricity,y} = 0,2647 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh} \times EG_y \text{ (in tCO}_2\text{e)}$$

E.5. Difference between E.4 and E.3 representing the emissions reduction of the project activity

Reduction of emissions in this project is:

$$ER = BE_{electricity/year} - (L_{year} + PE_{year}) = 0,2647 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh} \times EG_{year} - 0$$

Therefore:

$$ER = 0,2647 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh} \times EG_y$$

E.6. Table providing values obtained when applying formulae above
--

According to the description of the methodology, calculation of emission reductions will be made using the equation presented above.

The following table presents estimated gains of electric power generation and resulting reduction of GHG emissions. With the implementation of the initiative Energias do Brasil is estimated to reach a reduction of **326.733tCO_{2e}** in ten years.



Table 05 – Estimation of emission reductions for the project activity

Year	Estimation of project activity emission reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of baseline emission reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of leakage (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of emission reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)
2007	0	29.703	0	29.703
2008	0	29.703	0	29.703
2009	0	29.703	0	29.703
2010	0	29.703	0	29.703
2011	0	29.703	0	29.703
2012	0	29.703	0	29.703
2013	0	29.703	0	29.703
2014	0	29.703	0	29.703
2015	0	29.703	0	29.703
2016	0	29.703	0	29.703
2017	0	29.703	0	29.703
Total (tCO₂e)	0	326.733	0	326.733

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

Formatted: Font: 9 pt

Conversion Rate: 0,2647 tCO₂/MWh

* Production of Electric Power started in December 2003

**SEÇÃO F. Environmental Impacts****F.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, including trans-boundary impacts**

The current environmental impacts of PCH Paraíso implantation for the electric power production were contemplated in the entitled document “EIA/RIMA” Environmental Impact Assessment Study.

PCH Paraíso received all the necessities environmental licenses.

F.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party.

The identified environmental aspects of the project are presented in the EIA/RIAMA document, which presents all mitigations procedures and measurements to an appropriate environmental impact management. It is worth to point out that the study was already approved by the competent environmental agencies and all environment impact adjustments are done or in process.

**SEÇÃO G. Stakeholders' comments****G.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled**

According to the federal and local legislation, the environmental licensing process requires public hearings with local stakeholders. The same legislation require that the announcement of the license (LP, LI and LO) to be posted in the official state or local journal and others regional journals.

For the development of the project activity in the standards established by the UNFCCC and Designated National Authorities (DNA), with high levels of transparency with the society, the Energias do Brasil established specific public hearing about the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) project PCH Paraíso. The community had the opportunity to clarify doubts about the Kyoto Protocol, CDM and the impacts of the project.

The stakeholders from local, regional and national levels received an invitation letter. Energias do Brasil also published an informative about the meeting in the Mato Grosso do Sul majors newspapers, making possible for the people who were interest in the subject attend the public hearings.

Besides the stakeholders comments required for the PCH Paraíso environmental license, the Brazilian Designated National Authorities (DNA) demands that the stakeholders comments must be based on a translated version of the Project Design Document (PDD) and that validation report to be edited by a Designated Operational Entity (DOE), according the Resolution n.1 - 11 of September of 2003, in order to present a letter of approval.

During the public hearing the participants were encouraged to ask questions. All questions were answered and doubts clarified by Energias do Brasil.

At the end of the meeting the stakeholders comments were handwrite by a participant, and was read out loud to all the presents at the time in order to receive a consensual agreement.

All the stakeholder comments goes through the company plans, which previously predicted that all the income of the sales of CER's of this project activity will be allocated in a fund managed by an entity founded exclusively to this objective. This fund will support social-environmental projects.

In the annex (Annex 6) are the stakeholder that received the invitation letter and the list of the participants at the public hearing.

G.2. Summary of comments received

The Brazilian Designated National Authorities (DNA) demands that all projects must be open to comments before validation.

As described above Energias do Brasil made the specific public hearing about the project in the region was the project is located.

**CDM – Executive Board**

page 40/60

As mentioned above, at the end of the public hearing the stakeholders prepared a document with their comments.

The stakeholders comments are shown below:



- na possibilidade de aprovação dos créditos de carbono que sejam atendidos as seguintes proposições:
- Que os recursos do fundo priorizem aplicação em projetos sócio-ambientais na preservação dos recursos hídricos do município onde estes localizados, a PCH e os municípios do entorno, com objetivo principal de manutenção destes recursos.
 - na criação de um órgão que vai gerir os recursos (que) dos créditos, que o município onde esta localizada a PCH tenha participação no processo de decisão na aplicação destes recursos.

Translation:

In the possible approval of the carbon credits, one must attend the following propositions:

- The income fund must give priority to regional social-environmental projects to water resources protection, with the objective to conserve these resources.
- In the creation of an entity to manage this income of these credits, the city where the Small Hydropower Plant is located must participate in the decision process of the allocation of this income.



G.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received
--

All comments received in the context of the environmental and operational licensing process were incorporated into current projects.

The comments about the CDM Project activity presented during the public hearing, as well as all the comments that may appear during the validation process, will be undertaken in transparency manner by Energias do Brasil.

**ANNEXES****Annex 1 – Contact information on participants in the project activity**

Organization:	Energias do Brasil
Street/ PO box:	R. Bandeira Paulista, 530
Building:	
City:	São Paulo
State / Region	SP
Postfix/ZIP:	04532-001
Country:	Brazil
Telephone:	+55 11 2185 5993
FAX:	+55 11 2185 5974
E-mail:	
URL:	http://www.energiasdobrasil.com.br
Represented by:	José Lopes Alves
Title:	Environment and Sustainability Director
Salutation:	Mr.
Name:	José Lopes Alves
Department:	Environment and Sustainability
Mobile:	
FAX, direct:	+55 11 2185 5993
Direct telephone:	+55 11 2185 5974
Personal e-mail:	jose.lopesalves@energiasdobrasil.com.br



Annex 2 – Information regarding public funding

There is no public funding involved in this project

**Annex 3 - Baseline information**

The baseline for calculating the emission rate for ING-SSEMW was developed according to the parameters of ACM0002, option 2 – Baseline scenario, being power imported from ING, where the emission factor is calculated in accordance with ACM0002 parameters.

Brazilian electric power system has been historically divided into two sub-systems: North-Northeast (N-NE) and South-Southeast-Midwest (S-SE-MW) This is mostly due to the historical evolution of the physical system, that has naturally been developed next to large consumption centers in the country.

The natural evolution of both systems increasingly demonstrates that integration is to come about. In 1998, the Brazilian Government announced the first part of an interconnection line between N-NE and S-SE-MW. With investments of about US\$ 700 million, the main purpose of the connection, at least in the Government's point of view, was to help to solve electric power problems existing in the country. S-SE-MW region could supply to N-NE in case of need, and conversely.

In spite of the established connection, technical documents still consider the Brazilian system as having two subsystems (Bosi , 2000)

“...where the Brazilian Electric Power System is divided into three separate sub-systems”

- (i) The Interconnected System South/Southeast/Midwest
- (ii) The Interconnected System North/Northeast, and
- (iii) The Insulated System (corresponding to 300 locations electrically insulated from interconnected systems)”

Bosi (2000) also provides strong arguments favoring the so-called multi-project Baselines:

“For large countries, with different boundary circumstances and different power systems based in different regions, baselines of multi-projects in the electric sector may require to be disaggregated below the country level for a believable representation of *what could have happened otherwise*”.

Finally, it is necessary to consider that although both systems are connected today, the electric power flow between them is limited by the capacity of transmission lines. Thus, only a part of the electric power generated in each of the systems can be transmitted. It is to expect that such part can change its direction and magnitude (until the limit of transmission lines) depending on hydrological patterns, climate, and other non-controllable factors. However it is not to expect that it represents a significant amount of the power demand of each sub-system. It should also be considered that the SE-NE interconnection was completed in 2004 only.

Presently Brazilian electric power system has nearly 91.3 GW of installed capacity, from a total of 1,420 generating companies. From these, nearly 70% are Hydropower Plants, 10% natural gas fueled thermo electrical plants, 5.3% diesel and fossil fuel thermoelectric plants, 3.1% plants fueled by biomass (sugarcane residue, rice bran, wood, etc...), 2% nuclear plants, 1.4% mineral coal plants, and yet 8.1 GW of installed capacity from neighboring countries (Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Paraguay) that can transmit power to the Brazilian network.

**CDM – Executive Board**

page 45/60

This extra capacity is really mostly ensured by 6.3 GW of the Paraguayan part of Binacional Itaipu, a Hydropower Plant jointly operated by Brazil and Paraguay, that delivers practically all generated power to the Brazilian network

Approved methodologies AM0015 and ACM0002 require project proponents to account for “all generating sources serving the system”. In that way, when applying one of these methodologies, project proponents in Brazil should search for, and research, all power plants serving the Brazilian system.

Actually, there is no public information on power generation sources available in Brazil. The national dispatch center, NSO (*Operador Nacional do Sistema*), claims that dispatch information is strategical for the agents of the electrical sector, and therefore should not be made available. On the other hand ANEEL, Brazilian Electric Power Agency, provides information in the installed capacity and other legal aspects of the electric sector, but no information on dispatch can be obtained with them.

Considering these aspects, the submittal of projects has been looking for a possible solution to calculate emission factor in Brazil in a more accurate way. Since real information on dispatch is essential, NSO was contracted to explain to participants the grade of detailed information that could be made available. After months of negotiations, daily information on dispatches of plants was made available, relative to the years of 2002, 2003, and 2004.

NSO actually centralizes and dispatches plants amounting to a total 75,547 MW installed capacity on 31/12/2004, of the whole 98,848.5 MW installed in Brazil in the same period of time (http://www.aneel.gov.br/arquivos/PDF/Resumo_Gr%C3%A1ficos_mai_2005.pdf), including the capacity of neighboring countries available to export to Brazil and emergency plants, to be dispatched only during periods of low availability in the network. Thus, the emission factor is calculated considering 76.4% of Brazilian installed capacity, which is a good figure, considering all difficulties involved with obtaining dispatch information in Brazil. Also, the remaining 23.6% correspond to plants, the dispatches of which are not coordinated by NSO, since they either operates based on power acquisition agreements not under the control of the dispatch authority, or located in non-interconnected grid, to which NSO has no access. Therefore this percent figure will not be affected by CDM projects, and there is no reason to consider it in the calculations to determine the emission factor.

Efficiency data on fossil fuel plants were taken from IEA document. This was made after considering that there was no more detailed information on efficiency, from public, renowned, and reliable sources.

From the reference as mentioned:

The efficiency of conversion (%) of fossil fuels to thermo electrical plants fed with fossil fuel was calculated based on the installed capacity of each plant and on the power effectively produced. For most thermo electrical plants under construction, a constant value of 30% was used to estimate its fossil fuel conversion efficiency.

This value was based on data as available in the literature and on observation of real conditions of this kind of plants operating in Brazil. It was assumed that the only 02 natural gas-combined cycle plants (amounting to 648 MW) have higher efficiency rate.



CDM – Executive Board

page 46/60

Also, only data relative to plants under construction in 2002 (starting operation in 2003) were estimated. All other efficiencies were calculated. As far as it is known, there has been no upgrade of the older thermo electrical plants as analyzed in the period (2002 to 2004). Therefore project participants have concluded that the best option available was to use such numbers, although they are not well consolidated.

Consolidated data on hour dispatch coming from NSO were used to determine the *lambda* factor for each of the years having available data. Total generation of low cost plants with mandatory dispatch is determined by total generation less generation of thermo electrical plants fed with fossil fuel, being such data determined upon daily dispatch data provided by NSO.

All this information was directed to the current CDM project validation auditors and thoroughly discussed with them, with the purpose to clarify every item and every possible doubt.

A summary of analyses follows. At first, a table with the 122 plants dispatched by NSO is shown. Then it comes a table with summarized conclusions of the analysis, with the calculation of the emission factor as presented. Finally, the curve of load duration for S-SE-MW system is presented.

Dispatch power plants by NSO:



Subsystem*	Fuel	Plant	Operation start-up (2, 4, 5)	Installed capacity (MW) (1)	Conversion efficiency (%) of fossil fuel (2)	Carbon Emission Rate (tC/TJ) (3)	Carbon Oxidation Fraction (3)	Emission (tCO ₂ /MWh)
S-SE-MW	H	Jauru	Set-2003	121.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Guaporé	Set-2003	120.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Três LÁguas	Aug-2003	306	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
S-SE-MW	H	Funil (MG)	Jan-2003	180.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Itiquira I	Set-2002	156.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Araucária	Set-2002	484.5	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
S-SE-MW	G.	Canoas	Set-2002	160.6	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
S-SE-MW	H	Piraju	Set-2002	81.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Nova Piratininga	Jun-2002	384.9	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
S-SE-MW	O	PCT CGTEE	Jun-2002	5.0	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
S-SE-MW	H	Rosal	Jun-2002	55.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Ibirité	Mai-2002	226.0	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
S-SE-MW	H	Cana Brava	Mai-2002	465.9	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Sta. Clara	Jan-2002	60.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Machadinho	Jan-2002	1,140.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Juiz de Fora	Nov-2001	87.0	0.28	15.3	99.5%	0.718
S-SE-MW	G.	Macaé Merchant	Nov-2001	922.6	0.24	15.3	99.5%	0.837
S-SE-MW	H	Lajeado (ANEEL res.402/2001)	Nov-2001	902.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Eletrobolt	Oct-2001	379.0	0.24	15.3	99.5%	0.837
S-SE-MW	H	Porto Estrela	Sep-2001	112.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	G.	Cuiaba (Mario Covas)	Aug-2001	529.2	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
S-SE-MW	G.	W.Arjona	Jan-2001	194.0	0.25	15.3	99.5%	0.804
S-SE-MW	G.	Uruguaiiana	Jan-2000	639.9	0.45	15.3	99.5%	0.447
S-SE-MW	H	S. Caxias	Jan-1999	1,240.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Canoas I	Jan-1999	82.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Canoas II	Jan-1999	72.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Igarapava	Jan-1999	210.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Porto Primavera	Jan-1999	1,540.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	D.	Cuiaba (Mario Covas)	Jan-1998	529.2	0.27	20.2	99.0%	0.978
S-SE-MW	H	Sobragi	Set-1998	60.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH EMAE	Jan-1998	26.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CEEE	Jan-1998	25.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH ENERSUL	Jan-1998	43.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CEB	Jan-1998	15.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH ESCELSA	Jan-1998	62.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CELESC	Jan-1998	50.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CEMAT	Jan-1998	145.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CELG	Jan-1998	15.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CERJ	Jan-1998	59.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH COPEL	Jan-1998	70.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CEMIG	Jan-1998	84.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH CPFL	Jan-1998	55.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	S.Mesa	Jan-1998	1,275.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	PCH EPAULO	Jan-1998	26.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Guilmar Amorim	Jan-1997	140.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Corumbá	Jan-1997	375.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Miranda	Jan-1997	408.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Nova Ponte	Jan-1994	510.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Segredo(Gov. Ney Braga)	Jan-1992	1,260.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000

**CDM – Executive Board**

page 48/60

S-SE-MW	H	Taquaruçu	Jan-1989	554.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Manso	Jan-1988	210.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	D. Francisca	Jan-1987	125.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Itá	Jan-1987	1,450.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Rosana	Jan-1987	369.2	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	N	Angra	Jan-1985	1,874.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	T. irmãos	Jan-1985	807.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Itaipú 60 Hz	Jan-1983	6,300.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Itaipú 50 Hz	Jan-1983	5,375.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Emborcação	Jan-1982	1,192.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Nova Avanhandava	Jan-1982	347.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Gov. Bento Munhoz - GBM	Jan-1980	1,676.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	S. SantiAug	Jan-1980	1,420.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Itumbiara	Jan-1980	2,280.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	O	Igarapé	Jan-1978	131.0	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
S-SE-MW	H	Itauba	Jan-1978	512.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	A. Vermelha (Jose E. Moraes)	Jan-1978	1,396.2	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	S. Simão	Jan-1978	1,710.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Capivara	Jan-1977	640.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	S. Osório	Jan-1975	1,078.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Marimbondo	Jan-1975	1,440.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Promissão	Jan-1975	264.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	C.	Pres. Medici	Jan-1974	446.0	0.26	26.0	98.0%	1.294
S-SE-MW	H	Volta Grande	Jan-1974	380.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Porto Colombia	Jan-1973	320.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Passo Fundo	Jan-1973	220.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Passo Real	Jan-1973	158.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Iha Solteira	Jan-1973	3,444.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Mascarenhas	Jan-1973	131.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Gov. Parigot de Souza - GPS	Jan-1971	252.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Chavantes	Jan-1971	414.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Jaguara	Jan-1971	424.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Sá Carvalho	Apr-1970	78.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Estreito (Luiz Carlos Barreto)	Jan-1969	1,050.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Ibitinga	Jan-1969	131.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Jupia	Jan-1969	1,551.2	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	O	Alegrete	Jan-1968	66.0	0.26	20.7	99.0%	1.40
S-SE-MW	G	Campos (Roberto Silveira)	Jan-1968	30.0	0.24	15.3	99.5%	0.837
S-SE-MW	G	Santa Cruz (RJ)	Jan-1968	766.0	0.31	15.3	99.5%	0.648
S-SE-MW	H	Paraibuna	Jan-1968	85.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Limoeiro (Armando Salles de Oliveira)	Jan-1967	32.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Caconde	Jan-1966	80.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	C	J. Lacerda C	Jan-1965	363.0	0.25	26.0	98.0%	1.345
S-SE-MW	C	J. Lacerda B	Jan-1965	262.0	0.21	26.0	98.0%	1.602
S-SE-MW	C	J. Lacerda A	Jan-1965	232.0	0.18	26.0	98.0%	1.869
S-SE-MW	H	Bariri (Alvaro de Souza Lima)	Jan-1965	143.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Funil (RJ)	Jan-1965	216.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	C	Figueira	Jan-1963	20.0	0.3	26.0	98.0%	1.121
S-SE-MW	H	Furnas	Jan-1963	1,216.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Barra Bonita	Jan-1963	140.8	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000

**CDM – Executive Board**

page 49/60

S-SE-MW	C	Charqueadas	Jan-1962	72.0	0.23	26.0	98.0%	1.462
		Jurumirim (Armando A. Laydner)	Jan-1962	97.7	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Jacuí	Jan-1962	180.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Pereira Passos	Jan-1962	99.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Tres Marias	Jan-1962	396.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Euclides da Cunha	Jan-1960	108.8	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Camargos	Jan-1960	46.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Santa Branca	Jan-1960	56.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Cachoeira Dourada	Jan-1959	658.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Salto Grande (Lucas N. Garcez)	Jan-1958	70.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Salto Grande (MG)	Jan-1956	102.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Mascarenhas de Moraes (Peixoto)	Jan-1956	478.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Itutinga	Jan-1955	52.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	C	S. Jerônimo	Jan-1954	20.0	0.26	26.0	98.0%	1.294
S-SE-MW	O	Carioba	Jan-1954	36.2	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
S-SE-MW	O	Piratininga	Jan-1954	472.0	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
S-SE-MW	H	Canastra	Jan-1953	42.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Nilo Peçanha	Jan-1953	378.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Fontes Nova	Jan-1940	130.3	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Henry Borden Sub.	Jan-1926	420.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Henry Borden Ext.	Jan-1926	469.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	I.Pombos	Jan-1924	189.7	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
S-SE-MW	H	Jaguari	Jan-1917	11.8	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
TOTAL(MW) =				66,007.01				

* Subsystem: S – South, SE-CO – Southeast-Midwest

** Fuel source(C, bituminous coal; D, diesel oil; G, natural gas; H, hydro; N, nuclear; O, residual fuel oil)

[1] Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Database on generation data (<http://www.aneel.gov.br/>, data collected in November 2004)

[2] Bosi M, A. Laurence, P. Maldonado, R. Schaeffer, A.F. Simoes, H. Winkler e J. M. Lukamba. Road testing baselines for GHG mitigation projects in the electric power sector. OECD/IEA October 2002.


[3] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Revised 1996 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.

[4] Operador Nacional do Sistema Elétrico. Centro Nacional de Operação do Sistema. Acompanhamento Diário da Operação do SIN (daily reports, 1 Jan. to 31 Dec. 2003)


[5] Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Superintendência de Fiscalização dos Serviços de Geração. Resumo Geral dos Novos Empreendimentos de Geração (<http://www.aneel.gov.br/>, data collected in November 2004)

**Emission factors for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected grid**


Baseline (including imports)	EF_{OM} [tCO ₂ /MWh]	Load [MWh]	LCMR [GWh]	Imports [MWh]
2002	0.8548	275.402.896	258.720	1.607.395
2003	0.9421	288.493.929	274.649	459.586
2004	0.8763	297.879.874	284.748	1.468.275
Total (2002-2004) =	861.776.699	818.118	3.535.256	
$EF_{OM, simple-adjusted}$ [tCO ₂ /MWh]	$EF_{BM,2004}$	Lambda		
0.4332	0.0962	λ_{2002}		
Alternative weights	Default weights	0.5053		
$w_{OM} = 0.75$	$w_{OM} = 0.5$	λ_{2003}		
$w_{BM} = 0.25$	$w_{BM} = 0.5$	0.5312		
EF_{CM} [tCO ₂ /MWh]	Default EF_{OM} [tCO₂/MWh]	λ_{2004}		
0.3494	0.2647	0.5041		



LOAD CURVE ING SSEMW, 2002



LOAD CURVE ING SSEMW, 2003



LOAD CURVE ING SSEMW, 2004



Annex 4 – Monitoring plan

The consolidated Methodology of monitoring ACM0002 defines the procedures of monitoring of the activities of the project.

Monitoring Plan:

As presented in the Table D.2.1.3, the data to be collected for the monitoring reports are updated by the emission factors (EFOM,y, EFBM,y, EFy) monthly value of energy generated (EGy).

The data of the emission factors will be annually updated starting from the data of ruling of plants, supplied by ONS.

The measurement of the generated energy is totally automated. All sensors relative instrument to the generation of electricity is redundant, as well as the instrument that totals the generated energy. These are connected through interface serial to a system supervisor (also redundant) installed in the room of control of each plant. The supervisor updates all the operational data in intervals of 5 seconds. The operator has access to this information through the supervisor or directly in the total instruments installed in the control panel at the same room.

All energy generated by PCH Paraíso is informed to the national regulatory authorities. The electric power market is strictly regulated and the existent norms specify the measurement equipments installed and the standard procedures to be followed.

The whole documentation is electronically stored, and the operators have direct access in case the information and documentation is needed.

**Annex 5 - Bibliography**

01. MME – Plano Decenal 2003-12:

Sumário Executivo do Plano Decenal de Expansão 2003/2012

Comitê Coordenador do Planejamento da Expansão dos Sistemas Elétricos

Ministério de Minas e Energia

www.ccpe.gov.br / www.mme.gov.br

02. Ministério de Minas e Energia, 2003

Balanço Energético Nacional 2003

Secretaria de Energia

www.mme.gov.br

03. ONS – Mapas do Sudeste e Centro-Oeste:

http://www.ons.org.br/ons/download/DU_Rede%20Oper.S-SE-MW.R36_06-09-04.pdf

04. Bosi, M. 2001

An Initial View on Methodologies for Emission Baselines: Electricity Generation Case Study

OECD and IEA Information Paper COM/ENV/EPOC/IEA/SLT (2001)4

<http://www.oecd.org/env/cc/>

05. Kartha, S., Lazarus, M. and Bosi, M., 2002

Practical Baseline Recommendations for Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Projects in the Electric Power Sector

OECD and IEA Information Paper COM/ENV/EPOC/IEA/SLT (2002)1

<http://www.oecd.org/env/cc/>

06. Bosi, M. and Laurence, A., 2002

Road Testing Baselines for Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Projects in the Electric Power Sector

OECD and IEA Information Paper COM/ENV/EPOC/IEA/SLT (2002)6

<http://www.oecd.org/env/cc/>

07. OECD, 2005

Economic Survey of Brazil 2005

OECD, ISBN 92-64-00747-4, February, 2005

<http://www.oecd.org>

08. PDD - Ecoenergy, 2003

Vale do Rosário Bagasse Cogeneration

rev. July 2003

CDM approved methodology - AM0015

http://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/CDMWF_AM_678093135

09. PDD - Ecoenergy, 2005

Alta Mogiana Bagasse Cogeneration Project – January 2005

Cerradinho Bagasse Cogeneration Project – January 2005



CDM – Executive Board

Campo Florido Bagasse Cogeneration Project – March 2005

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/>

10. PDD - Ecoinvest, 2005

ARAPUCCEL - Small Hydropower Power Plants Project, 2005

BRASCAN Project Activities, 2005

CATLEO Project Activities, 2005

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/>

11. CarboNetwork, 2002

Mudanças Climáticas: Oportunidades e Fragilidades, a CPFL no Contexto

12. 16th EB Meeting, UNFCCC/CDM, Anexo 1, 2004

Tool for the demonstration and assessment of Additionality

22 October 2004

<http://cdm.unfccc.int/>

13. Spiegelberg-Planer, R; Kaupang, B; Glorian and D, Blin, P – 2001

Performance of Generating Plant:

Seção 1: Thermal Generating Plant (100 Mw +) Availability And Unavailability Factors

World Energy Council, October, 2001

<http://www.worldenergy.org/wec-geis/global/downloads/pgp/pgp.pdf>

Operador Nacional do Sistema Elétrico,

Planejamento Anual da Operação Energética – Ano 2004

ONS RE 3/036/2004

<http://www.ons.org.br/ons/planejamento/index.htm>

**Annex 6 – Stakeholders project activity general meetings****NGOs:**

ENTITY	RESPONSABLE
ASSOCIAÇÃO CERRADO VIVO - ACV	Virgílio Napoleão Sabino
CI BRASIL – CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL DO BRASIL	Mônica Freire Bracellos Harris
EOA ECOLOGIA E AÇÃO	Alessandro Menezes
GEF PANTANAL ALTO TAQUARÍ	Humberto Cardoso Gonçalves
WWF BRASIL	Denise Hamú Marcos de La Penha
FBOMS - FÓRUM BRASILEIRO DE ONGS E MOVIMENTOS SOCIAIS PARA O MEIO AMBIENTE E O DESENVOLVIMENTO	Esther Neuhaus - Gerente Executiva

Stakeholders of the Municipality of Chapadão do Sul:

ENTITY	RESPONSABLE
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL – PREFEITO	Jocelito Krug
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL - VICE-PREFEITO	Alírio José Bacca
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL - SECRETARIA DE ADMINISTRAÇÃO	Ivanor Zorzo
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL - SECRETARIA DE OBRAS, TRANSPORTE E SERVIÇOS PÚBLICOS	Levi da Silva
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL - SECRETARIA DE SAÚDE	Nilzete Pereira Ribeiro
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL - SECRETARIA DE EDUCAÇÃO, CULTURA, DESPORTO E LAZER	Guerino Perius
PREFEITURA DE CHAPADÃO DO SUL - SECRETARIA DE FINANÇAS E PLANEJAMENTO	Itamar Mariani
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - PRESIDÊNCIA	Suraya Helena da Veiga Said
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - 1 VICE-PRESIDÊNCIA	Eduardo Belotti
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - 2 VICE-PRESIDÊNCIA	Élio Balem

**CDM – Executive Board**

CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - 1 SECRETÁRIO	Idalino Alves da Silva
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - 2 SECRETÁRIO	Ari Miguel Pettenan
VEREADOR	Clarice Gonçalves Fabiani
VEREADOR	João Valmir Tontini
VEREADOR	Homero Jandrey Locatelli
VEREADOR	Honório Rodolpho Hattge
JUIZADO DE DIREITO	Dr. Marcus Vinicius Tieppo Rodrigues
DEFENSORIA PÚBLICA	Dra. Grazielle Carra Dias

Stakeholders of the Municipality of Costa Rica:

ENTITY	RESPONSABLE
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - PREFEITO	Waldeli dos Santos Rosa
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - VICE-PREFEITO	Edson Martins Moraes
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - SECRETARIA MUNICIPAL DE PROMOÇÃO SOCIAL	Áurea Maria Frezarim Rosa
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - SECRETARIA MUNICIPAL DE EDUCAÇÃO	Prof. ^a Manoelina Martins da Silva Arantes Cabral
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - SECRETARIA MUNICIPAL DE OBRAS	Anivaldo Martins de Souza
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - SECRETARIA MUNICIPAL DE SAÚDE	Antonio Aparecido Rainho
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - SECRETARIA MUNICIPAL DE ADMINISTRAÇÃO	José Antonio Gabaron Vargas
PREFEITURA DE COSTA RICA - SECRETARIA MUNICIPAL DE TURISMO E MEIO AMBIENTE	Prof. ^o Wilson Matheus
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - PRESIDÊNCIA	Ivan da Cruz Pereira
SUBPREFEITURA DO DISTRITO DE PARAÍSO	Ivan da Cruz Pereira
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - VICE-PRESIDÊNCIA	Joaquim Alcides Carrijo
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - 1 SECRETÁRIO	Waldomiro Bocalan
CÂMARA DE VEREADORES - 2 SECRETÁRIO	Lucas Lázaro Gerolomo
VEREADOR	Adair Tiago de Oliveira

**CDM – Executive Board**

page 57/60

VEREADOR	Lourenço Filisbino Paula
VEREADOR	Ivanildo Ferrari
VEREADOR	João Carlos de Oliveira
VEREADOR	Prof. ^a Evair Gomes Oliveira
SERVIÇO DE ABASTECIMENTO DE ÁGUA E ESGOTO - SAAE	Evaldo Pereira Mesquita
DIRETOR GERAL DA RÁDIO CIDADE FM	Luciana Lemos Paes Coelho
DIRETOR GERAL DA RÁDIO CIDADE FM	Eduardo Moreno Cannazzaro
PRESIDÊNCIA DA OAB, SUB-SEÇÃO COSTA RICA	Dr. Vilton Divino Amaral
ASSOCIAÇÃO DO DESENVOLVIMENTO COMUNITÁRIO DO PARAÍSO	Woton Vitorino Carvalho
JUIZADO DE DIREITO - 1ª VARA ELEITORAL E JUIZADO ESPECIAL	Dr. Zidiel Infantino Coutinho
JUIZADO DE DIREITO - 2ª VARA ELEITORAL E DIRETOR DO FORO	Dr. Luiz Alberto de Moura Filho
PROMOTORIA DE JUSTIÇA	Dr. Izonildo Gonçalves de Assunção Junior
PROMOTORIA DA INFÂNCIA E JUVENTUDE	Dr. ^a Majorie de Oliveira Zanchetta
DEFENSORIA PÚBLICA	Dr. ^a Maritza Brandão
DELEGACIA	Dr. Lúcio Fátima da Silva Barros
COMANDANTE DO 2 PELOTÃO DA POLÍCIA MILITAR	1º Tenente Geter Delorena Ostemberg
CARTÓRIO DE REGISTRO CIVIL, LAERTE PAES COELHO	Aleida Lemos Coelho
CARTÓRIO DE REGISTRO CIVIL, LAERTE PAES COELHO	Dr. ^a Laércia Aparecida Lemos Coelho Canazzaro
CARTÓRIO DO 1 OFÍCIO	Valdemir Aleves

Stakeholders of the State of Mato Grosso do Sul and other States:

ENTITY	RESPONSABLE
PROCURADORIA GERAL DO ESTADO DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Dr. Sérgio Luiz Morelli
SECRETARIA DE ESTADO DE MEIO AMBIENTE	José Elias Moreira
CONSELHO ESTADUAL DE RECURSOS HÍDRICOS	José Elias Moreira

**CDM – Executive Board**

INSTITUTO DE MEIO AMBIENTE PANTANAL – IMAP	Cid Rôner de Castro Paulino
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Professor Robert Schiaveto de Souza
UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DOM BOSCO	Professor Armando Garcia Arnal
SUPERINTENDÊNCIA ESTADUAL DO IBAMA /MS	Nereu Fontes
ASSEMBLÉIA LEGISLATIVA DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Londres Machado
ACRISUL - ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS CRIADORES DO MS	Laucídio Coelho neto
AEAMS - ASSOCIAÇÃO DOS ENGENHEIROS AGRÔNOMOS DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Wilson Roberto Gonçalves
EMBRAPA - CNPGC	Rafael Geraldo de Oliveira Alves
CREA/MS - CONSELHO REGIONAL DE ENGENHARIA, ARQUITETURA E AGRÔNOMIA DE MS	Amarildo Miranda Melo
IPRH - INSTITUTO DE PESQUISA DE RECURSOS HÍDRICOS E MEIO AMBIENTE	Sérgio Murilo Nascimento Luciene Nogueira Queder
MMA - MINISTÉRIO DE MEIO AMBIENTE	Paulo Guilherme Francisco Cabral
FAMASUL - FEDERAÇÃO DE AGRICULTURA E PECUÁRIA DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Leôncio de Souza Brito Filho
FIEMS - FEDERAÇÃO DAS INDÚSTRIAS DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Alfredo Fernandes
AGEPAN - AGÊNCIA ESTADUAL DE REGULAÇÃO DE SERVIÇOS PÚBLICOS DE MATO GROSSO DO SUL	Anízio Pereira Tiago

**List of Participants:**

1

7 891027 120580

Audiência Pública
referente ao Projeto de MDL (Mecanismos de
Desenvolvimento Limpo) PCH Paraíso, reali-
zado dia 10 de maio de 2006 em Costa
Rica.

1. Carlos Afonso Sales - repres. Prof. Robert Schwartz de Souza - UAM
2. Martha Silva Gutierrez C. - IMAP
3. Jucelia Afagallato - IMAP
4. Vanildo Ferrari - CAMARA MUN.
5. Marcelo Zuchi Vidotti - comissão munic. turismo
6. Wilfrido Martins - SEC. Turismo meio Ambient
7. Wladimir dos Santos - Prefeitura
8. Bráulio Gomes Oliveira - Diretora
9. Silvestre de Castro - Jornalista / Redator
10. Manoel de Oliveira - Promotor de Justiça
11. Vitalino dos Santos - SEMEC
12. Marilene Martins J. Cabral - Sec. mun. Educação
13. Gaudin Pinheiro Pereira - Sec. Mun. Educação
14. Joana Fátima Reb
15. Marilete B. R. R. - SEMED
16. Vera Lúcia Beat O. Amador
17. Bartolomeu dos Santos - MS. Aud.
18. Afonso Lyrio Rodrigues S
19. André P. N. Pereira
20. André P. N. Pereira
21. Filipe Lima de Sousa
22. GERARDO G. VARGAS
23. Adailson P. Salazar
24. Antônio Manoel de Araújo
25. Marcelino dos de Amorim

200g) LIVRO DE ATAS - 50 FOLHAS - Cód. 12.058 - CAPA: PAPELÃO 600g/m² - REVESTIDO EM PAPEL KRAFT 110g/m² - FOLHAS INTERNAS: PAPEL OFF-SET 56g/m² - FORMATO: 205 x 300 mm



- 26- Marcia Silva R. R. Larvalha
- 27- Quimara Sebastião de Sousa
- 28- Renata Barbosa de Vilela
- 29- OSMAR M. RIBEIRO
- 30- Aivaldo Batista de Amorim
- 31- Cassiano Candido Cordeiro
- 32- Juarez Divino da Silva
- 33- Mirielle Thome de Freitas
- 34- Jm Aro f. VARGAS
- 35- Juliana de Fátima Silva Bracarda
- 36- Quimara Aparecida Cordeiro
- 37- ~~Quimara~~
- 38- ~~Allegria de Aguiar~~
- 39- Milton Regis C. Moura
- 40- Dulcineia Rosa de Almeida
- 41- Rita Adalberto de Souza M. Moraes
- 42- Rita Platão de Souza Solmeiro
- 43- Gair Lucio Coelho Oliveira
- 44- Nádia R. Santa
- 45- Anirce Marta Silva
- 46- Evonides Castro D. Coelho
- 47- Alceu Margarido de Almeida
- 48- Maria Barbosa Moreira
- 49- Antunes L. Santana
- 50- Eliana Soares Lopes Lima
- 51- ~~Onide de Silva~~
- 52- Dielmar Bica Barreira
- 53- ~~Isamir de Freitas~~
- 54- Mara Urbano de Silva