Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

BUREAU VERITAS

BUREAU VERITAS
CERTIFICATION
Reviewed
Init
Date: 26/04/2012

DETERMINATION REPORT

ANO "CENTER OF ENVIRONMENTAL INNOVATION"

DETERMINATION OF THE CARBON SEQUESTRATION VIA AFFORESTATION IN SIBERIAN SETTLEMENTS, RUSSIAN FEDERATION

REPORT NO. RUSSIA-DET/0275/2012

REVISION NO. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: Russia-det/0275/2012

DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
26/04/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
ANO CEI	Mr. Andrey Stetsenko

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the "Carbon sequestration via afforestation in Siberian settlements, Russian Federation" project of ANO CEI located in Zalesovo district, Altay krai, Russian Federation on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

The determination scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study, monitoring plan and other relevant documents, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion. The overall determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the determination process is a list of Clarification and Corrective Actions Requests (CL and CAR), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.

In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (Version 03) and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.:	Subject Group:	
Russia-det/0275/2012	JI	
Project title: "Installation of combined cycle gas turbine at Yugo-Zapadnaya CHP in Saint-Petersburg, Russia"		
Work carried out by: Daniil Ukhanov – Team leader, Lead verifier Olga Pentelkina - Verifier		
Work reviewed by: Leonid Yaskin – Internal Technical Reviewer Evgeniy Prudnikov - Verifier		
Work approved by: Leonid Yaskin - Operational Manager		
Date of this revision: 26/04/2012	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 63

Indexing terms

☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

Abbreviations

AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
ANO CEI	Autonomous Noncommercial Organization “Center for Environmental Innovation”
BVC	Bureau Veritas Certification
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CL	Clarification Request
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
DDR	Draft Determination Report
DR	Document Review
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIAR	Environmental Impact Assessment Report
ERU	Emission Reduction Unit
GHG	Greenhouse House Gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IE	Independent Entity
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
RF	Russian Federation
tCO2e	Tonnes CO2 equivalent
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change

1 INTRODUCTION

The company ANO Center of Environmental Innovation (hereafter called "the company") has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project "Carbon sequestration via afforestation in Siberian settlements, Russian Federation" (hereafter called "the project") in Zalesovo District, Altai krai, Russian Federation.

This report summarizes the findings of the determination of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

The determination serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The determination is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are determined in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Determination is a requirement for all JI projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of emissions reductions units (ERUs).

UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

1.2 Scope

The determination scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

The determination is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

1.3 Determination team

The determination team consists of the following personnel:

Daniil Ukhanov

Bureau Veritas Certification, Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier

Olga Pentelkina

Bureau Veritas Certification, Verifier

This determination report was reviewed by:

Leonid Yaskin

Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

Evgeniy Prudnikov
Bureau Veritas Certification, Verifier

2 METHODOLOGY

The overall determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

In order to ensure transparency, a determination protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 01 of the Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual, issued by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee at its 19 meeting on 04/12/2009. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of determination and the results from determining the identified criteria. The determination protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a JI project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent determination process where the determiner will document how a particular requirement has been determined and the result of the determination.

The completed determination protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1 Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by ANO CEI and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form, Approved CDM methodology and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Determination Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, ANO CEI revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 26/04/2012.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version(s) 01 (initial), 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08 (final).

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 16/04/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed off-site interview with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. ANO CEI representatives were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
ANO CEI	➢ Reasoning for project implementation ➢ Project management organization ➢ Project history and Implementation schedule ➢ Baseline scenario ➢ Common practice ➢ Project scenario ➢ Emission calculation ➢ Investment issues ➢ Commissioning and proven trials ➢ Capacity issues ➢ Environmental permissions ➢ Environmental Impact Assessment
(LOCAL Stakeholders)	N/A
CONSULTANT	N/A

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the project design.

If the determination team, in assessing the PDD and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to JI project requirements, it will raise these issues and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

(a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake in the published PDD that is not in accordance with the (technical) process used for the project or relevant JI project requirement or that shows any other logical flaw;

(b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the determination team to assess compliance with the JI project requirement in question;

(c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to project implementation but not project design, that needs to be reviewed during the first verification of the project.

The determination team will make an objective assessment as to whether the actions taken by the project participants, if any, satisfactorily resolve the issues raised, if any, and should conclude its findings of the determination.

To guarantee the transparency of the verification process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the verification protocol in Appendix A.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION (quated by PDD Section A.2)

The project is devoted to activities on protection and management of the afforested degraded agricultural land in Zalesovo district, 142 km from Barnaul, the capital of Altai Kray of the Russian Federation. The project covers 9489,37 hectares of land, that have the status of non-forested area.

Project objectives:
reduction of the anthropogenic burden on the environment and impacts of global climate change on Altai region through increase of the afforested areas and, subsequently, increase of CO2 sequestration from the atmosphere;
development of the algorithms for estimation of the carbon absorption in forest ecosystems on the local level, and through that, implementation of the JI project activities corresponding to atr. 6 of Kyoto Protocol;
development of the mechanisms for active management and protection of the forest areas, not included in the State Forest Fund.

Situation before the project

Before the forest protection measures organized under this project since 2000, this land must have been used purely for agricultural purposes (the targeted use of land). This means that according to the Land Code of the Russian Federation, all trees on that land must have been destroyed via cutting or could be destroyed due to the forest fires.

Project
The project activities are aimed at sequestration of CO2 via creation of new forest (carbon-absorbing forest planting) on the post-agrogenic crude

soils of Ob-Chumysh rivers interfluve in Zalesovo district, due to stopping active agricultural activities and organization of forest protection and management measures.

The following priority measures have been included in the project activities:
1) Creation of the forest fire-prevention strips (1,5-3,0 m wide) on the boarders of project land;
2) Periodic monitoring of the project territory via the visual monitoring during the field visits and analysis of the satellite pictures;
3) Cooperation with the forest enterprises in the neighboring areas;
4) Additional attraction of the automobiles and tractors for forest protection in the project territory;
5) Cooperation with the local community, Zalesovo municipality and administration of Altai Kray on this project;
6) Coordination of the forest fire protection with the Inter-Regional Fire Fighting Commission (including Altai and Kemerovo regions).

The projects aims at using modern methods and technologies for annual inventory and protection of forest land from diseases and fires, including those related to the agricultural straw firing, etc.

The project is protected from the institutional risk via close cooperation with Zalesovo municipality, renting the project land for 49 years, use of the land for the authorized purposes.

NGO CEI is the leading Russian non-governmental, not-for-profit organization working on realization of the Constitutional rights for favorable environment and reliable information about its state, health protection, compensation of damage to human health and property caused by violation of the environmental laws and regulation.

The main directions of NGO CEI work:
Analytical support of decision making on environmental management and sustainable use of natural resources, mitigation of climate change and reduction of damage and adaptation to climatic change impacts;
Dissemination of information about the modern, innovative, market-based methods for reduction of environmental pollution, rational use of natural resources, implementation of the international climate change agreements;
Practical projects and programs on environmental improvements, sustainable development, including preparation and implementation of afforestation and forest management projects, reduction of carbon emissions, use of renewable energy sources, energy efficiency improvement and energy saving.

NGO CEI is guided by the principles of sustainable development and environmental and social responsibility, as well as support of Joint Implementation activities under the art. 6 of Kyoto Protocol to UNFCCC.

Hence, through this project NGO CEI resolves both the issue of mitigation of climate change and development of the mechanisms for attracting carbon investments into the afforestation and forest management projects in Russia and worldwide.

The main factors allowing to implement this project include as follows:
Possibility of its implementation under the Kyoto Protocol mechanism (JI) for minimization of the costs on annual renting of land, maintenance and protection of the forest on project land, as well as further reinvesting in similar activities in Altai Kray aimed at environmental improvements and creation of forest belts for protection of agricultural land, avoiding soil erosion, loss of humus, biodiversity conservation, etc. Thus, when discussing the project idea at the working meetings with municipal and regional authorities, and assessing the opportunity for getting investments from the project ERUs, NGO CEI took positive decision about possibility of project implementation under Art. 6 of Kyoto Protocol;
Following the principles of sustainable development and best practice will significantly reduce carbon emissions/increase sequestration of carbon from the atmosphere and positively affect the quality of local environment.

Realization of the project was dealt with overcoming of a number of economic obstacles. However, NGO CEI believes that the revenue from sale of project ERUs will allow to resolve the financial barriers further on.

The project activity does not lead to expansion of the activities undertaken before the project, outside of project boundaries, i.e. the project does not lead to extension of the land area. The territory of afforested land is the same before and after the project. The project activity facilitates natural afforestation of the typical species in that areas (mainly birch).

Kyoto history of project:

- 6 July 2000 – Request to the regional forest authorities about consideration of the possibility to implement a pilot carbon sequestration afforestation project under art. 6 of Kyoto Protocol to UNFCCC. Determination of the partners on the project in Zalesovo district of Altai krai.
- 14 July 2000 – Request for initiation of development and implementation of the pilot project on carbon sequestration via afforestation in Zalesovo district on the territory of agricultural and other land (inconvenient, etc.) that can satisfy requirements of atr. 6 of Kyoto Protocol.

- 20 July 2000 – Agreement on cooperation in implementation of the carbon sequestration afforestation project with the local partner organization, including measures on monitoring of trees and soil, risks of forest fires and diseases, illegal logging and destruction of trees, creation of forest fire protective lines on the territory of municipal "land redistribution fund" (approx. 10000 hectares).
- 2000-2007 – Annual implementation of measures on monitoring of trees and soil, risks of forest fires and diseases, illegal logging and destruction of trees, creation of forest fire protective lines on the territory of selected project lands.
- 6 September 2007 – Meeting of the Working Group on project implementation in Administration of Zalesovo municipality on the progress in realization of project activities, determination of tasks until 2012 and coordination of activities and management of the project.
- 2007-2012 – Scientific research on assessment of carbon sequestration by trees and soil, setting boundaries of project lands, preparation of the information materials for development of project design documentation, preparation of the contracts for renting the project land, monitoring of trees and soil, risks of forest fires and diseases, illegal logging and destruction of trees, creation of forest fire protective lines on the territory of selected project lands.

Starting conditions
According to the starting conditions, the project land would have to be used for their "targeted" purpose which is the agricultural activity (plowing land), without any environmental and climate mitigating measures. This would be determined by the current practice of the similar land in this district. According to the annual reports by Zalesovo municipal administration, 100% of the existing Land Redistribution Fund is "targeted" for agricultural use.

None of the measures, except the project activities aimed at saving of the new forest grown on the agricultural land, could change the type of using this land.

Hence, the baseline scenario is determined by the following:

Absence of the incentives for implementation of this project. The use of agricultural land for "targeted" purposes is considered as business as usual. The project activity does not aim at further logging and sale of timber (due to various reasons, such as low value of birch and other species, very long period of maturing, lack of demand, etc.). Hence, the environmental activity does not bring any benefits, so that Zalesovo administration (as the primary owner of the land) would never consider such measures as priority ones.

Absence of the investment attractiveness of such projects. Without JI mechanism, NGO CEI would not implement this project as it is not commercially viable without revenue from ERUs sale.
Emission reductions/ sequestration

The project will bring the following results:
Significant sequestration of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere;
Substantial improvement of the environmental situation in Zalesovo district and Altai Kray, including climate change mitigation and adaptation, increased biodiversity, watershed protection, reduction of soil erosion, reduction of risks of forest fires in the neighborhood with local villages and towns, etc.
Improvement of the quality of life, creation of new jobs for local population.

4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS

In the following sections, the conclusions of the determination are stated.

The findings from the desk review of the original project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are described in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A.

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A. The determination of the Project resulted in 24 Corrective Action Requests and 3 Clarification Requests.

The number between brackets at the end of each section correspond to the DVM paragraph.

Outstanding issues related to general description to the project, PP's response and the AIE conclusion are summarized in Appendix A (refer to CAR 01 - CAR 05 and CL 01).
The issued CARs concern:
CAR 01 – the sectoral scope;
CAR 02 – the data of the project participants;
CAR 03 – the indication of the project location;
CAR 04 – the delineation of project boundary;
CAR 05 – the technology to be employed under the project;
CL 01 – the history of the project.

4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)

The project has no approvals by the Parties involved, therefore CAR 06 remains pending.

Bureau Veritas Certification should receive this letter from the project participants after its official issuance.

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The participation of the legal entity listed as project participant in the PDD is not authorized by the Host Party because the project approval was not received.

The authorization is deemed to be provided through the issuance of the project approvals.

4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD explicitly indicates that using a methodology for baseline setting and monitoring developed in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines (hereinafter referred to as JI specific approach) was the selected approach for identifying the baseline.

JI specific approach

The PDD provides a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner, as well as justification, that the baseline is established:

(a) By listing and describing the following plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one:

   a. Continuation of the existing situation (agricultural use of the project land);
   b. The project itself (without JI registration);

(b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform policies and legislation, socio-economic development, legal status of lands and national forestry and agricultural policies as appropriate. In this context, the following key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account:
   a. Legal status of lands;
   b. Description of economic situation in the sector and socio-demographic factors and demand forecasting.
   c. The availability of capital (including investment barriers);
   d. Local availability of technology/equipment;
   e. Fuel prices and availability;

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the JI specific approach, the baseline is identified appropriately.

Outstanding issues related to Baseline setting (22-26), PP's response and the AIE conclusion are summarized in Appendix A (refer to CARs 07).
The raised CAR concerns:
CAR 07 – the actual baseline emissions.

4.4 Additionality (27-31)

JI specific approach

Traceable and transparent information showing that the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to enhancements of net anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs was provided.

Additionality proofs are provided. To demonstrate the additionality of the project five steps were implemented:
Step 1: Identification of alternatives;
Step 2: Investment analysis, and (or)
Step 3: Barrier analysis;
Step 4: Common practice analysis;
Step 5: Provision of additionality proofs.

Plausible alternatives to the project were identified in Section B.1. Simple cost analysis was applied. It shows that "The project itself without JI registration" scenario is unprofitable in comparison with "Continuation of the existing situation (agricultural use of the project land)" scenario.

The common practice analysis shows that the project activity is not the common practice in Russia.

Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the analysis using the approach chosen.

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

Not applicable.

4.6 Crediting period (34)

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began, and the starting date is 20/07/2005, which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 50 years or 600 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 5 years, and its starting date as 01/01/2008, which is after the date the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are generated by the project.

The PDD states that the crediting period for the issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.

Outstanding issues related to Project Boundary (34), PP's response and the AIE conclusion are summarized in Appendix A (refer to CL 02).
The raised CL concerns:
CL 02 – the starting date of project.

4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)

The PDD, in its monitoring plan section, explicitly indicates that JI specific approach was selected.

JI specific approach

The monitoring plan describes all relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored, and the period in which they will be monitored, in particular also all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance, such as:

- Trunk diameter of *i* tree;
- Cross sectional area of the *i* trunk of tree;
- Number of trees in the trial area;
- Height of the *i* tree in the trial area.

The monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable, valid, and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored such as those listed in the PDD, Section D.1, Table D.1-1.

The monitoring plan draws on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" developed by the JISC.

The monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguishes:

(i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination (Refer to Table D.1-1)

(ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination (such as carbon content in the wood).

(ii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period, such as:

- Trunk diameter of *i* tree;
- Cross sectional area of the *i* trunk of tree;
- Number of trees in the trial area;
- Height of the *i* tree in the trial area.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording; please refer to PDD, Section D.1.2.1).

The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the calculation project removals such as formulae in Section D.1.2.3, D.1.2.4 and D.1.4 (formulae 1 – 11).

The monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process. All the QC/QA procedures are specified in PDD Section D.2.This includes, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available on request.

The monitoring plan clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities. The operating and management structure for GHG monitoring is described in PDD Section D.3, Table D.3.1, Figure D.3.1.

On the whole, the monitoring report reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.

The monitoring plan provides, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources (Development of grid GHG emission factors for power systems of Russia) but not including data that are calculated with equations.

The monitoring plan indicates that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for five years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.

Outstanding issues related to Monitoring plan (35-39), PP's response and the AIE conclusion are summarized in Appendix A (refer to CAR 08 – CAR 23 and CL 03).
The raised CARs concern:
CAR 08 – the key characteristics that are monitored;
CAR 09 – the period of monitoring characteristics;
CAR 10 – the decisive factors for the control and reporting of the project performance;
CAR 11 – the blank sections;
CAR 12 – the complete translation of PDD text;
CAR 13 – the identification of default values;
CAR 14 – the references to documents;
CAR 15 – the emergency procedures;
CAR 16 – the description of frequency of data monitoring;
CAR 17 – the equation numbering;
CAR 18 – the uncertainty of key parameters;
CAR 19 – the IPCC methodology reference;
CAR 20 – the statistical representativeness of trial areas;
CAR 21 – the QC and QA procedures;
CAR 22 – the identification of responsibilities;
CAR 23 – the storage of data.
CL 03 – the notification of Decision 16/CMP.1.

4.8 Leakage (40-41)

JI specific approach

The PDD appropriately describes an assessment of the potential leakage of the project. The leakage is assumed to be zero.

4.9 Estimation of emission reductions (42-47)

JI specific approach

The PDD indicates assessment of net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario as the approach chosen to estimate the net removals generated by the project.

The PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:

(a) Net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary), which are 1,768,894 tons of CO2eq;

(b) Leakage are assumed to be zero;

(c) Net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are assumed to be zero;

(d) Enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), which are 1,768,894 tons of CO2eq.

The estimates referred to above are given:

(a) On a year basis;

(b) From 01/01/2008 to 31/12/2012, covering the whole crediting period;

(c) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis;

(d) For each GHG gas, which is CO2;

(e) In tonnes of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol;

The formula used for calculating the estimates referred above (see Section D.1.2.3, D.1.2.4, D.1.4), are consistent throughout the PDD.

For calculating the estimates referred to above, key factors, influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project, were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred to above are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

The estimation referred to above is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

The estimates referred to above are consistent throughout the PDD.

The annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

The PDD, in Section E, includes an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation.

Outstanding issues related to Estimation of emission reductions (42-47), PP's response and the AIE conclusion are summarized in Appendix A (refer to CAR 24).
The raised CAR concerns:
CAR 24 – the excel spreadsheet calculation model.

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

Changes in the project activities which increase the area planted, do not fall under the "Regulations for the assessment of environmental impacts (planned commercial and other activities in the Russian Federation", approved by order of the National Commission for the Protection of the Environment of the Russian Federation № 372 of May 16, 2000. Main goal of the project is voluntary absorption of GHG emissions (CO2) emissions from the atmosphere, which means that the project cannot harm the environment and, on the contrary, it helps to reduce pollutant emissions.

The project activity does not adversely impact on the environment, as is aimed at reducing CO2 emissions, by means of their absorption.

4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)

Stakeholder consultation was not undertaken as it is not required by the host party.

4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)

Not applicable.

4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)

The PDD appropriately specifies how the LULUCF project conforms to:

(a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying the good practice guidance for land use, land-use change and forestry as decided by the CMP, as appropriate;
(b) The definition of "forest" selected by the host Party, which specifies:

(i) A single minimum tree crown cover value between 10 and 30 per cent; and

(ii) A single minimum land area value between 0.05 and 1 hectare; and

(iii) A single minimum tree height value between 2 and 5 metres.

JI specific approach

The baseline chosen takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC, basing on the IPCC 2006 principles and equations (transition from one pool to another).

The baseline chosen also ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol (refer to Section A.4.2 of PDD).

The project boundary defined in the PDD, which is indicated on Fig B.3.1 of PDD, geographically delineates the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants.

The project boundary defined in the PDD encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are:

(a) Under the control of the project participants, such as (above-ground and below-ground biomass);

(b) Reasonably attributable to the project, such as (re to clause a); and

(c) Significant, such as (re to clause a).

The project boundary defined in the PDD accounts for all changes in the following carbon pools: above-ground biomass, belowground biomass.

The PDD provides:

The information of which carbon pools are selected, which is (above-ground and below-ground biomass);

The project boundary defined in the PDD is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment.

The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD in its section (re to Section B.5).

All gases and sources/sinks included are explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline, such as (use of fertilizers, combustion of fossil fuels used in on-site vehicles) or the LULUCF project are appropriately justified.

The PDD, in section Section D.1.1, provides an appropriate description of the sampling design that will be used for the calculation of the net anthropogenic removals by sinks occurring within the project boundary in the project scenario and in the baseline scenario, including, inter alia, stratification, determination of number of plots and plot distribution etc.

Leakage were reasonably neglected that is conservative (re to Section B.5 and Section D.4).

4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)

Not applicable.

5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES

No comments, pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI Guidelines, were received.

6 DETERMINATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a determination of the "Carbon sequestration via afforestation in Siberian settlements, Russian Federation" Project in Russia. The determination was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The determination consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion.

Net anthropogenic removals by sinks attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented and maintained as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The review of the project design documentation Version 08 and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria.

The determination revealed two pending issues related to the current determination stage of the project: the issue of the written approval of the project and the authorization of the project participant by the host Party. If the written approval and the authorization by the host Party are awarded, it is our opinion that the project as described in the Project Design Document, Version 08 dated 26.04.2012 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.

The determination is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report.

7 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by ANO CEI that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Carbon sequestration via afforestation in Siberian settlements, Russian Federation, PDD Version 08, dated 26.04.2012.
/2/ Excel spreadsheets with calculation of net anthropogenic removals “Расчет кол-ва площадок 14.xls”, “Предвар обслед статистика.xls”, “Предвар обслед протокол.xls”, “Предвар обслед протокол (5 areas &D3 D4).xls”, “Расчет общий (on 14 areas with D3 D4).xls”, “ZALESOVO CO2 calculations.xls”.
/3/ Carbon sequestration via afforestation in Siberian settlements, Russian Federation, PDD Version 01- Version 07.

Category 2 Documents:
Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

/1/ Decision of Foresters league #2 dd. 10.04.10;
/2/ Conclusion on official review of report;
/3/ Report of forest characteristics research prepared by AltaiState Agricultural University, 2012;
/4/ Protocol of decision making dd. 07.09.2007;
/5/ Agreement on collaboration # 2000/20-07;
/6/ Agreement on collaboration with CEI # 2007/06/09;
/7/ Description of preliminary research of forest lands prepared by ASAU;
/8/ Forest managing instruction approved by Minsitry of Natural Resources 06.02.2008 #31;
/9/ Confirmation of not forest for 50 years (photographic achieve files);
/10/ Methodological recommendations on forest inventory procedure, approved by Rosselkhoz dd. 10.11.11 #472;
/11/ Interstate Standard GOST 16483.0-89 “on general requirements on physic-mechanical testing of wood”;
/12/ State standard GOST 23431-79 “Timber. Structure and physic-mechanical properties of wood”;
/13/ Article “Soil carbon pool changes in soils of Russia in 1990 – 2004”;
/14/ Sector standard “Taxation and forest inventory. Classification and notification, main calculation equations, terms and definitions” OST 56-73-84.

Persons interviewed:

List persons interviewed during the determination or persons that contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.

/1/ A. Stetsenko – President, ANO CEI;

/2/ G. Safonov – Director, ANO CEI.

1. o0o -

APPENDIX A: COMPANY PROJECT DETERMINATION PROTOCOL
DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

Table 1
Check list for determination, according JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL (Version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
General description of the project				
Title of the project				
-	Is the title of the project presented?	The title of the project is "Carbon sequestration via afforestation in Siberian settlements, Russian Federation". Type of project: Sequestration of greenhouse gases from the atmosphere.		OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	**CAR 01.** Please correct "Sector" to Sectoral Scope: (14) Land-use, land-use change and forestry.	CAR 01	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	The version is 01.		OK
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	The PDD date is 26.01.2012.		OK
Description of the project				
-	Is the purpose of the project included with a concise, summarizing explanation (max. 1-2 pages) of the: a) Situation existing prior to the starting date of the project; b) Baseline scenario; and c) Project scenario (expected outcome, including a technical description)?	The PDD formulates objectives of the project as follows: - reduction of the anthropogenic burden on the environment and impacts of global climate change on Altai region through increase of the afforested areas and, subsequently, increase of CO2 sequestration from the atmosphere; - development of the algorithms for estimation of the carbon absorption in forest ecosystems on the local level, and through that, implementation of the JI project		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		activities corresponding to art. 6 of Kyoto Protocol; - development of the mechanisms for active management and protection of the forest areas, not included in the State Forest Fund. Requirements a), b), c) to the content of Section A.2 are met.		
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	The history of the project (incl. its JI component) is summarized in sufficient detail in the Section A2 PDD. **CL 01.** Please provide the documented evidences of the facts mentioned in the history of the project: - documents confirming that project land was used for the agricultural purposes; - request of NGO "Zdorovie sredy" that was sent to Administration of Zalesovo Municipality and the Forest Agency of Altai Kray; - protocol or other evidences of the meeting in Zalesovo municipal administration; - agreement for undertaken measures at the project land that was signed between "Zalesovskiy Agropromsnab" and local entrepreneur A.Lyskov; - agreement of NGO CEI, "Zdorovie sredy" and their partners.	CL 01	OK
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	The Party and project participant involved in the project are listed as follows: Party A – Russian Federation (Host Party); legal entity - Autonomous Non-commercial Organization "Center for Environmental Innovation" (NGO CEI) Party B – to be defined.		OK
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	**CAR 02.** The data of the project participant are presented in due tabular format. Please present Annex 1 in English.	CAR 02	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Contact information is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.		OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Russian Federation is indicated as Host Party.		OK
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	Russian Federation.		OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Altay Kray, Zalesovo District.		OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	**CAR 03.** Please indicate the city/town/community etc. of the project location.	CAR 03	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	**CAR 04.** Please provide the detailed delineation of the project boundary including information allowing the unique identification of the LULUCF project.	CAR 04	OK
Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project				
-	Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	**CAR 05.** Please provide information about technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project.	CAR 05	OK
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	It is stated in Section A.4.4 on page 15 that “The project aims at sequestration of CO2 from the atmosphere. Such sequestration can only be achieved by implementing the project activities on creation and protection of the carbon-absorbing forest.”		OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	The estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period is provided in the Section A.4.4.1.		OK
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO2e?	The estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period is provided in tCO2e.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	The data from questions above are presented in tabular format. Refer to Table A.4.4.1.		OK
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	The length of the crediting period is indicated as 5 years.		OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO2 equivalent provided?	Total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO2 equivalent are provided.		OK
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	**CAR 06.** The project has no written approvals by the Parties involved. The project approval by Parties will be provided following the determination of the PDD at hand.	CAR 06	Pending
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	Host Party involved is the Russian Federation.		OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 04.		Pending
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, the written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional.		OK
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved				
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: − A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity? or − Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?	The project participant Autonomous Non-commercial Organization "Center for Environmental Innovation" (NGO CEI) is deemed to be authorized with the issue of the project approval by the Host Party. Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 03.		Pending
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the	It is explicitly indicated in the PDD Section B.1 that a JI specific approach is applied according to the Guidance on		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	baseline? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Version 3 (hereafter referred Guidance).		
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner is not provided since baseline emissions equal zero. **CAR 07.** Please provide information about the actual baseline emissions which were conservatively neglected.	CAR 07	OK
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established: (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one? (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? − Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account? (c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, date sources and key factors? (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions? (e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure? (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate?	The baseline is established basically: (a) By listing and describing future baseline scenarios available for the project participant and selecting the most likely scenario: Alternative 1: Continuation of the existing situation (agricultural use of the project land). Alternative 2: The project itself (without JI registration). (b) The relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances were analysed and concluded in PDD. (c) Generally in a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies parameters, data sources and key factors. (d) By taking into account key factors that affect a baseline, such as situations in the regions in 1990-s and legislation as to agricultural lands. (e) Yes. (f) Yes.		OK
24	If selected elements or combinations of	N/A		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements or combinations together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 23 above?			
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	N/A		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	NA		OK
26 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	NA		OK
26 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	NA		OK
26 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	NA		OK
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a result?	NA		OK
Additionality				
JI specific approach only				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used?	The PDD indicates that approach (a) is used.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions or enhancements of removals; (b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; (c) Application of the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board".			
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	The PDD provide a clear justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description in Section B4.		OK
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Additionality proofs are provided through five (5) stages: Stage 1. Identification of alternatives; Stage 2. Investment analysis, and (or) Stage 3. Barrier analysis; Stage 4. Common practice analysis. Stage 5. Provision of additionally proofs, Hoverer, only 1st, 2nd, 4th stages was performed because "the investment analysis shows that Project is not the most financially attractive"		OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	The additionally is demonstrated appropriately		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
30	If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	N/A		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	NA		OK
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	NA		OK
31 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?	NA		OK
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?	NA		OK
31 (e)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	NA		OK
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects				
JI specific approach only				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (i) Under the control of the project participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	NA		OK
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?	NA		OK
32 (c)	Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate?	NA		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?	NA		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	NA		OK
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	The starting date is determined to be September 17, 2000 when was the discussion and approval of the intentions of this project as a JI project, the withdrawal of lands under the protection and use of the intended purpose. **CL 02**. Please provide supporting document.	CL 03	OK
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes		OK
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	Operational lifetime is defined as 50 years or 600 months, from 17/09/2000 till 17/09/2050.		OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	The length of crediting period is defined as 5 years or 60 months.		OK
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	The starting date of the crediting period after the date of the first emission reductions.		OK
34 (d)	Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?	The crediting period is defined as from 01/01/2008 to 31/12/2012.		OK
34 (d)	If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval? Are the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented separately for those until 2012 and those after	N/A		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	2012?			
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	It is explicitly indicated that a JI specific approach is chosen.		OK
JI specific approach only				
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe: − All relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored? − The period in which they will be monitored? − All decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance?	**CAR 08.** Please clearly indicate the key characteristics that were monitored. **CAR 09.** Please provide information on the period in which key characteristics was monitored. **CAR 10.** Please clearly indicate all decisive factors for the control and reporting of the project performance. **CAR 11.** If a section of JI LULUCF PDD form is not applicable, it shall be explicitly stated that the section is left blank on purpose (see cl.13 Guidelines for users of the JI LULUCF PDD form v.4). CAR 08 refers to the Section D. **CAR 12.** Please provide the complete translation of PDD text in English including the headlines of the tables in Section D.	CAR 08 CAR 09 CAR 10 CAR 11 CAR 12	OK OK OK OK OK
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 08, CAR 09 and CAR 10.		OK
36 (b)	If default values are used: − Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? − Do the default values originate from recognized sources? − Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels?	**CAR 13.** The default values are not clearly identified.	CAR 13	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?			
36 (b) (i)	For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 08, CAR 09 and CAR 10.		OK
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, − Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? − Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	**CAR 14.** Please provide the electronic references or documents themselves to the all documents mentioned in Section D.	CAR 14	OK
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	**CAR 15.** Please specify the emergency procedures to be followed if expected data are not available.	CAR 15	OK
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	International System Units (SI units) are used.		OK
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 08		OK
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 08.		OK
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”?	N/A		OK
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 08, CAR 09 and CAR 10.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination? (iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?			
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	Most of methods employed for data monitoring are described in the monitoring plan. **CAR 16.** The frequency of data monitoring and recording is not described. Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 14.	CAR 16	OK
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?	The baseline emissions are not calculated because they are accepted to be equal to zero. The project emissions/removal estimation/calculation formulas presented in the Section D.1.2.3 and Section D.1.2.4. Leakages accepted to be equal to zero.		OK
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	The underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae is well explained.		OK
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 14.		OK
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	**CAR 17.** Please indicate the equations numbers.	CAR 17	OK
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Yes		OK
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	The conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures was justified.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	N/A		OK
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline ensured?	N/A		OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	N/A		OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 14.	Pending	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 14.	Pending	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Implicit and explicit assumptions are explained in a transparent manner. The assumptions in the monitoring plan are specified and explained in Section D.1.		OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	N/A		OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals provided?	**CAR 18.** The uncertainty of key parameters is not described and remains unclear.	CAR 18	OK
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project? Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found?	Monitoring plan refers to the national and international monitoring standards. **CAR 19.** Please provide detailed information on the IPCC methodology used for the calculation of carbon abortion by soils mentioned in Section D.1.2.3.	CAR 19 CL 02	OK OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		CL 03. Please clarify the application of the "Decision 16/CMP.1. Land use, land-use change forestry// Report of the Conference of the Parties…" on the page 52. Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 13.		
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	**CAR 20.** Please justify the statistical representativeness of trial areas sampling.	CAR 20	OK
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available upon request?	**CAR 21.** Please provide information on the quality assurance and control procedures.	CAR 21	OK
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	**CAR 22.** Please provide the clear identification of the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities.	CAR 22	OK
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type? If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 19.		OK
36 (l)	Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources but not including data that are calculated with equations?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 08 and CAR 11.		OK
36 (m)	Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of	**CAR 23.** The monitoring plan does not indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.	CAR 23	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	ERUs for the project?			
37	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?	N/A		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	NA		OK
38 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	NA		OK
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	NA		OK
38 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	NA		OK
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	NA		OK
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach				
39	If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period: (a) Is the underlying project composed of clearly identifiable components for which	N/A		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently? (b) Can monitoring be performed independently for each of these components (i.e. the data/parameters monitored for one component are not dependent on/effect data/parameters to be monitored for another component)? (c) Does the monitoring plan ensure that monitoring is performed for all components and that in these cases all the requirements of the JI guidelines and further guidance by the JISC regarding monitoring are met? (d) Does the monitoring plan explicitly provide for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?			
Leakage				
JI specific approach only				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	The appropriate description of potential leakage estimation is provided in Section E.4.		OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	N/A		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	N/A		OK
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following	Information presented in the Section E confirms that		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions	approach (a) is chosen.		
43	If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary)? (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	Yes, ex ante estimates of project emissions, baseline emissions and emission reduction are provided in Section E. **CAR 24.** Please provide excel spreadsheet calculation model.	CAR 24	OK
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	N/A		OK
45	For both approaches in 42 (a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given: (i) On a periodic basis? (ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? (iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? (iv) For each GHG? (v) In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto	(a) Estimates in 42 are given: (i) For 2008-2012; (ii) Yes; (iii) On a sink-by-sink basis; (iv) For the only GHG CO2; (v) In tones of CO2 equivalent; (b) The formulae used for calculating the estimates in 43 are consistent throughout the PDD; (c) Refer to CAR 05 and CAR 07 (d) Refer to CAR 11 (e) N/A. (f) Yes;		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	Protocol? (b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (c) For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate? (d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent? (e) Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice? (f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner? (g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (h) Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?	(g) The estimates in 43 are consistent throughout the PDD; (h) Yes		
46	If the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 24.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	emissions or net removals calculation?			
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
47 (a)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	NA		OK
47 (b)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented in the PDD: − On a periodic basis? − At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? − On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? − For each GHG? − In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? − Are the formula used for calculating the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? − Are the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? − Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?	NA		OK
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 14.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?			
48 (b)	If the analysis in 48 (a) indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?	The Section F.2. of PDD reasonably states "the project activity does not adversely impact on the environment" .		OK
Environmental impacts				
49	If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide: (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	This type of project is not liable to arrangement of stakeholders' consultation in form of public hearing.		OK
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)				
50	Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under: (a) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in .Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects.? If the project contains more than one JI SSC project type component, does each component meet the relevant threshold criterion? (b) One of the SSC project categories defined	N/A		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	in the most recent version of appendix B of annex II to decision 4/CMP.1, or an additional project category approved by the JISC in accordance with the relevant provision in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects"?			
51	Does the SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled component of a large project by explaining that there does not exist a JI (SSC) project with a publicly available determination in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines: (a) Which has the same project participants; and (b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and (c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and (d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point?	N/A		OK
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
52 (a)	Do all projects in the bundle: (i) Have the same crediting period? (ii) Comply with the provisions for JI SSC projects defined in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects", in particular the thresholds referred to in 50 (a) above? (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e.	N/A		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	location, technology/measure etc.)?			
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?	N/A		OK
52 (c)	Has the AIE received (from the project participants): (i) Information on the bundle using the form developed by the JISC (F-JI-SSCBUNDLE)? (ii) A written statement signed by all project participants indicating that they agree that their individual projects are part of the bundle and nominating one project participant to represent all project participants in communicating with the JISC? (iii) Indication by the Parties involved that they are aware of the bundle in their project approvals referred to in 19 above?	N/A		OK
53	If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category? (b) Apply the same technology or measure? (c) Located in the territory of the same host Party?	N/A		OK
54	If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Have SSC PDDs been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle? (b) Does each SSC PDD contain a single JI SCC project in the bundle?	N/A		OK
55	If the projects in the bundle use the same	N/A		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	baseline, does the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provide an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle?			
56	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan? (a) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects; (b) By preparing an overall monitoring plan including a proposal of monitoring of performance of the constituent projects on a sample basis, as appropriate.	N/A		OK
56 (b)	If the approach 57 (b) above is used, (i) Are all the JI SSC projects located in the territory of the same host Party? (ii) Do all the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category? (iii) Do all the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure? (iv) Does the overall monitoring plan reflect good monitoring practice appropriate to the bundled JI SSC projects and provide for collection and archiving of the data needed to calculate the emission reductions achieved by the bundled projects?	N/A		OK
Applicable to all JI SSC projects				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	NA		OK
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
58	Does the PDD appropriately specify how the LULUCF project conforms to:	The PDD appropriately specify how the LULUCF project conforms to:		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying good practice guidance for LULUCF as decided by the CMP, as appropriate? (b) In the case of afforestation, reforestation and/or forest management projects, the definition of "forest" selected by the host Party, which specifies: (i) A single minimum tree crown cover value (between 10 and 30 per cent)? and (ii) A single minimum land area value (between 0.05 and 1 hectare)? and (iii) A single minimum tree height value (between 2 and 5 metres)?	(a) Yes. (b) The project activity is afforestation. (i) Yes. (ii) Yes. (iii) Yes. Please refer to PDD Section A.4.2.		
JI specific approach only				
59	Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above Does the PDD provide an explanation how the baseline chosen: − Takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC? − Ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 19. PDD ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol in the Section A.4.2.		OK
60	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (a) Does the project boundary geographically delineate the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants? (b) If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land, (i) Does each discrete area of land have a unique geographical identification?	(a) Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 04. (b) N/A. (c) (i) Yes. (ii) Yes. (iii) Yes. (d) The project boundary account for all changes in the above-ground and below-ground biomass carbon pools. The Litter, Dead wood and Soil organic carbon pools are		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area? (ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land? (c) Does the project boundary encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are: (i) Under the control of the project participants; (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and (iii) Significant? (d) Does the project boundary account for all changes in the following carbon pools: − Above-ground biomass; − Below-ground biomass; − Litter; − Dead wood; and − Soil organic carbon? (e) Does the PDD provide: (i) The information of which carbon pools are selected? (ii) If one or more carbon pools are not selected, transparent and verifiable information that indicates, based on conservative assumptions, that the pool is not a source? (d) Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria in (b) above?	neglected for conservativeness. (e) (i) Yes, refers to Section B2. (ii) Yes. (d) N/A.		
61 (a)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included appropriately described and justified in the PDD?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 04		OK
61 (b)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.)	The exclusion of carbon pools: Litter, Dead wood and Soil		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	Are all gases and sources/sinks included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline or the LULUCF project appropriately justified?	organic carbon are appropriately justified in Section B.2.		
62	Monitoring plan - in addition to 35-39 Does the PDD provide an appropriate description of the sampling design that will be used for the calculation of the net anthropogenic removals by sinks occurring within the project boundary in the project scenario and, in case the baseline is monitored, in the baseline scenario, including, inter alia, stratification, determination of number of plots and plot distribution etc.?	The sampling design is described in the Section D.1.1. Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 20.		OK
63	Does the PDD take into account only the increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?	The appropriate description of potential leakage estimation is provided in Section E.4. The leakages are accepted to be equal to zero.		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	NA		OK
64 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	NA		OK
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	NA		OK
64 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced	NA		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	approved CDM methodology?			
64 (d)	Are the baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage established appropriately as a result?	NA		OK
Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
66	Does the PDD include: (a) A description of the policy or goal that the JI PoA seeks to promote? (b) A geographical boundary for the JI PoA (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all JPAs included in the JI PoA will be implemented? (c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including: − The maintenance of records for each JPA? − A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)? − Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA? (d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used? (e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA?	NA		OK
67	*Project approvals by Parties involved - additional to 19-20* Are all Parties partly or entirely within the	NA		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	geographical boundary for the JI PoA listed as "Parties involved" and indicated as host Parties in the PDD?			
68	*Authorization of project participants by Parties involved - additional to 21* Is the coordinating entity presented in the PDD authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA?	NA		OK
69	*Baseline setting - additional to 22-26* Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?	NA		OK
70	*Additionality - additional to 27-31* Does the PDD indicate at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated? (a) For the JI PoA (b) For each type of JPA	NA		OK
71	*Crediting period - additional to 34* Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?	NA		OK
72	*Monitoring plan - additional to 35-39* Is the monitoring plan established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA?	NA		OK
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?	NA		OK
73	For each real JPA listed, does the PDD provide the information of: (a) Name and brief summary of the JPA? (b) The type of JPA? (c) A geographical reference or other means of identification? (d) The name and contact details of the	NA		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	entity/individual responsible for the operation of the JPA? (e) The host Party(ies)? (f) The starting date of the JPA? (g) The length of the crediting period of the JPA? (h) Confirmation that the JPA meets all the eligibility requirements for its type, including a description of how these requirements are met? (i) Confirmation that the JPA has not been determined as a single JI project or determined under a different JI PoA?			

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Determination team conclusion
CAR 01. Please correct "Sector" to Sectoral Scope: (14) Land-use, land-use change and forestry.	-	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 02. The data of the project participant are presented in due tabular format. Please present Annex 1 in English.		Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected. See PDD (section A.3 and Annex 1).	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.

CAR 03. Please indicate the city/town/community etc. of the project location	-	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 04. Please provide the detailed delineation of the project boundary including information allowing the unique identification of the LULUCF project.	-	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Provided. See changes in section A.4.1.4.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 05. Please provide information about technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project	-	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Information was provided in section A.4.3 of PDD.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 06. The project has no written approvals by the Parties involved.	-	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 The written approvals will be received later. Corrections were made in section A.5.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 07. Please provide information about the actual baseline emissions which were conservatively neglected.	23	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected. See section B.3 PDD.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 08. Please clearly indicate the key characteristics that was monitored	36 (a)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Characteristics are indicated. See changes on p.31, table D.1.2.1. Response 2 from 25/04/2012 See page 38.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD. Please provide the consistency of the page reference with the PDD. Response 2 is accepted The consistency of the page with the reference was provided.

CAR 09. Please provide information on the period in which key characteristics was monitored	36 (a)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Periods are indicated in table D.1.2.1.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 10. Please clearly indicate the all decisive factors for the control and reporting of the project performance	36 (a)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Decisive factors were indicated. See table D.1.2.1, changes on p.31 and section D.1.2.3. Response 2 from 25/04/2012 See pages 38, 39, 40. Response 3 from 25/04/2012 Corrected/all reference are included	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD. Please provide the consistency of the page reference with the PDD. Conclusion on Response 2 Consistency of the page references was not provided. Conclusion on Response 3 Accepted. CAR is closed.
CAR 11. If a section of JI LULUCF PDD form is not applicable, it shall be explicitly stated that the section is left blank on purpose (see cl.13 Guidelines for users of the JI LULUCF PDD form v.4). CAR 08 refers to the Section D.	36 (a)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected. Response 2 from 25/04/2012 Corrections were made in section D.1.	Response 1 is not accepted. Please see the Section D.1. Response 2 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 12. Please provide the complete translation of PDD text in English including the headlines of the tables in Section D.	36 (a)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected. See section D.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.

CAR 13. The default values are not clearly identified.	36 (b)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Default values are described in section D.1.2.3 (see table D.1.2.3-1 and description of equations). Response 2 from 25/04/2012 Default values were indicated in Table D.1-1 (see section D page 26).	Response 1 is not accepted. The default values are not presented in Section D.1.2.3. Table D.1.2.3-1 is not provided. Conclusion on Response 2 The default values are indicated in the Table D.1-1. CAR is closed.
CAR 14. Please provide the electronic references or documents themselves to the all documents mentioned in Section D.	36 (b) (ii)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Provided/please see for all PDD	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 15. Please specify the emergency procedures to be followed if expected data are not available.	36 (b) (iii)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Information was added. See p.43 of PDD Response 2 from 25/04/2012 Default values are indicated in table D.1-1. Emergencies are indicated in section D.1.5. p.45.	Response 1 is not accepted. The default values are not presented in Section D.1.2.3. Table D.1.2.3-1 in not provided. Conclusion on Response 2 CAR is closed closed based on due amendments made to the PDD. The information on default values and emergency procedures was provided table D.1-1, Section D.1.5., Section D.3 of PDD.
CAR 16. The frequency of data monitoring and recording is not described.	36 (e)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Frequency of data monitoring and recording was added. See table D.1.2.1.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 17. Please indicate the equations numbers.	36 (f) (iii)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Numbers are indicated. See section D.1.2.3.	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 18. The uncertainty of key parameters is not described and remains unclear.	36 (f) (vii)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012	Response 1 is accepted.

		The uncertainty monitored level is indicated in section D.2 of PDD.	CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 19. Please provide detailed information on the IPCC methodology used for the calculation of carbon abortion by soils mentioned in Section D.1.2.3.	36 (g)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected/we used own approach based on the principles and equations of the IPCC2006 (based on transition from one pool to another, without formulas) /A formula was derived from the research Kurganova .IN., Lopez de Guerenu V.O. Shvidenko A.Z., Sapozhnikov P.M. Changing in the total pool of organic carbon in fallow soil of Russia in 1990-2004. Soil Science, 2010, № 3, pp. 361-368). As regards the soil used in the own approach based on the principles and equations of the IPCC2006, offering to assess changes in carbon stocks in the pool during the transition from one control mode to another. In our case the transition from the agricultural land of tillage to carbon depositing forest plantations is considered. The process of replenishment of soil by carbon is complex and depends on the time passed since the cessation of tillage. To identify the values of absorption the information of studies was used in own approach (Kurganova .IN., Lopez de Guerenu V.O. Shvidenko A.Z., Sapozhnikov P.M. Changing in the total pool of organic carbon in fallow soil of Russia in 1990-2004. Soil Science, 2010, № 3, pp. 361-368). We also changed the calculation of the scientific research and The adjusted emission reduction achieved. See the attached report and explain an adjusted/	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on the explanations and due amendments made to the PDD.

CAR 20. Please justify the statistical representativeness of trial areas sampling.	36 (h)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Please see page 20, section 3 (survey results) and annex 1 on p31 of attached Report of the Altai Agrarian University: *The relative accuracy of the accepted 0.1 (10%) at a confidence* *of 0.95. Quantile of the Student distribution t taken in the light* *expected number of sample plots (y = 14) according to Annex* *1, ie, t = 2,16. The calculation started from t = 1,96 (at 0.95) and repeated as long as* *the estimated value of y from the alleged differed by no more than 1.* *The result is rounded up to whole numbers.* Response 2 from 24/04/2012 i.Please see attached file and excel calculations/Also correction was made on p37-38 (green marker) II Please see attached file and excel calculations/Also correction was made on p37-38 (green marker) III. Corrected/please see 34 &36 yellow (areas r=9.8 m, area=300 m2 is TYPO) IV. Correct file is sent at 04/20/2012 (Report_forest_characteristics-final.pdf). Previously sent "Altai Agrarian University Report" an invalid file. V. provided/please see attached excel files: Расчет кол-ва площадок 14, Предвар обслед статистика, Предвар обслед протокол	Response 1 is not accepted. I. Please provide the information for the justifying the choice of number of trial areas (sample plots). Please provide the information on the analysis of input data, including airphoto interpretation and explanation of decision on spatial distribution of the trial areas. II. Please provide the information about collection of input data for the calculation of number of trial areas (sample plots), such as average timber stock for 1 ha. III. Please clarity the radius and size of the trial areas. The Report of the Altai Agrarian University describes the trial areas r=3.57m area=40m2 (see Section 3 of Report_forest_characteristics-final.pdf).The PDD states in Section D that trial areas r=9.8 m, area=300 m2. IV. Please take note that "Altai Agrarian University Report" file sent at 04/16/2012 the (Отчет АГАУ.pdf) and file sent at 04/20/2012 (Report_forest_characteristics-final.pdf) contain the inconsistent information. V. Please provide the information on inventory data of selected sample plots.

		Response 3 from 24/04/2012 I,Iii /provided/see section d (green marker) and annex 3 and attached later file Altai Agrarian University Report Ii& iv corrected excel file will be provide tomorrow Response 4 from 26/04/2012 I Corrected/please see D section II&III&iV Provided/please see excel files	Conclusion on Response 2. i. Please provide the transparent description of data collection methodology. ii. The provided excel calculations do not contain complete information. Please provide relevant requested information. Please provide the consistency of used methodology to the parameters of the trial areas. iii. Please provide the correct version of the requested document. Please provide transparent justification of chosen radius of trail areas. iv. The provided file ("Расчет кол-ва площадок 14.xls") contains the information on the final stage of the calculation. Due the absence of input data information it is impossible to justify the validity of calculations. Please provide requested information on inventory data of selected sample plots. CAR will be closed after the provision of requested information and documents.

			Conclusion on Response 3. (j) please develop the presented methodology in Section D of PDD in order to provide the transparent information on the sampling design. For the moment the PDD does not present the clear methodology and not justifies the sampling of 14 trial areas. Please provide information/formulas of calculation of 14 trial areas. PDD does not present the link between two stages of monitoring: 1st stage is the collection data on the 5 sampling areas, 2nd – the calculation of trial areas number (14) on the basis of the results from the 1st stage. (ii) pending. In addition to the requested information please provide the calculation spreadsheet for the formulas D.3. and D.4. of PDD. (iii) accepted due the presented document. (iiii) pending CAR will be closed after the provision of requested information and documents. Conclusion on Response 4: (i) the requested information presented in Section D of PDD. (ii) The requested information provided in xls files. (iii) accepted due the presented document (iv) The requested information provided in xls files.

			CAR is closed due the provision of requested information and documents.

CAR 21. Please provide information on the quality assurance and control procedures.	36 (i)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Provided. See section D.2.	Conclusion on Response 1 . CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CAR 22. Please provide the clear identification of the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities.	36 (j)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Corrected/please see43page Response 2 from 25/04/2012 Corrected/please see D3 on 46-47 page	Response 1 is not accepted. The requested information is not provided in the page 43. Response 2 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD in Section D 3..
CAR 23. The monitoring plan does not indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.	36 (m)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Changed. See p. 43 of PDD. Response 2 from 25/04/2012 Corrected/please see D3 on 46-47 page	Response 1 is not accepted. The requested information is not provided in the page 43. Response 2 is accepted. CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD in Section D 3..
CAR 24. Please provide excel spreadsheet calculation model.	43	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Provided/please see Excel file	Response 1 is accepted. CAR is closed based on the provided excel spreadsheet ZALESOVO CO2 calculations.xls

CL 01. Please provide the documented evidences of the facts mentioned in the history of the project: - documents confirming that project land was used for the agricultural purposes; - request of NGO "Zdorovie sredy" that was sent to Administration of Zalesovo Municipality and the Forest Agency of Altai Kray; - protocol or other evidences of the meeting in Zalesovo municipal administration; - agreement for undertaken measures at the project land that was signed between "Zalesovskiy Agropromsnab" and local entrepreneur A.Lyskov; agreement of NGO CEI, "Zdorovie sredy" and their partners.	-	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Please see attached files «История» Response 2 from 25/04/2012 Please see attached files «История» Where - documents confirming that project land was used for the agricultural purposes-see folder «подтверждение 50 лет не существования леса» and explanation of these documents are listed in section A4.2 on p16 (files in a folder indicate the presence of collective farms, within the project boundaries, and the fact that they owned to the 1930-1999 period these lands as agricultural land.) - request of NGO "Zdorovie sredy" that was sent to Administration of Zalesovo Municipality and the Forest Agency of Altai Kray –see file Letter 2000-1,2 - protocol or other evidences of the meeting in Zalesovo municipal administration-see file Protocol_Zalesovo - agreement for undertaken measures at the project land that was signed between "Zalesovskiy Agropromsnab" and local entrepreneur A.Lyskov –see file Agreement 2000-1,2,3; 2007-6-7 - agreement of NGO CEI, "Zdorovie sredy" and their partners.-see file Agreement 2007-3-5	Conclusion on Response 1: The response is not clear. Please provide the mentioned files. Conclusion on Response 2: CL is closed based on due amendments made to the PDD.
CL 02. Please provide supporting document about starting date of the project.	34 (a)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012	Conclusion on Response 1: CL is closed based on the provided documents

		Please see attached file Agreement 2000-1,2,3	"Agreement 2000-1..7.pdf"
CL 03 Please clarify the application of the "Decision 16/CMP.1. Land use, land-use change forestry// Report of the Conference of the Parties…" on the page 52.	36 (g)	Response 1 from 20/04/2012 Confusing data was deleted from Annex 3.	Conclusion on Response 1: Response 1 is accepted based on amendments made to the PDD. CL is closed.