

FINDINGS OVERVIEW

FINDINGS FROM VALIDATION OF JEPIRACHI CDM VAL0004

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

Description of table:

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

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

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

Date: Raised by:

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
2	CAR	Letter from the ministry of environment where it is specified that the project is voluntary. Letter of approval which certifies that the project contributes to the sustainable development	1.2
Date: 01/12/2005 The approval letter of the Government's Environmental Department was presented where they confirm the voluntary participation. 1 st page of document 0001-2-1332. The approval letter of the Government's Environmental Department was presented where they assert that the project contributes to a sustainable development, according to the CORPOGUAJIRA report, competent environmental authority. 2 nd page of document 0001-2-1332. Host country LoA received Date: 15/12/05 [Acceptance and close out] Closed			

Date: 1/11/05 Raised by: GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
3	CAR	Baseline options are not adequately defined. They would better be defined as (1) the expansion plan without the project, (2) the expansion plan with the project without CERs and (3) the expansion plan with the project with CERs. The project is not sufficiently large to impact upon the implementation of the	3.1

		expansion plan. Line bases probable without the implementation of the project.	
Date: 1/12/05 (1) The expansion plan is executed by the UPME and consistently it was not considered to be within the expansion plan, the document of the generation plan 2001- 2015 (is attached 1) 3.1 where it is clear that Jepirachi was not considered in the plan. Points (2) and (3) can be seen within table P&G, which is in the feasibility document of the project. (Attach-Expansion plan UPME) (2) The veracity of the data with which the calculate of the line bases was demonstrated, the data is extracted from a supplier of national information, updated call NERO and the information extracted with the one of the data base where the calculation of the line bases was made. (Attach- feasibility)			
Date: 15/12/05 [Acceptance and close out] OK closed			

Date:1/11/05

Raised by: GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
4	CAR	The discussions of additionality is good 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 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.	3.2
Date: 01/12/2005 The analysis of the barriers is the definitive one just as it was presented in the version 2 of the PDD. The information included in the squares corresponds to definitive information given by the government and which was validated. Financial analysis removed			
Date: 15/12/05 [Acceptance and close out] Closed			

Date:1/11/05

Raised by:GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
5	NIR	Once clearly defined, the most likely baseline scenario is the implementation of the expansion plan without the project.	3.3
Date: 01/12/05 If the Project wouldn't have been done, the daily offer would have been used in accordance with the daily demand, this means that 17.723 tons CO ₂ (first year) would have been produced due to the fact that this value corresponds to the sum of the thermal plants that would be generating this energy disparity. This figures are available in the UPME and were verified by J. Restrepo. The only entity which can make the projections nationally is the UPME reason why EEPM can decide whether if it carries out any project or not.			
Date: 15/12/05 [Acceptance and close out] OK			

Date: 1/11/05

Raised by: GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
6	CAR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section G2 does not amount to a summary of stakeholder comments 2. If there is a summary of the commentaries provided by the communities. 	7.4

Date: 01/12/05

1. According to the evidence presented, a planned and adequate process has been applied with the neighbouring communities and with the regional authorities (Corpo Guajira, Ministerio del Interior, Alcaldía de Uribia) whereas they have always been informed, have been invited to participate and their opinions have been considered. The document discharged by EEPPM in sept/2002 where the region's commentaries are contained in pages 24 and 25, is attached. (attach- EIA).
2. A general summary: "DOCUMENTO RESUMEN del Proyecto de Aprovechamiento Eólico Jepirachi" in pages 23, 24 and 25. Annexed document.

Date: 15/12/05

[Acceptance and close out] Closed

Date: 1/11/05

Raised by: GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
7	CAR	Section G3 does not amount to a report on how due account was taken of any comments	7.5

Date: 01/12/05

It was evident that in all meetings there are minutes and within them there are worries of the communities and adjustments on the initiated actions.

Date: 15/12/05

[Acceptance and close out] Closed

Date: 1/11/05

Raised by: GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
8	CAR	<p>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.</p> <p>Please also provide letters in Annex 6 and 7</p>	8.1

Date: 01/12/2005

It was corrected with the version 2.

Date: 15/12/05

[Acceptance and close out] Closed

Date: 1/11/05

Raised by: GP

No.	Type	Issue	Ref
9	NIR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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 2. Demonstrate if norms or laws exist to consult stakeholders. 3. To provide an official copy of a letter from the Ministry of environment confirming that the EIA was completed in 	8.1.2

		accordance with the Colombian laws where it considers that there is no significant environmental impact.	
Date: 01/12/2005 1. Letter attached from the ministry of environment 2. The agreements 169 of the OIT, law 21 of 1991 and decree 1320 of 98 exist. Electrical law 143 of 1994 in I articulate 53 and the EPM internal policy concerning environment and society, have been contemplated during the planning and execution of the project. 3. Annexed letter from the Ministry environment with consecutive number 0001-2-1332 where it declares on page 2 : "Fulfillment of enviromental regulations".			
Date: 15/12/05 [Acceptance and close out] Closed			

Date: 1/11/05		Raised by: GP	
No.	Type	Issue	Ref
10	CAR	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	8.3.2
Date: 01/12/2005 corrected in official notice in PDD version 2. point A.4.4, page 5.			
Date: 15/12/05 [Acceptance and close out] Closed			

Observations:

1) It is observed a good management of the communities with suitable staff in order to establish a work plan, all the registers of the meetings and the agreements are filed, also there are registers of the summons by radio and the films of the most important meetings. EEPPM issues magazines and brochures with the information of the work made in the zone which is distributed to the interested parts.

2) The machines of measurement are equipment approved and are calibrated in conformity with the requirements of the CREG, which is the national entity that regulates and controls the use of these equipments. The machine of measurement that is connected with the national net is being changed this month; this machine is better and issues the registers by satellite.

3) PDD states that monitoring and reporting team has been identified and in place. To be confirmed during verification.