

Validation Protocol

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

Requirement	Description	
Participation requirements	The participation requirements as set out in Decision 17/CP.7 need to be satisfied	Covered in table 1
Baseline and monitoring methodology	The baseline and monitoring methodology complies with the requirements pertaining to a methodology previously approved by the Executive Board	Baseline methodology is covered in table 2 Monitoring methodology is covered in table 4
Additionality	The project activity is expected to result in a reduction in anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases that are additional to any that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity	Covered in table 3
Monitoring plan	Provisions for monitoring, verification and reporting are in accordance with relevant decisions of the COP/MOP	Covered in table 5
Environmental impacts	Project participants have submitted to the designated operational entity documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity, including transboundary impacts and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party;	Covered in table 6
Comments by local stakeholders	Comments by local stakeholders have been invited, a summary of the comments received has been provided, and a report to the designated operational entity on how due account was taken of any comments has been received;	Covered in Table 7
Other requirements	The project activity conforms to all other requirements for CDM project activities in relevant decisions by the COP/MOP and the Executive Board.	Covered in Table 8

Small sale projects and AR projects have specific requirements which are covered in Table 9-11

Further remarks on the use of this document:

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

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

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

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
1.1 The project shall assist Parties included in Annex I in achieving compliance with part of their emission reduction commitment under Art. 3 and be entered into voluntarily.	DR	A3	No LoA from Finland to date	CAR 1	OK
1.2 The project shall assist non-Annex I Parties in achieving sustainable development and shall have obtained confirmation by the host country thereof, and be entered into voluntarily	DR	A3	No LoA from Colombia yet	CAR 2	OK
1.3 All Parties (listed in Section A3 of the PDD) have ratified the Kyoto protocol and are allowed to participate in CDM projects	DR	UNFCCC web site	Yes, all parties have ratified	OK	OK
1.4 The project results in reductions of GHG emissions or increases in sequestration when compared to the baseline; and the project can be reasonably shown to be different from the baseline scenario	DR	PDD	Yes, the project reduces GHG emissions through installation of a wind power plant	OK	OK
1.5 Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited NGOs shall have been invited to comment on the validation requirements for minimum 30 days (45 days for AR projects), and the project design document and comments have been made publicly available	DR	UNFCCC web site	Compelled between 13/10/05 and 11/11/05. No comments were received	OK	OK

REQUIREMENT	MoV	Ref	Comment	Draft finding	Concl
1.6 The project has correctly completed a Project Design Document, using the current version and exactly following the guidance	DR	PDD	Yes, the PDD is well written and there are no substantive or editorial deficiencies	OK	OK
1.7 The project shall not make use of Official Development Assistance (ODA), nor result in the diversion of such ODA	DR		No ODA has been used in the project according to the Manager of Project Mr. Luis Carlos Rubiano	OK	OK
1.8 For AR projects, the host country shall have issued a communication providing a single definition of minimum tree cover, minimum land area value and minimum tree height. Has such a letter been issued and are the definitions consistently applied throughout the PDD?			n/a	n/a	n/a
1.9 Does the project meet the additional requirements detailed in: Table 9 for SSC projects Table 10 for AR projects Table 11 for AR SSC projects			n/a	n/a	n/a
1.10 Does the PDD use accurate and reliable information that can be verified in an objective manner?			Yes, the PDD and annexes are transparent	OK	OK

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

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
2.1 Does the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the methodology	DR	PDD and ACM 0002	Yes, project is wind power	OK	Ok
2.2 Is the project boundary consistent with the approved methodology	DR	PDD	Yes	OK	Ok
2.3 Are the baseline emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	DR	PDD	Yes; although there is a claim to use a weighting of 1 for Operating Margin. The claim can be justified but is not in accordance with ACM0002. Despite	OK	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			the claim, they have calculated baseline emissions using 50/50 weighting.		
2.4 Are the project emissions determined in accordance with the methodology described	DR	PDD	There are no project emissions	OK	Ok
2.5 Is the leakage of the project activity determined in accordance with the methodology described	DR	PDD	Yes, there are is no leakage	OK	Ok
2.6 Are the emission reductions determined in accordance with the methodology described	DR	PDD	Yes, emission reductions are based on energy generation * grid emission factor	OK	Ok

Table 3 Additionality (Ref: PDD Section B3 and AM)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.1 Does the PDD follow all the steps required in the methodology to determine the additionality	DR	PDD and Addit tool	No; baseline options are not adequately defined. They would better be defined as the expansion plan without the project, the expansion plan with the project without CERs and the expansion plan with the project with CERs. The project is not sufficiently large to impact upon the implementation of the expansion plan.	CAR 3	Ok
3.2 Is the discussion on the additionality clear and have all assumptions been supported by transparent and documented evidence	DR	PDD	Yes; the discussions of additionality but step 3 includes details of a financial analysis presented as "complementary information to the barrier analysis". The status of this data is a little uncertain. If it is to be considered in the additionality discussion, it should be included under	CAR 4	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Step 2, Financial analysis; but it is also clear that step 2 OR step 3 can be followed. Please clarify. If the table is to be used, please provide full reference to the source of the data cited.		
3.3 Does the selected baseline represent the most likely scenario among other possible and/or discussed scenarios?	DR	PDD	Once clearly defined, the most likely baseline scenario is the implementation of the expansion plan without the project.	NIR 5	ok
3.4 Is it demonstrated/justified that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario	DR	PDD	Yes; thermal and hydro power generation is the most likely baseline.	OK	Ok

Table 4 Monitoring methodology (PDD Section D and AM)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.1 Does the project meet all the applicability criteria listed in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	Yes	OK	Ok
4.2 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the baseline emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	N/a the project chooses option 2, direct monitoring of project emissions	OK	Ok
4.3 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the project emissions as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	Yes	OK	Ok
4.4 Does the PDD provide for the monitoring of the leakage as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	No leakage	OK	Ok
4.5 Does the PDD provide for Quality Control (QC) and Quality Assurance (QA) Procedures as required in the monitoring methodology	PDD	DR	Yes, metering is regulated under relevant utilities acts	OK	Ok

Table 5 Monitoring plan (PDD Annex 4)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
5.1 Monitoring of Sustainable	PDD	DR	N/A – no significant	OK	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Development Indicators/ Environmental Impacts			environmental or social impacts identified, following EIA and SIA		
5.1.1 Does the monitoring plan provide the collection and archiving of relevant data concerning environmental, social and economic impacts?			n/a		Ok
5.1.2 Is the choice of indicators for sustainability development (social, environmental, economic) reasonable?			n/a		Ok
5.1.3 Will it be possible to monitor the specified sustainable development indicators?			n/a		Ok
5.1.4 Are the sustainable development indicators in line with stated national priorities in the Host Country?			n/a		Ok
5.2 Project Management Planning			Project is already operational and a Monitoring Plan has been included in Annex 4		Ok
5.2.1 Is the authority and responsibility of project management clearly described?			PDD states that team has been identified and in place. To be confirmed during verification	Obser vation	Ok
5.2.2 Is the authority and responsibility for registration, monitoring, measurement and reporting clearly described?			See above		ok
5.2.3 Are procedures identified for training of monitoring personnel?			See above		Ok
5.2.4 Are procedures identified for emergency preparedness for cases where emergencies can cause unintended			See above		Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
emissions?					
5.2.5 Are procedures identified for calibration of monitoring equipment?			See above		Ok
5.2.6 Are procedures identified for maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations?			See above		Ok
5.2.7 Are procedures identified for monitoring, measurements and reporting?			See above		Ok
5.2.8 Are procedures identified for day-to-day records handling (including what records to keep, storage area of records and how to process performance documentation)			See above		Ok
5.2.9 Are procedures identified for dealing with possible monitoring data adjustments and uncertainties?			See above		Ok
5.2.10 Are procedures identified for review of reported results/data?			See above		Ok
5.2.11 Are procedures identified for internal audits of GHG project compliance with operational requirements where applicable?			See above		Ok
5.2.12 Are procedures identified for project performance reviews before data is submitted for verification, internally or externally?			See above		ok
5.2.13 Are procedures identified for corrective actions in order to provide for more accurate future monitoring and reporting?			See above		Ok

Table 6 Environmental Impacts (Ref PDD Section F and relevant local legislation)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
6.1 Has an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	PDD	DR	Yes. EIA has been performed and no significant impacts reported	OK	Ok
6.2 Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, is an EIA approved?			EIA was performed	OK	Ok
6.3 Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?			No impacts are considered significant	OK	Ok
6.4 Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?			Yes	OK	Ok
6.5 Have identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design?			No impacts identified. Social programmes have been built in, in excess of requirements	OK	Ok
6.6 Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?			yes	OK	Ok

Table 7 Comments by local stakeholders (Ref PDD Section G)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1 Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?			<p>Strategies of information and communications adapted to the cultural particularities were implemented to allow the community, the workers and the organizations of the region to know about the advances and the activities in the construction stage of the project.</p> <p>The face to face communication with the authorities, the leaders and the local and regional institutions was a privileged one complemented with</p>	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			mass media in Spanish and Wayuunaiki with regional cover, in addition to informative meetings and murals, bulletins, attention to visitors of the project, guided production of videos and visits.		
7.2 Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?			An information and communications plan was made with the object of establishing harmonic relations between the project and the different social actors from the influence area, throughout an integral social management oriented towards the implementation of projects of the plan of environmental handling and the promotion of the communitarian participation, by means of agreed strategies of communication with the cultural particularities of wayuu. Attach-Acta1&2	OK	Ok
7.3 If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?			Local communities were consulted during the EIA	OK	Ok
7.4 Is a summary of the stakeholder comments received provided?			No. Section G2 does not amount to a summary of stakeholder comments	CAR 6	Ok
7.5 Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?			No Section G3 does not amount to a report on how due account was taken of any comments	CAR 7	Ok

Table 8 Other requirements

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.1 Project Design Document					
8.1.1 Editorial issues: does the project correctly apply the PDD template and has the document been completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.			PDD has been well written. References to Annexes on front page are not correct. Annex 6 is missing and Annex 7 in the PDD is actually Annex 8 on the front cover. Annex 7 is missing. Please also provide letters in Annex 6 and 7	CAR 8	Ok
8.1.2 Substantive issues: does the PDD address all the specific requirements under each header. If requirements are not applicable / not relevant, this must be stated and justified			No see 7.4 and 7.5 above. Please provide copy of official communication from Min of Environment confirming EIA was completed in accordance with Colombian Law and no environmental impacts were considered significant	CAR 6 and 7 NIR 9	Ok Ok
8.2 Technology to be employed					
8.2.1 Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?			Yes	OK	Ok
8.2.2 Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?			Yes	OK	Ok
8.3 Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?			No	OK	Ok
8.2.4 Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the project period?			No	OK	Ok

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
8.3 Duration of the Project/ Crediting Period					
8.3.1 Are the project's starting date and operational lifetime clearly defined and reasonable?			Yes	OK	Ok
8.3.2 Is the assumed crediting time clearly defined and reasonable (renewable crediting period of max. two x 7 years or fixed crediting period of max. 10 years)?			No. Crediting period is stated as 21 years but section E4 talks about 14 years. The values in table E4 are not clearly explained and it is requested dates in table E4 alongside the years	CAR 10	Ok
8.3.3 Does the project's operational lifetime exceed the crediting period			Yes	OK	Ok

Table 9 Additional requirements for SSC projects n/a

Table 10 Additional requirements for AR projects n/a

Table 11 Additional requirements for SSC AR projects n/a

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

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Project participants exist as legal entities, confirmation that EEPPM is one of the biggest utilities in Colombia			The legal existence of EEPPM was in conformity with the colombian law.	OK	OK
The Secretary of Environment is the DNA			Confirmed from UNFCCC website	OK	OK
Description of project activity, location, Wayuu Indigenous territory is accurate			The description of the project area is accurate. The documents concerning this topic were checked, such as photographic records, official documents signed	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			by Corpoguajira, official documents of local reunions, notes taken about the project by magazines about the whole project.		
Jepirachi is the first windpower project in Colombia and there are no more wind farms planned (confirmation trough interview with SIN)			The document emitted by the Secretary of Environment was read, where it is clear that it is a pioneer project This was also seen in the UPME.	OK	OK
Jepirachi is considered as minor plant and therefore has preferential despatching option as spinning reserve			In the document emitted by UPME the ranks of the generation plants is established, this shows that it is a small scale project.	OK	OK
Please confirm description of Colombian SIN on page 5 – (13.2 GW in 2001; 67% hydro; increasing thermal investment due to unreliable nature of hydro...)			This information was verified directly from EEPPM through internet with the CND at the following address www.xm.com.co/	OK	OK
Please visit www.mem.com.co and verify data in Annex 3 concerning plant name and emission factor in Table 1 and Table 2 and data in Table 3.			www.xm.com.co/ This is the new consult link, but in order to get precise information a password is to be purchased. The auditor checked that the information provided by the EEPPM was true for calculating the base line.	OK	OK
Please verify Annex 5 through consultation with representative of SIN			This information was verified directly from EEPPM through internet with the CND at the following address www.xm.com.co/	OK	OK
Likewise, please verify Expected capacity additions listed in table B.3.1 of PDD on page 11			This information was verified directly from EEPPM through internet with the CND at the following address www.xm.com.co/	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Please confirm whether the data listed is available at www.upme.gov.co (see page 15 of PDD)			The data is always available, a fee has to be paid in order to get a password and this way get the information. The auditor verified the access and the information of the reckoning of EEPPM.	OK	OK
Confirm stakeholder consultation has taken place by contacting some of the community members			It was shown by many ways that the Stakeholders have been taken into account through the whole process of implementation and beginning of the project, there are some official documents, radio propaganda in native language and Spanish, recordings of local meetings with the Secretary of Energy and some local government authorities in native and Spanish language also and official documents signed by the stakeholders, EEPPM and local authorities (Corpoguajira).	OK	OK

- oOo -