

Comment 1

27-03-08 3:05am

Name: Raghu**City: Aurangabad****Organisation: CDM Future****Country: India**

1. I think our project developers and consultants are still unable to understand the issues with wind power projects.. This is one more project added to the party. I have never seen a wind mill being developed in any part of the country with just over 20% PLF that too for 1.25 MW wind mill. Additionality section need to be relooked very carefully and all the assumptions made are seems to be vague and made very conveniently to prove the additionality. It is also not clear why excel sheet is not uploaded at this stage.

2.Can PP/consultant prove the reduction in the average emission intensity (SOx, NOx, PM, etc.), average effluent intensity and average

solid waste intensity of power generation in the system in absolute terms as a part of sustainable development benefits of the project. Pls indicate the figures in the PDD.

3. Consultant is totally ignorant on mentioning the enough valid reasons for the delay in applying the project for CDM.DOE should look in to this issue and should not submit for EB unless dully satisfied.

4. Wind power is entirely dependent on the wind availability, terrain and soil roughness in the area. If these factors are favourable, wind can be viable at any place irrespective of the state or location. It is amusing to read the common practice analysis comparing total wind capacity out of total generation. This will be remain like this for decades in India and wind can never be common practice on this basis. Pls do not make such stupid analysis to fool the EB and RIT.

5. Moreover, the additionality section seems to be copied from the another wind project applied for validation. This indicates the consultant's capability in handling the projects. Poor project developer must have no idea on this and suffer for consultant's mistakes later when it comes for review.

6. From the stakeholder section, it is clear that no formal stakeholder meeting is conducted which is against the required procedures. DOE should look this issue very seriously.