VERIFICATION REPORT
UNITED CARBON FINANCE LTD.

VERIFICATION OF THE
WASTE HEAPS DISMANTLING BY TEMP LTD-A IN UKRAINE
SECOND PERIODIC FOR THE PERIOD 01/07/2009 – 31/12/2010

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0672/2012

REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: UKRAINE-ver/0672/2012

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
07/08/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
United Carbon Finance Ltd.	Tahir Musayev

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the second periodic verification of the "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" project of «Temp LTD-A» LLC located in Sverdlovsk, Luhansk region, Ukraine, and applying JI specific approach, 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 verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against 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 verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the verification process is a list of Clarification, Corrective Actions Requests, Forward Actions Requests (CR, CAR and FAR), presented in Appendix A.

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions, or misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 2904172 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent for the monitoring period from 01/07/2009 to 31/12/2010.

Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
UKRAINE-ver/0672/2012	JI
Project title:	
"Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine"	
Work carried out by:	
Kateryna Zinevych - Team Leader, Lead Verifier Sergiy Kustovskyy - Team Member, Verifier Vladimir Lukin – Team member, Technical specialist	
Work reviewed by:	
Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer Alexey Kulakov – Technical Specialist	
Work approved by:	
Ivan Sokolov – Climate Change Operational Manager	

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
07/09/2012	02	29

Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION 3
1.1 Objective 3
1.2 Scope 3
1.3 Verification Team 3

2 METHODOLOGY 4
2.1 Review of Documents 4
2.2 Follow-up Interviews 4
2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests 5

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS 6
3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications 6
3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91) 6
3.3 Project implementation (92-93) 6
3.4 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98) 7
3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100) 8
3.6 Data management (101) 8
3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110) 8

4 VERIFICATION OPINION 8

5 REFERENCES 11

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL 14

1 INTRODUCTION

United Carbon Finance Ltd. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" (hereafter called "the project") at Sverdlovsk, Luhansk region, Ukraine.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification 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

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Independent Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period.

The objective of verification can be divided in Initial Verification and Periodic Verification.

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

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.

1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Kateryna Zinevych
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier

Sergiy Kustovskyy
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Member, Climate Change Verifier

Vladimir Lukin
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical specialist

This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Alexey Kulakov
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical Specialist

2 METHODOLOGY

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

In order to ensure transparency, a verification 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 verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) submitted by United Carbon Finance Ltd. and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD) and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report version(s) 01, 02 and project as described in the determined PDD.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 06/08/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed on-site interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of United Carbon Finance Ltd. and Temp LTD-A were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Temp LTD-A	Organizational structure Responsibilities and authorities Roles and responsibilities for data collection and processing Installation of equipment Data logging, archiving and reporting Metering equipment control Metering record keeping system, database IT management Training of personnel Quality management procedures and technology Internal audits and check-ups
United Carbon Finance Ltd.	Baseline methodology Monitoring plan Monitoring report Excel spreadsheets

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification 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 GHG emission reduction calculation.

If the Verification Team, in assessing the monitoring report and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to the monitoring requirements, it should 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 that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;

(b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the Verification Team to assess compliance with the monitoring plan;

(c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

The Verification 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 verification.

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

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 10 Corrective Action Requests and 3 Clarification Requests.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

No FARs were raised during previous verification.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval by the Ukraine #2456/23/7 dated 05/09/2012 has been issued by the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine.

Written project approval by the Netherland Designated Focal Point was received for the proposed project, reference 2011JI47, dated 22/11/2011.

The abovementioned written approvals are unconditional.

The identified areas of concern as to the Project approval by Parties involved, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CAR 01, CAR 02).

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

The proposed project is a progressive project that envisages processing and dismantling of the waste heaps, which are located in the Luhansk Region of Ukraine.

The main idea of the project is to process waste heaps originated due to coal extraction from mines. Coal extraction from the mine's waste heap will prevent greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere as if in the

case of spontaneous burning and will produce additional amount of coal instead of its mining. Emission reductions due to the implementation of this project will come from three major sources:
- Removing the source of green-house gas emissions from the burning / slow burning waste heap by the extraction of non-combusted coal contained in a waste heap;
- Negative leakage through reduced fugitive emissions of methane due to the replacement of coal that would have been mined, by the coal extracted from the heap under the project activity.
- Reduce electricity consumption at waste heap dismantling in comparison with energy consumption at coal mine.

The Project is aimed at coal extraction from the mine's waste heaps of the Luhansk Region of Ukraine. These waste heaps have been accumulated some time before the start of the project activity from the mining waste of underground mines. Project activity will prevent greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere during combustion of the heaps and will contribute an additional amount of coal, without the need for mining. The Project activities include installation of the equipment for coal extraction and beneficiation near the processing waste heaps and applying special machinery that will perform preparation, loading and transportation of the rock from the waste heaps to the beneficiation factory. After purifying of the matter, the extracted coal will be sold for heat and power generation and the remaining bare rock will be utilized for land engineering and road building.

The project has been operational for the whole monitoring period.

The identified areas of concern as to the project implementation, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CL 01, CL 02).

3.4 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)

The monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website.

For calculating the emission reductions, 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 emission reductions are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, including default emission factors, are selected by carefully balancing

accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

The calculation of emission reductions is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

The identified areas of concern as to the compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CARs 03 - 06).

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

Not applicable

3.6 Data management (101)

The data and their sources, provided in monitoring report, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

The implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures. These procedures are mentioned in the section "References" of this report.

The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order.

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner.

The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan.

The identified areas of concern as to the data managemet, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CARs 07 - 10).

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the second periodic verification of the "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" Project in Ukraine, which applies JI specific approach. The verification 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 verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against 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 verification report and opinion.

The management of United Carbon Finance Ltd is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD version. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 02 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is accurately calculated and is free of material errors, omissions, or misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm, with a reasonable level of assurance, the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/07/2009 to 31/12/2010

For the period from 01/07/2009 to 31/12/2009

Baseline emissions	:	829918	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Leakage	:	- 251820	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Project emissions	:	2188	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Emission Reductions	:	1079550	tonnes of CO2 equivalent

For the period from 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions	:	1398378	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Leakage	:	- 429697	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Project emissions	:	3453	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Emission Reductions	:	1824622	tonnes of CO2 equivalent

Total for the monitoring period

Baseline emissions	:	2228296	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Leakage	:	-681517	tonnes of CO2 equivalent

Project emissions	:	5641	tonnes of CO2 equivalent
Emission Reductions	:	2904172	tonnes of CO2 equivalent

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by United Carbon Finance Ltd that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Project Design Document "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" version 3.0 dated 18/07/2012.
/2/ Monitoring Report for 01/07/2009-31/12/2010 "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine", version 01 dated 03/08/2012.
/3/ Monitoring Report for 01/07/2009-31/12/2010 "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine", version 02 dated 05/09/2012.
/4/ Emission Reductions Calculation version 1 excel file dated 05/09/2012
/5/ Letter of Approval #2456/23/7 for the project "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" issued by State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine dated 05/09/2012.
/6/ Letter of Approval № 2011JI47 dated 22/11/2011 for the project "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" issued by DFP of the Netherlands.

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

/1/ Order # 21-П dated 21/03/2008 "On approval and enactment of instruction", Temp LTD-A LLC, Antratsyt city
/2/ Order # 31-П dated 01/07/2008 "On assignment of documentation storage terms", Temp LTD-A LLC, Antratsyt city
/3/ Instruction dated 21/03/2008 on monitoring of main enterprise activity parameters for implementation of JI project within Kyoto Protocol mechanisms, Temp LTD-A LLC
/4/ Photo–General view of processing facility "Voroshylovska", Temp LTD-A LLC
/5/ Photo–General view of waste heap processing facility "Voroshylovska", Temp LTD-A LLC
/6/ Statement dated 15/09/2008 on meters replacement
/7/ Passport on multitariff active and reactive energy meter LZQM 321.02.534
/8/ Acceptance certificate on multitariff active and reactive energy meter LZQM 321.02.534, fabrication # 446002. Fabrication date–26/02/2007
/9/ Photo– multitariff active and reactive energy meter LZQM 321.02.534, fabrication # 446002, 2007
/10/ Statement on technical check of power meters dated 16/10/2008
/11/ Passport on multitariff active and reactive energy meter EMS 132.11.4
/12/ Acceptance certificate on multitariff active and reactive energy meter EMS

132.11.4, fabrication # 352641. Fabrication date–12/05/2006

/13/ Photo–multitariff active and reactive energy meter EMS 132.11.4, fabrication # 352641, 2006

/14/ Passport on multitariff active and reactive energy meter LZQM 321.02.534

/15/ Acceptance certificate on multitariff active and reactive energy meter LZQM 321.02.534, fabrication # 588429. Fabrication date–21/04/2008

/16/ Photo–multitariff active and reactive energy meter LZQM 321.02.534, fabrication # 588429, 2008

/17/ Technical passport on electronic railway scales type BTB-150C, fabrication # 030200814 at Donetsk railway Karakhash station. Passport dated of 14/02/2005

/18/ Photo–general view of electronic railway scales Donetsk railway Karakhash station

/19/ Photo–display of electronic railway scales Donetsk railway Karakhash station

/20/ Turnover balance sheet as per billing statement 203 for November 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/21/ Operating data of processing facility “Voroshylovska” for 2008-2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/22/ Acceptance certificate on power meter type NIK 2303 ART2T, fabrication # 0060944. Fabrication date 01/03/2010

/23/ Passport on power meter type NIK 2303 ART2T

/24/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for April 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC

/25/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for July 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC

/26/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for November 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC

/27/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for December 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC

/28/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for January 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

/29/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for May 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

/30/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for March 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

/31/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for April 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

/32/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for August 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

/33/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for March 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/34/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for June 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/35/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for July 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/36/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for May 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/37/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 49835544 dated 31/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/38/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 49835369 dated 24/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/39/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 50090314 dated 17/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/40/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 52273537 dated 29/08/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/41/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 52273380 dated 20/08/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/42/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 52273225 dated 06/08/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/43/ Permit on increased risk works execution and increased risk equipment operation # 3129.08.30 – 10.10.1 dated 24/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/44/ Permit on increased risk works execution and increased risk equipment operation # 57.08.30 – 10.10.1 dated 14/01/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/45/ Permit on increased risk works execution and increased risk equipment operation # 1265.10.30 – 10.10.1 dated 26/04/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/46/ Complex state expert opinion # 412 dated 17/10/2007, Temp LTD-A LLC
/47/ State license Series АБ # 206551 on project works.
Production site electricity supply working project, Temp LTD-A LLC, dated 2007
/48/ License Series АБ # 206551 dated 01/10/2005, Temp LTD-A LLC
/49/ EIA of project on building of concentration plant dated 25/09/2006, Temp LTD-A LLC
/50/ Expert opinion on occupational health and safety # 36189153.051549 C.11. as per the Agreement # 3472, dated 07/12/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/51/ Educational and training programme on occupational health and safety of conveyor operator for 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/52/ Organizational and technical preventive measures on occupational health and safety for 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/53/ Organizational and technical preventive measures on occupational health and safety for 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

Persons interviewed:

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

/1/ Sergiy Karuna – Legal Councel, Temp LTD-A
/2/ Alexander Glotov - Deputy director for Operations, Temp LTD-A
/3/ Elena Korotchenko - Chief accountant, Temp LTD-A
/4/ Sergey Aleksyutin - Chief power engineering specialist (electrician) , Temp LTD-A
/5/ Tahir Musayev - representative of the project Developer United Carbon Finance Ltd

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Check list for verification, according to the JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL (Version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01. Please provide the Letter of Approval issued by the DFP of Ukraine. Please also specify ITL of the project in the MR. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02. Please specify ITL of the project in the MR.	CAR 01 CAR 02	OK OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	See CAR 01 above.	OK	OK
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	Clarification Request (CL) 01. Please clarify whether dismantling facility was operational for the whole monitoring period or were there any stoppages in its operation? Clarification Request (CL) 02. In most cases facilities applying the same technology as in the Project do not operate in winter time. On p.9 of the MR it is stated that "If some main project equipment has not been	CL 01 CL 02	OK OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		working during monitoring (...)emission reductions for this period will be assumed equal to 0. However, excel calculation file provides the calculation for winter months. Please explain.		
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	The project has been operational for the whole monitoring period.	OK	OK
Compliance with monitoring plan				
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	Yes, the monitoring occurs in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD.	OK	OK
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?	Yes, all relevant key factors were taken into account, as appropriate.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03. Please exclude reference 2 from p.3 of the Monitoring report.	CAR 03	OK
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04. Reference 6 does not contain the referred value 0.85. Please correct or clarify how the value was achieved. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05. For the parameter $EF_{CH4,\ CM}$ please use the latest version of NIR for 1990-2010. Please check the reference 11. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06. Please check and correct the reference 11	CAR 04 CAR 05 CAR 06	OK OK
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	Yes, the calculation of emission reductions based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.	OK	OK
Applicable to JI SSC projects only				
96	Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	period on an annual average basis? If the threshold is exceeded, is the maximum emission reduction level estimated in the PDD for the JI SSC project or the bundle for the monitoring period determined?			
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	N/A	OK	OK
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	N/A	OK	OK
98	If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report? Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	final in the past?			
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	N/A	OK	OK
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	N/A	OK	OK
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	Yes, the implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures.	OK	OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07. Please provide passport and calibration certificates that ensure accuracy of measuring in the monitoring period for scales reg.#3713. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08.	CAR 07 CAR 08 CAR 09 CAR 10	OK OK OK OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		Please provide passport and calibration certificate for electric power meter reg.#446002. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 09. Please provide the documental evidences that training of personnel was conducted in each year of the monitoring period. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 10. Please provide the numbers for all the tables in the MR (see table on p.4 of the MR).		
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The evidences and records used for the monitoring maintained are in a traceable manner	OK	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	N/A	OK	OK
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	N/A	OK	OK
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?			
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	N/A	OK	OK
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	N/A	OK	OK
Applicable to sample-based approach only				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable, taking into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as:	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− The types of JPAs; − The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used; − The geographical location of each JPA; − The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified; − The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified; − The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and − The samples selected for prior verifications, if any?			
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?	N/A	OK	OK
108	Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? If the AIE	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then does the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?			
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC.s ex ante assessment? (Optional)	N/A	OK	OK
110	If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?	N/A	OK	OK

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarification and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01. Please provide the Letter of Approval issued by the DFP of Ukraine. Please also specify ITL of the project in the MR.		Letter of Approval issued by the DFP of Ukraine is provided.	

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02. Please specify ITL of the project in the MR.		In accordance with JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL paragraphs 90 “The AIE should assess whether at least one written project approval by a Party involved in the JI project, other than the host Party(ies), has been issued by the DFP of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest” . Project approval by Parties involved is provided to the verification team.	
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03. Please exclude reference 2 from p.3 of the Monitoring report.		Excluded	

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04. Reference 6 does not contain the referred value 0.85. Please correct or clarify how the value was achieved.		Reference is corrected. The referred value 0.85 kg/m3 is taken as an average between two suggested types of diesel: summer and winter http://elarum.ru/info/standards/gost-305-82/table 2 from GOST 305-82 Diesel Fuel. Specifications. Values are converted from kg/m3 into kg/l.	

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05. For the parameter $EF_{CH4, CM}$ please use the latest version of NIR for 1990-2010. Please check the reference 11.		In latest NIR of Ukraine 1990-2010 asserts that there is coefficient of methane emission for coal that is already mined 2,4 m3/t (p.122). 2,4 m3/t (p.122) is a coefficient of emissions of methane in the post-coal mining whereas in our calculations we use another coefficient such as average rate for fugitive methane emissions from coal mining. The principal difference between these two factors is one takes into account the emissions of methane during the mining, while another - post production. The period after the coal is not considered in the project. That is why we use average rate for fugitive methane emissions from coal mining from latest NIR where the coefficient is presented. Reference 11 is checked.	
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06. Please check and correct the reference 11.		See answer to CAR 05.	

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07. Please provide passport and calibration certificates that ensure accuracy of measuring in the monitoring period for scales reg.#3713.		Passport and calibration certificates that ensure accuracy of measuring in the monitoring period for scales reg.#3713 is provided. In MR v1 was made a mistake in the dates of calibration. The mistake is corrected.	
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08. Please provide passport and calibration certificate for electric power meter reg.#446002.		Passport and calibration certificate for electric power meter reg.#446002 is provided.	
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 09. Please provide the documental evidences that training of personnel was conducted in each year of the monitoring period.		The documental evidences that training of personnel was conducted according to schedule are provided.	
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 10. Please provide the numbers for all the tables in the MR (see table on p.4 of the MR).		The numbers for all the tables in the MR is provided.	
Clarification Request (CL) 01. Please clarify whether dismantling facility was operational for the whole monitoring period or were there any stoppages in its operation?		Scheduled downtimes for repairs and due to the severe frosts is presented in sheet “data” of excel file and in section B.1 of MR.	

Clarification Request (CL) 02. In most cases facilities applying the same technology as in the Project do not operate in winter time. On p.9 of the MR it is stated that “If some main project equipment has not been working during monitoring (...)emission reductions for this period will be assumed equal to 0. However, excel calculation file provides the calculation for winter months. Please explain.		The calculation of emission reductions during the winter months takes place only when there is a sale of coal from the stock. Thus in the calculation takes into account only the amount of coal that has been enriched and sold to the final buyer in Ukraine.	