



**CLEAN DEVELOPMENT MECHANISM
PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM (CDM-PDD)
Version 03 - in effect as of: 28 July 2006**

CONTENTS

- A. General description of project activity
- B. Application of a baseline and monitoring methodology.
- C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period
- D. Environmental impacts
- E. Stakeholders' comments

Annexes

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

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

Santa Terezinha – Tapejara Cogeneration Project. (Usina de Açúcar Santa Terezinha Ltda.)

Version: 8.

Date (DD/MM/YYYY): 24/01/2007.

A.2. Description of the project activity:

The primary objective of the Santa Terezinha – Tapejara Cogeneration Project is to supply Brazil's rising demand for energy due to economic growth and to improve the supply of electricity, while contributing to the environmental, social and economic sustainability by increasing renewable energy's share of total the Brazilian and the Latin America and the Caribbean region's electricity consumption. One fundamental goal of the project is the efficient use of resources, particularly indigenous resources, while minimizing impact on the environment.

Santa Terezinha – Tapejara Cogeneration Project consists on the installation of a modernized equipment using bagasse more efficiently to cogenerate electricity (Figure 1). Through this expansion, replacing old equipment, the sugar mill will generate power surplus for sale and, at the same time, carbon credits by reducing greenhouse gases emissions, contributing to the sustainable development. A more efficient cogeneration of this renewable fuel allows Usina Santa Terezinha – Tapejara mill to sell a surplus of electricity to the grid and creates a competitive advantage.

The cogeneration project will generate enough energy not only for powering the sugar mill (thus eliminating the consumption of energy from the grid for the expanding capacity of the facility), but also for delivering surplus energy to the national grid. This electricity given to the grid will displace energy that the government would have provided with a strong use of fossil fuels. This displacement of energy thus creates a reduction of greenhouse gases emissions. This project also creates social and economical benefits that constitute a real contribution to Brazil's sustainable development.

This renewable energy project is owned by Usina de Açúcar Santa Terezinha Ltda., a sugar cane based distillery originally founded in 1964. In the eighties, Santa Terezinha acquired COVAPI – Cooperativa Agrícola dos Produtores de Cana do Vale do Pirapó Ltda., in the municipal district of Paranacity, which started to operate with the name of Destilaria de Álcool São José S.A. and COTAL - Cooperativa Agrícola dos Produtores de Cana de Tapejara Ltda., which started to operate by the name of Destilaria Julina S.A. In 1994, Santa Terezinha also acquired COPICAR – Cooperativa Agroindustrial dos Produtores de Cana de Icaraíma Ltda., which starts operating as Usina de Álcool e Açúcar Ivaté S.A., located in the Municipal district of Ivaté, Northwest of Paraná. Today, Santa Terezinha Group has 4 production units in the cities: Ivaté, Maringá, Paranacity and Tapejara. During the last 2004/2005 crop season, Santa Terezinha Group (all units) processed about 6,404,370 tonnes of sugar cane, produced 127,407 m³ of alcohol and 688,160 tonnes of sugar.




Figure 1 - Flowchart of the electricity generation inside a Sugar and Alcohol Production
(Source: Codistil)

The Brazilian government has done efforts to reduce the country's dependency on fossil fuels. The law nº 10,438, enacted in April 2002, created the Proinfa - *Programa de Incentivo às Fontes Alternativas de Energia Elétrica* (Program of Incentives to Alternative Energy Sources). Among others, one of this initiative's goals is to increase the renewable energy sources share in the Brazilian electricity market, thus contributing to a greater environmental sustainability. In order to achieve such goals, the Brazilian government has designated the federal state-owned power utility Eletrobrás - *Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S/A* to act as the primary offtaker of electric energy generated by alternative energy facilities in Brazil, by entering into long-term PPAs (Power Purchase Agreements) with alternative energy producers, at a guaranteed price of at least 80% of the average energy supply tariff charged to ultimate consumers. Santa Terezinha - Tapejara applied for Proinfa and was elected.

The creation of Proinfa indicates that, without specific support, the renewable sources and the small projects would hardly be implemented otherwise. The Project can be seen as an example of a solution by the private sector to the Brazilian electricity crisis of 2001, contributing to the sustainable development of the country. Santa Terezinha Cogeneration Project thus comes to prove that with the commercialization of CERs, it is viable to develop a generation project in Brazil. This will have a positive effect for the country beyond the evident reductions in GHG.



The revenues obtained from the sale of the CERs will also help Usina de Açúcar Santa Terezinha Ltda., the owner of the project, to continue supporting the community. Usina Santa Terezinha have a strong social responsibility evidenced in numerous initiatives concentrated in three projects: *human capital* with programmes and training for its employees, *construction of popular houses* by supporting the construction of dwelling groups and *plan of the participation of the employees in the results of the company*. Santa Terezinha also contribute with sports sponsorship supporting several groups as Associação Maringaense de Basquete and Associação Maringaense de Tênis de Mesa, and provide their employees with medical attention, insurance and transportation. These revenues distribution and social efforts must be added to the environmental benefits when evaluating the contribution to sustainable development of this project activity. Besides the social benefits mentioned above, Usina Santa Terezinha are working on environmental projects, such as regular water quality assessment, erosion control, reposition of vegetal area with native species, preservation of ecologic reservoir areas, and participation in the *Plano Estratégico Sócio Ambiental* (Socioenvironmental Strategic Plan) of the State of Paraná..



Figure 2: Usina Santa Terezinha – Tapejara unit view

A.3. Project participants:

Detailed contact information on party(ies) and private/public entities involved in the project activity is listed in Annex 1.

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

**A.4. Technical description of the project activity:****A.4.1. Location of the project activity:**

Santa Terezinha is located in Tapejara, state of Paraná, south of Brazil.




Figure 3 – Political division of Brazil showing the state of Paraná and the city of Tapejara
(Source: www.citybrazil.com.br)

A.4.1.1. Host Party(ies):

Brazil

A.4.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.:

Paraná

A.4.1.3. City/Town/Community etc:

Tapejara

A.4.1.4. Detail of physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity (maximum one page):

Usina Santa Terezinha is located in Tapejara 20°43'00" South 52°52'10" West, northwest of Paraná state, at some 549 km from Curitiba, capital of the state, Brazil. Tapejara has 13,786 inhabitants and 591 km².

Paraná is located on south of Brazil and its economic is based on the agriculture (sugarcane, corn, soy, wheat, coffee, manioc), industry and vegetal extraction (wood and mate-herb). Paraná also has a huge hydroelectric potential especially due to the existence of the Iguaçu River, where there are several hydroelectric power plants and small hydro power plants (PCH – Pequenas Centrais Hidrelétricas).

**A.4.2. Category(ies) of project activity:**

Type: Energy and Power.

Sectoral Scope: 1 – Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources).

Category: Renewable electricity generation for a grid (energy generation, supply, transmission and distribution).

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

Biomass power conversion technologies for power production can be classified into one of the three following categories: direct combustion technologies, gasification technologies, and pyrolysis. Direct combustion technologies, such as the used in Usina Santa Terezinha, are probably the most widely known option for simultaneous power and heat generation from biomass. It involves the oxidation of biomass with excess air in a process that yields hot gases that are used to produce steam in boilers. The steam is used to produce electricity in a Rankine cycle turbine. Rankine cycle configurations could also be classified into two: condensing and backpressure, depending on the proportion of the steam used for industrial processes and where in the turbine that steam is obtained. Typically, electricity only is produced in a “condensing” steam cycle, while electricity and steam are co-generated in an “extracting” steam cycle.

Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project, a greenhouse gas (GHG) free power generation project, will result in GHG emissions reductions by displacing electricity generation from fossil-fuel thermal plants that would have otherwise dispatched to the grid.

Santa Terezinha - Tapejara utilizes bagasse as biomass. All this biomass is a by product in different agricultural processes. In the absence of the project, the bagasse would have been used for power generation for internal use (and with a lower efficiency).

For the estimation of emission reductions from electrical energy, a baseline emission factor is calculated as a combined margin of the operating and build margin emission factors. To determine these two factors, the project electricity system is defined by the spatial extent of the power plants that can be dispatched without significant transmission constraints. Similarly, the connected electricity system is defined as an electricity system that is connected by transmission lines to the project electricity system and in which power plants can be dispatched without significant transmission constraints.

The estimated emission reductions of CO₂ for the first crediting period are 306,907 tonnes.




Figure 4 - Rankine Cycle

The project replaces old equipment and will operate with a new configuration, using 1 boiler, 1 backpressure turbine, 1 condensing turbine, 1 generator. The old equipment will be deactivated. At full capacity, Usina Santa Terezinha - Tapejara is expected to generate yearly 142,697 MWh power surplus, operating at full capacity during the season. It will displace energy from the grid by both avoiding the consumption of power from the grid in the project and by delivering clean energy to the grid. Santa Terezinha – Tapejara has already signed a Power Purchase Agreement with national energy company Eletrobrás (*Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S/A*) for the purchase of the power delivered to the grid from June 2006.

Technical Description:

Baseline

Boilers

Boiler 1

Model SZ 180.

Pressure – 21 Kgf/cm²

Temperature -300 °C

Capacity – 60 Ton/h

Steam enthalpy – 721.23 Kcal/Kg steam

Efficiency – 80%

Year of installation– 1.981 (now in Stand By).

Boiler 2

Model SZ 120.

Pressure – 21 Kgf/cm²

Temperature -216 °C

Capacity – 30 Ton/h

Steam enthalpy – 721.23 Kcal/Kg steam

Efficiency – 80%

Project

Boiler

Brand:Monodroon

Modelo AMD 100 – 9GI.

Capacity: 300 ton/h

Pressure: 67 Kgf/cm²

Temperature:480°C

Steam enthalpy – 804.67 Kcal/Kg steam

Efficiency – 84%

Year of installation – 2006

Generators

Generator I:

Manufacturer: WEG

Power: 26.5 MW/ 13800 volts



Year of installation – 1.993 (now in Stand By).

Boiler 3

Model BMP 4600/6T.

Pressure – 21 Kgf/cm²

Temperature -300 °C

Capacity –120 Ton/h.

Steam enthalpy – 721.23 Kcal/Kg steam

Efficiency – 80%

Year of installation– 1.995 (now in Stand By).

Generators

Generator 2:

Manufacturer: MAUSA

Model: LD 4/1500

Power: 1.2 MW

Type: backpressure

Year of installation: 1981 (deactivated in 2003)

Generator 2:

Manufacturer: MAUSA

Model: LD 4/1500

Power: 1.2 MW

Type: backpressure

Year of installation: 1993 (deactivated in 2003)

Generator 3:

Manufacturer: WEG

Model: SPW 1000

Power: 16.5 MW

Type: backpressure

Year of installation: 2004 (deactivated in 2006)

Generator II:

Manufacturer: WEG

Power: 24 MW/ 13800 volts

Turbines

Turbine I

Type: Backpressure

Manufacturer: TGM

Power: 26.5 MW

Turbine II

Type: Condensing

Manufacturer: TGM

Power: 24 MW

A.4.4 Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period:

The chosen crediting period for this project is the renewable crediting period of 7 years. The estimated amount of emission reductions of the project can be seen at Table 1.

Years	Annual estimation of emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂
2007 (from March 1 st on)	41,546
2008	42,291



2009	43,175
2010	43,175
2011	43,175
2012	43,175
2013	43,175
2014 (until February 29)	7,196
Total Estimated Emissions Reductions	306,907
Total number of crediting years	7
Annual average over the crediting period of estimated reductions	43,844

Table 1 – Estimated emission reductions for the first crediting period

A.4.5. Public funding of the project activity:

There is no public funding involved on the Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project.

The Project is being financed by the Brazilian Development Bank, BNDES - *Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social*, which is a federal owned company subordinated to the Ministry of Development, Industry and Foreign Trade, MDIC - *Ministério do Desenvolvimento, Indústria e Comércio Exterior*. Despite of being a state-owned bank, BNDES is one of the unique sources of long-term financing in the country and is the preferable debt source for the private sector in Brazil.

This project does not receive any public funding and it is not a diversion of ODA.

SECTION B. Application of a baseline methodology**B.1 Title and reference of the approved baseline methodology applied to the project activity:**

ACM0006 – “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from biomass residues”, version 4, October 2006.

ACM0002 - “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”, Version 6, dated on 19/05/2006.

“Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”, Version 2, dated on 28/11/2005.

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

The ACM0006 methodology is applied to the Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project because this is an “Energy efficiency project”: this project replaces equipment in an existing sugar cane mill. It uses one type of biomass: bagasse, a byproduct of the production of sugar. The replacement increases the power generation capacity, while the thermal biomass firing capacity is maintained.



The project complies with all the conditions limiting the applicability of the methodology:

- (i) *No other biomass types than biomass residues are used in the project plant and these biomass residues are the predominant fuel used in the project plant. Biomass is defined as a by-product, residue or waste stream from agriculture, forestry and related industries.*

The primary fuel in the project plant is a biomass consisting of sugar cane bagasse. The bagasse used in the Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project comes from the production of sugar carried in the same facility where the project is located.

- (ii) *The implementation of the project shall not result in an increase of the processing capacity of raw input or other substantial changes in the process:*

Any increases in the bagasse production are due to Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project natural expanding business and could not be attributed to the implementation of the cogeneration project. The graph below shows that the production for the sugar mill has had an incrementing trend for years (see figure 5), long before the implementation of the project activity. This project does not have an impact in processing capacity; Santa Terezinha - Tapejara will not increase their installed capacity because of this project, but due to the recent and remarkable expansion of the sugar, and mainly, of the ethanol market in Brazil. The offer of ethanol in the Brazilian market is not supplying the rapid increasing demand caused by the use of flex-fuel cars, that can run on gasoline, ethanol or any blend of the two

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Sugar production (1,000 tonnes)	115	124	169	177

Figure 5 - Santa Terezinha - Tapejara's sugar production

Santa Terezinha - Tapejara will generate approximately 75.56 KWh per tonne of sugar cane processed. See Table 3 in Annex 3 for Santa Terezinha - Tapejara's electricity generation evolution.

- (iii) *The biomass used by the project facility should not be stored for more than one year:*

The sugar mills, generally, store a small amount of bagasse for the next season in order to start plant operations when the new crop season/ harvest begins. The bagasse is stored from the end of the harvest season in December in the Brazilian South region, until the beginning of the following harvest season, in March. The volume of bagasse stored between seasons is insignificant, less than 5% of the total amount of bagasse generated during the year or during the harvest period.

- (iv) *No significant energy quantities, except for transportation of the biomass, are required to prepare the biomass residues for fuel consumption:*

The biomass used in this project is not transformed in any way before being used as a fuel.

B.3. Description of the sources and gases included in the project boundary

Source	Gas		Justification/Explanation
--------	-----	--	---------------------------



Baseline	Grid electricity generation	CO ₂	Included	Main emission source
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative
	Heat generation	CO ₂	Included	Main emission source
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative
	Uncontrolled burning or decay of surplus biomass residues	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emissions from surplus biomass residues do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector
		CH ₄	Excluded	Project participants decided to not include this emission source, because case B4 of ACM0006 is not the most likely baseline scenario
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This is conservative. Note also that emissions from natural decay of biomass are not included in GHG inventories as anthropogenic sources
Project Activity	On-site fossil fuel consumption	CO ₂	Excluded	There are no emissions due to fossil fuel consumption
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small
	Off-site transportation of biomass residues	CO ₂	Excluded	Bagasse is produced inside the mills. No off-site transportation of bagasse is necessary
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emission source is assumed to be very small
	Combustion of biomass residues for electricity and / or heat generation	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emissions from surplus biomass do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector
		CH ₄	Excluded	This emission source is not included because CH ₄ emissions from uncontrolled burning or decay of biomass in the baseline scenario are not included
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emissions source is assumed to be very small
	Storage of biomass residues	CO ₂	Excluded	It is assumed that CO ₂ emissions from surplus biomass residues do not lead to changes of carbon pools in the LULUCF sector
		CH ₄	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. Since bagasse is stored for not longer than one year, this emission source is assumed to be small
		N ₂ O	Excluded	Excluded for simplification. This emissions source is assumed to be very small

B.4 Description of how the baseline scenario is identified and description of the identified baseline scenario:

Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project uses bagasse for the generation of heat and electricity. The project activity replaces less efficient equipment that used the biomass to generate electricity to the sugar mill. This corresponds to scenario #14, considering the replacement of equipment



for more efficient technology. The installed capacity of the plant changes, due to the increase in efficiency, using the same type and quantity of biomass as before.

The scenario of ACM0006 under which the project is analyzed was identified after the study of the alternatives for the different components of the project. The result of that analysis of components gave the following results: a) power generation: in the absence of the project, energy would have been generated partially in existing and new grid-connected power plants (alternative P4) and partially in the existing cogeneration plant using the same biomass until the end of the lifetime of the existing plant. The project activity would have been in that case not implemented as a CDM project activity at the end of the lifetime of the existing plant (alternative P5); b) biomass: in the absence of the project, the biomass would have been used for heat and electricity generation in the project site (alternative B4); c) Heat: in the absence of the project activity, heat would have been generated in boilers using the same type of biomass until the existing plant would have been replaced without the incentives of the CDM (alternative H5). The identified alternatives for the different components of the project activity correspond to scenario 14, an energy efficiency project, obtained by the replacement of the existing biomass power units by new highly efficient ones.

B.5. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the registered CDM project activity (assessment and demonstration of additionality):

In order to determine if the project activity is additional, the additionality tool approved by the Executive Board is applied¹. The following steps are applied:

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

Not applicable

Step 1. Identification of alternatives to the project activity consistent with the current laws and regulations

Sub-step 1a. Define alternatives to the project activity

To define the alternatives to the project activity, there are two-sided analysis, taking into consideration the perspective of the project owner and the perspective of the country.

From the project owner's perspective, the cogeneration project allows the company to export electricity to the grid. Without the project, the plant would continue to operate with low energy efficiency and could not export electricity to the grid.

From the country's perspective, the alternative for producing a similar amount of energy, as the one Santa Terezinha - Tapejara is to provide, would be to use current generation system, which is electricity supplied by large hydro and thermal power stations. Brazil is increasingly depending on thermal plants (mainly natural gas fired).

During a period of restructuring the entire electricity market, as is the current Brazilian situation, investment uncertainty is the main barrier for small renewable energy power projects. In this scenario, these projects compete with existing plants (operating margin) and with new projects (build margin), in which thermal plants usually attract the attention of financial investors.

¹ <http://cdm.unfccc.int/EB/Meetings/016/eb16repan1.pdf>

**Sub-step 1b. Enforcement with applicable laws and regulations**

The usage of electricity from the grid is in complete compliance with all applicable legal and regulatory requirements. The use of thermal electricity in the generation system is not only in compliance with regulations but also of increasing importance. The proposed project activity is not the only alternative in compliance with regulations.

SATISFIED/PASS – Proceed to Step 2

Step 2. Investment analysis

Not applicable.

Step 3. Barrier Analysis

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

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

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

- Building a competition friendly environment, with the gradual elimination of the captive consumer. The option to choose an electricity services supplier, which began in 1998 for the largest consumers, and should be available to the entire market in 2006;
- Dismantling of the state monopolies, separating and privatizing the activities of generation, transmission and distribution;
- Allowing free access to the transmission lines, and
- Placing the operation and planning responsibilities to the private sector.

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

At the end of 2000, after five years of privatization, the results were modest (Figure 6). Despite high expectations, investments in new generation did not follow the increase in consumption.




Figure 6 - Participation of private capital in the Brazilian electricity market in December 2000 (Source: BNDES, 2000).

The decoupling of GDP (average of 2% increase in the period of 1980 to 2000) from electricity consumption increase (average of 5% increase in the same period) is well known in developing countries, mainly due to the expansion of the supply services to new areas and the growing infra-structure. The necessary measures to prevent bottlenecks in services were taken. These include an increase of generation capacity higher than the GDP growth rate and strong investments in energy efficiency. In the Brazilian case, the increase in the installed generation capacity (average of 4% in the same period) did not follow the growth of consumption as can be seen in Figure 7.

Without new installed capacity, the only alternatives were energy efficiency improvements or higher capacity utilization (capacity factor). Regarding energy efficiency, the government established in 1985 PROCEL (the National Electricity Conservation Program). Although the results of the program were remarkable, the efficiency achievement was not big enough to cover the mentioned gap between the need of new generation capacity and consumption growth.




Figure 7 - Cumulated variation of GDP, electricity supply (installed capacity) and demand (consumption). Source: Eletrobrás, IBGE




Figure 8 - Evolution of the rate of generated energy to installed capacity (Source: Eletrobrás)

The remaining alternative, to increase the capacity factor of the old plants, was actually the most widely used, as can be seen in Figure 8.

To understand if such increase in capacity factor brought positive or negative consequences one needs to analyze the availability and price of fuel. In the Brazilian electricity model the primary energy source is the water accumulated in the reservoirs. Figure 9 shows what happened to the levels of “stored energy” in the reservoirs from January 1997 to January 2002. It can be seen that reservoirs which were planned to withstand 5 years of less-than-average rainy seasons, almost collapsed after a single season of low rainfall (2000/2001 experienced 74% of the historical average rain. This situation depicts a very intensive use of the country’s hydro resources to support the increase in demand without increase of installed capacity. Under the situation described there was still no long-term solution for the problems that finally caused shortage and rationing in 2001.




Figure 9 - Evolution of the water stored capacity for the Southeast/Midwest (SE-MW) and Northeast (NE) interconnected subsystems and intensity of precipitation in the rainy season (ENA) in the southeast region compared to the historic average (Source: ONS)

Aware of the difficulties since the end of the 1990's, the Brazilian government signalized that it was strategically important for the country to increase thermoelectric generation and consequently be less dependent of hydropower. With that in mind the federal government launched in the beginning of the year of 2000 the *Thermoelectric Priority Plan (PPT, "Plano Prioritário de Termelétricas"*, Federal Decree 3,371 of February 24th, 2000, and Ministry of Mines and Energy Directive 43 of February 25th, 2000), originally planning the construction of 47 thermo plants using Bolivian natural gas, totalizing 17,500 MW new installed capacity until December of 2003. During 2001 and the beginning of 2002 the plan was rearranged to 40 plants and 13,637 MW to be installed until December 2004 (Federal Law 10,438 of April 26th, 2002, Article 29). As of today, December 2004, 20 plants totalizing around 9,700 MW are operational.

During the rationing of 2001 the government also launched the *Emergency Energy Program* with the short-term goal of building 58 small to medium thermal power plants until the end of 2002 (using mainly diesel oil, 76,9 %, and residual fuel oil, 21.1 %), totalizing 2,150 MW power capacity (CGE-CBEE, 2002).

It is clear though that hydroelectricity is and will continue as the main source responsible for the electricity base load in Brazil. However, most if not all-hydro resources in the South and Southeast of the country have been exploited, and most of the remaining reserves are located in the Amazon basin, far from the industrial and population centers (OECD, 2001). Clearly, new additions to Brazil's electric power sector are shifting from hydroelectricity to natural gas plants (Schaeffer *et al.*, 2000).




Figure 10 – Historical Brazilian Natural Gas Consumption and Production (Source: EIA²)

With discoveries of vast reserves of natural gas in the Santos Basin in 2003 (Figure 11) the policy of using natural gas to generate electricity remains a possibility and it still will continue to have interest from private-sector investments in the Brazilian energy sector.




Figure 11 - National Historical Proved Reserves of Natural Gas (Source: Petrobrás)

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

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

² EIA – Energy Information Administration (www.eia.doe.gov)



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

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

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

Investment Barrier

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

As a consequence of the long period of inflation, the Brazilian currency experienced a strong devaluation, effectively precluding commercial banks from providing any long-term debt financing. The



lack of a long-term debt market has caused a severe negative impact on the financing of energy projects in Brazil.

Interest rates for local currency financing are significantly higher than for US Dollar financing. The National Development Bank – BNDES is the only supplier of long-term loans. Debt financing from BNDES are made primarily through commercial banks. The credit market is dominated by shorter maturities (90 days to 1 year) and long-term credit lines are available only to the strongest corporate borrowers and for special government initiatives. Credit is restricted to the short-term in Brazil or the long-term in dollars offshore.

Financial domestic markets with a maturity of greater than 1 year are practically non-existent in Brazil. Experience has shown that in moments of financial stress the duration of savings instruments have contracted to levels close to one day with a massive concentration in overnight banking deposits. Savers do not hold long-term financial contracts due to the inability to price-in the uncertainty involved in the preservation of purchasing power value (Arida *et al.*, 2005).

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




Figure 12 - SELIC rate (source: *Banco Central do Brasil*)

The most liquid government bond is the LFT (floating rate bonds based on the daily Central Bank reference rate). As of January 2004, 51.1% of the domestic federal debt was in LFTs and had duration of one day. This bond rate is almost the same as the CDI - Interbank Deposit Certificate rate that is influenced by the SELIC rate, defined by COPOM³.

The SELIC Rate has been oscillating since 1996 from a minimum of 15% p.a. in January 2001 to a maximum of 45% p.a. in March 1999. Figure 12 shows SELIC Rate after January, 2004.

The Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project was developed on a project finance basis. To finance construction, project sponsor (Usina de Açúcar Santa Terezinha Ltda.) took advantage of the financing lines of BNDES. This financial support covered 75% of the project costs with a rate of TJLP (BNDES Long Term Interest Rate – 10%) plus a 3.5% spread risk for a term of 8-year and 1-year grace period.

3 COPOM – Comitê de Política Monetária (Monetary Policy Committee).



This investment analysis takes a look at the factors relating to potential certified emission reductions (CERs) and the incentives derived from them in the project investment decision taking process. Thus, in taking the decision to undertake the project, the investment profitability studies considered the potential monetization of CO₂ credits that the project would produce.

The Project was set up with an expected financial IRR – Internal Rate of Return of the approximately 12.63% per year. The project's IRR is very similar to the SELIC rate in effect at the time of financing, although the project is a riskier investment as compared to Brazilian government bonds. The inclusion of the revenues from CERs makes the project's IRR increase from 12.63% to 15.41%. Such increase in return would partially compensate for the additional risk investor would take with this project.

In addition to the increase of 278 basis points, CERs revenues would bring the project additional benefits due to the fact that they are generated in hard currencies (dollar or euro). The CDM incentive allows Santa Terezinha - Tapejara to hedge its debt cash flow against currency devaluation. Moreover, the CER Free Cash Flow, in dollars or euro, could be discounted at an applicable discount interest rate, thus increasing the project leverage.

It is important to notice that the direct comparison between the SELIC rate and the IRR is not accurate and the idea is not to introduce a benchmark analysis, but to set a parameter as a reference. Given an energy project is a riskier investment than a government bond, it is necessary to have a much higher financial return, compared to the SELIC reference rate. Given the circumstances, rationale and distortions of the Brazilian economy, it is not straightforward to define the meaning of this difference of rates, and a developer might feel more comfortable than others, depending on the situation.

The high level of guarantees required to finance an energy project in Brazil is a barrier for developing new projects. Insurance, financial guarantees, financial advisories are requirements which increase the cost of the project and are barriers to project achievability.

Other financial barriers are related to the power purchase agreement (PPA). The PPA is required in order to obtain long-term financing from a bank and the lack of adequate commercial agreements from the energy buyers may influence directly the negotiation between the bank and the project developer. Most of the utilities in Brazil do not have a satisfactory credit risk thus representing a barrier to obtain long-term funding.

The law nº 10,438, enacted in April 2002, created the Proinfa - *Programa de Incentivo às Fontes Alternativas de Energia Elétrica* (Program of Incentives to Alternative Energy Sources). Among others, one of this initiative's goals is to increase the renewable energy sources share in the Brazilian electricity market, thus contributing to a greater environmental sustainability. In order to achieve such goals, the Brazilian government has designated the federal state-owned power utility Eletrobras - *Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S/A* to act as the primary offtaker of electric energy generated by alternative energy facilities in Brazil, by entering into long-term PPAs (Power Purchase Agreements) with alternative energy producers, at a guaranteed price of at least 80% of the average energy supply tariff charged to ultimate consumers. Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project applied for Proinfa and was elected.

The creation of Proinfa indicates that, without specific support, the renewable sources and the small projects would hardly be implemented otherwise. Santa Terezinha - Tapejara Cogeneration Project can be seen as an example of a solution by the private sector to the Brazilian electricity crisis of 2001, contributing to the sustainable development of the country.

The existence of Proinfa is a proof that a sound incentive is necessary to promote the construction of renewable energy projects in Brazil and there is room for CDM projects. Proinfa legislation proposed to increase the capacity of renewable energy power generation to about 3,300 MW by 2006, but from the 1,100 MW Proinfa reserved to biomass energy sources, only 685.24 MW have been contracted so far. According to a Brazilian energy magazine⁴, there are two main reasons for this: 1) the average IRR for the investment in the production of sugar cane/ethanol is 3% higher than the average IRR for the

⁴ Brasil Energia, n. 299, October, 2005. P.83



investment in cogeneration; 2) entrepreneurs have considered the tariff of R\$ 97.24/MWh (as of June 2004) not profitable. In 2005, BNDES presented the last final version of its financing incentive line to Proinfa, which is different from the one first considered for the program, that was considered insufficient. It means that for the last 5 years, the government had to present a new proposition (or incentive) per year, in order to convince the developers to invest in renewable energy projects.

In addition to all those barriers mentioned above, sugar mills do not have a strong incentive to invest in their own power plants. In general, the revenues of selling electricity in a cogeneration project do not represent more than 5% of the total revenues of a sugar mill. Thus, sugar mills tend to invest in their core business, sugar and ethanol, instead of investing in electricity generation for the grid.

The conclusion is that CDM incentives play an important role in overcoming financial barriers

Institutional Barrier

As described above, since 1995 government electricity market policies have been continuously changing in Brazil. Too many laws and regulations were created to try to organize and to provide incentives for new investments in the energy sector. The results of such regulatory instability were the contrary to what was trying to be achieved. During the rationing period, electricity prices surpassed R\$ 600/MWh (around USD 200/MWh) and the forecasted marginal price of the new energy reached levels of R\$ 120 – 150/MWh (around USD 40). In the middle of 2004, the average price was below R\$ 50/MWh (less than USD 20/MWh). This relatively high volatility of the electricity price in Brazil, although in the short term, contributes to difficult the analysis of the market by the developers.

Barriers due to prevailing practice

The history of the sugarcane industry has demonstrated that the industry is a traditional and stable business and has consistently helped to support the country's economy. It has historically enjoyed governmental support such as fixed prices and subsidies. Another characteristic of this sector is the specialization in commodity (sugar and ethanol) transactions. But there is a cultural barrier, which is a considerable obstacle: the generation of electricity to sell to the grid and the electricity negotiation in the energy market is something relatively new to this industry. That can be in part overcome with the Clean Development Mechanism.

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

As described above, the main alternative to the project activity is to continue the status quo, the sugarcane mills only concentrating their investments on sugar and ethanol. Therefore the barriers above would not affect the investment in other opportunities.

Step 4. Common Practice Analysis

Sub-step 4a. Analyze other activities similar to the proposed project:

Some sugar mills have optimized their power plants in order to export electricity; but numerous risks and barriers have prevented the implementation of the proposed project activity among the majority of the sugar mills. In the Brazilian South Region, less than 20% of the mills have developed expansion programs for their power plants (Anuário da Cana, Procana: 2003).

Sub-step 4b. Discuss any similar options that are occurring:

One of the points to be considered when analyzing a renewable energy project investment in Brazil is the possibility to participate in the Proinfa Federal Government Program, which is considered one of



the more viable financing alternatives for these projects and provides long-term PPAs and special financing conditions. This project activity is participating in the Program.

Both processes of negotiating a PPA with utility companies and obtaining funding from BNDES are always very cumbersome. BNDES also requires several guarantees in order to provide financing. Other risks and barriers are related to the operational and technical issues associated with small cogeneration projects, including their capability to comply with the PPA contract and the potential non-performance penalties. Moreover, traditional sugar producers would prefer concentrating investments on their traditional business (sugar and ethanol) than venturing in new projects with new risks and low returns (see Investment Barrier) where they have little or no know-how.

Regardless of the risks and barriers mentioned above, the main reason for the reduced number of similar project activities is the economic cost. Project feasibility requires a PPA contract with a utility company, but the utilities do not have the incentives or motivation to buy electricity generated by small cogeneration projects.

Most of the developers which funded their projects outside Proinfa have taken CDM as decisive factor for completing their projects.

Therefore, to the best of our knowledge the vast majority of similar projects being developed in the country are participating in the Proinfa Program and not in the CDM. Nevertheless, there is no official restraint for projects derived from public policies to participate in the CDM.

The power sector suffered with more than one year (2003-2004) without regulation, and even today the legislation is not clear yet for all the investors and players. The prevailing business practice in Brazil, as far as obtaining financing and financial guarantees to the projects, is a barrier to investment in renewable energy projects. The access of long-term funding for renewable energy projects is difficult, mainly because of the guarantees needed and the lack of a real project finance structure. The high cost of capital in Brazil is a barrier for projects to be developed.

Because of reasons mentioned above, less than 20% of the sugar mills in the Brazilian South region have developed similar activities to that of Santa Terezinha - Tapejara, as mentioned above. Some of the new projects have taken into consideration CDM in their decision to expand their cogeneration plant.

Step 5. Impact of CDM Registration

The sugarcane plantation is part of the country's colonization period. The commercialization of sugarcane has become part of the Brazilian culture was introduced during the 16th century when the Portuguese colonized the country. Brazil became the first producer and exporter of sugar in the world. Since then, sugarcane has been an important part of the Brazilian agricultural industry.

Currently in Brazil there are more than 5 million hectares of land producing sugarcane and there are more than 320 sugar mills producing sugar, ethanol and electricity to supply their own energy consumption. Consequently the potential to generate electricity for commercialization (exporting to the grid), is estimated at around 6-8 GW in the short term and 15-22 GW in the long term. In 2003, only 619 MW were generated for commercialization⁵. This potential has always existed and has grown as the sugarcane industry has grown. However, the investments to expand the sugar mills' power plants have only occurred since 2000. Although a flexible legislation allowing independent energy producers has existed since 1995, it was only after 2000 that sugar producers started to study this proposed project activity as an investment alternative for their power plants in conjunction with the introduction of the CDM.

The CDM has made it possible for mills to set up their cogeneration plants and export excess electricity to the grid by helping to overcome financial barriers through the financial benefits obtained from CDM revenues. Additionally, CDM has helped to overcome institutional and cultural barriers since

⁵ <http://www.portalunica.com.br> (Union of the Sugar Industry in São Paulo)



the CDM has made the project sponsors take more seriously into consideration the generation of renewable electricity.

Therefore, the registration of the proposed project activity will have a strong impact in paving the way for similar projects to be implemented in Brazil, which may bring about among other things development in technologies.

This kind of activity will be encouraged once this project activity gets registered.

B.6. Emission reductions:

B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices:

ACM0006 - “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from biomass residues”, version 4, October 2006, was chosen.

The chosen methodology is applicable to biomass-based cogeneration projects connected to the grid. The methodology considers emission reductions generated from cogeneration projects using sugarcane bagasse. This fits perfectly the operation at Santa Terezinha Cogeneration project, so the choice of methodology is justified.

The identified alternatives for the different components of the project activity correspond to scenario 14, an energy efficiency project, obtained by the replacement of the existing biomass power units by new highly efficient ones.

Scenario 14 is valid because the old and less efficient equipment is replaced by new and more efficient one. This change would have occurred without the incentives of the CDM at the end of the lifetime of the old equipment. For Santa Terezinha Cogeneration Project, it was conservatively estimated that the replaced equipment, at the time of the replacement, still had over 25 years of life. This corresponds to typical average technical lifetime of this type of equipment in this industry in Brazil. According to the manufacturers, this kind of equipment has a technical lifetime of 30 years, and common practice in Brazil shows that sugar mill equipment can be used, with good maintenance, for over 50 years. Oldest boiler was installed in 1981. The oldest turbo was installed in 1981. All the three baseline boilers will continue to be used as stand-by.

Emission reductions from heat are not considered because the heat efficiency of the new plant is larger than the heat efficiency of the pre-project equipment and for conservativeness reasons, they are excluded, i.e., $ER_{heat,y} = 0$.

The thermal efficiency of the project plant is larger than the thermal efficiency of the old plant, as shown in the table below. Data is related to the combustion of the same amount of biomass, 75 tonnes of bagasse, for both situations: before and after the project implementation.

	Before	After
Steam Production	180 ton/hour	300 ton/hour
Steam Pressure	21 Kgf/cm ²	65 Kgf/cm ²
Steam Enthalpy	730.1 Kcal/Kg steam	804.7 Kcal/Kg steam

Biomass decay was non-existent, nor have biomass been burned in an uncontrolled manner, as biomass was used in the past to generate electricity for internal use. For scenario #14, $BE_{biomass,y} = 0$.

B.6.2. Data and parameters that are available at validation:



Data / Parameter:	EF_{grid,y}
Data unit:	tCO ₂ /MWh
Description:	CO ₂ emission factor for grid electricity during the year y
Source of data used:	The latest approved version of ACM0002 to calculate the grid emission factor: version 6, May 19, 2006.
Measurements procedures (if any):	
Monitoring frequency:	At the start of the project activity
	<p>According to ACM0002, version 6, May 19, 2006, baseline emission factor (EF_y) is calculated as a combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) factors. The calculation of the operating margin emission factor(s) must be based on one of the following methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Simple operating margin ○ Simple adjusted operating margin ○ Dispatch data analysis operating margin ○ Average operating margin. <p>Dispatch data analysis operating margin should be the first methodological choice. Since not enough data was supplied by the Brazilian national dispatch center, the choice is not currently available. The simple operating margin can only be used where low-cost/must-run resources⁶ constitute less than 50% of total grid generation in: 1) average of 5 most recent years, or 2) based on long-term normals for hydroelectricity production. The share of hydroelectricity in the total electricity production for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected system is much higher than 50%, resulting in the non-applicability of the simple operating margin to the project. The fourth alternative, an average operating margin, is an oversimplification and does not reflect at all the impact of the project activity in the operating margin. Therefore, the simple adjusted operating margin will be used in the project. See more details in Annex 3.</p>
Any comment:	

Data / Parameter:	$\eta_{el, pre project}$
Data unit:	MWh _{el} / MWh _{biomass}
Description:	Average net efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant prior to project implementation.
Source of data:	On-site measurements conducted prior to the implementation of the project activity.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Measure the quantity of fuels fired and the electricity generation during a representative time period and divide the quantity of electricity generated by the energy quantity of the fuels fired. The three most recent historical years should preferably be used to determine the average efficiency, where such data is available and where this time period is reasonably representative.
Any comment:	Applicable to scenario 14

⁶ Low operating cost and must run resources typically include hydro, geothermal, wind, low-cost biomass, nuclear and solar generation (AM0015, 2004).



Data / Parameter:	$\epsilon_{th,pre}$ project
Data unit:	MWh _{th} / MWh _{biomass}
Description:	Average net efficiency of heat generation in the project plant prior to project implementation
Source of data:	On-site measurements, to be conducted prior to the implementation of the project activity.
Measurement procedures (if any):	Measure the quantity of fuels fired and the heat generation during a representative time period and divide the quantity of heat generated by the energy quantity of the fuels fired. The three most recent historical years should preferably be used to determine the average efficiency, where such data is available and where this time period is reasonably representative..
Any comment:	Applicable to scenario 14

B.6.3 Ex-ante calculation of emission reductions:

$$ER_y = BE_{thermal,y} + BE_{electricity,y} - PE_y - L_y \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

Where:

ER_y are the emission reductions of the project activity during year y

$BE_{electricity,y}$ are the baseline emissions due to displacement of electricity in year y

$BE_{thermal,y}$ are the baseline emissions due to displacement of thermal energy in year y

PE_y are project emissions in year y (zero for this project activity)

L_y are the leakage emissions in year y (zero for this project activity)

Estimate of project emissions:

Project emissions include CO₂ emissions from transportation of biomass residues to the project site (PE_{Ty}) and CO₂ emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels due to the project activity ($PEFF_y$), CO₂ emissions from consumption of electricity ($PE_{EC,y}$) and, where this emission source is included in the project boundary and relevant, CH₄ emissions from the combustion of biomass residues ($PE_{Biomass,CH4,y}$):

$$PE_y = PET_y + PEFF_y + PE_{EC,y} + GWP_{CH4} \cdot PE_{Biomass,CH4,y}$$

PET_y = CO₂ emissions during the year y due to transport of the biomass residues to the project plant (tCO₂/yr)

$PEFF_y$ = CO₂ emissions during the year y due to fossil fuels co-fired by the generation facility or other fossil fuel consumption at the project site that is attributable to the project activity (tCO₂/yr)

$PE_{EC,y}$ = CO₂ emissions during the year y due to electricity consumption at the project site that is attributable to the project activity (tCO₂/yr)

GWP_{CH4} = Global Warming Potential for methane valid for the relevant commitment period

$PE_{Biomass,CH4,y}$ = CH₄ emissions from the combustion of biomass residues during the year y (tCH₄/yr)

Based on the renewable source of technology, the project emissions are nil. There are no CO₂ emissions from on-site fuel consumption of fossil fuels, because the power plant has been using, before



and after the project activity, only bagasse as fuel. Therefore, no calculation of estimate of GHG emissions is necessary.

$$PE_y = 0$$

Estimated leakage emissions:

The main emissions giving rise due to leakage in the context of electric sector projects are emissions arising due to activities such as power plant construction, fuel handling (extraction, processing and transport). Project participants do not need to consider these emission sources as leakage in applying this methodology. So, leakage was considered nil, because all the biomass combusted in the project plant is produced on-site. There is no need to purchase biomass off-site and no diversion of biomass from other uses to the project plant as a result of the project activity. Therefore:

$$L_y = 0$$

Estimated baseline emissions:

The amount of electricity to be considered for the displacement of power from the grid is calculated using the equation below. This equation corresponds to the chosen scenario #14 of the ACM0006 methodology:

$$EG_y = EG_{project plant, y} * \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{el, pre project}}{\varepsilon_{el, project plant, y}} \right) \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

EG_y is determined based on the average net efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant prior to project implementation, $\varepsilon_{el, pre project}$, and the average net efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant after project implementation, $\varepsilon_{el, project plant, y}$, shown in Equation 8, where:

EG_y is the net quantity of increased electricity generation as a result of the project activity (incremental to baseline generation) during the year y in MWh,

$EG_{project plant, y}$ is the net quantity of electricity generated in the project plant during the year y in MWh,

$\varepsilon_{el, pre project}$ is the average net efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant prior to project implementation, expressed in MWh_{el}/MWh_{biomass}.

$\varepsilon_{el, project plant, y}$ is average net energy efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant, expressed in MWh_{el}/MWh_{biomass}.

The average net energy efficiency of heat electricity in the project plant ($\varepsilon_{el, project plant, y}$) should be calculated by dividing the electricity generation during the year y by the sum of all fuels (biomass residue types k and fossil fuel types i), expressed in energy units, as follows:



$$\varepsilon_{el, project plant, y} = \frac{EG_{project plant, y}}{\sum_k NCV_k \cdot BF_{k, y} + \sum_i NCV_i \cdot FF_{project plant, i, y}}$$

where:

$\varepsilon_{el, project plant, y}$ = Average net energy efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant

$EG_{project plant, y}$ = Net quantity of electricity generated in the project plant during the year y (MWh)

$BF_{k, y}$ = Quantity of biomass residue type k combusted in the project plant during the year y (tons of dry matter or liter)

NCV_k = Net calorific value of the biomass residue type k (GJ/ton of dry matter or GJ/liter)

NCV_i = Net calorific value of fossil fuel type i (GJ / mass or volume unit)

$FF_{project plant, i, y}$ = Quantity of fossil fuel type i combusted in the biomass residue fired power plant during the year y (mass or volume unit per year)

For this project, as seen above, $PE_y=0$, $L_y=0$. And, as seen in section B.2, $BE_{thermal, y}=0$ and $BE_{biomass, y}=0$.

We conclude that $ER_y = BE_{electricity, y} = 0.2611 \times EG_y$.

See calculation of EG_y in the annexed spreadsheet “Santa Terezinha_calculation_CERs_scenario 14_2006.12.13.xls”.

B.6.4 Summary of the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions:

The full implementation of the Santa Terezinha - Tapejara project connected to the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest electricity interconnected grid will avoid an average estimated yearly emission of around 43,844 tCO₂e, and a total reduction of about 306,907 tCO₂e over the first 7 years crediting period (up to and including 2014, see Table 2):

Years	Estimation of project activity emissions reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of baseline emissions reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of leakage (tonnes of CO ₂ e)	Estimation of emissions reductions (tonnes of CO ₂ e)
Year 1 (2007) (from March 1st on)	0	41,546	0	41,546
Year 2 (2008)	0	42,291	0	42,291
Year 3 (2009)	0	43,175	0	43,175
Year 4 (2010)	0	43,175	0	43,175
Year 5 (2011)	0	43,175	0	43,175
Year 6 (2012)	0	43,175	0	43,175
Year 7 (2013)	0	43,175	0	43,175
Year 8 (2014) (until Feb 28)	0	7,196	0	7,196
Total (tonnes of CO₂e)		306,907		306,907



Table 2 - Estimation of emission reductions

B.7 Application of the monitoring methodology and description of the monitoring plan:	
B.7.1 Data and parameters monitored:	
Data / Parameter:	EG_{project plant,y}
Data unit:	MWh/year
Description:	Net quantity of electricity generated in the project plant during the year y
Source of data:	On-site measurements
Measurement procedures (if any):	
Monitoring frequency:	Continuously
QA/QC procedures to be applied:	The consistency of metered net electricity generation should be cross-checked with receipts from electricity sales (if available) and the quantity of fuels fired (e.g. check whether the electricity generation divided by the quantity of fuels fired results in a reasonable efficiency that is comparable to previous years).
Any comment:	
Data / Parameter:	$\eta_{el,project plant,y}$
Data unit:	MWh _{el} / MWh _{biomass}
Description:	Average net efficiency of electricity generation in the project plant
Source of data:	On-site measurements
Measurement procedures (if any):	Measure the quantity of fuels fired and the electricity generation during a representative time period and divide the quantity of electricity generated by the energy quantity of the fuels fired.
Any comment:	Calculation done according to section B.6.3
Data / Parameter:	BF_{Bagasse,y}
Data unit:	Metric tonnes
Description:	Quantity of bagasse combusted in the project plant during the year y
Source of data:	On-site measurements
Measurement procedures (if any):	Use weight or volume meters. Adjust for the moisture content in order to determine the quantity of dry biomass. The quantity shall be crosschecked with the quantity of electricity (and heat) generated and any fuel purchase receipts (if available).
Monitoring frequency:	Continuously, with an annual energy balance.
QA/QC procedures:	Crosscheck the measurements with an annual energy balance that is based on purchased quantities and stock changes
Any comment:	
Data / Parameter:	NCV_{bagasse}
Data unit:	MWh/tonnes
Description:	Net calorific value of bagasse
Source of data:	Either conduct measurements or use accurate and reliable local or national data where available



Measurement procedures (if any):	Measurements shall be carried out at reputed laboratories and according to relevant international standards.
Monitoring frequency:	In case of measurements: At least every six months, taking at least three samples for each measurement. In case of other data sources: Review the appropriateness of the data annually.
QA/QC procedures:	Check consistency of measurements and local / national data with default values by the IPCC. If the values differ significantly from IPCC default values, possibly collect additional information or conduct measurements.
Any comment:	

B.7.2 Description of the monitoring plan:

Data that has to be monitored during the life of the contract are the net quantity of electricity generated at the project plant ($EG_{\text{project plant},y}$) and the quantity of bagasse (and its NCV). The project owner will continuously measure these values.

As per the procedures set by the Approved monitoring methodology ACM0006 - Monitoring methodology for emissions reductions from grid connected bagasse cogeneration projects.

The project sponsor will proceed with the necessary measures for the power control and monitoring. Together with the information produced by ANEEL and ONS, it will be possible to monitor the power generation of the project and the grid power mix.

The measurement of the energy generated to the grid will be done by two three-phase four wire electronic redundant meters which will send data to COPEL's (*Companhia Paranaense de Energia*) grid through a gateway. They will be installed in a metallic panel inside COPEL's control room.

The calibration of the instruments will be done according to the regulations of ANEEL, *Procedimentos de Distribuição de Energia Elétrica no Sistema Elétrico Nacional – PRODIST – Módulo 5 – Sistemas de Medição*, document PND1A-DE8-0550, of October 20, 2005 (<http://www.aneel.gov.br>).

The methodology considers monitoring emissions reductions generated from cogeneration projects using sugarcane bagasse. The monitoring plan, for emissions reductions occurring within the project boundary, is based on monitoring the amount of electricity supplied to the grid. The electricity baseline emission factor is determined ex-ante and will only be updated at renewal of the crediting period.

SantaTerezinha- Tapejara is responsible for the project management, monitoring and reporting as well as for organising and training of the staff in the appropriate monitoring, measurement and reporting techniques. The person in charge for the project monitoring and reporting is Antonio Sperandio, Industrial manager. Staff will also be trained on the operation of boilers and electric generators.

General maintenance and maintenance of monitoring equipment and installations will be done yearly, according to the internal procedures of Santa Terezinha - Tapejara and the manufacturers' recommendations. The established procedures reflect good monitoring and reporting practices.

Santa Terezinha – Tapejara will monitor the emission of SO_x, NO_x and CO, following the SEMA 041/2002 regulation, and the production of solid residues at the combustion of bagasse in the boilers, as well as the production of liquid residues.

B.8 Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology and

**the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)**

The baseline and monitoring studies were conducted according to approved methodology ACM0006 – “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from biomass residues”, version 4, October 2006. They were completed on January, 15th, 2007 by Ricardo Besen of Ecoinvest Carbon Brasil Ltda.

Ecoinvest Carbon Brasil Ltda.
Rua Padre João Manoel, 222
São Paulo, 01411-000
Brazil

Tel: +55 (11) 3063-9068
Fax: +55 (11) 3063-9069
E-mail: rbesen@ecoinvestcarbon.com

SECTION C. Duration of the project activity / Crediting period**C.1 Duration of the project activity:****C.1.1. Starting date of the project activity:**

(DD/MM/YYYY): 31/05/2006.

C.1.2. Expected operational lifetime of the project activity:

25y-0m

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

01/03/2007

C.2.1.2. Length of the first crediting period:



7y-0m

C.2.2. Fixed crediting period:**C.2.2.1. Starting date:**

This section is left blank on purpose.

C.2.2.2. Length:

This section is left blank on purpose.

SECTION D. Environmental impacts**D.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, including transboundary impacts:**

The plant possesses preliminary and construction licenses. The licenses were issued by the Paraná Environmental Agency, *IAP – Instituto Ambiental do Paraná*, and are available for consultation under request, as well as the environmental studies.

In the processes, reports containing investigation of the following aspects were prepared:

- Impacts to climate and air quality.
- Geological and soil impacts.
- Hydrological impacts (surface and groundwater).
- Impacts to the flora and animal life.
- Socioeconomic (necessary infrastructure, legal and institutional, etc.).

In Brazil, the sponsor of a project that involves construction, installation, expansion or operation, even with no new significant environmental impact, must obtain new licenses. The licenses required by the Brazilian environmental regulation are (Resolution n. 237/97):

- The preliminary license (“*Licença Prévia*” or L.P.),
- The construction license (“*Licença de Instalação*” or L.I.); and
- The operating license (“*Licença de Operação*” or L.O.).

Santa Terezinha - Tapejara has the authorization issued by ANEEL to operate as an independent power producer and has the energy reference approval to participate on PROINFA Program (*ANEEL Resolution 065 of May 25th, 2004*). Moreover, the power plant has the licenses emitted by *IAP – Instituto Ambiental do Paraná*, the environmental agency of the state of Paraná (*Operating License - n° 6353/2004 dated of 16/12/2004 and valid until 16/12/2006*).



A water-impounding permit was required from Superintendência de Desenvolvimento de Recursos Hídricos e Saneamento Ambiental on October 13th, 2005

Santa Terezinha – Tapejara cogeneration project has signed a power purchase agreement that is also contingent to the compliance of all environmental regulations.

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

After the assessment of the preliminary environmental report by the state environmental authority some minor requirements were made in order to issue the licenses. The project sponsors are fulfilling all the requirements, thus, the environmental impact of the project activity is not considered significant and no full environmental impact assessment, such as EIA/RIMA, was required.

SECTION E. Stakeholders' comments

E.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled:

Public discussion with local stakeholders is compulsory for obtaining the environmental construction and operating licenses, and once the project already received the licenses, the project has consequently gone through a stakeholder comments process. The legislation also requests the announcement of the issuance of the licenses (LP, LI and LO) in the official journal (*Diário Oficial da União*) and in the regional newspaper to make the process public and allow public information and opinion.

Additionally, the Brazilian Designated National Authority for the CDM, *Comissão Interministerial de Mudanças Globais do Clima*, requires the compulsory invitation of selected stakeholders to comment the PDD sent to validation in order to provide the letter of approval.

The organizations and entities invited for comments on the project were:

- Prefeitura Municipal de Tapejara
- Câmara Municipal de Tapejara
- IAP – Instituto Ambiental do Paraná
- Ministério Público do Paraná
- Secretaria do Meio Ambiente de Tapejara
- Associação dos Funcionários da Usina Santa Terezinha



- FBOMS – Fórum Brasileiro de ONGs e Movimentos Sociais para o Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente

No concerns were raised in the public calls regarding the project.

E.2. Summary of the comments received:

No major issues were commented and all of the comments from the stakeholders were incorporated into the final design of the system and its operation.

E.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received:

All comments received from stakeholders during the process for obtaining the Environmental License and Operational Permit were incorporated into the project. Usina Santa Terezinha obtained Construction License following the requests made by IAP – Instituto Ambiental do Paraná, the environmental agency, and signed a PPA with Eletrobras - Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S/A, thus providing enough evidence that that due account of stakeholders comment was taken.

Annex 1CONTACT INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROJECT ACTIVITY

Organization:	Usina de Açúcar Santa Terezinha Ltda.
Street/P.O.Box:	Estrada Água da Areia – Km 1,5
Building:	
City:	Tapejara
State/Region:	PR
Postcode/ZIP:	87430-000
Country:	Brazil
Telephone:	55 (44) 3218 1900
FAX:	55 (44) 3218 1957
E-Mail:	
URL:	www.usacucar.com.br
Represented by:	
Title:	
Salutation:	Mr.
Last Name:	Torres
Middle Name:	
First Name:	Genaildo
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	
Direct tel:	
Personal E-Mail:	genaildo@usacucar.com.br

Organization:	Ecoinvest Carbon Brasil Ltda.
Street/P.O.Box:	Rua Padre João Manoel 222
Building:	
City:	São Paulo
State/Region:	São Paulo
Postfix/ZIP:	01411-000
Country:	Brazil
Telephone:	+55 (11) 3063-9068
FAX:	+55 (11) 3063-9069
E-Mail:	
URL:	
Represented by:	
Title:	Director
Salutation:	Mr.
Last Name:	Martins Jr.
Middle Name:	de Mathias
First Name:	Carlos
Department:	
Mobile:	
Direct FAX:	



Direct tel:	
Personal E-Mail:	cmm@ecoinvestcarbon.com



Annex 2 – Information regarding public Funding

No public funding is involved in the present project.

This project is not a diverted ODA from an Annex 1 country.

**Annex 3 – Baseline Information**

Years	Total installed capacity (MW)	Capacity factor of boilers	Electric generation (MW)	Installed Capacity (MW) to internal use	Installed Capacity (MW) to export to the grid	Capacity Factor %	Hours of operation during the year	MWh year exported to the grid
Year 1_2007	50.5	74%	37.3	9.3	28	83%	6,144	142,697
Year 2_2008	50.5	77%	38.5	10.5	28	83%	6,144	142,697
Year 3_2009	50.5	80%	40.3	12.3	28	83%	6,144	142,697
Year 4_2010	50.5	80%	40.3	12.3	28	83%	6,144	142,697
Year 5_2011	50.5	80%	40.3	12.3	28	83%	6,144	142,697
Year 6_2012	50.5	80%	40.3	12.3	28	83%	6,144	142,697
Year 7_2013	50.5	80%	40.3	12.3	28	83%	6,144	142,697

Table 3 – Santa Terezinha - Tapejara – Electricity generation evolution

The Brazilian electricity system (figure below) has been historically divided into two subsystems: the North-Northeast (N-NE) and the South-Southeast-Midwest (S-SE-CO, From the Portuguese *Sul-SudEste-Centro-Oeste*). This is due mainly to the historical evolution of the physical system, which was naturally developed nearby the biggest consuming centers of the country.

The natural evolution of both systems is increasingly showing that integration is to happen in the future. In 1998, the Brazilian government was announcing the first leg of the interconnection line between S-SE-CO and N-NE. With investments of around US\$ 700 million, the connection had the main purpose, in the government's view, at least, to help solve energy imbalances in the country: the S-SE-CO region could supply the N-NE in case it was necessary and vice-versa.

Nevertheless, even after the interconnection had been established, technical papers still divided the Brazilian system in two (Bosi, 2000):

“... where the Brazilian Electricity System is divided into three separate subsystems:

- i) The South/Southeast/Midwest Interconnected System;
- ii) The North/Northeast Interconnected System; and
- iii) The Isolated Systems (which represent 300 locations that are electrically isolated from the interconnected systems)”

Moreover, Bosi (2000) gives a strong argumentation in favor of having so-called *multi-project baselines*:

“For large countries with different circumstances within their borders and different power grids based in these different regions, multi-project baselines in the electricity sector may need to be disaggregated below the country-level in order to provide a credible representation of ‘what would have happened otherwise.’”

Sistema de Transmissão 2001-2003




Figure 13 - Brazilian Interconnected System (Source: ONS)

Finally, one has to take into account that even though the systems today are connected, the energy flow between N-NE and S-SE-CO is heavily limited by the transmission lines capacity. Therefore, only a fraction of the total energy generated in both subsystems is sent one way or another. It is natural that this fraction may change its direction and magnitude (up to the transmission line's capacity) depending on the hydrological patterns, climate and other uncontrolled factors. But it is not supposed to represent a significant amount of each subsystem's electricity demand. It has also to be considered that only in 2004 the interconnection between SE and NE was concluded, i.e., if project proponents are to be coherent with the generation database they have available as of the time of the PDD submission for validation, a situation where the electricity flow between the subsystems was even more restricted is to be considered.

The Brazilian electricity system nowadays comprises of around 91.3 GW of installed capacity, in a total of 1,420 electricity generation enterprises. From those, nearly 70% are hydropower plants, around 10% are natural gas-fired power plants, 5.3% are diesel and fuel oil plants, 3.1% are biomass sources (sugarcane bagasse, black liquor, wood, rice straw and biogas), 2% are nuclear plants, 1.4% are coal plants, and there are also 8.1 GW of installed capacity in neighboring countries (Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela and Paraguay) that may dispatch electricity to the Brazilian grid. (<http://www.aneel.gov.br/aplicacoes/capacidadebrasil/OperacaoCapacidadeBrasil.asp>). This latter capacity is in fact comprised by mainly 6.3 GW of the Paraguayan part of *Itaipu Binacional*, a hydropower plant operated by both Brazil and Paraguay, but whose energy almost entirely is sent to the Brazilian grid.

Approved methodologies ACM0002 asks project proponents to account for "all generating sources serving the system". In that way, when applying the methodology, project proponents in Brazil should search for, and research, all power plants serving the Brazilian system.



In fact, information on such generating sources is not publicly available in Brazil. The national dispatch center, ONS – *Operador Nacional do Sistema* – argues that dispatching information is strategic to the power agents and therefore cannot be made available. On the other hand, ANEEL, the electricity agency, provides information on power capacity and other legal matters on the electricity sector, but no dispatch information can be got through this entity.

In that regard, project proponents looked for a plausible solution in order to be able to calculate the emission factor in Brazil in the most accurate way. Since real dispatch data is necessary after all, the ONS was contacted, in order to let participants know until which degree of detail information could be provided. After several months of talks, plants' daily dispatch information was made available for years 2002, 2003 and 2004.

Project proponents, discussing the feasibility of using such data, concluded it was the most proper information to be considered when determining the emission factor for the Brazilian grid. According to ANEEL, in fact, ONS centralized dispatched plants accounted for 75,547 MW of installed capacity by 31/12/2004, out of the total 98,848.5 MW installed in Brazil by the same date ([http://www.aneel.gov.br/arquivos/PDF/Resumo Gráficos mai 2005.pdf](http://www.aneel.gov.br/arquivos/PDF/Resumo_Gr%C3%A1ficos_mai_2005.pdf)), which includes capacity available in neighboring countries to export to Brazil and emergency plants, that are dispatched only during times of electricity constraints in the system. Therefore, even though the emission factor calculation is carried out without considering all generating sources serving the system, about 76.4% of the installed capacity serving Brazil is taken into account, which is a fair amount if one looks at the difficulty in getting dispatch information in Brazil. Moreover, the remaining 23.6% are plants that do not have their dispatch coordinated by ONS, since: either they operate based on power purchase agreements which are not under control of the dispatch authority; or they are located in non-interconnected systems to which ONS has no access. In that way, this portion is not likely to be affected by the CDM projects, and this is another reason for not taking them into account when determining the emission factor.

In an attempt to include all generating sources, project developers considered the option to research for available, but non-official data, to supply the existing gap. The solution found was the International Energy Agency database built when carrying out the study from Bosi *et al.* (2002). Merging ONS data with the IEA data in a spreadsheet, project proponents have been able to consider all generating sources connected to the relevant grids in order to determine the emission factor. The emission factor calculated was found more conservative when considering ONS data only (Table 4).

Year	<i>EF_{OM non-low-cost/must-run}</i> [tCO ₂ /MWh]		<i>EF_{BM}</i> [tCO ₂ /MWh]	
	Ex-ante	Ex-post	Ex-ante	Ex-post
2001-2003	0.719	0.950	0.569	0.096

**Table 4 – Ex ante and ex-post operating and build margin emission factors
(ONS-ADO, 2004; Bosi *et al.*, 2002)**

Therefore, considering all the rationale explained, project developers decided for the database considering ONS information only, as it was capable of properly addressing the issue of determining the emission factor and doing it in the most conservative way.

The aggregated hourly dispatch data got from ONS was used to determine the lambda factor for each of the years with data available (2002, 2003 and 2004). The Low-cost/Must-run generation was determined as the total generation minus fossil-fuelled thermal plants generation, this one determined through daily dispatch data provided by ONS. All this information has been provided to the validators, and extensively



discussed with them, in order to make all points crystal clear. The figures below show the load duration curves for the three considered years, as well as the lambda calculated.

Emission factors for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected grid				
Baseline (including imports)	EF_{OM} [tCO ₂ /MWh]	Load [MWh]	LCMR [MWh]	Imports [MWh]
2003	0.9823	288,933,290	274,670,644	459,586
2004	0.9163	302,906,198	284,748,295	1,488,275
2005	0.8086	314,533,592	296,690,687	3,535,252
	Total (2003-2005) =	906,373,081	856,109,626	5,463,113
	$EF_{OM, simple-adjusted}$ [tCO ₂ /MWh]	$EF_{EM, 2005}$	Lambda	
	0.4349	0.0872	λ_{2003}	
	Alternative weights	Default weights	0.5312	
	$W_{OM} = 0.75$	$W_{OM} = 0.5$	λ_{2004}	
	$W_{EM} = 0.25$	$W_{EM} = 0.5$	0.5055	
	Alternative EF_y [tCO ₂ /MWh]	Default EF_y [tCO ₂ /MWh]	λ_{2005}	
	0.3480	0.2611	0.5130	

Table 5 – Emission factors for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected grid (simple adjusted operating margin factor)




Figure 14 - Load duration curve for the S-SE-CO system, 2003




Figure 15 - Load duration curve for the S-SE-CO system, 2004




Figure 16 – Load duration curve for the S-SE-CO system, 2005



	Subsystem*	Fuel source**	Power plant	Operation start [2, 4, 5]	Installed capacity (MW) [1]	Fuel conversion efficiency (%) [2]	Carbon emission factor (tCO ₂ /tJ) [3]	Fraction carbon oxidized [3]	Emission factor (tCO ₂ /MWh)
1	S-SE-CO	H	Jauú	Sep-2003	121.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
2	S-SE-CO	H	Gauporé	Sep-2003	120.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
3	S-SE-CO	G	Três Lagoas	Aug-2003	306.0	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
4	S-SE-CO	H	Furnil (MG)	Jan-2003	180.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
5	S-SE-CO	H	Itaipua I	Sep-2002	156.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
6	S-SE-CO	G	Araucária	Sep-2002	494.5	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
7	S-SE-CO	G	Canóas	Sep-2002	160.6	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
8	S-SE-CO	H	Piraju	Sep-2002	81.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
9	S-SE-CO	G	Nova Piratininga	Jun-2002	384.9	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
10	S-SE-CO	O	PCT CGTEE	Jun-2002	5.0	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
11	S-SE-CO	H	Rosal	Jun-2002	55.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
12	S-SE-CO	G	Itiriré	May-2002	226.0	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
13	S-SE-CO	H	Caná Brava	May-2002	465.9	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
14	S-SE-CO	H	Sta. Clara	Jan-2002	60.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
15	S-SE-CO	H	Machadinho	Jan-2002	1,140.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
16	S-SE-CO	G	Juiz de Fora	Nov-2001	87.0	0.28	15.3	99.5%	0.718
17	S-SE-CO	G	Macacé Merchant	Nov-2001	922.6	0.24	15.3	99.5%	0.837
18	S-SE-CO	H	Lajeado (ANEEL res. 402/2001)	Nov-2001	902.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
19	S-SE-CO	G	Elétrico	Oct-2001	373.0	0.24	15.3	99.5%	0.837
20	S-SE-CO	H	Porto Estrela	Sep-2001	112.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
21	S-SE-CO	G	Cuiabá (Mario Covas)	Aug-2001	529.2	0.3	15.3	99.5%	0.670
22	S-SE-CO	G	W. Aijona	Jan-2001	194.0	0.25	15.3	99.5%	0.804
23	S-SE-CO	G	Uruguaiana	Jan-2000	639.9	0.45	15.3	99.5%	0.447
24	S-SE-CO	H	S. Caxias	Jan-1999	1,240.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
25	S-SE-CO	H	Canóas I	Jan-1999	82.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
26	S-SE-CO	H	Canóas II	Jan-1999	72.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
27	S-SE-CO	H	Igarapava	Jan-1999	210.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
28	S-SE-CO	H	Porto Primavera	Jan-1999	1,540.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
29	S-SE-CO	D	Cuiabá (Mario Covas)	Oct-1998	529.2	0.27	20.2	99.0%	0.978
30	S-SE-CO	H	Sobragé	Sep-1998	60.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
31	S-SE-CO	H	PCH EMAE	Jan-1998	26.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
32	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CEFE	Jan-1998	25.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
33	S-SE-CO	H	PCH ENERSUL	Jan-1998	43.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
34	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CEB	Jan-1998	15.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
35	S-SE-CO	H	PCH ESCELSA	Jan-1998	62.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
36	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CELESC	Jan-1998	50.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
37	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CEMAT	Jan-1998	145.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
38	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CELG	Jan-1998	15.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
39	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CERJ	Jan-1998	59.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
40	S-SE-CO	H	PCH COPEL	Jan-1998	70.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
41	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CEMIG	Jan-1998	84.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
42	S-SE-CO	H	PCH CPFL	Jan-1998	55.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
43	S-SE-CO	H	S. Mesa	Jan-1998	1,275.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
44	S-SE-CO	H	PCH E PAULO	Jan-1998	26.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
45	S-SE-CO	H	Guilmar Amorim	Jan-1997	140.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
46	S-SE-CO	H	Corumbá	Jan-1997	375.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
47	S-SE-CO	H	Miranda	Jan-1997	408.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
48	S-SE-CO	H	Noav Ponte	Jan-1994	510.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
49	S-SE-CO	H	Segredo (Gov. Ney Braga)	Jan-1992	1,260.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
50	S-SE-CO	H	Itaipu	Jan-1989	554.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
51	S-SE-CO	H	Manito	Jan-1988	210.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
52	S-SE-CO	H	D. Francisca	Jan-1987	125.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
53	S-SE-CO	H	Itá	Jan-1987	1,450.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
54	S-SE-CO	H	Rosana	Jan-1987	369.2	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
55	S-SE-CO	N	Angra	Jan-1985	1,874.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
56	S-SE-CO	H	T. Imajós	Jan-1985	807.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
57	S-SE-CO	H	Itaipu 60 Hz	Jan-1983	6,300.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
58	S-SE-CO	H	Itaipu 50 Hz	Jan-1983	5,375.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
59	S-SE-CO	H	Emborcação	Jan-1982	1,192.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
60	S-SE-CO	H	Nova Avanhandava	Jan-1982	347.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
61	S-SE-CO	H	Gov. Bento Munhoz - GBM	Jan-1980	1,676.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000

* Subsystem: S - south, SE-CO - Southeast-Midwest
** Fuel source (C, bituminous coal; D, diesel oil; G, natural gas; H, hydro; N, nuclear; O, residual fuel oil).
[1] Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Banco de Informações da Geração (<http://www.aneel.gov.br/>, data collected in november 2004).
[2] Bosi, M., A. Laurence, P. Maldonado, R. Schaeffer, A.F. Simoes, H. Winkler and J.M. Lukamba. Road testing baselines for GHG mitigation projects in the electric power sector. OECD/IEA information paper, October 2002.
[3] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Revised 1996 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.
[4] Operador Nacional do Sistema Elétrico. Centro Nacional de Operação do Sistema. Acompanhamento Diário da Operação do SIN (daily reports from Jan. 1, 2001 to Dec. 31, 2003).
[5] Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Superintendência de Fiscalização dos Serviços de Geração. Resumo Geral dos Novos Empreendimentos de Geração (<http://www.aneel.gov.br/>, data collected in november 2004).

Table 6 – Power plants database for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected grid, part 1



	Subsystem*	Fuel source**	Power plant	Operation start [2, 4, 5]	Installed capacity (MW) [1]	Fuel conversion efficiency (%) [2]	Carbon emission factor (tCO ₂ /TJ) [3]	Fraction carbon oxidized [3]	Emission factor (tCO ₂ /MWh)
62	S-SE-CO	H	S. Santiago	Jan-1980	1,420.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
63	S-SE-CO	H	Itumbiara	Jan-1980	2,280.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
64	S-SE-CO	O	Igarapé	Jan-1978	131.0	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
65	S-SE-CO	H	Itauba	Jan-1978	512.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
66	S-SE-CO	H	A. Vermelha (Jose E. Moraes)	Jan-1978	1,396.2	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
67	S-SE-CO	H	S. Simão	Jan-1978	1,710.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
68	S-SE-CO	H	Capivara	Jan-1977	640.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
69	S-SE-CO	H	S. Osório	Jan-1975	1,078.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
70	S-SE-CO	H	Marimbondo	Jan-1975	1,440.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
71	S-SE-CO	H	Promissão	Jan-1975	264.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
72	S-SE-CO	C	Pres. Medici	Jan-1974	446.0	0.26	26.0	98.0%	1.294
73	S-SE-CO	H	Volta Grande	Jan-1974	380.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
74	S-SE-CO	H	Porto Colombia	Jun-1973	320.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
75	S-SE-CO	H	Passo Fundo	Jan-1973	220.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
76	S-SE-CO	H	Passo Real	Jan-1973	158.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
77	S-SE-CO	H	Ilha Solteira	Jan-1973	3,444.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
78	S-SE-CO	H	Mascarenhas	Jan-1973	131.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
79	S-SE-CO	H	Gov. Parigot de Souza - GPS	Jan-1971	252.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
80	S-SE-CO	H	Chavantes	Jan-1971	414.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
81	S-SE-CO	H	Jaguara	Jan-1971	424.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
82	S-SE-CO	H	Sá Canhalho	Apr-1970	78.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
83	S-SE-CO	H	Estreito (Luiz Carlos Barreto)	Jan-1969	1,050.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
84	S-SE-CO	H	Itutinga	Jan-1969	131.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
85	S-SE-CO	H	Jupia	Jan-1969	1,551.2	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
86	S-SE-CO	O	Alegrete	Jan-1968	66.0	0.26	20.7	99.0%	1.040
87	S-SE-CO	G	Campos (Roberto Silveira)	Jan-1968	30.0	0.24	15.3	99.5%	0.837
88	S-SE-CO	G	Santa Cruz (RJ)	Jan-1968	766.0	0.31	15.3	99.5%	0.648
89	S-SE-CO	H	Paraibuna	Jan-1968	85.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
90	S-SE-CO	H	Limoeiro (Armando Salles de Oliveira)	Jan-1967	32.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
91	S-SE-CO	H	Caconde	Jan-1966	80.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
92	S-SE-CO	C	J. Lacerda C	Jan-1965	363.0	0.25	26.0	98.0%	1.345
93	S-SE-CO	C	J. Lacerda B	Jan-1965	262.0	0.21	26.0	98.0%	1.602
94	S-SE-CO	C	J. Lacerda A	Jan-1965	232.0	0.18	26.0	98.0%	1.869
95	S-SE-CO	H	Bariri (Alvaro de Souza Lima)	Jan-1965	143.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
96	S-SE-CO	H	Funil (RJ)	Jan-1965	216.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
97	S-SE-CO	C	Figueira	Jan-1963	20.0	0.3	26.0	98.0%	1.121
98	S-SE-CO	H	Furnas	Jan-1963	1,216.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
99	S-SE-CO	H	Barra Bonita	Jan-1963	140.8	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
100	S-SE-CO	C	Charqueadas	Jan-1962	72.0	0.23	26.0	98.0%	1.462
101	S-SE-CO	H	Jurumirim (Armando A. Laydner)	Jan-1962	97.7	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
102	S-SE-CO	H	Jacui	Jan-1962	180.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
103	S-SE-CO	H	Pereira Passos	Jan-1962	99.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
104	S-SE-CO	H	Tres Marias	Jan-1962	396.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
105	S-SE-CO	H	Euclides da Cunha	Jan-1960	108.8	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
106	S-SE-CO	H	Camargos	Jan-1960	46.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
107	S-SE-CO	H	Santa Branca	Jan-1960	56.1	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
108	S-SE-CO	H	Cachoeira Dourada	Jan-1959	658.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
109	S-SE-CO	H	Salto Grande (Lucas N. Garcez)	Jan-1958	70.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
110	S-SE-CO	H	Salto Grande (MG)	Jan-1956	102.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
111	S-SE-CO	H	Mascarenhas de Moraes (Peixoto)	Jan-1956	478.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
112	S-SE-CO	H	Itutinga	Jan-1955	52.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
113	S-SE-CO	C	S. Jerônimo	Jan-1954	20.0	0.26	26.0	98.0%	1.294
114	S-SE-CO	O	Carlobo	Jan-1954	36.2	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
115	S-SE-CO	O	Piratinga	Jan-1954	472.0	0.3	20.7	99.0%	0.902
116	S-SE-CO	H	Canastra	Jan-1953	42.5	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
117	S-SE-CO	H	Nilo Peçanha	Jan-1953	378.4	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
118	S-SE-CO	H	Fontes Nova	Jan-1940	130.3	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
119	S-SE-CO	H	Henry Borden Sub.	Jan-1926	420.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
120	S-SE-CO	H	Henry Borden Ext.	Jan-1926	469.0	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
121	S-SE-CO	H	I. Pombos	Jan-1924	189.7	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
122	S-SE-CO	H	Jaguari	Jan-1917	11.8	1	0.0	0.0%	0.000
Total (MW) =					64,478.6				
* Subsystem: S - south, SE-CO - Southeast-Midwest									
** Fuel source (C, bituminous coal; D, diesel oil; G, natural gas; H, hydro; N, nuclear; O, residual fuel oil).									
[1] Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Banco de Informações da Geração (http://www.aneel.gov.br/), data collected in november 2004).									
[2] Bosi, M., A. Laurence, P. Maldonado, R. Schaeffer, A.F. Simoes, H. Winkler and J.M. Lukamba. Road testing baselines for GHG mitigation projects in the electric power sector. OECD/IEA information paper, October 2002.									
[3] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Revised 1996 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories.									
[4] Operador Nacional do Sistema Elétrico. Centro Nacional de Operação do Sistema. Acompanhamento Diário da Operação do SIN (daily reports from Jan. 1, 2001 to Dec. 31, 2003).									
[5] Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica. Superintendência de Fiscalização dos Serviços de Geração. Resumo Geral dos Novos Empreendimentos de Geração (http://www.aneel.gov.br/), data collected in november 2004).									

Table 7 – Power plants database for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected grid, part 2

According to the selected approved methodology (ACM0002), the baseline emission factor is calculated as (EF_y) as a combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) factors. For the purpose of determining the build margin and the operating margin emission factors, the project electricity system is defined by the spatial extent of the power plants that can be dispatched without significant transmission constraints. Similarly the connected electricity system is defined as that electricity system that is connected by transmission lines to the project electricity system and in which power plants can be dispatched without significant transmission constraints.

From ACM0002 (Version 6 of May 19th, 2006), a baseline emission factor (EF_y) is calculated as a combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) factors according to the following three steps:

- **STEP 1** - Calculate the operating margin emission factor(s), based on one of the following methods

- Simple operating margin
- Simple adjusted operating margin
- Dispatch data analysis operating margin
- Average operating margin.

Dispatch data analysis operating margin should be the first methodological choice. Since not enough data was supplied by the Brazilian national dispatch center, the choice is not currently available. The simple operating margin can only be used where low-cost/must-run resources⁷ constitute less than 50% of total grid generation in: 1) average of 5 most recent years, or 2) based on long-term normals for hydroelectricity production. The share of hydroelectricity in the total electricity production for the Brazilian South-Southeast-Midwest interconnected system is much higher than 50% (see table 8 below), resulting in the non-applicability of the simple operating margin to the project.

Year	Share of hydroelectricity (%)
1999	94.0
2000	90.1
2001	86.2
2002	90.0
2003	92.9

Table 8 - Share of hydroelectricity generation in the Brazilian S-SE-MW interconnected system, 1999 to 2003 (ONS, 2004).

The fourth alternative, an average operating margin, is an oversimplification and does not reflect at all the impact of the project activity in the operating margin. Therefore, the simple adjusted operating margin will be used in the project.

The simple adjusted operating margin emission factor ($EF_{OM,adjusted,y}$ in tCO₂/MWh) is a variation on the simple operating margin, where the power sources (including imports) are separated in low-cost/must-run power sources (k) and other power sources (j):

$$EF_{OM, simple-adjusted,y} = (1 - \lambda_y) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,y}} + \lambda_y \cdot \frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{k,y}} \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

Where:

- λ_y is the share of hours in year y (in %) for which low-cost/must-run sources are on the margin.
- $F_{i,j,y}$ is the amount of fuel i (in mass or volume unit) consumed by relevant power sources j (analogous for sources k) in year(s) y ,
- j refers to the power sources delivering electricity to the grid, not including low-operating cost and must-run power plants, and including imports to the grid. For imports from connected electricity system located in another country, the emission factor is 0 (zero).
- k refers to the low-operating cost and must-run power sources.
- $COEF_{i,j}$ is the CO_{2e} coefficient of fuel i (tCO_{2e}/mass or volume unit of the fuel), taking into account the carbon dioxide equivalent emission potential of the fuels used by relevant power sources j (analogous for sources k) and the percent oxidation of the fuel in year(s) y and,

⁷ Low operating cost and must run resources typically include hydro, geothermal, wind, low-cost biomass, nuclear and solar generation (AM0015, 2004).

- $GEN_{j,y}$ is the electricity (MWh) delivered to the grid by source j (analogous for sources k),

The most recent numbers for the interconnected S-SE-MW system were obtained from the Brazilian national dispatch center, ONS (from the Portuguese *Operador Nacional do Sistema Elétrico*) in the form of daily consolidated reports (ONS-ADO, 2004). Data from 120 power plants, comprising 63.6 GW installed capacity and around 828 TWh electricity generation over the 3-year period were considered. With the numbers from ONS, Equation 4 is calculated, as described below:

$$EF_{OM-LCMR,y} = \frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{j,k}} \quad \text{Equation 4}$$

Where:

- $EF_{OM-LCMR,y}$ is emission factor for low-cost/must-run resources (in tCO_2/MWh) by relevant power sources k in year(s) y .

Low-cost/must-run resources in Brazilian S-SE-MW interconnected system are hydro and thermonuclear power plants, considered free of greenhouse gases emissions, i.e., $COEF_{i,j}$ for these plants is zero. Hence, the emission factor for low-cost/must-run resources results, $EF_{OM,y} = 0$.

$$EF_{OM,y} = (1 - \lambda_y) \frac{\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y} \cdot COEF_{i,j}}{\sum_j GEN_{j,y}} \quad \text{Equation 5}$$

Where:

- $EF_{OM,y}$ is the simple operating margin emission factor (in tCO_2/MWh), or the emission factor for non-low-cost/must-run resources by relevant power sources j in year(s) y .

Non-low-cost/must-run resources in Brazilian S-SE-MW interconnected system are thermo power plants burning coal, fuel oil, natural gas and diesel oil. These plants result in non-balanced emissions of greenhouse gases, calculated as follows:

These plants result in non-balanced emissions of greenhouse gases. The product $\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}$ for each one of the plants was obtained from:

$$F_{i,k,y} = \frac{GEN_{i,k,y} \cdot 3.6 \times 10^{-6}}{\eta_{i,k,y} \cdot NCV_i} \quad \text{Equation 6}$$

$$COEF_{i,k} = NCV_i \cdot EF_{CO_2,i} \cdot 44/12 \cdot OXID_i \quad \text{Equation 7}$$

$$\text{Hence, } F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k} = \frac{GEN_{i,k,y} \cdot EF_{CO_2,i} \cdot OXID_i \cdot 44/12 \cdot 3.6 \times 10^{-6}}{\eta_{i,k,y}} \quad \text{Equation 8}$$

Where variable and parameters used are:

- $\sum_{i,j} F_{i,j,y}$ is given in [kg], $COEF_{i,j}$ in [tCO_2e/kg] and $F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}$ in [tCO_2e]
- $GEN_{i,k,y}$ is the electricity generation for plant k , with fuel i , in year y , obtained from the ONS database, in MWh
- $EF_{CO_2,i}$ is the emission factor for fuel i , obtained from the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, in tC/TJ .

- $OXID_i$ is the oxidization factor for fuel i , obtained from the Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, in %.
 - 44/12 is the carbon conversion factor, from tC to tCO₂.
 - 3.6×10^{-6} is the energy conversion factor, from MWh to TJ.
 - $\eta_{i,k,y}$ is the thermal efficiency of plant k , operating with fuel i , in year y , obtained from PCF (2003).
 - NCV_i is the net calorific value of fuel i [TJ/kg].
- $\sum_{k,y} GEN_{k,y}$ is obtained from the UT database, as the summation of non-low-cost/must-run resources electricity generation, in MWh.

Year	$\frac{\sum_{i,k} F_{i,k,y} \cdot COEF_{i,k}}{\sum_k GEN_{k,y}}$ [tCO ₂ /MWh]	λ_y [%]
2003	0.9823	0.5312
2004	0.9163	0.5055
2005	0.8086	0.5130

Table 9 - Share of hours in year y (in %) for which low-cost/must-run sources are on the margin in the S-SE-MW system for the period 2003-2005 (ONS-ADO, 2005).

With the numbers from ONS, the first step was to calculate the lambda and the emission factors for the simple operating margin. The λ_y factors are calculated as indicated in methodology ACM0002, with data obtained from the ONS database. Figure 15, Figure 16 and Figure 17 (see above, in Annex 3) present the load duration curves and λ_y determination for years 2003, 2004 and 2005, respectively. The results for years 2003, 2004 and 2005 are presented in Table 9.

Finally, applying the obtained numbers to calculate $EF_{OM, simple-adjusted, 2002-2004}$ as the weighted average of $EF_{OM, simple-adjusted, 2003}$, $EF_{OM, simple-adjusted, 2004}$ and $EF_{OM, simple-adjusted, 2005}$ and λ_y to Equation 5:

$$\bullet \quad EF_{OM, simple-adjusted, 2003-2005} = 0.4349 \text{ tCO}_2\text{/MWh}$$

- **STEP 2** – Calculate the build margin mission factor ($EF_{BM,y}$) as the generation weighted average emission factor (tCO₂/MWh) of a sample of power plants m , as follows:

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

Where $F_{i,m,y}$, $COEF_{i,m}$ and $GEN_{m,y}$ are analogous to the variables described for the simple OM method (ACM-0002) for plants m , based on the most recent information available on plants already built. The sample group m consists of either:

- The five power plants that have been built most recently, or
- The power plants capacity additions in the electricity system that comprise 20% of the system generation (in MWh) and that have been built most recently.

Project participants should use from these two options that sample group that comprises the larger annual generation.

Applying the data from the Brazilian national dispatch center to the equation above:



$$EF_{BM,2005} = 0.0872 \text{ tCO}_2\text{/MWh}$$

- **STEP 3** – Calculate the baseline emission factor EF_y , as the weighted average of the operating margin factor ($EF_{OM,y}$) and the build margin factor ($EF_{BM,y}$):

$$EF_y = w_{OM} \cdot EF_{OM,y} + w_{BM} \cdot EF_{BM,y} \quad \text{Equation 9}$$

Finally, the electricity baseline emission factor is calculated through a weighted-average formula, considering both the OM and the BM, being the weights 50% and 50% by default:

$$EF_y = 0.5 \times 0.4332 + 0.5 \times 0.0962$$

$$EF_y = 0.2611 \text{ tCO}_2\text{/MWh}$$



Annex 4 – Monitoring Plan

This section is intentionally left blank (see section B.7.2 for monitoring plan).

Anexo 5



BIBLIOGRAFY

- Arida, P. E. L. Bacha e A. L. Resende (2005).** *Credit, Interest, and Jurisdictional Uncertainty: Conjectures on the Case of Brazil.* [Crédito, Juros e Incerteza Jurisdicional: Conjecturas sobre o Caso do Brasil] Em F. Giavazzi, I. Goldfajn e S. Herrera (orgs.), *Inflation Targeting, Debt, and the Brazilian Experience* [Metas de inflação, dívida e a experiência brasileira], 1999 a 2003. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bosi, M., A. Laurence, P. Maldonado, R. Schaeffer, A. F. Simoes, H. Winkler and J.-M. Lukamba (2002).** Road testing baselines for greenhouse gas mitigation projects in the electric power sector. OCDE and IEA information paper.
- BNDES (2000).** O setor elétrico – Desempenho 1993/1999. Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social. Informe Infra-estrutura, nº 53. <http://www.bndes.gov.br/>
- CGE/CBEE (2002).** Programa de Energia Emergencial. Câmara de Gestão da Crise de Energia Elétrica – Comercializadora Brasileira de Energia Emergencial.
- Eletrobrás (1999).** Diretrizes para estudos e projetos de pequenas centrais hidrelétricas. Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S.A. Website: <http://www.eletrobras.gov.br/>
- IBGE (2004).** Banco de dados Cidades@. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística (<http://www.ibge.gov.br/>).
- Kartha, S., M. Lazarus e M. Bosi (2002).** Practical baseline recommendations for greenhouse gas mitigation projects in the electric power sector. OCDE and IEA information Paper.
- OCDE (2001).** OCDE Economic Surveys: Brasil. Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development [Organização para a Cooperação e o Desenvolvimento Econômico], Paris, França.
- OCDE (2004).** Environmental Outlook [Panorama Ambiental]. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [Organização para a Cooperação e o Desenvolvimento Econômico]. Website: <http://www.oecd.org/env/>
- OCDE (2005).** Estudo econômico do Brasil da OCDE 2005: Normas do setor elétrico. Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development [Organização para a Cooperação e o Desenvolvimento Econômico], Paris, França
- ONS (2004).** De olho na energia: Histórico da energia, carga própria de energia 1999-2003. Operador Nacional do Sistema Elétrico Brasileiro. Website: <http://www.ons.gov.br/>
- ONS-ADO (2004).** Acompanhamento Diário da Operação do Sistema Interligado Nacional. ONS-CNOS, Centro Nacional de Operação do Sistema. Relatórios diários sobre todo o sistema elétrico interligado de 1º de janeiro de 2001 a 31 de dezembro de 2003. Website: <http://www.ons.gov.br/>
- Pinto Júnior, H. (2003).** Les problèmes des réformes structurelles et institutionnelles inachevées: le cas de l'industrie électrique au Brésil. *Révue de l'Energie* 544, 103-111,
- Schaeffer, R., J. Logan, A. S. Szklo, W. Chandler e J. C. de Souza (2000).** *Electric Power Options in Brasil.* Pew Center on Global Climate Change.
- SIESE (2002).** Sistema de Informações Empresariais do Setor de Energia Elétrica: Boletim Anual. Eletrobrás (Centrais Elétricas Brasileiras S.A.) - MME (Ministério de Minas e Energia do Brasil). Website: http://www.eletrobras.gov.br/IN_Informe_SIESE/
- Tolmasquim, M.T. (2003) [Ed.].** Fontes Renováveis de Energia no Brasil. Editora Interciência
- UNEP-LAC (2002).** Relatório Final da 7ª Reunião do Comitê Inter-Sessões do Foro dos Ministros do Meio Ambiente da América Latina e do Caribe. Programa do Meio Ambiente das Nações Unidas, Escritório Regional para a América Latina e o Caribe. 15 a 17 de maio de 2002, São Paulo (Brasil).