



JI DETERMINATION REVIEW FORM

(version 02)

(by submitting this form, a Party involved in a JI activity (through the DFP) or a JISC member request a review)

Party involved (DFP) / **JISC member** submitting the form:

Reference number and **title** of the proposed JI activity:

0211 Utilization of coke gas with electricity generation by two 6 MWe CHP at "ZaporozhCox Plant"

Type of JI activity: **large scale** **small scale** **LULUCF** **PoA/JPA**

Background

1. The requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements defined by the CMP or the JISC with regard to determinations pursuant to paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines have to be met and appropriately dealt with by the accredited independent entity (AIE).
2. Project participants shall submit to an AIE a JI PDD/PoA DD that contains all information needed for the determination of whether the proposed JI activity fulfills the conditions specified in the questions below, as provided in paragraph 31 of the JI guidelines.
3. The AIE shall determine whether the proposed JI activity meets the conditions of paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines, as specified in the questions below.
4. The AIE shall make its determination publicly available through the secretariat, together with an explanation of its reasons, including a summary of comments received and a report of how due account was taken of these, in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines.
5. Where applicable, the AIE shall take into consideration paragraphs 26-39 of the procedures for programmes of activities under the verification procedure under the JISC (JI PoA procedures).

Request for review

Please respond to the questions presented below by marking the appropriate check box:

Yes	No	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE determined appropriately that the proposed JI activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ has been approved by the Parties involved listed in the JI PDD/PoA DD? ▪ would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur? ▪ has an appropriate baseline and monitoring plan in accordance with the criteria set out in appendix B of the JI guidelines?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE confirmed that the project participants have submitted documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed JI activity, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party, and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, have undertaken an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE made its determination publicly available through the secretariat together with an explanation of its reasons, including a summary of the comments received and a report of how due account was taken on these?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the coordinating entity of the JI PoA included only JPA(s) that appear to meet all the eligibility requirements defined in the JI PoA DD? <i>(applicable to JI PoA only)</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	➤ Has the AIE confirmed that the eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs have been fulfilled and the operational and management arrangements for the implementation of the JI PoA have been established by the coordinating entity? <i>(applicable to JI PoA only)</i>

Please describe in detail the reasons for requesting the review, including the specific requirements in the JI guidelines that are not fulfilled, and attach supporting documentation, if appropriate.

- Regarding the crediting period, it is necessary to clarify of inconsistency between the PDD and Determination report.
- It is not clear that the project could not result in an overall increase in production of COG, and hence an increase in fossil fuel emissions, in order to increase steam generation and thereby electricity generation and ERU revenues from the new CHP units.
- The amount of COG delivered to Zaporozhstal should be monitored and compared with historical average deliveries to ensure that any decrease in externally delivered COG is not greater than that caused by the difference in steam input and output through the new units.