

## CDM: FORM FOR SUBMISSION OF A "LETTER TO THE BOARD" (Version 01.2)

This form should be used only by project participants and other stakeholders for submitting a "Letter to the Board" in accordance with the latest version of the *Modalities and procedures for direct communication with stakeholders* 

Name of the stakeholder <sup>1</sup> submitting this form (individual/organization):	D. Satish			
	Ecofarm wind projects			
Address and contact details of the individual submitting this form:	Address: 18, Nadamuni St, pycrofts road Chennai india			
	Telephone number:			
	E-mail address: dsatish83chennai@gmail.com			
Title/Subject (give a short title or specify the subject of your submission)	Clarification on para 6 of Investment guidelines			
Please mention whether the submitter of the form is:	X Project participant			
	Other stakeholder, please specify			
Specify whether you want the letter to	To be treated as confidential			
be treated as confidential <sup>2</sup> :	X To be publicly available (UNFCCC CDM web site)			
Please choose any of the type(s) below <sup>3</sup> to describe the purpose of this submission.				
🗌 Type I:	Type I:			
X Request for clarification	on Revision of existing rules			
🗌 Standards. P	Please specify reference			
Procedures. Please specify reference				
X Guidance. Please specify reference Guidance for investment analysis				
Forms. Please specify reference				
Others. Please specify reference				
Type II: Request for Introduction of new rules				
Type III: Provision of information and suggestions on policy issues				
Please describe in detail the issue on whee exact reference source and version (if an	nich you request a response from the Board, including the oplicable).			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> DNAs and DOEs shall use the respective DNA/DOE forms for communication with the Board.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  As per the applicable modalities and procedures, the Board may make its response publicly available.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Latest CDM regulatory documents and information are available at: <u>http://cdm.unfccc.int/Reference/index.html</u> .

## >>

We have conceptualised a project with CDM benefits in 2006. The Board decision of the company has indicated that wind power would be required for its manufacturing units, to be set up during the course of time. The financials have been computed for a period of 20 years matching with the technical lifetime of the wind generators.

As there is no option rather than sale of electricity to the grid up to the time period that the manufacturing facility is ready to use the generated power, the implementation (start date of operation, from 2006) as per the Power Purchase agreements has indicated tariff rate of sale to grid (Rs. 2.70/kWh) for three years (up to 2008). As the manufacturing facility is operational thereon, the Wheeling agreements have been in place to wheel the generated energy to the manufacturing facility from 2009 onwards. The savings (Rs. 3.65/kWh) is accounted in the financial calculations for for a period of 13 years (from 2009 onwards) and the additionality has been proved. However the CDM consultant who is handling the project has advised us to apply the most conservative tariff rate of Rs. 3.65 / kWh for the entire lifetime of 20 years (starting from 2006 to 2025).

As per para 6, the investor is required to consider the options available and thereon determine the financial additionality. Thus we have estimated the additionality by accounting for the sale to grid tariff rate for the years up to which our manufacturing facility is established to wheel the energy. If we apply the conservative tariff rate, it is not logical or in agreement with para 6 of the investment guidelines.

The scenario is summarised below,

Options	1-3 years tariff rate	4-20 years tariff rate
Scenario as per Para 6 guidelines	Rs. 2.70/kWh	Rs. 3.65 / kWh
Scenario as	Rs. 3.65 / kWh	Rs. 3.65 / kWh
per CDM consultant		

We are also aware of the EBs concern of the increase of tariff rate after implementation of the project activity. However in this case we had no other option but to sell the electricity to the grid for first few years until our manufacturing facility was capable of utilising the generated power. Thus there was no increase of tariff as such due to revision of rates by the state agencies.

In this context, we wish to clarify from the EB the following,

- 1. Is it correct in interpreting the para 6 guidelines and applying two tariff rates for the financial assumptions.
- Does the financial analysis while recommending validation to the DoE need to prove additionality on the base case based on the most conservative rate of tariff or can the PDD specifically state that the base case is proved additional taking the two type tariff as per para 6.

Please provide any specific suggestions or further information which would address the issue raised in the previous section, including the exact reference source and version (if applicable).

>>

[replace this bracket with text, the field will expand automatically with size of text]

If necessary, list attached files containing relevant information (if any)	• [replace this bracket with text, the field will expand automatically with size of text]			
Section below to be filled in by UNFCCC secretariat				
Date when the form was received at UNFCCC secretariat		10 April 2012		
Reference number		2012-091-S		

- - - - -

## History of document

Version	Date	Nature of revision
01.2	08 February 2012	Editorial revision.
01.1	09 August 2011	Editorial revision.
01	04 August 2011	Initial publication date.
Document	Decision Class: Regulatory Document Type: Form Business Function: Governance	