DETERMINATION REPORT
UNITED CARBON FINANCE LTD.

DETERMINATION OF THE
WASTE HEAPS DISMANTLING BY TEMP LTD-A IN UKRAINE

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-DET/0568/2012

REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: UKRAINE-det/0568/2012

DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
17/07/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
United Carbon Finance Ltd.	Tahir Musayev

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" project of «Temp LTD-A» LLC located in Sverdlovsk, Luhansk region, Ukraine 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 Action 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 and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
UKRAINE-det/0568/2012	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
Dmytro Balyn – Team member, Technical specialist

Work reviewed by:
Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer
Vasiliy Kobzar – Technical Specialist

Work approved by:
Ivan Sokolov – Climate Change Operational Manager

Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
26/07/2012	02	66

Indexing terms

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

United Carbon Finance Ltd. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine 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 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 emission reduction 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:

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

Sergiy Kustovskyy
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Member, Climate Change Verifier

Dmytro Balyn
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical specialist

This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Vasiliy Kobzar
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical Specialist

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 United Carbon Finance Ltd. 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, United Carbon Finance Ltd. revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 18/07/2012.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version(s) 02, 03.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 19/07/2012 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	➢ Implementation schedule ➢ Project management organisation ➢ Evidence and records on reconstruction and new equipment and its operation ➢ Environmental Impact Assessment ➢ Project monitoring responsibilities ➢ Monitoring equipment ➢ Quality control and quality assurance procedures ➢ Environmental impacts affected ➢ Local authorities and public opinion
CONSULTANT United Carbon Finance Ltd.	➢ Applicability of methodology ➢ Baseline and Project scenarios ➢ Barriers analysis ➢ Additionality justification ➢ Common practice analysis ➢ Monitoring plan ➢ Conformity of PDD to JI requirements

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 determination protocol in Appendix A.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

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.

In the baseline scenario it is assumed that the common practice of waste heaps burning will continue, waste heaps will be burning and emitting GHG into the atmosphere until the coal is consumed. Whereas using improved extraction techniques, proposed in this project, the residual coal can be extracted from the waste heaps and the coal can be used to for the energy needs of local consumers. The reclaimed coal will replace coal that would have otherwise been mined, causing fugitive emissions of methane during the mining process.

Thus, the baseline scenario is the continuation of the current situation, which is the continuation of the situation before the project was installed, without beneficiation plant and waste heap dismantling.

The 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 includes the installation of coal extraction units and the grading of the extracted coal. Extracted coal is then sold for heat and power production.

Therefore, in the project scenario the coal extracted from the waste heaps will partly substitute the coal from the mine, decreasing fugitive methane emissions, and reduce emissions GHG emissions due to waste heap combustion by extracting all of the combustible material from the waste heaps.

Once the waste heap has been processed and coal is extracted, the land released from under the waste heap is remediated and returned to the community. The residue after processing, which is mainly barren rock, is used to shape terrain of abandoned open-cast mining sites so that such areas may be used again.

Brief summary of the history of the project: The project has been initiated in the start of 2006. Installation and construction works were initiated by the end of 2007. 01st of April 2008 is the date of commissioning of the beneficiation plant equipment .The operations at the facility have started on the 01st of April 2008. The JI was one of the drivers for the project from the start and financial benefits provided by the JI mechanism were

considered as one of the reasons to start the project and are crucial in the decision to start the operations.

CARs (CAR01, CAR02, CAR03, CAR25), CLs (CL01) and their resolutions/conclusions applicable to project description are listed in the APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL (Table 2) below.

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 25 Corrective Action Requests and 3 Clarification Requests.

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

4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)

The project has been officially presented for endorsement to the Ukrainian authorities. State Environmental Investments Agency of Ukraine has issued a Letter of Endorsement for the project #2168/23/7 dated 16/08/2011.

Bureau Veritas Certification received these letters from the project participants and does not doubt their authenticity.

As for the time being no written approval for the project was issued by Ukrainian Party. After receiving Determination Report from the Accredited Independent Entity the project documentation will be submitted to the Ukrainian Designated Focal Point (DFP) which is State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine, for receiving a Letter of Approval.

Bureau Veritas Certification considers the letters to be unconditional in accordance with paragraphs 19-20 of the DVM.

CARs (CAR04), and their resolutions/conclusions applicable to project approval by Parties involved are listed in the APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL (Table 2) below.

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The official authorization of each legal entity listed as project participant in the PDD by Parties involved will be provided in the written project approvals (refer to 4.1 above).

CARs (CAR04), and their resolutions/conclusions applicable to project approval by Parties involved are listed in the APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL (Table 2) below.

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.

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

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. *Scenario 1. Continuation of existing situation*
The situation before the project was installed, without beneficiation plant and waste heap dismantling. In the current situation waste heaps are not utilized. Coal contained in the waste heaps is not a subject of extraction and; as a result, spontaneous self-heating and subsequent burning of waste heaps leading to uncontrolled GHG emissions is very common. Coal is produced by underground mines that causes fugitive emissions of methane as well as the formation of new waste heaps.

b. *Scenario 2. Direct energy production from the heat energy of burning waste heap*
Waste heaps are not extinguished and not monitored properly. Some burning heaps are used to produce energy by direct insertion of heat exchangers into the waste heap. This captures a certain amount of heat energy for direct use or conversion into electricity. Coal for industrial use is not extracted from the waste heaps under this scenario. Coal is produced by underground mines of the region and used for

energy production or other purposes. Mining activities result in fugitive gas release, and the formation of more waste heaps.

c. Scenario 3. *Production of construction materials from waste heap matter*
Waste heaps are being processed in order to produce construction materials (bricks, panels, etc.). Coal in the waste heap matter is burnt during the agglomeration process. Coal is produced by underground mines of the region and used for energy production or other purposes. Mining activities result in fugitive gas release, and the formation of more waste heaps.

d. Scenario 4. *Systematic monitoring of waste heaps condition, regular fire prevention and application of extinguishing measures*
Waste heaps are systematically monitored and its thermal condition is observed. Regular fire prevention measures are taken. Coal is not extracted from the waste heaps, but is produced by underground mines and used for energy production or other purposes. Mining activities result in fugitive gas release and formation of more waste heaps.

e. Scenario 4. *Coal extraction from waste heaps without JI incentives*
Although this scenario is similar to the project activity only, the project itself does not benefit from the possible development as a joint implementation project. In this scenario waste heaps are processed in order to extract coal and use it in the energy sector. Less coal is produced by underground mines of the region.

(b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. In this context, the following key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account:

a. Although efforts to stop burning waste heaps and break them down are completely in line with the existing environmental legislation of Ukraine, the solution of these problems is rather costly, requires significant efforts and, actually, is not addressed in a systematic way in Ukraine. The main reason is deficiency of necessary financial resources and lack of political will. The situation is deteriorated by the fact that coal mining itself has decreased over the last 10-12 years as a result of the lack of financing and high net cost of coal extraction;

b. Key factors that affect the baseline such as sectoral reform policies and legislation, economic situation/growth and socio-demographic factors as well as decreasing and/or increasing demand to be met by the project, availability of capital, technologies/techniques, skills and know-how, availability of

best available technologies/techniques in the future, fluctuations in fuel prices, national expansion plans for the energy;

c. Describe any availability of capital (including investment barriers) Ukraine is considered to be a high risk country for doing business and investing in. Almost no private capital is available from domestic or international capital markets for mid to long term investments, and any capital that is available has high cost. In table 5 the PDD Version 3.0 dated 18/07/2012 represents risks of doing business in Ukraine according to various international indexes and studies;
d. The most plausible future scenario identified by performing a barrier analysis. Key factors that affect the baseline such as sectoral reform policies and legislation, economic situation/growth and socio-demographic factors as well as decreasing and/or increasing demand to be met by the project, availability of capital, technologies/techniques, skills and know-how, availability of best available technologies/techniques in the future, fluctuations in fuel prices, national and/or subnational expansion plans for the energy sector taken into account while formulating the plausible feature scenarios;
e. Ukrainian coal sector is largely state-controlled. Energy and Coal Ministry of Ukraine decides production level of state mines, based on their performance. After this, state controlled mines sell their coal to the state Trading Company "Coal of Ukraine". This company also buys coal from private mines and arranges supply of coal to thermal electricity companies. Prices for coal mines differ significantly for public and private mines. In general, prices of state mines are more than 60% higher than the prices for private enterprises;
f. The role of energy sector is absolute and crucial for Ukraine. Power sector is a political factor of sovereignty in Ukraine. Ukrainian economy is considered to be one of the most energy intensive in the world in terms of the consumption of primary energy per a gross domestic product unit. On March 15, 2006 the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine adopted “Energy Strategy of Ukraine till 2030”. The Energy strategy considers exploration of alternative and renewable energy sources as a significant factor in increasing the level of energy safety, decrease of energy anthropogenic impact on the environment and counteractions against global climate change.

The alternatives have been identified based on national practice and reasonable assumptions with regard to the sectoral legislation and reform, economic situation in the country, availability of raw materials and fuel as well as technologies and logistics etc.

Existing Ukrainian laws and regulations treat waste heaps as sources of possible dangerous emissions into the atmosphere. In general the burning of waste heaps should be extinguished and measures must be taken to prevent fires in the future. However, due to the large numbers of waste heaps and their substantial sizes, combined with the limited resources of the owners, they typically do not even undertake the minimum required regular monitoring. Even when informed of a burning waste heap, and measures have to be taken under existing legislation, it is more typical to accept the fine for air contamination, rather than take action to extinguish the burning waste heap itself.

In such circumstances it is safe to say that all scenarios do not contradict existing laws and regulations.

All scenarios, except Scenario 1 - Continuation of existing situation, face prohibitive barriers. Therefore, continuation of existing situation is the most plausible future scenario and is the baseline scenario.

The project “Processing of waste heaps at Monolith-Ukraine” is selected as the comparable JI project. Accredited independent entity has already positively determined that it would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of net anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur. This determination has already been deemed final by the JISC. Appropriate documentation such as PDD and Determination Report regarding this project is available traceably and transparently on the UNFCCC JI Website:
http://ji.unfccc.int/JI_Projects/DB/IPT7L3CLGIZTGGX27T2101W7XCUCW/Determination/DNV-CUK1315829182.27/viewDeterminationReport.html

CARs (CAR05 - CAR09), CLs (CL02) and their resolutions/conclusions applicable to baseline setting are listed in the APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL (Table 2) below.

4.4 Additionality (27-31)

The PDD provides a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description, as per item 4.3 above.

The developer of the project proved that anthropogenic emissions under the project are lower than the emissions that would take place in the absence of the project activity.

Additionality proofs are provided. Five plausible and realistic alternative scenarios were identified for each type of modernization identified in the project:

- Continuation of existing situation
- Direct energy production from the heat energy of burning waste heap
- Production of construction materials from waste heap matter
- Coal extraction from waste heaps without JI incentives
- Systematic monitoring of waste heaps condition, regular fire prevention and application of extinguishing measures

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

CARs (CAR10, CAR11) and their resolutions/conclusions applicable to additionality are listed in the APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL (Table 2) below.

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

The project boundary defined in the PDD, which in accordance with the specific approach is delineated by the physical site of the entire technological complex, encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that are

(i) Under the control of the project participants such as:

- CO2 emissions related to fossil fuel (diesel) consumption for the process of coal extraction from the waste heap;
- CO2 emissions related to electricity use for the process of coal extraction from the waste heap.

(ii) Reasonably attributable to the project such as:

- CO2 emissions related to waste heap burning;
- CO2 emissions related to coal consumption;
- Fugitive methane due to coal mining in the mines;
- CO2 emissions related to consumption of electricity due to mining.

The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD

Based on the above assessment, the AIE hereby confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity.

No outstanding issues were raised as to the project boundary.

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 01/04/2008, which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 14 years and 9 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 4 years and 9 months, and its starting date as 01/04/2008, which is on 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.

The PDD states that the extension of its crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval, and the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012 in all relevant sections of the PDD.

CARs (CAR12), CLs (CL03) and their resolutions/conclusions applicable to crediting period are listed in the APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL (Table 2) below.

4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)

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

The monitoring plan describes all the necessary factors and key characteristics that will be monitored, and the period during which they will be monitored, particularly all the critical factors for controlling and reporting on project activities, such as reporting forms, the operating structure and management structure of the enterprise, that will be applied when implementing the monitoring plan.

The monitoring plan specifies the parameters, constant values and variables that are reliable (i.e. consistent and accurate values), dependable (i.e. that is clearly related to results that are measured) and provide a clear picture of emission reductions that are subject to monitoring, such as: total amount of diesel fuel, coal and electricity consumed.

The monitoring plan has properly given a list of standard variables that are contained in Annex B to the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting

and monitoring" developed by the JISC, including: baseline emissions (BE_y, $BE_{XX,y}$), project emissions (PE_y, $PE_{XX,y}$), electricity consumption (EC_y), CO_2 emission factor ($EF_{CO2,XX}$, $EF_{CH4,XX}$, $EF_{CO2,ELEC,y}$), leakages in year - LE_y, $LE_{XX,y}$, global warming potential - GWP_{XX}, density - ρ_x, net calorific value - NCV_{XX}, fuel quantity combusted - FC_{XX}, oxidation factor for fuel combustion $OXID_{XX}$.

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;

(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;

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording. For any monitoring period the following parameters have to be collected and registered:

- additional electricity consumed in the relevant period as a result of the implementation of the project activity;
- amount of diesel fuel that has been used for the project activity in the relevant period;
- amount of coal that has been extracted from the waste heaps and combusted for energy use in the project activity in the relevant period which is equal to the amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use;
- average ash content of sorted fraction , which is extracted from waste heap;
- average moisture of sorted fraction, which is extracted from waste heap.

The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions, leakage and project emissions.

Emissions in the baseline scenario are calculated as follows:

$$BE_y = BE_{WHB,y} \qquad \text{(Equation 1)}$$

where:

BE_y - Baseline Emissions in the period ***y*** (t CO_2eq),
$BE_{WHB,y}$ - Baseline Emissions due to burning of the waste heaps in the period ***y*** (t CO_2eq).

These, in turn, are calculated as:

$$BE_{WHB,y} = FC_{BE,Coal,y}/1000*\rho_{WHB}*NCV_{Coal}*OXID_{Coal}*k^{C}_{Coal}*44/12 \quad \text{(Equation 2)}$$

where:
$FC_{BE,Coal,y}$ - Amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use, equivalent to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heaps in the project activity in the period ***y***, t.
ρ_{WHB} - Correction factor for the uncertainty of the waste heaps burning process. This factor is defined on the basis of the survey of all the waste heaps in the area that provides a ratio of waste heaps that are or have been burning at any point in time to all existing waste heaps.
NCV_{coal} - Net Calorific Value of coal, GJ/t.
$OXID_{coal}$ - Carbon Oxidation factor of coal.
k^{C}_{Coal} - Carbon content of coal, tC/TJ.
44/12 - Ration between molecular mass of CO_2 and C. Reflect oxidation of C to CO_2.

Leakages in the period y are calculated as follows:

$$LE_y = LE_{CH4} \quad \text{(Equation 3)}$$

Leakages due to fugitive emissions of methane in the mining activities in the period ***y*** (t CO_2eq).

$$LE_{CH4,y} = FC_{BE,Coal,y} * EF_{CH4,CM} * \rho_{CH4} * GWP_{CH4} \quad \text{(Equation 4)}$$

where:
$FC_{BE,Coal,y}$ - Amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use, equivalent to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heaps in the project activity in the period ***y,*** t,
$EF_{CH4,\ CM}$ - Emission factor for fugitive methane emissions from coal mining, m^3/t,
ρ_{CH4} - Methane density, t/m^3,
GWP_{CH4} - Global Warming Potential of Methane, t CO_2eq / t CH_4.

Emissions from the project activity are calculated as follows:

$$PE_y = PE_{EL,y} + PE_{Diesel,y} \quad \text{(Equation 5)}$$

where

PE_y - Project Emissions due to project activity in the period y (t CO_2eq),

$PE_{EL,y}$ - Project Emissions due to consumption of electricity from the grid by the project activity in the period y (t CO_2eq),

$PE_{Diesel,y}$ - Project Emissions due to consumption of diesel fuel by the project activity in the period y (t CO_2eq).

These, in turn, are calculated as:

$$PE_{EL,y} = EC_{PJ,y} * PE_{grid,y} \quad \text{(Equation 6)}$$

where:

$EC_{PJ,y}$ - Additional electricity consumed in period *y* as a result of the implementation of the project activity (MWh),

$EF_{grid,\ y}$ - Relevant emission factor for the electricity from the grid in the period ***y***, kgCO2/kWh (t CO_2/MWh)

$$PE_{Diesel,y} = FC_{PJ,Diesel,y}/1000 * NCV_{Diesel} * OXID_{Diesel} * k^{C}_{Diesel} * 44/12 \quad \text{(Equation 7)}$$

where:

$FC_{PJ,Diesel,y}$ - Amount of diesel fuel that has been used for the project activity in the period ***y***, t.

NCV_{Diesel} - Net Calorific Value of diesel fuel, GJ/t;

$OXID_{Diesel}$ - Carbon Oxidation factor of diesel fuel, ratio;

k^{C}_{Diesel} - Carbon content of diesel fuel, t C/TJ;

44/12 - Ration between molecular mass of CO_2 and C. Reflect oxidation of C to CO_2.

The annual emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - LE_y - PE_y \quad \text{(Equation 8)}$$

where:

ER_y - Emissions reductions of the JI project in year *y* (t CO_2eq)

LE_y - Leakages in year *y* (t CO_2eq);

BE_y - Baseline Emission in year *y* (t CO_2eq);

PE_y - Project Emission in year *y* (t CO_2eq).

The monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, which are sufficiently described in

tabular form in sections of the PDD D.1.1.1., D.1.1.3. and 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.

For monitoring, collection, registration, visualization, archiving, reporting of the monitored data and periodical checking of the measurement devices the management team headed by the Director of the company is responsible. A detailed structure of the team and team members will be established in the Monitoring Manual prior to initial and first verification.

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 (e.g. official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, IPCC, commercial and scientific literature etc.) 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 two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.

The identified areas of concern as to the monitoring plan, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 13 – CAR 22).

4.8 Leakage (40-41)

The PDD appropriately describes an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explains which sources of leakage are to be calculated, and which can be neglected.

This project will result in a net change in fugitive methane emissions due to the mining activities. As coal in the baseline scenario is only coming from mines it causes fugitive emissions of methane. These are calculated as standard country specific emission factor applied to the amount of coal that is extracted from the waste heaps in the project scenario (which is the same as the amount of coal that would have been mined in the baseline scenario). Source of the leakage is the fugitive methane emissions due to coal mining. These emissions are specific to the coal that is being mined. Coal produced by the project activity is not mined but extracted from the waste heap through the advanced beneficiation process. Therefore, coal produced by the project activity substitutes the

coal would have been otherwise mined in the baseline. Coal that is mined in the baseline has fugitive methane emissions associated with it and the coal produced by the project activity does not have such emissions associated with it.

The PDD provides a procedure for estimation of leakage.

No outstanding issues were raised as to leakage

4.9 Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (42-47)

The PDD indicates assessment of emissions in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario as the approach chosen to estimate the emission reductions generated by the project.

The PDD provides estimates of:

(a) Emissions in the project scenario (within the project boundary), which are:

- 17490 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2008-2012;
- 34040 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2013-2022.

(b) Leakage, which is:

- -2028766 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2008-2012;
- -4125910 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2013-2022.

(c) Emissions in the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are:

- 6687714 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2008-2012;
- 13719660 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2013-2022.

(d) Emission reductions adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), which are:

- 8698990 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2008-2012;
- 17811530 tonnes of CO_2eq in 2013-2022.

The estimates referred to above are given:

(a) On an annual basis;

(b) From 01/04/2008 to 31/12/2022, covering the whole crediting period;

(c) Based on primary sources;

(d) For each GHG gas, such as CO_2;

(e) In tonnes of CO_2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or amended in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol.

Formulae for calculating the above estimations are given in section 4.7. All formulae are in the correct sequence and compliance across the PDD.

For calculating the estimates referred to above, key factors, e.g. energy prices and availability, market development 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, such as feasibility studies, production forecasts, actual historical monitored data are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, such as emission factor for electricity consumption, emission factor for diesel fuel and coal, were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

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 average annual emission reduction estimations over the crediting period are calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total number of months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

Detailed algorithms of calculations and their results are described in section D, E and supporting documents to the PDD.

The identified areas of concern as to the estimation of emission reductions, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 23).

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

The PDD lists and attaches documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party. The full scope EIA in accordance with the Ukrainian legislation has been conducted for the proposed project in 2006 for the processing facility by the local developer Ltd. Scientific and industrial design company "Alyans".

The report has been reviewed by the competent authorities of Ukraine. The environmental impact of the project has not been considered significant or prohibitive.

The PDD provides conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party, if the analysis referred to above indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party.

The identified areas of concern as to environmental impacts, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 24).

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)

Not applicable.

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 "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" Project in Ukraine. 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.

The additionality of the project has been assessed through provision of traceable and transparent information showing that the same approach for additionality demonstration has already been taken in cases for which determination is deemed final and which can be regarded as comparable, as suggested in item “b)“ of Paragraph 44 of “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” version 03. The PDD identifies a comparable project, demonstrates that the identified project is a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances, and provides justification, that determination for a comparable project is relevant for the project at hand.

Emission reductions 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 determination revealed one pending issue related to the current determination stage of the project: the issue of the written approval of the project. 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 3.0 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.

The review of the project design documentation (version 3.0) and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country 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 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 2.0 dated 10/07/2012
/2/ Emission Reductions Calculation version 2.0 excel file dated 10/07/2012
/3/ Project Design Document "Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine" version 3.0 dated 18/07/2012
/4/ Emission Reductions Calculation version 3.0 excel file dated 18/07/2012
/5/ LoE #2168/23/7 dated 16/08/2011 issued by the State environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine

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/ Technical passport on electronic railway scales type BET-150B2, fabrication # 686 at Donetsk railway Dariivka station. Passport dated of 20/06/2011

/21/ Delivery note # 0000005838 dated 26/08/2011 on oil products distribution

/22/ Decommissioning statement # СпТ-007В dated 31/08/2011, Voroshylovska station warehouse

/23/ Turnover balance sheet as per billing statement 203 for August 2011

/24/ Passport on quality # 1902 dated 30/08/2011

/25/ Delivery note # 0000006095 dated 01/09/2011 on oil products distribution

/26/ Invoice # ПМ-0016 on internal distribution dated 01/09/2011, Voroshylovska station warehouse

/27/ Delivery note # 0000006468 dated 09/09/2011 on oil products distribution

/28/ Invoice # ПМ-0017 on internal distribution dated 09/09/2011, Voroshylovska station warehouse

/29/ Delivery note # 0000006467 dated 09/09/2011 on oil products distribution

/30/ Invoice # ПМ-0018 on internal distribution dated 09/09/2011, Voroshylovska station warehouse

/31/ Photo–general view of electronic railway scales Donetsk railway Karakhash station

/32/ Turnover balance sheet as per billing statement 203 for March 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/33/ Decommissioning statement # СпТ – 01К dated 31/03/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/34/ Delivery note # 0000001282 dated 15/03/2011 on oil products distribution, Temp LTD-A LLC

/35/ Goods delivery note # 0000001282 dated 15/03/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/36/ Turnover balance sheet as per billing statement 203 for October 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/37/ Delivery note # 0000007741 dated 28/10/2011 on oil products distribution, Temp LTD-A LLC

/38/ Goods delivery note # 0000007741 dated 28/10/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/39/ Turnover balance sheet as per billing statement 203 for November 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/40/ Operating data of processing facility “Voroshylovska” for 2008-2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/41/ Acceptance certificate on power meter type NIK 2303 ART2T, fabrication # 0060944. Fabrication date 01/03/2010

/42/ Passport on power meter type NIK 2303 ART2T

/43/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for April 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC

/44/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for July 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC

/45/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for November 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/46/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for December 2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/47/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for January 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC
/48/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for May 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC
/49/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for March 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC
/50/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for April 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC
/51/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for August 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC
/52/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for March 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/53/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for June 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/54/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for July 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/55/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for May 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/56/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for March 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/57/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for April 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/58/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for September 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/59/ Information note on the amount and cost of electricity distributed to the supplier for November 2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/60/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 49835544 dated 31/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/61/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 49835369 dated 24/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/62/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 50090314 dated 17/10/2008, Temp LTD-A LLC
/63/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 52273537 dated 29/08/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/64/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 52273380 dated 20/08/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/65/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 52273225 dated 06/08/2010, Temp LTD-A LLC
/66/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 51608032 dated 29/11/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/67/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 51608099 dated 29/11/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC
/68/ Pay slip on acceptance of freight # 51267904 dated 10/11/2011, Temp LTD-A

LLC

/69/ Permit on increased risk works execution and increased risk equipment operation # 733.11.09 – 10.10.1 dated 07/10/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/70/ 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

/71/ 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

/72/ 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

/73/ Complex state expert opinion # 412 dated 17/10/2007, Temp LTD-A LLC

/74/ State license Series АБ # 206551 on project works.
Production site electricity supply working project, Temp LTD-A LLC, dated 2007

/75/ License Series АБ # 206551 dated 01/10/2005, Temp LTD-A LLC

/76/ EIA of project on building of concentration plant dated 25/09/2006, Temp LTD-A LLC

/77/ Expert opinion on occupational health and safety # 36189153.051549 C.11. as per the Agreement # 3472, dated 07/12/2011, Temp LTD-A LLC

/78/ Educational and training programme on occupational health and safety of conveyor operator for 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/79/ Organizational and technical preventive measures on occupational health and safety for 2010, Temp LTD-A LLC

/80/ Organizational and technical preventive measures on occupational health and safety for 2009, Temp LTD-A LLC

/81/ Protocol # 164 dated 17/12/2011 of commission session on occupational health and safety knowledge testing, Temp LTD-A LLC

/82/ Protocol # 157 dated 18/12/2011 of commission session on occupational health and safety knowledge testing, Temp LTD-A LLC

/83/ Protocol # 143 dated 04/07/2011 of commission session on occupational health and safety knowledge testing, Temp LTD-A LLC

/84/ Protocol # 131 dated 23/05/2011 of commission session on occupational health and safety knowledge testing, Temp LTD-A LLC

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/ 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: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL
BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION HOLDING SAS

DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

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?	Waste heaps dismantling by Temp LTD-A in Ukraine	OK	OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	Sectoral scope 8: Mining/mineral production	OK	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	Version of the document is presented	OK	OK
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	Date of the document is presented	OK	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)?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01. Section A.2 should not exceed 2 pages as per "Guidelines for users of the Joint implementation project design document form" version 04. Please make the proper corrections.	CAR 01	OK
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	Brief summary of the history of the project is presented	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	Project participants and Parties involved are listed in Section A.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	Yes, the data is presented in tabular format	OK	OK
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Yes, contact information is provided as necessary	OK	OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Temp LTD-A LLC is the project host	OK	OK
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	Ukraine	OK	OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Luhansk region	OK	OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Sverdlovsk, Rovenky Towns and surrounding districts.	OK	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	Clarification Request (CL) 01. In section A.4.1.4 as well as in section A.4.1.1 waste heap #5 of mine “Voroshylovska” is mentioned two times. Please clarify whether there are two different dismantling facilities, or it is the same one.	CL 01	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?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 25. Please provide the implementation schedule for the JI project in section A.4.2.	CAR 25	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)	The necessary information is provided in section A.4.3. of the PDD. The section does not exceed one page.	OK	OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02.	CAR 02	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	reductions over the crediting period?	The values of estimated emission reduction for 2022 and Total estimated emission reductions after the crediting period provided in section A.4.3.1 does not correspond with the values provided in the excel calculation file. Please make the corrections.		
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO2e?	Yes	OK	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Data presented in Tabular format	OK	OK
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	5 years	OK	OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO2 equivalent provided?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03. Please check the value of annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period in Table 1. See also CAR 02	CAR 03	OK
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04. Please provide written project approvals by the Parties involved.	CAR 04	Conclusion is pending
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	Ukraine is identified as Host Party.	OK	OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	See CAR 04 above.	Pending	Pending
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	See CAR 04 above.	Pending	Pending
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	See CAR 04 above.	Pending	Pending

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	legal entity? or − Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?			
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	JI specific approach is used for identifying baseline.	OK	OK
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Yes, PDD provides a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner.	OK	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	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05. Please provide the referred *Report on the fire risk of Donetsk Region's waste heaps, conducted by Scientific Research Institute "Respirator"* to the determination team (see reference 17). Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06. Please use the data of the latest National Inventory Report of Ukraine (1990 – 2010). Please also check the references for NIR (e.g. reference 25). Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07. Please provide the reference to the *Guide of quality, volume of coal production and enrichment products in 2008-2010* or the copy of this document to the determination team. Clarification Request (CL) 02. Please clarify how the emissions of methane depend on the amount of coal that was mined. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08. References 28 and 29 on page 23 do not contain the	CAR 05 CAR 06 CAR 07 CL 02 CAR 08 CAR 09	OK OK OK OK OK OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?	referred documents. Please make the proper corrections. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 09. Please provide all key parameters for baseline setting in tabular form at the end of section B.1.		
24	If selected elements or combinations of 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?	The baseline scenario has been established in accordance with Appendix B of the JI Guidelines and in accordance with the Guidance on Criteria for Baseline Setting and Monitoring by the JISC.	OK	OK
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	Multi-project factor was not used.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	N/A	OK	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)?	N/A	OK	OK
26 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	N/A	OK	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?	N/A	OK	OK
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	result?			
Additionality				
JI specific approach only				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used? (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".	Approach (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 was used.	OK	OK
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 10. In section B.2 of the PDD it is stated that "The proposed and comparative projects utilize **similar technology** (…) Projects use gravity separation method". However, the comparative project does not use the mentioned technology. As it can be found from section A.4.2 of the comparative project, the method of dry beneficiation is applied. Wet beneficiation (flotation) is applied in the framework of the proposed project. Please make the amendments in section B.2	CAR 10	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 11. Most of the references provided for Table 5 do not contain information about 2008 which is the year of project start. Please make the proper corrections. See also CAR 10 above.	CAR 11	OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	See CAR 10 above. See CAR 11 above.	OK	OK
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	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	N/A	OK	OK
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	N/A	OK	OK
31 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?	N/A	OK	OK
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?	N/A	OK	OK
31 (e)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	N/A	OK	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?	The relevant information is provided in section B.3 of the PDD. The project boundary is defined in line with the requirements.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(iii) Significant?			
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?	Yes, the project boundary is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above.	OK	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?	Yes, project boundary represented in scheme form on Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 and in tabular form in Table 6.	OK	OK
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?	All gases and sources included are explicitly stated, and the all exclusions of sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	N/A	OK	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?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 12. Please provide the documental evidence of starting date.	CAR 12	OK
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes, 01/04/2008	OK	OK
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	14 years and 9 months (177 months)	OK	OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	4 years and 9 months (57 months)	OK	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?	Yes.	OK	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	Clarification Request (CL) 03: Please specify that the crediting period of ERUs generating started after the beginning of 2008 and continuing over the	CL 03	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the operational lifetime of the project?	life cycle.		
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 2012?	The relevant information is provided in section C.3.	OK	OK
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	JI specific approach was used.	OK	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?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 13. Please provide the copy of agreement with the laboratory for conduction of analysis of ash content and moisture of fraction. Please provide the quality certificates for coal for 2010 for cross-checking. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 14. Please provide the documental evidence that the data concerning JI project will be stored for the period of two years after the last ERUs transaction. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 15. References 50 and 53 do not contain the referred documents. Please make the proper corrections. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 16. Tables in the PDD are numbered partly. Please make the proper corrections (see Tables on p.40-41). Corrective Action Request (CAR) 17. Table on p.40-41 contain the information on the parameters that should be monitored during the crediting period.	CAR 13 CAR 14 CAR 15 CAR 16 CAR 17 CAR 18 CAR 22	OK OK OK OK OK OK OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		However, the title before the beginning of this Table states that the parameters that are not monitored are listed. Please make the corresponding corrections. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 18. Table at the end of p.41 do not contain information on ash content and moisture of fraction. Please add this information to the table. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 22. Please provide the documental evidences of the amount of coal extracted from the waste heap in 2008 – 2010 for cross-checking.		
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?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 19. Please provide the data sources for the parameters 1 and 2 in table of Section D.1.1.1, parameters 11, 12, 13 for table of Section D.1.1.3	CAR 19	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? − Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?	See CARs 05, 06, 07, 08, 15 above.	OK	OK
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?	See CAR 19 above	OK	OK
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, − Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are	See CARs 05, 06, 07, 08, 15 above.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	taken? − Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?			
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 20. Please specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable for all data sources (e.g. emission factor for the electricity from the grid).	CAR 20	OK
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	International System Unit (SI units) is used partly.	OK	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?	Yes, there are several parameters used to calculate baseline emissions that are obtained through monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Yes, use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. is consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan.	OK	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"?	Yes monitoring plan developed in line with "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring".	OK	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 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?	See CAR 17 above.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 21. Please specify the methods of data monitoring (including its frequency) for parameters that are monitored during the crediting period, e.g. parameters 1 and 2 in table of Section D.1.1.1, parameters 11, 12, 13 for table of Section D.1.1.3.	CAR 21	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?	In the PDD described and explained all the algorithms and formulas used to calculating emissions for the baseline and project scenarios.	OK	OK
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	Yes, all necessary algorithms and formulae are clearly described.	OK	OK
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Yes, all variables, equation format, subscripts etc. used consistent.	OK	OK
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	Yes, analysis of supporting document justified conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures of monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	Uncertainty level of data is described in Section D.2 of the PDD.	OK	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?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	No, all algorithms and formulas clearly explained	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent	Yes.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?			
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	See CARs 05, 06, 07, 08, 11, 15 above.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Used assumptions and procedures do not have significant uncertainty.	OK	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?	Used assumptions and procedures not have significant uncertainty.	OK	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?	Uncertainty range was defined as low.	OK	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?	All monitoring standards that used in proposed monitoring plan are commonly used in Ukraine for energy consumtion metering.	OK	OK
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	Statistical techniques are not used for the monitoring.	OK	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?	The quality assurance and control procedures described in section D.2 of PDD.	OK	OK
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the	Yes, the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities are clearly identified in section D.3 of	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	monitoring activities?	PDD.		
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?	The monitoring plan, on the whole, reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.	OK	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?	Yes, all used parameters presented in sections D.1.1.1 and D.1.1.3 of PDD. See also CAR 19 above.	OK	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 ERUs for the project?	See CAR 14 above.	OK	OK
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?	No selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools used in monitoring plan.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	revised to a newer version in the past two months)?			
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	N/A	OK	OK
38 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	N/A	OK	OK
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	N/A	OK	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 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)-	There are no overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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 corresponding information is provided in section D.1.3.	OK	OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	Yes, PDD provides a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage.	OK	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	OK
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following 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	Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario was used.	OK	OK
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?	Emissions for the project, baseline scenario and emission reductions were ex ante estimated. Results of estimations provided in section E of PDD and excel spreadsheets.	OK	OK
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of:	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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?			
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 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	Calculation of emission reductions presented in the PDD of the proposed project corresponds to most of the requirements of paragraph 45 of DVM. Corrective Action Request (CAR) 23. Average annual estimates of the emissions for each period are not provided. Please supplement the tables in section E.	CAR 23	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
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 emissions or net removals calculation?	Yes, the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation.	OK	OK
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?	N/A	OK	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 CO_2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 24. Please provide the documental evidence of the environmental impacts assessment to the determination team.	CAR 24	OK
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?	No significant environmental impacts related to project implementation expected.	OK	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	No stakeholder consultation process for the JI projects is required by the Host Party. No negative comments were received.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
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 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”?	N/A	OK	OK
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	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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?			
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. location, technology/measure etc.)?	N/A	OK	OK
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?	N/A	OK	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	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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	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	OK
55	If the projects in the bundle use the same 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?	N/A	OK	OK
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	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	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
Applicable to all JI SSC projects				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	N/A	OK	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: (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)?	N/A	OK	OK
JI specific approach only				
59	Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
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? (a) 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? (ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area? (ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land? (b) 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? (c) 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?	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(c) 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?			
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?	N/A	OK	OK
61 (b)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.) 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?	N/A	OK	OK
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.?	N/A	OK	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?	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	N/A	OK	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)?	N/A	OK	OK
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	N/A	OK	OK
64 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	N/A	OK	OK
64 (d)	Are the baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage established appropriately as a result?	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
67	*Project approvals by Parties involved - additional to 19-20* Are all Parties partly or entirely within the geographical boundary for the JI PoA listed as "Parties involved" and indicated as host Parties in the PDD?	N/A	OK	OK
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?	N/A	OK	OK
69	*Baseline setting - additional to 22-26* Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
71	*Crediting period - additional to 34* Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?	N/A	OK	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?	N/A	OK	OK
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?	N/A	OK	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 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?	N/A	OK	OK

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
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01. Section A.2 should not exceed 2 pages as per "Guidelines for users of the Joint implementation project design document form" version 04. Please make the proper corrections.	-	Corrected.	Issue is closed based on the corrections made in the PDD.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02. The values of estimated emission reduction for 2022 and Total estimated emission reductions after the crediting period provided in section A.4.3.1 does not correspond with the values provided in the excel calculation file. Please make the corrections.	-	Corrected.	CAR is closed based on the corrections made in the PDD.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03. Please check the value of annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period in Table 1.	-	The value of annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period in Table 1 is checked and corrected.	Issue is closed based on the corrections made in the PDD.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04. Please provide written project approvals by the Parties involved.	19	The project has been officially presented for endorsement to the Ukrainian authorities. State Environmental Investments Agency of Ukraine has issued a Letter of Endorsement for the project #2168/23/7 dated 16/08/2011. According to the national Ukrainian procedure, the LoAs by Ukraine is expected after the project determination.	CAR is not closed. Letter of Approval by Ukraine is not provided to the determination team.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05. Please provide the referred *Report on the fire risk of Luhansk Region's waste heaps, conducted by Scientific Research Institute "Respirator"* to the determination team (see reference 17).	23	The referred *Report on the fire risk of Luhansk Region's waste heaps, conducted by Scientific Research Institute "Respirator"* is provided to the determination team. Response of 24/07/2012. The latest version of the Report was provided to the determination team.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. Analysis of the provided document had shown that the referred value 0.78 in the research is provided for Donetsk region. Please make the corrections in Table 3 of the PDD. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 Issue is closed.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06. Please use the data of the latest National Inventory Report of Ukraine (1990 – 2010). Please also check the references for NIR (e.g. reference 25).	23	The data of the latest National Inventory Report of Ukraine (1990 – 2010) is used. The references for NIR is checked. Response of 24/07/2012. Numbers of pages is added.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012. For those parameters that are taken from the NIR please provide the numbers of pages on which the values are provided. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012. Issue is closed based on the corrections made in the PDD.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07. Please provide the reference to the *Guide of quality, volume of coal production and enrichment products in 2008-2010* or the copy of this document to the determination team.	23	The copy of *Guide of quality, volume of coal production and enrichment products in 2008-2010* is provided to the determination team. Response of 24/07/2012. Statement of transfer and acceptance for various grades of coal is added. We are waiting this documents from TEMP LTD-A and will provide its to you as soon as possible.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. Please use the values of ash content and moisture for the same coal rank as it was sold to consumers in the project scenario. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012. Issue is closed. The values of ash content and moisture are considered to be applied in accordance with the requirements.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08. References 28 and 29 on page 23 do not contain the referred documents. Please make the proper corrections.	23	Reference 29 was checked and it contains the referred documents such as NEIA Orders No.43 dated 28.03.2011, No.62 dated 15.04.2011, No.63 dated 15.04.2011,No.75 dated 12.05.2011. Reference 28 was checked and it contains the referred document, but to view it in English registration is needed, we propose a Russian analogue of this document available at http://www.gosthelp.ru/text/GOST30319196GazprirodnyjM.html Response of 24/07/2012. The correct name of the referred document is provided.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. For reference 28 please provide the correct name of the referred document in the PDD. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 CAR is closed.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 09. Please provide all key parameters for baseline setting in tabular form at the end of section B.1.	23	All key parameters for baseline which are monitored are provided in tabular form at the end of section B.1., additional parameters for baseline which are not monitored is presented in tabular form on page 21.	Issue is closed.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 10. In section B.2 of the PDD it is stated that "The proposed and comparative projects utilize **similar technology** (…) Projects use gravity separation method". However, the comparative project does not use the mentioned technology. As it can be found from section A.4.2 of the comparative project, the method of dry beneficiation is applied. Wet beneficiation (flotation) is applied in the framework of the proposed project. Please make the amendments in section B.2	29 (a)	Section B.2 is checked and corrected.	Issue is closed.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 11. Most of the references provided for Table 5 do not contain information about 2008 which is the year of project start. Please make the proper corrections.	29 (b)	Corrected. Response of 24/07/2012. Corrected.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. The references still do not contain the information of 2008. Please correct. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 The PDD was checked. Based on the corresponding corrections CAR 11 is closed.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 12. Please provide the documental evidence of starting date.	34 (a)	The documental evidence of starting date is provided.	Issue is closed based on the analysis of provided information.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 13. Please provide the copy of agreement with the laboratory for conduction of analysis of ash content and moisture of fraction. Please provide the quality certificates for coal for 2010 for cross-checking.	36 (a)	Copy of agreement with the laboratory for conduction of analysis of ash content and moisture of fraction and the quality certificates is provided. Since the end of 2010 the company opened and certified its own laboratory. Documents by our own laboratory are provided.	Issue is closed based on the analysis of provided information.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 14. Please provide the documental evidence that the data concerning JI project will be stored for the period of two years after the last ERUs transaction.	36 (a)	In accordance with order of the company the data concerning JI project will be stored for the period of two years after the last ERUs transaction. Response of 24/07/2012. See attached	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. Please provide the corresponding order to the determination team Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 The relevant document was provided to the determination team. Issue is closed.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 15. References 50 and 53 do not contain the referred documents. Please make the proper corrections.	36 (a)	References 50 and 53 was checked and they contain the referred documents such as Ukraine National Inventory Report submitted 13/04/2012. When you click on the link of the document on unfccc site, it automatically is loaded.	OK, CAR is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 16. Tables in the PDD are numbered partly. Please make the proper corrections (see Tables on p.40-41).	36 (a)	Corrected.	CAR is closed.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 17. Table on p.40-41 contain the information on the parameters that should be monitored during the crediting period. However, the title before the beginning of this Table states that the parameters that are not monitored are listed. Please make the corresponding corrections.	36 (a)	Table on p.40-41 (table 8) contains the 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. Table 7 contains the 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. Table 9 contains the Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period. All these tables need in accordance with paragraph 36 (d) of DVM. Response of 24/07/2012. This is our principal position fixed the inventory data in 2010, to divide the parameters into three groups 1. 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. 2. the 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.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. The parameters that will be changed in the monitoring period for the updated data should be excluded from tables 7 and 8 and included into table 9 of the PDD (parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period). Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 Based on the analysis of provided proofs it can be concluded that the approach applied for the dividing of the corresponding parameters is similar to the approaches applied in the referred projects approved by AIEs and the State Agency of Environmental Investments of Ukraine. CAR is closed as a result.

		3.The Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period. Moreover, in the second group we include the parameters that are calculated by outside parties, such as statistics and inventory data, which are determined once for each relevant year and remain fixed through the project life cycle. If these parameters for relevant year is unavailable, we will use the latest data which are available. Additional information about the number of already registered projects, including determined and verified by Bureau Veritas, in which is not the monitored parameters are taken from the inventory and other statistical sources: Waste Heap Dismantling by PE "ARDS-SERVIS" with the Aim of Decreasing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere http://ji.unfccc.int/JIITLProject/DB/XVDE1L6O88BNKAKN29NAZ3WEDEPDSU/details Waste Heap Dismantling by PE ICC "TEFIDA" with the Aim of Decreasing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere http://ji.unfccc.int/JIITLProject/DB/54VR9YWYC9AB2G2ME2Y049H8DDME6I/details Waste Heap Dismantling in Luhansk Region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reduction Greenhouse Gases Emissions to Atmosphere http://ji.unfccc.int/JIITLProject/DB/MWT8YE8A68MBKRG48QJ8Q4O44M7BVY/details and also see attached.	

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 18. Table at the end of p.41 do not contain information on ash content and moisture of fraction. Please add this information to the table.	36 (a)	Table at the end of p.41 (table 9) do not contains information on ash content and moisture of fraction, but it contain such a parameter as Amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use, equivalent to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heaps in the project activity in period *y.* This parameter is integrated and already included information about ash content and moisture of fraction	Issue is closed based on the appropriate explanation provided by the project developers.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 19. Please provide the data sources for the parameters 1 and 2 in table of Section D.1.1.1, parameters 11, 12, 13 for table of Section D.1.1.3	36 (b)	The data sources for the parameters 1 and 2 in table of Section D.1.1.1, parameters 11, 12, 13 for table of Section D.1.1.3 is provided. Response of 24/07/2012. Data sources is data of the company. See attached files.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. The data sources for the mentioned parameters are still not provided in the PDD. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 CAR is closed.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 20. Please specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable for all data sources (e.g. emission factor for the electricity from the grid).	36 (b) (iii)	In cases if any errors, fraud, inconsistencies or situations when monitoring data are unavailable will be identified during the monitoring process special commission will appointed by project host management that will conduct a review of such case and issue an order that must also include provisions for necessary corrective actions to be implemented that will ensure such situations are avoided in future. As regards the national emission factor for the electricity from the grid, it is refer to data and parameters that are not monitored and is taken from DFP orders. If this parameter for relevant year is unavailable, we will use the latest data which are available.	Issue is closed based on the appropriate explanation.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 21. Please specify the methods of data monitoring (including its frequency) for parameters that are monitored during the crediting period, e.g. parameters 1 and 2 in table of Section D.1.1.1, parameters 11, 12, 13 for table of Section D.1.1.3.	36 (e)	Recording frequency of data monitoring for parameters that are monitored during the crediting period is provided in table of Section D.1.1.1 and in table of Section D.1.1.3. The methods of these data monitoring are described in section D.1.	CAR is closed.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 22. Please provide the documental evidences of the amount of coal extracted from the waste heap in 2008 – 2010 for cross-checking.	36 (a)	The documental evidences of the amount of coal extracted from the waste heap in 2008 – 2010 for cross-checking is provided. Response of 24/07/2012. See attached files "Data of the company…". These are special reports which are formed monthly and represented the monitoring tables of the project JI.	Verifier's note of 23/07/2012 CAR is not closed. Please provide the monthly and annual reports based on the shipment of the coal mentioned in section D.1. Verifier's note of 25/07/2012 The provided documentation was analysed by the determination team. Based on this analysis issue is considered to be closed.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 23. Average annual estimates of the emissions for each period are not provided. Please supplement the tables in section E.	45	Average annual estimates of the emissions for each period are provided in table 2 section A.4.3.1. Tables of section E is a part of section E.6. Joint Implementation Project Design Document form Version 01 - in effect as of: 15 June 2006.This template shall not be altered. It shall be completed without modifying/adding headings or logo, format or font.	Issue is closed.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 24. Please provide the documental evidence of the environmental impacts assessment to the determination team.	48 (a)	The documental evidence of the environmental impacts assessment to the determination team is provided.	CAR is closed based on the analysis of documentation provided.
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 25. Please provide the implementation schedule for the JI project in section A.4.2.	-	The implementation schedule for the JI project in section A.4.2. is provided.	Issue is closed.

Clarification Request (CL) 01. In section A.4.1.4 as well as in section A.4.1.1 waste heap #5 of mine “Voroshylovska” is mentioned two times. Please clarify whether there are two different dismantling facilities, or it is the same one.	-	In section A.4.1.4 as well as in section A.4.1.1 is mentioned three project objects such as - Waste heaps processing facility “Voroshylovska” on waste heap #5 of former coal mine Voroshylovska at address: Luhansk region, Sverdlovsk, manufacturing facilities complex (near Novodar'yivka village, town of Rovenky, Luhansk region) ; - Waste heap # 5, Luhansk region., Sverdlovsk district., mine “Voroshylovska” ; - Waste heap former mine # 54, Luhansk region, Rovenky, Str. Dzerzhinsky. Besides, we would like to draw your attention that the waste heap #5 as an object of the project is mentioned only one time, another object is the processing facility.	CL is closed.
Clarification Request (CL) 02. Please clarify how the emissions of methane depend on the amount of coal that was mined.	23	Please see Equation 6.	CL is closed.
Clarification Request (CL) 03: Please specify that the crediting period of ERUs generating started after the beginning of 2008 and continuing over the life cycle.	34 (d)	The crediting period of ERUs generating started after the beginning of 2008 and continuing over the life cycle. See section C of PDD.	Issue is closed.