Comment 1	30-11-06 10:47am
Name: Peter Smith	**City: London**
Organisation: P.S. Associates	**Country: United Kingdom**

(1) The project has individual project promoters and Enercon as a part of the bundle. How can the additionality be the same in these cases? How can it be proved that Enercon actually needed CDM to make the turbines viable? Enercon as a manufacturer sets up the machines for sale later or for its own use. But there is no additionality that can be established. The complete analysis is erroneous.
(7) The IRR has to crossover 16% to make the CDM revenues necessary for the project to reach the benchmark. This is not the case in the calculations shown in the PDD. DOE to clarify.

(8) The CER rate that has been considered has not been mentioned.

(9) EIAs for different sites are different as they are based on site specific characteristics. How can the same information be provided for all the three Enercon PDDs that have posted on the web together in November 2006.