



VALIDATION REPORT

SALDANHA SMALL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT IN BRAZIL

REPORT No. 2007-0582

REVISION No. 01D

DET NORSKE VERITAS



VALIDATION REPORT

| | |
|---|--|
| Date of first issue: 2007-04-04 | Project No.: 28624550 |
| Approved by: Michael Lehmann Technical Director | Organisational unit: Climate Change Services |
| Client: Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda. and EcoSecurities Group PLC | Client ref.: Eroná Lopes de Oliveira – Hidroluz and Pedro Costa Moura - EcoSecurites |

DET NORSKE VERITAS
CERTIFICATION AS

Veritasveien 1
N-1322 Høvik
Norway
<http://www.dnv.com>

Summary:

Det Norske Veritas Certification AS. (DNV) has performed a validation of the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” in Brazil on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM modalities and procedures, the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board. This validation report summarizes the findings of the validation.

The validation consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design documents, ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders and iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

This validation report summarizes the findings of the validation. The only changes made to this version of the validation report compared to the validation report rev. 1B dated 13 November 2007 referred to in the letter of approval of the DNA of Brazil are linked to the status of issuance of the letter of approval by the DNAs of Brazil and the Netherlands, the version of AMS-I.D and complementary information added with regard to the investment analysis taking in account the requirements adopted by CDM EB at its 38th meeting.

In summary, it is DNV's opinion that the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project”, as described in the revised PDD of 21 Feb 2008, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM, and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the simplified baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-I.D (Version 13 of 14 December 2007) for small-scale CDM project activities. Hence, DNV will request the registration of the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” as a CDM project activity.

| | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Report No.: 2007-0582 | | Subject Group: Environment | |
| Report title: Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project in Brazil | | | |
| Work carried out by: Luis Filipe Tavares, Tonje Folkestad, Hendrik W. Brinks, Michael Lehmann | | | |
| Work verified by: Einar Telnes, Mari Grooss Viddal | | | |
| Date of this revision: 09 June 2008 | Rev. No.: 01d | Number of pages: 13 | |

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Indexing terms | |
| Key words Climate Change Kyoto Protocol Validation Clean Development Mechanism | Service Area Verification |
| | Market Sector |
| | Process Industry |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission from the client or responsible organisational unit | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> free distribution within DNV after 3 years | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strictly confidential | |

© 2002 Det Norske Veritas AS

All rights reserved. This publication or parts thereof may not be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying or recording, without the prior written consent of Det Norske Veritas AS.



| <i>Table of Content</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|--|--------------------|
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Validation Objective | 1 |
| 1.2 Scope | 1 |
| 1.3 Description of Proposed CDM Project | 2 |
| 2 METHODOLOGY..... | 2 |
| 2.1 Review of Documents | 4 |
| 2.2 Follow-up Interviews | 4 |
| 2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests | 4 |
| 2.4 Internal Quality Control | 4 |
| 3 VALIDATION FINDINGS | 5 |
| 3.1 Participation Requirements | 5 |
| 3.2 Project Design | 5 |
| 3.3 Baseline Determination | 6 |
| 3.4 Additionality | 6 |
| 3.5 Monitoring Plan | 7 |
| 3.6 Calculation of GHG Emissions | 8 |
| 3.7 Environmental Impacts | 9 |
| 3.8 Comments by Local Stakeholders | 9 |
| 4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS | 9 |
| 5 VALIDATION OPINION | 10 |
| REFERENCES..... | 11 |
| Appendix A Validation Protocol | |
| Appendix B Certificates of Competence | |



Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| ANEEL | Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica (Brazilian National Electricity Agency) |
| BFCA | Brazilian Fuel Consumption Account |
| BM | Build margin |
| BNDES | Brazilian Bank for Development |
| CAR | Corrective Action Request |
| CDM | Clean Development Mechanism |
| CCC | Conta de Consumo de Combustível (Fuel Consumption Account) |
| CEF | Carbon Emission Factor |
| CER | Certified Emission Reduction |
| CERON | Centrais Elétricas de Rondônia S.A. (Rondônia State Electricity Company) |
| CH ₄ | Methane |
| CL | Clarification request |
| CO ₂ | Carbon dioxide |
| CO ₂ e | Carbon dioxide equivalent |
| DNV | Det Norske Veritas |
| DNA | Designated National Authority |
| GHG | Greenhouse gas(es) |
| ELETRORÁS | Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S/A (Brazilian Electrical Central) |
| ELETRONORTE | Centrais Elétricas do Norte do Brasil (Electrical Central of North of Brazil) |
| GTON | Grupo Técnico Operacional da Região Norte (North Region Technical Operational Group) |
| GWP | Global Warming Potential |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| MP | Monitoring Plan |
| N-NE | North-Northeast |
| N ₂ O | Nitrous oxide |
| NGO | Non-governmental Organisation |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| OM | Operation Margin |
| PCA | Plano de Controle Ambiental (Environmental Control Plan) |
| PDD | Project Design Document |
| SEDAM | Secretaria de Estado do Desenvolvimento Ambiental (Rondônia State Environmental Agency) |
| S-SE-CO | South-Southeast-Midwest |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |



1 INTRODUCTION

Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda. and EcoSecurities Group PLC have commissioned Det Norske Veritas Certification AS. (DNV) to perform a validation of the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project”, located at Saldanha River, Alta Floresta d’Oeste municipality, Rondônia State, Brazil.

This validation report summarises the findings of the validation of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC and host Party criteria for CDM projects, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. The only changes made to this version of the validation report compared to the validation report rev. 1B dated 13 November 2007 referred to in the letter of approval of the DNA of Brazil are linked to the status of issuance of the letter of approval by the DNAs of Brazil and the Netherlands, the version of AMS-I.D and complementary information about additionality and newest requirements from EB38 paragraph 54.

The validation team consisted of the following personnel:

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Mr. Luis Filipe Tavares | DNV Rio de Janeiro | Team Leader, CDM validator; |
| Mr. Michael Lehmann | DNV Oslo | Energy sector expert |
| Mrs. Tonje Folkestad | DNV Oslo | GHG Auditor |
| Mr. Hendrik W. Brinks | DNV Oslo | CDM Validator |
| Mr. Einar Telnes | DNV Oslo | Technical Reviewer |
| Ms. Mari Grooss Viddal | DNV Oslo | Technical Reviewer (of version 01d) |

1.1 Validation Objective

The purpose of a validation is to have an independent third party assess the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan, and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host Party criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design as documented is sound and reasonable and meets the identified criteria. Validation is a requirement for all CDM projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

1.2 Scope

The validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document (PDD). The PDD is reviewed against the criteria stated in Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM modalities and procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords, the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities and the relevant decisions by the CDM Executive Board, including the approved baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-I.D (Version 13 of 14 December 2007). The validation team has, based on the recommendations in the Validation and Verification Manual /25/ employed a risk-based approach, focusing on the identification of significant risks for project implementation and the generation of CERs.

The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and corrective actions requests may provide input for improvement of the project design



1.3 Description of Proposed CDM Project

The project consists of a small run-of-river Saldanha hydroelectric power plant, with an installed capacity of 5.0 MW located at Alta Floresta d'Oeste municipality at the Saldanha River in Rondônia State. The plant started operations in March 2006.

The plant is connected to an isolated electricity system: Rondônia-Acre, located in Rondônia State, Northern Region of Brazil.

Emission reductions are claimed from displacing the isolated grid electricity with the estimated electricity generated by the small hydroelectric power plant and supplied to the isolated grid. Estimated GHG emission reductions from the project are 280 590 tonnes CO₂ equivalent (tCO₂e) during the 10 years crediting period, which results in estimated average annual emission reductions of 28 059 tCO₂e.

2 METHODOLOGY

The validation consisted of the following three phases:

- I a desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan;
- II follow-up interviews with project stakeholders;
- III the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customised for the project, according to the Validation and Verification Manual /25/. The protocol shows in transparent manner criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from validating the identified criteria. The validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organises, details and clarifies the requirements a CDM project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

The validation protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in Figure 1.

The completed validation protocol for the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

Findings established during the validation can either be seen as a non-fulfilment of validation protocol criteria or where a risk to the fulfilment of project objectives is identified. *Corrective action requests* (CAR) are issued, where:

- i) mistakes have been made with a direct influence on project results;
- ii) validation protocol requirements have not been met; or
- iii) there is a risk that the project would not be accepted as a CDM project or that emission reductions will not be certified.

The term *Clarification* may be used where additional information is needed to fully clarify an issue.



| Validation Protocol Table 1: Mandatory Requirements for CDM Project Activities | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Requirement | Reference | Conclusion | Cross reference |
| <i>The requirements the project must meet.</i> | <i>Gives reference to the legislation or agreement where the requirement is found.</i> | <i>This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (OK), a Corrective Action Request (CAR) of risk or non-compliance with stated requirements or a request for Clarification (CL) where further clarifications are needed.</i> | <i>Used to refer to the relevant checklist questions in Table 2 to show how the specific requirement is validated. This is to ensure a transparent Validation process.</i> |

| Validation Protocol Table 2: Requirement Checklist | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Checklist Question | Reference | Means of verification (MoV) | Comment | Draft and/or Final Conclusion |
| <i>The various requirements in Table 1 are linked to checklist questions the project should meet. The checklist is organised in seven different sections. Each section is then further sub-divided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question.</i> | <i>Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.</i> | <i>Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.</i> | <i>The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.</i> | <i>This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (OK), or a Corrective Action Request (CAR) due to non-compliance with the checklist question (See below). A request for Clarification (CL) is used when the validation team has identified a need for further clarification.</i> |

| Validation Protocol Table 3: Resolution of Corrective Action Requests and Requests for Clarification | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarifications | Ref. to Table 2 | Summary of project participants' response | Final conclusion |
| <i>If the conclusions from the draft Validation are either a Corrective Action Request or a Clarification Request, these should be listed in this section.</i> | <i>Reference to the checklist question number in Table 2 where the Corrective Action Request or Clarification Request is explained.</i> | <i>The responses given by the project participants during the communications with the validation team should be summarised in this section.</i> | <i>This section should summarise the validation team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Table 2, under "Final Conclusion".</i> |

Figure 1 Validation protocol tables



2.1 Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (version 1 of 5 February 2007 /1/, the version 2 dated 05 April 2007 /2/ and version 3 dated 28 Sep 2007 /3/ and the final version 5 dated 21 Feb 2008) was submitted by Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda. and EcoSecurities and were assessed by DNV as a part of the validation. Version 3 was submitted to adjust the actual electricity generation capacity and the actual starting date of the project, version 4 was submitted changing the Annex I Party project participant and version 5 was updated to version 13 of AMS-I.D and to include complementary information regarding the investment analysis used for demonstrating additionality.

In addition, the spreadsheets for the calculations of the operating and build margin emission factors for the Rondônia-Acre grid /6/ and financial calculations /7/ were assessed.

Other documents, such as the Environmental Impact Assessment, the Environmental Licences and licence requirements as well as the letters sent to local stakeholders, were reviewed during the follow-up interviews in order to ensure the accuracy of the provided information.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

DNV contacted the project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. The interviews took place on 3 April 2007 and the main topics involved were:

- Environmental licenses and legal compliance;
- Local stakeholder consultation process;
- Additionality of the project;
- Baseline emission calculations;
- Emission factor calculation.

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the validation was to resolve any outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for DNV's positive conclusion on the project design.

The initial validation of the project identified one corrective action request and seven requests for clarification. The project participant's response to DNV's initial findings, which included the submission of the final PDD dated 21 Feb 2008, addressed the corrective action request and requests for clarifications to DNV's satisfaction.

To guarantee the transparency of the validation process, the concerns raised are summarised in chapter 3 below and documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Appendix A.

2.4 Internal Quality Control

The draft validation report including the initial validation findings underwent a technical review before being submitted to the project participants. The final validation report underwent another technical review before requesting registration of the project activity. The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer qualified in accordance with DNV's qualification scheme for CDM validation and verification.



3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

The findings of the validation are stated in the following sections. The validation criteria (requirements), the means of verification and the results from validating the identified criteria are documented in more detail in the validation protocol in Appendix A.

The final validation findings relate to the project design as documented and described in the PDD of 21 Feb 2008.

3.1 Participation Requirements

The project participants are Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda. and EcoSecurities Group PLC. The host Party (Brazil) and the Annex I Party (the Netherlands) meet all relevant participation requirements, have authorized the project participants and have provided written approval of voluntary participation in the project /31//32/.

3.2 Project Design

The “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” comprises a small run-of-river hydroelectric power plant located in the Saldanha River. The power plant has two new simple Francis turbines installed for generation of electricity. The generation of the renewable electricity partly displaces electricity generation based on fossil fuels supplied to the isolated Rondônia-Acre grid. Due to transmission constraint, this isolated grid is not linked to the interconnected N-NE and S-SE-CO Brazilian grids systems.

Run-of-river small hydroelectric projects use water, either from small holding ponds or directly from the river. In order to be considered as a small hydro power project by the Brazilian Power Regulatory Agency, ANEEL, the area of the reservoir must be less than 3 km². The Saldanha unit uses water directly from the river, with minimum flooded area of 0.0075 km² and hence has a power density of 600 W/m².

The project design engineering reflects good practice. The total installed capacity for the power plant is 5.0 MW. As the nominal installed capacity of the project is less than 15 MW and the plant will supply generated electricity to the grid, the project is eligible as a type I.D small-scale CDM project activity (*Renewable Energy Projects / Renewable electricity generation for a grid*) as outlined in Appendix B of the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities /26/. The project is not a de-bundled component of a larger project activity.

A 10 years crediting period is selected, starting on 1 August 2008 or on the date of registration of the CDM project activity, whichever is later. The first action of the project activity was 28 November 2003, corresponding to the purchase receipt of first equipments (generators GEVISA SA) /14/. This date is considered as the starting date for the project activity. The expected operational lifetime of the project is more than 30 years.

The DNA of Brazil has confirmed that the project assists in achieving sustainable development /31/.

The validation did not reveal any information that indicates that the project can be seen as a diversion of ODA funding towards Brazil.



3.3 Baseline Determination

The project applies the approved simplified baseline methodology for selected small-scale CDM project activity categories, category I.D – *Renewable electricity generation for a grid* (AMS-I.D version 13) /26/. This category is applicable as the project consists of renewable energy generation units that supply electricity to an electricity distribution system (i.e. the Isolated Rondônia-Acre grid - North region of Brazil) which is supplied by at least one fossil fuel powered generating unit.

As stipulated in AMS-I.D, the baseline emission coefficient is determined in accordance with the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” /28/, as the average of the simple operating margin (OM) and the build margin (BM), i.e. the combined margin. Electricity generation data of power plants connected to the Rondônia-Acre isolated grid was provided by CERON /8/, Eletrobras-GTON Isolated Systems Operational Plan /9/ and Eletronorte /10/. In addition, fuel consumption data of connected thermo power plants was provided by CERON, Eletrobras and Eletronorte. Carbon emission factors for fossil fuels from IPCC were applied to calculate plant specific emission coefficients.

3.4 Additionality

Evidence that the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to implement the project was provided through written communication between Hidroluz and Incomex, a consulting company /17/, in order to assess potential CDM revenues. The communication emphasizes the necessity of CDM/CER revenues and subrogation in order to realize the Saldanha project. The letter issued on 26 February 2003 was verified by DNV. The starting date of the project activity, the purchase of the generators, is 28 November 2003. According to the ANEEL Resolution 727 /11/ the starting date of construction was on 1 April 2004.

The additionality of the project is demonstrated through an analysis of the following barriers: (a) investment barriers, (b) technological barriers, (c) barriers due to prevailing practice for the two scenarios: i) continuation of current activities (produce energy by thermal sources) and ii) construction of new renewable energy plants.

While the continuation of current activities does not face any barriers, the construction of new renewable energy plants face an investment barrier and a barrier due to prevailing practice. DNV’s assessment of the presented investment barriers and barriers due to prevailing practice is as follows:

(a) *Investment barriers*: The project faces an investment barrier due to the lack of long-term financing options for medium-sized investors, lack of interest from local utilities and higher costs for implementation of small hydro units in the Northern region compared to other regions of Brazil.

DNV was able to confirm that although the ANEEL’s Brazilian Fuel Consumption Account - BFCA (law no. 9648 of 27 May 1998) subsidizes new renewable energy generation units with up to 75% of the implementation costs, this was not the case for the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project”. The construction of a 69 kV/138kV substation, which was requested by CERON (the operator of the Rondônia-Acre grid and buyer of electricity), was not granted any subsidy and the total subsidy amounted thus to 49% only.



Upon DNV's request, the project participant provided in the PDD of 21 February 2008 an investment analysis based on input data valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision taken by the project participant. This analysis shows the project's internal rate of return (IRR) was 5,01% at the time of the investment decision, and the net present value (NPV) with a discount rate of 16,56% (the average Brazilian bond SELIC in the years 2001-2003 less 1 standard deviation)/16/ is R\$ -10 477 741.

The main input values of the IRR analysis are taken from the following sources;

- SHP Saldanha Feasibility Study (Reference Data /Saldanha Calculation) /7/
- Value referred on ANEEL resolution nº 349, Oct. 5th, 2004) based on preliminary investments studies /12/
- Analysing the Performance of the Brazilian Northern Country Autonomous Plants /22/
- Brazilian Court of Audit Report, 2004 /23/
- The electricity tariff taken from the Cabixi II invoice from December 2003 (Cabixi II is a hydropower plant located in same area and supplying electricity to CERON under the same conditions as Saldanha /24/, at the time of starting date of project)

DNV compared the input parameters for the financial analysis included in the PDD with the parameters stated in the sources listed above and was able to confirm that all the values applied are consistent with the values stated in the above sources.

A sensitive analyse, provided in the form the spreadsheet "Saldanha calculation" /7/, with respect to the amount of electricity generated, electricity tariff /21/, O&M costs and total investments /14//15/ was performed. This evidenced that the benchmark, determined as the average SELIC rate of 16,56% during 2001-2003 is reached only with an increase in electricity generation of 36.90%, an increase in grid tariff of 10.50%, decrease in O&M costs of more than 100% and decrease in total investment costs by 13.10%. It is unlikely that these parameters increase or decrease to such an extent. Thus the project faces financial/economic barriers compared to the business as usual scenario.

(b) Technical/technological barriers: DNV confirms that, as argued in the PDD, there are no significant technical/technological barriers. All the technologies involved in both scenarios are available in the market, and have been used effectively in Brazil.

(c) Prevailing business practice barriers: From 2001 until 2005, thermal generation inside the isolated system has increased. It is clearly demonstrated that the prevailing practice in terms of energy generation in Rondônia is predominantly thermal and consequently, the trend in the region is construction of units using fossil fuels, instead of hydro units. The installed capacity from thermal plants has 7 facilities with generation of 1,729 GWh in 2005 compared with 6 hydro facilities with generation of 899 GWh in 2005 /6/. Thus thermal power plants can be regarded as the prevailing practise.

In conclusion, the assessment of the arguments presented above is deemed to sufficiently demonstrate that the project is not a likely baseline scenario and that emission reductions resulting from the project are additional.

3.5 Monitoring Plan

The project applies the approved monitoring methodology AMS-I.D (Version 13 of 14 December 2007) - "Grid connected renewable electricity generation" for Type I – Renewable



Energy Projects, according to the “Appendix B of the “Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities” - Indicative simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for selected small-scale CDM project activities /26/.

The main parameter to monitor is the net electricity generated and supplied to the grid, to be obtained from one meter for the plant which will be read by the project developer as well as by CERON. Data collected by the project participant will be cross-checked with electricity invoice issued by Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda. The generated energy by the power plant will be multiplied by the combined margin emission coefficient for the Rondônia-Acre grid.

Regarding leakage, no sources of emissions were identified. The electricity generating equipment is not transferred from any other activity as verified by purchase receipt from “HISA – Hidraulic Industrial S.A.

Detailed monitoring procedures, including responsibilities for project management, procedures for QA/QC of monitoring reports, frequency and calibration were verified. All electricity measuring instruments are to be calibrated by the CERON, which signed a long term Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) with Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda.

3.6 Calculation of GHG Emissions

Project emissions are considered zero for this project. According to paragraph 9, option (a), of AMS-I.D /26/, baseline emissions are calculated as the amount of electricity generated by the project hydroelectric power plant (in kWh) multiplied by the grid emission coefficient (kg CO₂e/kWh). According to the ACM0002 / “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”, the grid emission coefficient is calculated *ex-ante* as the average of the “simple operating margin” and the “build margin”. The system boundary is the Rondônia-Acre isolated grid, located in Rondônia State in the Northern Region of Brazil.

The calculations /6/ are based on electricity generation in the grid and fuel consumption data of thermal plants provided by CERON, Eletrobras and Eletronorte for the years 2003-2005 which are the most recent statistics available at the time of the PDD submission. The data was verified against the data provided by CERON and Eletronorte and by data published on the Eletrobras/GETON website.

As the Rondônia-Acre electric grid has less than 50% of low-cost must run, the simple OM method was considered for the determination of the operating margin (OM). The build margin emission coefficient (BM) was calculated considering the most recent 20% power plants capacity additions (in MWh) in the electricity system. The simple-adjusted operating margin (OM) emission coefficient is calculated to be 0.8682 tCO₂e/MWh and the build margin (BM) emission coefficient is 1.0160 tCO₂e/MWh, resulting in a combined margin emission coefficient of 0.9421 tCO₂/MWh (weighted average of the build and operating margin), which is fixed *ex-ante* for the crediting period.

By applying the grid emission factor calculated *ex-ante* as above, the calculation results in emission reductions of 28 059 tCO₂e per year. The GHG calculations are complete and transparent, and their accuracy has been verified.



3.7 Environmental Impacts

The “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” has been granted the Environment Operation Licence No. 004371 issued by NUCOF/SEDAM/RO on 13 December 2007 and valid until 13 December 2009. The license was issued after all possible impacts were analyzed and considered by the Rondônia State Environmental Agency (SEDAM) and the Environment Control Plan (PCA) /19/. No adverse environmental impacts are identified, which seems reasonable given the nature of the project design. Transboundary environmental impacts are not foreseen.

3.8 Comments by Local Stakeholders

Local stakeholders, such as the Municipal Government, the state environment agency, the Brazilian forum of NGOs, neighbouring communities and the office of the attorney general have all been invited to comment on the project, in accordance with the requirements of Resolution 1 of the Brazilian DNA. Letters were sent to the City Hall of Alta Floresta D'Oeste, Environmental Secretary of Alta Floresta D'Oeste, the State Prosecutor, SEDAM and Community Association of Alta Floresta D'Oeste. Copies of the letters sent to the stakeholders were assessed by DNV. No comments have been received.

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

DNV had published the PDD of 21 Feb 2008 on the DNV's Climate Change web site^{*} and Parties, stakeholders and NGOs are, through the UNFCCC CDM web site, invited to provide comments during the period from 28 February 2008 to 28 March 2008. No comments were received

Prior to this, the PDD of 05 February 2007 was made publicly available on DNV's climate change website and Parties, stakeholders and NGOs were through the CDM website invited to provide comments during a 30 days period from 10 Feb 2007 to 11 Mar 2007. No comments were received.

^{*} <http://www.dnv.com/certification/climatechange/Projects/ProjectList.asp>



5 VALIDATION OPINION

Det Norske Veritas Certification AS. (DNV) has performed a validation of the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” in Brazil. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism and host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The project participants are Hidroluz Centrais Elétricas Ltda. and EcoSecurities Group PLC. The host Party Brazil and the Netherlands, as Annex I Party, meet all relevant participation requirements, have authorized the project participants and have provided written approval of voluntary participation in the project.

The project consists of a run-of-river small hydropower plants with Francis turbines with an overall generation capacity of 5.0 MW.

By promoting renewable energy, the project is in line with the current sustainable development priorities of Brazil. The DNA of Brazil confirmed that the project assists in achieving sustainable development.

The project correctly applies the simplified baseline methodology for selected small-scale CDM project activity categories, category I.D – Renewable electricity generation for a grid (AMS-I.D, Version 13 of 14 December 2007). The additionality of the project is demonstrated by applying the barrier analysis as contained in Attachment A to the simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities. The presented barriers demonstrate that the project is not a likely baseline scenario.

An ex-ante fixed combined margin emission coefficient of 0.9421 tCO₂e/MWh for the Rondônia-Acre grid was calculated in accordance with the simplified baseline methodology for category I.D small-scale CDM project activities version 13, applying the combined margin approach. The determination of this combined margin emission coefficient is based on actual electricity generation data provided by CERON, Eletrobras-GTON Isolated Systems Operational Plan and Eletronorte for the Rondônia-Acre grid.

By promoting renewable energy and displacing fossil fuel-based electricity, the project results in reductions of CO₂ emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. Given that the project is operated as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The project correctly applies the monitoring methodology AMS-I.D. The monitoring plan sufficiently specifies the monitoring requirements.

In summary, it is DNV's opinion that the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” as described in the revised and resubmitted project design document of 21 Feb 2008, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology for category I.D small-scale CDM project activities (AMS-I.D, Version 13 of 14 December 2007). Hence, DNV will request the registration of the “Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project” as a CDM project activity.



REFERENCES

Documents provided by the project proponent that relate directly to the project:

- /1/ *Project Design Document for the Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project – Version 01 of 5 February 2007.*
- /2/ *Project Design Document for the Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project – Version 02 of 5 April 2007*
- /3/ *Project Design Document for the Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project – Version 03 of 28 Sep 2007*
- /4/ *Project Design Document for the Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project – Version 04 of 13 Nov 2007*
- /5/ *Project Design Document for the Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project – Version 05 of 21 Feb 2008*
- /6/ EcoSecurities – Datasheet to calculate the Combined Margin for Rondônia-Acre Isolated Grid: “2003-2005 Rondônia-Acre.xls”
- /7/ EcoSecurities – Datasheet to calculate the emission reduction and financial calculation, Excel spreadsheets: “Saldanha calculation.xls”
- /8/ Monthly reports of CERON/COS - Operation System Control for 2003 to 2005
- /9/ Eletrobras-GTON Isolated Systems Operational Plan for 2005.
http://www.eletrobras.gov.br/img/menu/01_ccc_off.gif
- /10/ Eletronorte - CAC “Monthly Accompaniment of Acre Units”.
- /11/ ANEEL Resolution number 727 of 18/12/2002 - “Authorization for installation of 4 800 kW in Saldanha hydropower plant”.
<http://www.aneel.gov.br/cedoc/res2002727.pdf>
- /12/ ANEEL Resolution number 349 of 05/10/2004 - “Postpone implementation to 2004 and application on sub-rogation right. <http://www.aneel.gov.br/cedoc/rea2004349.pdf>
- /13/ ANEEL Resolution number 487 of 10/03/2006 - “Authorization to start the operation on 13 March 2006 of Saldanha hydropower plant.
<http://www.aneel.gov.br/cedoc/dsp2006487.pdf>
- /14/ Purchase receipt 51327 issued on 28/11/03 by Gevisa SA for generators model 271R502 # XVH227001338 and # XVH227001339
- /15/ Purchase receipt 068 issued 27/07/2004 by HISA-Hidraulica Industrial SA for turbines Francis #1960 and 1961
- /16/ Brazilian bond SELIC - <http://www.receita.fazenda.gov.br/Pagamentos/jrselic.htm>
- /17/ Letter CT/017/2003 from Mr Erona Oliveira Lopes – Hidroluz to Incomex issued on 26 February 2003, about the necessity of CDM CERs and subrogation in order to make the Saldanha implementation possible.
- /18/ Operation License, Operation Licence No. 004371, issued by NUCOF/SEDAM/RO on



13 December 2007 and valid until 13 December 2009.

- /19/ Environment Control Plan issued on 2002 by Antonio Carlos Vieira, Agricultural Engineer and Jose Valdirley Scardueli, Florestal Engineer for Saldanha Small Hydro Electric Unit
- /20/ Brazilian bond SELIC <http://www.receita.fazenda.gov.br/Pagamentos/jrselic.htm>
- /21/ Saldanha/Hidroluz / CERON PPA # DT053/06 signed on 20 March 2006
- /22/ Analysing the Performance of the Brazilian Northern Country Autonomous Plants (<http://www.seeds.usp.br/pir/arquivos/congressos/CLAGTEE2003/Papers/TEPP%20B-157.pdf>)
- /23/ Brazilian Court of Audit, 2004 "Auditoria Operacional. Conta de Consumo de Combustíveis Fósseis dos sistemas isolados – CCC-isol"; Tribunal de Contas da União – TCU; Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica – ANEEL e Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S.A – Eletrobrás, 2004.
- /24/ Invoice for electricity supplied by Cabixi II plant (Incomex project) in 2003 dated 2 January 2004

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents:

- /25/ International Emission Trading Association (IETA) & the World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund (PCF): *Validation and Verification Manual*. <http://www.vvmanual.info>
- /26/ "Appendix B of the "Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities" - Indicative simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for selected small-scale CDM project activities: AMS-I.D – "Grid connected renewable electricity generation" for Type I – *Renewable Energy Projects*. Version 13 of 14 December 2007.
- /27/ CDM-EB: Approved Consolidated Baseline and Monitoring Methodology ACM0002 - "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 6 of 19 May 2006
- 28/ "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", version 01 of EB35
- /29/ Attachment A to the "Appendix B of the "Simplified modalities and procedures for small-scale CDM project activities" - Indicative simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for selected small-scale CDM project activities. Version 06 of September 2005.
- /30/ Thresholds and Criteria for the Eligibility of Hydroelectric Power Plants with Reservoirs as CDM Project Activities – EB 23
- /31/ Comissão Interministerial de Mudança Global do Clima (DNA of Brazil): *Letter of Approval*. 30 November 2007.
- /32/ The Netherlands' Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM): *Letter of Approval* 14 January 2008.

Persons interviewed during the validation, or persons who contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above:



/33/ Pablo Fernandez – EcoSecurities

/34/ Marcelo Aguiar – Ecosecurites

- o0o -

APPENDIX A

VALIDATION PROTOCOL FOR SMALL-SCALE CDM PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Table 1 - Mandatory Requirement for Small Scale Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) Project Activities

| Requirement | Reference | Conclusion | Cross Reference/ Comment |
|---|---|------------|--|
| 1. The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3 | Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.2 | OK | Table 2, Section E.4.1 |
| 2. The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof | Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.2, Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §23a | OK | Table 2, Section A.3. |
| 3. The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in contributing to the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC | Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.2. | OK | Table 2, Section E.4.1 |
| 4. The project shall have the written approval of voluntary participation from the designated national authority of each party involved | Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5a, Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §23a | | Comissão Interministerial de Mudança Global do Clima (DNA of Brazil): <i>Letter of Approval</i> . 30 November 2007, The Netherlands' Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM): Letter of Approval 14 January 2008. |
| 5. The emission reductions should be real, measurable and give long-term benefits related to the mitigation of climate change | Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5b | OK | Table 2, Section E.1 to E.4 |
| 6. Reduction in GHG emissions must be additional to any that would occur in absence of the project activity, i.e. a CDM project activity is additional if anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity | Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5.c, Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §26 | OK | Table 2, Section B.2.1 |
| 7. In case public funding from Parties included in Annex I | Decision 17/CP.7, | OK | The validation did not reveal any |

| Requirement | Reference | Conclusion | Cross Reference/ Comment |
|--|--|------------|--|
| is used for the project activity, these Parties shall provide an affirmation that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance and is separate from and is not counted towards the financial obligations of these Parties. | CDM Modalities and Procedures Appendix B, § 2 | | information that indicates that the project can be seen as a diversion of ODA funding towards Brazil. |
| 8. Parties participating in the CDM shall designate a national authority for the CDM | CDM Modalities and Procedures § 29 | OK | The Brazilian designated national authority for the CDM is the Comissão Interministerial de Mudança Global do Clima. The DNA of the Netherlands is the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment. |
| 9. The host Party and the participating Annex I Party shall be a Party to the Kyoto Protocol | CDM Modalities and Procedures § 30, 31b | OK | Brazil ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 23 August 2002. Netherlands ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 31 May 2002 |
| 10. The participating Annex I Party's assigned amount shall have been calculated and recorded | CDM Modalities and Procedures §31b | OK | The assigned amount of the Netherlands is 92% of the emissions in 1990. |
| 11. The participating Annex I Party shall have in place a national system for estimating GHG emissions and a national registry in accordance with Kyoto Protocol Article 5 and 7 | CDM Modalities and Procedures §31b | OK | The Netherlands have in place a national registry. |
| 12. The proposed project activity shall meet the eligibility criteria for small scale CDM project activities set out in § 6 (c) of the Marrakesh Accords and shall not be a debundled component of a larger project activity | Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §12a,c | OK | Table 2, Section A.1 |

| Requirement | Reference | Conclusion | Cross Reference/ Comment |
|---|---|------------|---|
| 13. The project design document shall conform with the Small Scale CDM Project Design Document format | Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities, Appendix A | OK | |
| 14. The proposed project activity shall confirm to one of the project categories defined for small scale CDM project activities and uses the simplified baseline and monitoring methodology for that project category | Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §22e | OK | Table 2, Section A.1.3, B and D |
| 15. Comments by local stakeholders are invited, and a summary of these provided | Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §22b | OK | Table 2, Section G |
| 16. If required by the host country, an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity is carried out and documented | Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §22c | OK | Table 2, Section F |
| 17. Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs have been invited to comment on the validation requirements and comments have been made publicly available | Simplified Modalities and Procedures for Small Scale CDM Project Activities §23b,c,d | OK | <p>DNV had published the PDD of 21 Feb 2008 on the DNV Climate Change web site (www.dnv.com/certification/climatechange) and Parties, stakeholders and NGOs are, through the UNFCCC CDM web site, invited to provide comments during the period from 28 February 2008 to 28 March 2008. No comments were received</p> <p>Prior to this, the PDD of 05 February 2007 was made publicly available on DNV's climate change website (www.dnv.com/certification/climatechange)</p> |

| Requirement | Reference | Conclusion | Cross Reference/ Comment |
|-------------|-----------|------------|--|
| | | | ange) and Parties, stakeholders and NGOs were through the CDM website invited to provide comments during a 30 days period from 10 Feb 2007 to 11 Mar 2007. No comments were received. |

Table 2 Requirements Checklist

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|------|---|--------------|--------------|
| A. Project Description The project design is assessed. | | | | | |
| A.1. Small scale project activity It is assess whether the project qualifies as small scale CDM project activity. | | | | | |
| A.1.1. Does the project qualify as a small scale CDM project activity as defined in paragraph 6 (c) of decision 17/CP.7 on the modalities and procedures for the CDM? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The project has an installed capacity of 5.0 MW, which is below the stipulated limit of 15 MW, qualifying as a small scale CDM project activity as Type I, Category D defined in paragraph 6 (c) of decision 17/CP.7 on the modalities and procedures for the CDM. | | OK |
| A.1.2. The small scale project activity is not a debundled component of a larger project activity? | /1/ | DR | No. The proponent has not registered any small scale CDM projects in the last 2 years and the project boundary is not within 1 km radius of any other proposed small scale CDM project | | OK |
| A.1.3. Does proposed project activity conform to one of the project categories defined for small scale CDM project activities? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The project conforms to the type (i) category of small-scale CDM project activities, "renewable energy project activities with a maximum output capacity equivalent to up to 15 megawatts" | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| A.2. Project Design Validation of project design focuses on the choice of technology and the design documentation of the project. | | | | | |
| A.2.1. Are the project's spatial (geographical) boundaries clearly defined? | /1/ | DR | Yes. GPS coordinates are given. | | OK |
| A.2.2. Are the project's system (components and facilities used to mitigate GHG's) boundaries clearly defined? | /1/ | DR I | The project system boundaries are given as the physical, geographical site of the renewable generation source as well as the electricity grid that previously provided electricity to the municipality of Alta Floresta D'Oeste, which is not connected to the national grid, and will include all direct emissions related to the mix of electricity produced for those generators that will be added by the Project. | | OK |
| A.2.3. Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The project design engineering is based on established technology suitable for small hydroelectric plants. | | OK |
| A.2.4. Will the project result in technology transfer to the host country? | /1/ | DR | No. The turbines will be purchased from a Brazilian producer. | | OK |
| A.2.5. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period? Does the project make provisions for meeting training and maintenance needs? | /1/ | DR I | The project will require minimal additional training and project maintenance. Moreover, support from the manufacturer is assured, and, as verified, the operator has experience from another Small Hydro plant. | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| A.3. Contribution to Sustainable Development The project's contribution to sustainable development is assessed | | | | | |
| A.3.1. Will the project create other environmental or social benefits than GHG emission reductions? | /1/ | DR | The project will have environmental and social benefits like job opportunities, locally improved air quality due to substitution of fossil fuels, improvement of domestic technical capacity. | | OK |
| A.3.2. Will the project create any adverse environmental or social effects? | /1/ | DR I | Run-off-river power plants are not expected to result in large flooded areas. Other impacts are not foreseen. Integration and protection with environment is assured through PCA (Environment Control Plan). | | OK |
| A.3.3. Is the project in line with sustainable development policies of the host country? | /1/ | DR I | The DNA of Brazil confirmed that the project assists in achieving sustainable development | . | OK |
| A.3.4. Is the project in line with relevant legislation and plans in the host country? | /1/ | DR I | The project has a regulatory permit from ANEEL nº 727/2002, 349/2004 and 487/2006 to operate the plant. The Operation License was issued on 13/12/07 and is valid until 13/12/09. The location is not influenced from Indian Protect Agency FUNAI. | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|---|--------------|--------------|
| B. Project Baseline The validation of the project baseline establishes whether the selected baseline methodology is appropriate and whether the selected baseline represents a likely baseline scenario. | | | | | |
| B.1. Baseline Methodology It is assessed whether the project applies an appropriate baseline methodology. | | | | | |
| B.1.1. Is the selected baseline methodology in line with the baseline methodologies provided for the relevant project category? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The project belongs to the renewable energy category, and is a small-scale project; therefore the selected baseline methodology is appropriate. | | OK |
| B.1.2. Is the baseline methodology applicable to the project being considered? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The project complies with paragraph 1 of baseline methodology AMS-I.D: (renewable energy that) "...supply electricity to and/or displace electricity from an electricity distribution system that is or would have been supplied by at least one fossil fuel fired generating unit." | | OK |
| B.2. Baseline Determination It is assessed whether the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario and whether the selected baseline represents a likely baseline scenario. | | | | | |
| B.2.1. Is it demonstrated that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario due to the existence of one or more of the following barriers: investment barriers, | /1/ | DR I | By comparing the investment incentives for thermal and renewable electricity generation, the PDD argues that there is an investment barrier, as well as a barrier of prevailing | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|------|---|--|--------------|
| technology barriers, barriers due to prevailing practice or other barriers? | | | <p>practice.</p> <p>Since the project is already operating, it needs to be documented that CDM was considered before construction, and that it was a prerequisite for the investment, i.e. that the project is different from the baseline scenario.</p> <p>The IRR/NPV calculation indicates that the investment was R\$ 28 000 000, however according ANEEL resolution 349, the subrogation was based on R\$ 18 000 000. DNV request more clarification.</p> <p>Please document/elaborate on the following assumptions affecting the analysis:</p> <p><u>Investment barrier:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the comparative analysis between thermal and hydro electricity chosen? Is investment in a thermal plant a relevant option for the project participant? • How will the additionality be affected if the CCC subrogation does not qualify as an E-situation? See also section B.2.3 • A sensitivity analysis on variations in rainfall • The assumed load factor needs to be confirmed (discrepancy in figures in section B.6.3 and Annex 5: resp 75 or 71%) • The assumed load factor needs to be substantiated with documentation. <p><u>Prevailing practice barrier:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please explain the relevance of the plans | <p>CL-1</p> <p>CAR-1:</p> <p>CL-3</p> | |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|---------|---|--------------|--------------|
| | | | <p>and forecasts made for Porto Velho system, and confirm that this system is separate from the Rondonia-Acre isolated system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please explain the statement that hydro generation is expected to decrease by 5%. Please provide the reference, justify the forecast, and specify the time period for which this forecast was made. | CL-4 | |
| B.2.2. Is the application of the baseline methodology and the discussion and determination of the chosen baseline transparent and conservative? | /1/ | DR | The baseline is defined as the Rondônia-Acre isolated system; it consists in 9 thermoelectric plants, adding 681.55 MW of installed capacity and 13 hydroelectric plants adding 259.50 MW of installed capacity. | | OK |
| B.2.3. Are relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances taken into account? | /1/ | DR I | <p>The PDD refers to Brazilian law 9648/98 ("the CCC subrogation") which effectively provides subsidies to renewable electricity generation in isolated grids. It is argued that this policy will be classified as an E- project under Annex 3 of the EB 16 report, ie. is not to be considered.</p> <p>However, the E- classification only applies to laws or policies implemented after November 2001, while the Brazilian law 9648/98 was implemented in 1998.</p> <p>Please clarify, and explain how the additionality will be affected if the CCC subrogation does not qualify as an E- situation.</p> | CL-5 | OK |
| B.2.4. Is the baseline selection compatible with the available data? | /1/ | DR | The data used for calculating OM and BM are based on a variety of sources referred to in Annex 3 of the PDD. | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|---|--|--------------|
| B.2.5. Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario describing what would have occurred in absence of the project activity? | /1/ | DR I | The baseline is defined as the Rondônia-Acre isolated system, consisting of thermal and hydro-based power stations. The components of the grid, and thus of the baseline, are provided. The project will avoid installation of new thermal unit. | | OK |
| C. Duration of the Project / Crediting Period It is assessed whether the temporary boundaries of the project are clearly defined. | | | | | |
| C.1.1. Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined? | /1/ | DR I | The project start is defined as the start of operation, which happened 1 March 2006. The expected operational lifetime is 30 years. However the ANEEL Resolution 487 of 10 March 2006 define the starting date for operation 13 March 2006. DNV request clarification. It needs to be documented that CDM was considered before plant construction, and that it was a prerequisite for the investment, i.e. that the project does not in itself represent the baseline scenario. | CL-2 CL-4 | OK |
| C.1.2. Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined (renewable crediting period of seven years with two possible renewals or fixed crediting period of 10 years with no renewal)? | /1/ | DR I | Yes. The project asks for a fixed crediting period of 10 years, starting on 1 May 2008, however, It needs to be confirmed that the crediting period will only start after the date of registration. | CL-6 | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|---|--------------|--------------|
| D. Monitoring Plan The monitoring plan review aims to establish whether all relevant project aspects deemed necessary to monitor and report reliable emission reductions are properly addressed. | | | | | |
| D.1. Monitoring Methodology It is assessed whether the project applies an appropriate monitoring methodology. | | | | | |
| D.1.1. Is the selected monitoring methodology in line with the monitoring methodologies provided for the relevant project category? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The chosen monitoring methodology (paragraph 13 of AMS-I.D) corresponds to the project category (renewable energy generation of less than 15 MW installed capacity). | | OK |
| D.1.2. Is the monitoring methodology applicable to the project being considered? | /1/ | DR | Yes. | | OK |
| D.1.3. Is the application of the monitoring methodology transparent? | /1/ | DR I | The application of the monitoring methodology is transparent when it comes to monitoring the electricity production. The emission factor was calculated <i>ex-ante</i> . | | OK |
| D.1.4. Will the monitoring methodology give opportunity for real measurements of achieved emission reductions? | /1/ | DR | Yes. | | OK |
| D.2. Monitoring of Project Emissions It is established whether the monitoring plan provides for reliable and complete project emission data over time. | | | | | |
| D.2.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data | /1/ | DR | The Saldanha unit uses water directly from the river, with minimum flooded area of 0.0075 km ² | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| necessary for estimation or measuring the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundary during the crediting period? | | I | of flooded area and power density of 600 W/m ² and the project emissions can be ignored when the power density of the project is greater than 10 W/m ² . | | |
| D.2.2. Are the choices of project GHG indicators reasonable? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |
| D.2.3. Will it be possible to monitor / measure the specified project GHG indicators? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |
| D.2.4. Will the indicators give opportunity for real measurements of project emissions? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |
| D.3. Monitoring of Leakage If applicable, it is assessed whether the monitoring plan provides for reliable and complete leakage data over time. | | | | | |
| D.3.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining leakage? | /1/ | DR I | N/A. According to AMS I.D Version 13, a leakage calculation is only needed if the renewable energy equipment is transferred from another activity or to another activity. The electricity generating equipment is not transferred from any other activity as verified by purchase receipt from "HISA – Hidraulic Industrial S.A. | | OK |
| D.3.2. Are the choices of leakage indicators reasonable? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |
| D.3.3. Will it be possible to monitor / measure the specified leakage indicators? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |
| D.3.4. Will the indicators give opportunity for real measurements of leakage effects? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| D.4. Monitoring of Baseline Emissions It is established whether the monitoring plan provides for reliable and complete project emission data over time. | | | | | |
| D.4.1. Does the monitoring plan provide for the collection and archiving of all relevant data necessary for determining baseline emissions during the crediting period? | /1/ | DR | Yes, the monitoring plan provides for reading the net amount of electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity. | | OK |
| D.4.2. Is the choice of baseline indicators, in particular for baseline emissions, reasonable? | /1/ | DR | Yes. For renewable grid-based energy projects, the crucial indicator to monitor is the net amount of electricity fed into the grid. | | OK |
| D.4.3. Will it be possible to monitor / measure the specified baseline indicators? | /1/ | DR | Yes. See previous question. | | OK |
| D.4.4. Will the indicators give opportunity for real measurements of baseline emissions? | /1/ | DR | Yes. See previous question. | | OK |
| D.5. Project Management Planning It is checked that project implementation is properly prepared for and that critical arrangements are addressed. | | | | | |
| D.5.1. Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described? | /1/ | DR | Yes. Energy sales receipts will be collected for the hydro plant and cross checked with the readings. This information will be transferred to EcoSecurities, which is responsible for the monitoring report. | | OK |
| D.5.2. Is the authority and responsibility for registration monitoring measurement and reporting clearly described? | /1/ | DR I | See D.5.1 | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| D.5.3. Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel? | /1/ | DR I | The project will require minimal additional training and project maintenance. Moreover, support from the manufacturer is assured, and, as verified, the responsible employees have previous work experience from another Small Hydro plant. | | OK |
| D.5.4. Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended emissions? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | OK |
| D.5.5. Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment? | /1/ | DR | Yes. Meter(s) are calibrated by the distribution concessionaire CERON in accordance with national standards established by INMETRO - entity responsible for calibration standards and recalibrated according to manufacturer specifications, but at least once every 3 years. | | OK |
| D.5.6. Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations? | /1/ | DR | The electricity meter(s) will undergo maintenance subject to industry standards. | | OK |
| D.5.7. Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting? | /1/ | DR | Yes. Meter readings and energy sales receipts will be collected by the plant operation personnel and transferred to EcoSecurities on a monthly basis in order to monitor emission reductions. To guarantee the consistency and accuracy of the data collected from the meter(s), data will be cross-checked with the sale receipts which will show the amount of energy supplied to the grid. | | OK |
| D.5.8. Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how | /1/ | DR I | See D.5.1 | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Page A-15

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|------|---|--------------|--------------|
| to process performance documentation) | | | | | |
| D.5.9. Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties? | /1/ | DR | See D.5.1 | | OK |
| D.5.10. Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements as applicable? | /1/ | DR | See D.5.1 | | OK |
| D.5.11. Are procedures identified for project performance reviews? | /1/ | DR | See D.5.1 | | OK |
| D.5.12. Are procedures identified for corrective actions? | /1/ | DR | See D.5.1 | | OK |
| E. Calculation of GHG emission It is assessed whether all material GHG emission sources are addressed and how sensitivities and data uncertainties have been addressed to arrive at conservative estimates of projected emission reductions. | | | | | |
| E.1. Project GHG Emissions The validation of ex-ante estimated project GHG emissions focuses on transparency and completeness of calculations. | | | | | |
| E.1.1. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect project emissions captured in the project design? | /1/ | DR | N/A. According to the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-I.D | | OK |
| E.1.2. Have all relevant greenhouse gases and sources been evaluated? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|------|---|--------------|--------------|
| E.1.3. Do the methodologies for calculating project emissions comply with existing good practice? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.1.4. Are the calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.1.5. Have conservative assumptions been used? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.1.6. Are uncertainties in the project emissions estimates properly addressed? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.2. Leakage It is assessed whether there leakage effects, i.e. change of emissions which occurs outside the project boundary and which are measurable and attributable to the project, have been properly assessed and estimated ex-ante. | | | | | |
| E.2.1. Are leakage calculation required for the selected project category and if yes, are the relevant leakage effects assessed? | /1/ | DR | N/A. According to baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-I.D, leakage is to be considered "if the energy generating equipment is transferred from another activity or if the existing equipment is transferred to another activity". The electricity generating equipment is not transferred from any other activity as verified by purchase receipt from "HISA – Hidraulic Industrial S.A. | | OK |
| E.2.2. Are potential leakage effects properly accounted for in the calculations (if | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|---|--------------|--------------|
| applicable)? | | | | | |
| E.2.3. Do the methodologies for calculating leakage comply with existing good practice (if applicable)? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.2.4. Are the calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner and (if applicable)? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.2.5. Have conservative assumptions been used (if applicable)? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.2.6. Are uncertainties in the leakage estimates properly addressed (if applicable)? | /1/ | DR | N/A | | |
| E.3. Baseline GHG Emissions The validation of ex-ante estimated baseline GHG emissions focuses on transparency and completeness of calculations. | | | | | |
| E.3.1. Are the baseline emission boundaries clearly defined and do they sufficiently cover sources for baseline emissions? | /1/ | DR | Yes. Baseline emissions are calculated on the basis of the emission factor for the Rondonia-Acre isolated grid. | | OK |
| E.3.2. Are all aspects related to direct and indirect baseline emissions captured in the project design? | /1/ | DR | Yes. | | OK |
| E.3.3. Have all relevant greenhouse gases and sources been evaluated? | /1/ | DR | Yes. The evaluation of the greenhouse gases and sources is deemed reasonable. | | OK |
| E.3.4. Do the methodologies for calculating baseline emissions comply with existing good practice? | /1/ | DR I | The emission factor was calculated <i>ex-ante</i> . | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| E.3.5. Are the calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner? | /1/ | DR | Yes, the calculation is transparent on Datasheet to calculate the Combined Margin for Rondônia-Acre Isolated Grid: "2003-2005 Rondônia-Acre.xls" | | OK |
| E.3.6. Have conservative assumptions been used? | /1/ | DR I | Documentation/justification should be provided on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OM and BM calculations • Load factor used in ex-ante calculation of emission reductions (75%) – there are also inconsistent figures in • Check assumed electricity price against the value in the PPA (assuming there is one in place since the project is already built) | GL-7 | OK |
| E.3.7. Are uncertainties in the baseline emissions estimates properly addressed? | /1/ | DR | Yes | | OK |
| E.4. Emission Reductions Validation of ex-ante estimated emission reductions. | | | | | |
| E.4.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline case? | /1/ | DR | The project is forecasted to reduce CO ₂ emissions to the extent of 280 590 tCO ₂ e (28 059 tCO ₂ e / year average) over the defined first 10 years crediting period. | | OK |
| F. Environmental Impacts It is assessed whether environmental impacts of the project are sufficiently addressed. | | | | | |
| F.1.1. Does host country legislation require an analysis of the environmental impacts of | /1/ | DR I | The Saldanha Small Hydroelectric Project has been granted the Operation Licence No. | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|--|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| the project activity? | | | 000'546, issued by NUCOF/SEDAM/RO on 13 December 2007 for the Saldanha hydropower plant and valid until 13 December 2009. Environment Licenses are issued after all possible impacts are analyzed by the State Environmental Agency, SEDAM and considering the Environment Control Plan (PCA) /19/. No adverse environmental impacts are identified, which seems reasonable given the nature of the project design. Transboundary environmental impacts are not foreseen. The renewed environmental license(s) must be presented during first verification of emission reductions. | | |
| F.1.2. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country? | /1/ | DR I | See F.1.1 | | OK |
| F.1.3. Will the project create any adverse environmental effects? | /1/ | DR I | See F.1.1 | | OK |
| F.1.4. Have environmental impacts been identified and addressed in the PDD? | /1/ | DR | See F.1.1 | | OK |
| G. Comments by Local Stakeholder Validation of the local stakeholder consultation process. | | | | | |
| G.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted? | /1/ | DR I | Yes. A list of consulted stakeholders is provided in the PDD section E.1 according with the requirements of Resolution 1 of the Brazilian DNA. Copies of the letters sent to the stakeholders were assessed by DNV. | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Checklist Question | Ref. | MoV* | Comments | Draft Concl. | Final Concl. |
|---|------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|
| G.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders? | /1/ | DR I | See G.1.1 | | OK |
| G.1.3. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws? | /1/ | DR I | See G.1.1 | | OK |
| G.1.4. Is a summary of the comments received provided? | /1/ | DR | See G.1.1 | | OK |
| G.1.5. Has due account been taken of any comments received? | /1/ | DR | No comments were received during the consultation. | | OK |

* MoV = Means of Verification, DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Table 3 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

| Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarification | Ref. to Table 2 | Summary of project participants' response | Final conclusion |
|---|------------------------|---|---|
| <p>CAR 1:</p> <p>The IRR/NPV calculations evidence that the investment was R\$ 28 000 000, however according ANEEL resolution 349, the subrogation was based on R\$ 18 000 000. DNV requests more clarification</p> | B.2.1 | <p>The difference of values is related to Substation investments that were not considered on ANEEL Resolution 349. The budget was presented to support the value of R\$ 28 000 000.</p> | <p>The complementary information related the implementation of 69 kV/138 kV substation, which was requested by CERON (the operator of the Rondônia-Acregrid and buyer of electricity), was not granted with any subsidy, and the investment calculation demonstrate an IRR of about 10%, which is lower than the implementation of thermo unit, the BAU in the North region of Brazil.</p> <p>This CAR is therefore closed.</p> |
| <p>CL 1</p> <p>Since the project is already operating, it needs to be documented that CDM was considered before construction, and that it was a prerequisite for the investment, i.e. that the project is different from the baseline scenario</p> | B.2.1 C.1.1 | <p>A step 0 document was provided to show CDM was considered before the project operation.</p> | <p>The Letter CT/017/2003 from Mr Erona Oliveira Lopes – Hidroluz to Incomex issued on 26 February 2003, about the necessity of CDM CERs and subrogation in order to realize the Saldanha project.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |
| <p>CL 2</p> <p>The project start is defined as the start of operation, which happened 1 March 2006. The expected operational lifetime is 30 years. However the ANEEL Resolution 487 of 10 March 2006 defines the starting date for operation as 13 March 2006. DNV request clarification.</p> | C.1.1 | <p>Starting date was modified at the PDD according to the ANEEL Resolution 727.</p> | <p>In the PDD version 3 the starting date of 01 April 2004 according to the ANEEL resolution 727 is evidenced.</p> <p>In the PDD version 5 the more correct starting date of 28 November 2003 according to the equipment purchase is evidenced.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |

| Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarification | Ref. to Table 2 | Summary of project participants' response | Final conclusion |
|---|-----------------|--|---|
| <p>CL 3</p> <p>Please document/elaborate on the following assumptions affecting the analysis:</p> <p><u>Investment barrier:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the comparative analysis between thermal and hydro electricity chosen? Is investment in a thermal plant a relevant option for the project participant? How will the additionality be affected if the CCC subrogation does not qualify as an E- situation? See also section B.2.3 A sensitivity analysis on variations in rainfall The assumed load factor needs to be confirmed (discrepancy in figures in section B.6.3 and Annex 5: 75 or 71%, respectively) The assumed load factor needs to be substantiated with documentation. | B.2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diesel thermal plants are the baseline for energy supply on the region, characterized by an isolated system. Therefore, both from a investment and prevailing practice perspectives, a thermal plant is more attractive than small hydro. The investment analysis considered the incentive from the CCC subrogation, no talking in consideration the E- situation. The PDD text was corrected accordingly. A spreadsheet with sensitivity analysis on variation in rainfall was provided. In fact, the analysis states that rain variation can only jeopardize the amount of energy generated. Further clarification was provided. PDD was corrected According to the calculation. <p>The load factor is calculated on the spreadsheet named "Calculation" under the document "Saldanha calculation v03 2007.04.05.xls".</p> | <p>The electricity generation in the North region of Brazil is confirmed the thermo generation as BAU due to the CCC subside.</p> <p>The reviewed PDD and financial calculation spreadsheet evidence that CCC subrogation was included to calculate the IRR and the statement of E- situation was removed. Sensitivity analysis was included.</p> <p>The financial calculation and reviewed PDD evidence the load factor as 71% calculated through the electricity generation agreed through PPA with CERON and the potential capacity of Saldanha.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |
| <p>CL 4</p> <p><u>Prevailing practice barrier:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please explain the relevance of the plans and forecasts made for Porto Velho system, and confirm that this | B.2.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Porto Velho system is integrated to the Rondônia-Acre system. The reference for this assertion is on the PDD and the information can be | <p>Complementary information and the Rondônia-Acrecombined margin calculation provide evidence that Porto Velho is integrated to the Rodônia-Acre system.</p> |

| Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarification | Ref. to Table 2 | Summary of project participants' response | Final conclusion |
|--|-----------------|--|---|
| <p>system is separate from the Rondonia-Acre isolated system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please explain the statement that hydro generation is expected to <i>decrease</i> by 5%. Please provide the reference, justify the forecast, and specify the time period for which this forecast was made. | | <p>can be verified on the 2003 Operational Plan at http://www.eletronbras.com.br/EM_At_uacao_SistIsolados/default.asp</p> | <p>The statement about hydro generation decrease is based on El Niño effect in northern Brazil, reducing the amount of rain and consequent lower the production of electricity.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |
| <p>CL 5</p> <p>The PDD refers to Brazilian law 9648/98 ("the CCC subrogation") which effectively provides subsidies to renewable electricity generation in isolated grids. It is argued that this policy will be classified as an E- project under Annex 3 of the EB 16 report, i.e. it is not to be considered.</p> <p>However, the E- classification only applies to laws or policies implemented after November 2001, while the Brazilian law 9648/98 was implemented in 1998.</p> <p>Please clarify, and explain how the additionality will be affected if the CCC subrogation does not qualify as an E-situation.</p> | B.2.3 | <p>As stated before on CL3 the information was already corrected on the PDD.</p> | <p>The reviewed PDD and financial calculation spreadsheet has evidenced that CCC subrogation was included to calculate the IRR and the statement of E- situation was removed.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |
| <p>CL 6</p> <p>It needs to be confirmed that the crediting period will only start after the date of registration.</p> | C.1.2 | <p>The PDD is now considering the crediting period starting on September 2007, when most likely the project will be registered.</p> | <p>The reviewed PDD defines the starting credit period of 01/08/2008, or on the date of registration of the CDM project activity, whichever is later.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |

| Draft report corrective action requests and requests for clarification | Ref. to Table 2 | Summary of project participants' response | Final conclusion |
|--|-----------------|--|---|
| <p>CL 7</p> <p>Documentation/justification should be provided on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OM and BM calculations • Load factor used in ex-ante calculation of emission reductions (75%) – inconsistent numbers are presented. • Check assumed electricity price against the value in the PPA (assuming there is one in place since the project is already built) | 19 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information was provided. ○ Load Factor is 71% as referred on CL3 above. <p>Correction was made to consider the value stated by PPA. To be conservative, this value is now considered since 2006.</p> | <p>The price of electricity was reviewed according to the PPA DT/053/06 with CERON.</p> <p>However, during the validation, the starting date of project activity changed, and thus the timing of decision making. To be consistent with the starting date, the price of electricity was taken from an invoice of a hydropower plant located in the same area and supplying electricity to CERON under the same conditions as the project activity. The invoice was in accordance with the timing of decision, given that the PPA was dated of 2006.</p> <p>With this last modification the financial analysis was considered correct.</p> <p>This CL is therefore closed.</p> |

- o0o -

APPENDIX B

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCE



CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

Mari Grooss Viddal

Qualification in accordance with DNV's Qualification scheme for CDM/JI (ICP-9-8-i1-CDMJi-i1)

| | | | |
|---|-----|----------------------|----|
| GHG Auditor: | Yes | | |
| CDM Validator: | Yes | JI Validator: | -- |
| CDM Verifier: | -- | JI Verifier: | -- |
| Industry Sector Expert for Sectoral Scope(s): | -- | | |
| Technical Reviewer for (group of) methodologies: | | | |
| ACM0001, AM0002, AM0003, AM0010, AM0011, AM0012, AMS-III.G | Yes | | |
| ACM002, AMS-I.A-D, AM0019, AM0026, AM0029, AM0045 | Yes | | |

Høvik, 26 September 2007

Michael Lehmann

Michael Lehmann

Technical Director, International Climate Change Services



CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

Luis Filipe Tavares

Qualification in accordance with DNV's Qualification scheme for CDM/JI (ICP-9-8-i1-CDMJ1-i1

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>GHG Auditor:</i> | Yes | |
| <i>CDM Validator:</i> | Yes | <i>JI Validator:</i> - |
| <i>CDM Verifier:</i> | Yes | <i>JI Verifier:</i> - |
| <i>Industry Sector Expert for Sectoral Scope(s):</i> | Sectoral scope 9 & 13 | |

Høvik, 6 November 2006

Einar Telnes
Director, International Climate Change Services

Michael Lehmann
Technical Director



CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

Tonje Folkestad

Qualification in accordance with DNV's Qualification scheme for CDM/JI (ICP-9-8-i1-CDMJ1-i1

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>GHG Auditor:</i> | Yes | | |
| <i>CDM Validator:</i> | -- | <i>JI Validator:</i> | - |
| <i>CDM Verifier:</i> | -- | <i>JI Verifier:</i> | - |
| <i>Industry Sector Expert for Sectoral Scope(s):</i> | -- | | |

Høvik, 5 February 2007

Einar Telnes
Director, International Climate Change Services

Michael Lehmann
Technical Director



CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

Hendrik Brinks

Qualification in accordance with DNV's Qualification scheme for CDM/JI (ICP-9-8-i1-CDMJ1-i1

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----|
| GHG Auditor: | Yes | | |
| CDM Validator: | Yes | JI Validator: | -- |
| CDM Verifier: | -- | JI Verifier: | -- |
| Industry Sector Expert for Sectoral Scope(s): | Sectoral scope 1, 2, 3 & 12 | | |
| Technical Reviewer for (group of) methodologies: | | | |
| ACM002, AMS-I.A-D, AM0019, AM0026, AM0029, AM0045 | Yes | AM0013, AM0022, AM0025, AM0039, AMS-III.H, AMS- III.I | Yes |
| ACM0006, AM0007, AM0015, AM0036, AM0042 | Yes | | |

Høvik, 18 July 2007

Einar Telnes
Director, International Climate Change Services

Michael Lehmann
Technical Director



CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

Michael Lehmann

Qualification in accordance with DNV's Qualification scheme for CDM/JI (ICP-9-8-i1-CDMJ1-i1)

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|-----|
| GHG Auditor: | Yes | | |
| CDM Validator: | Yes | JI Validator: | Yes |
| CDM Verifier: | Yes | JI Verifier: | Yes |
| Industry Sector Expert for Sectoral Scope(s): | Sectoral scope 1,2,3 & 9 | | |
| Technical Reviewer for (group of) methodologies: | | | |
| ACM0001, AM0002, AM0003, AM0010, AM0011, AM0012, AMS-III.G | Yes | AM0021 | Yes |
| ACM002, AMS-I.A-D, AM0019, AM0026, AM0029 | Yes | AM0023 | Yes |
| ACM003, ACM0005, AM0033, AM0040 | Yes | AM0024 | Yes |
| ACM0004 | Yes | AM0027 | Yes |
| ACM0006, AM0007, AM0015, AM0036, AM0042 | Yes | AM0028, AM0034 | Yes |
| ACM0007 | Yes | AM0030 | Yes |
| ACM0008 | Yes | AM0031 | Yes |
| ACM0009, AM0008, AMS-III.B | Yes | AM0032 | Yes |
| AM0006, AM0016, AMS-III.D | Yes | AM0035 | Yes |
| AM0009, AM0037 | Yes | AM0038 | Yes |
| AM0013, AM0022, AM0025, AM0039, AMS-III.H, AMS-III.I | Yes | AM0041 | Yes |
| AM0014 | Yes | AM0034 | Yes |
| AM0017 | Yes | AMS-II.A-F | Yes |
| AM0018 | Yes | AMS-III.A | Yes |
| AM0020 | Yes | AMS-III.E, AMS-III.F | Yes |

Høvik, 5 February 2007

Einar Telnes
Director, International Climate Change Services

Michael Lehmann
Technical Director



CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

Einar Ternes

Qualification in accordance with DNV's Qualification scheme for CDM/JI (ICP-9-8-i1-CDMJI-i1)

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----|
| GHG Auditor: | Yes | | |
| CDM Validator: | Yes | JI Validator: | -- |
| CDM Verifier: | Yes | JI Verifier: | -- |
| Industry Sector Expert for Sectoral Scope(s): | Sectoral scope 1, 2, 3 6 & 10 | | |
| Technical Reviewer for (group of) methodologies: | | | |
| ACM0001, AM0002, AM0003, AM0010, AM0011, AM0012, AMS-III.G | Yes | AM0027 | Yes |
| ACM002, AMS-IA-D, AM0019, AM0026, AM0029, AM0045 | Yes | AM0028, AM0034 | Yes |
| ACM003, ACM0005, AM0033, AM0040 | Yes | AM0030 | Yes |
| ACM0004 | Yes | AM0031 | Yes |
| ACM0006, AM0007, AM0015, AM0036, AM0042 | Yes | AM0032 | Yes |
| ACM0007 | Yes | AM0035 | Yes |
| ACM0008 | Yes | AM0038 | Yes |
| ACM0009, AM0008, AMS-III.B | Yes | AM0041 | Yes |
| AM0006, AM0016, AMS-III.D, ACM0010 | Yes | AM0034 | Yes |
| AM0009, AM0037 | Yes | AM0043 | |
| AM0013, AM0022, AM0025, AM0039, AMS-III.H, AMS-III.I | Yes | AM0046 | |
| AM0014 | Yes | AM0047 | |
| AM0017 | Yes | AMS-II.A-F, AM0044 | Yes |
| AM0018 | Yes | AMS-III.A | Yes |
| AM0020 | Yes | AMS-III.E, AMS-III.F | Yes |
| AM0021 | Yes | | |
| AM0023 | Yes | | |
| AM0024 | Yes | | |

Høvik, 5 February 2007

Einar Ternes
Director, International Climate Change Services

Michael Lehmann
Technical Director