



# VERIFICATION REPORT GLOBAL CARBON BV

## VERIFICATION OF THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AT ENERGO MASH SPETSSTAL (EMSS), KRAMATORSK, UKRAINE

SIXTH PERIODIC FOR THE THIRD QUARTER OF 2010 (01.07.2010-  
30.09.2010)

REPORT No. UKRAINE/0189/2010

REVISION No. 03

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION




---

 VERIFICATION REPORT
 

---

Date of first issue: 14/01/2011	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: Global Carbon BV	Client ref.: Lennard de Klerk

## Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 6<sup>th</sup> periodic verification of the “Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine”, JI Registration Reference Number 0104, project of Global Carbon BV located in Kramatorsk, Ukraine, and applying the JI specific approach, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the verification process is a list of Corrective Actions Requests (CAR) presented in Appendix A.

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as per determined changes. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 73 562 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>eq for the monitoring period from 01.07.2010 to 30.09.2010.

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

Report No.: UKRAINE/0189/2010	Subject Group: JI
Project title: “Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine”	
Work carried out by: Team Leader : Ivan Sokolov Team Member : Kateryna Zinevych Team Member : Oleg Skoblyk	
Work reviewed by: Leonid Yaskin – Internal Technical Reviewer	
Work approved by: Flavio Gomes – Climate Change Operational Manager	
Date of this revision: 28/01/2011	Rev. No.: 03
Number of pages: 32	

- No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- Limited distribution
- Unrestricted distribution



<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	5
Objective	5
Scope 5	
Verification Team	5
METHODOLOGY.....	6
Review of Documents	6
Follow-up Interviews	6
Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	7
VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS.....	7
Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)	8
Project implementation (92-93)	8
Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)	9
Revision of monitoring plan/Determination of the changes from the determined PDD (99-100)	10
Data management (101)	11
Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)	15
VERIFICATION OPINION.....	15
REFERENCES.....	17
BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION HOLDING SAS.....	22
VERIFICATION PROTOCOL.....	22
APPENDIX B: VERIFICATION TEAM.....	32
Appendix B: Verification team	35



## INTRODUCTION

Global Carbon BV has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine" (hereafter called "the project") at Kramatorsk, Ukraine, UNFCCC JI Reference Number 0104.

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

### Objective

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

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

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

### Scope

The verification 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 verification 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 monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.

### Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Ivan Sokolov  
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Kateryna Zinevych  
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

Oleg Skoblyk  
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier



This verification report was reviewed by:

Leonid Yaskin  
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

## **METHODOLOGY**

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

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

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

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

## **Review of Documents**

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

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report version(s) 1.0 dated 9<sup>th</sup> of November 2010, Monitoring Report version(s) 2.0 dated 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2010, Monitoring Report version(s) 3.0 dated 17<sup>th</sup> of December 2010 and project as described in the determined PDD.

## **Follow-up Interviews**

On 25/11/2010 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 EMSS and Global Carbon BV were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1 Interview topics**

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Energomashspetsstal (EMSS)	Organizational structure. Responsibilities and authorities. Training of personnel. Quality management procedures and technology. Implementation of equipment (records). Metering equipment control. Metering record keeping system, database.
Consultant: Global Carbon BV	Baseline methodology. Monitoring plan. Monitoring report. Deviations from PDD.

### **Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests**

The objective of this phase of the verification is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

If the Verification Team, in assessing the monitoring report and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to the monitoring requirements, it should raise these issues and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

- (a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;
- (b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the AIE to assess compliance with the monitoring plan;
- (c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

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

### **VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS**

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



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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 6 Corrective Action Requests.

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

### **Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)**

Written project approvals by the Netherlands and Ukraine have been issued by the NFPs of those Parties when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest.

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

### **Project implementation (92-93)**

The project activity consists of the energy efficiency measures at the premises of EMSS by the implementation of four subprojects:

**Subproject 1. Reconstruction of thermal and heating furnaces** – there are 35 thermal and heating furnaces in operation in different shops at the premises of EMSS. The main goal of this subproject is the reduction of the natural gas (NG) consumption on 26 of these furnaces by commissioning of new automated NG burners (this enables to maintain the required temperature inside of the furnace) and by implementation of new thermal insulation for the walls, front doors and roofs of the furnaces.

**Subproject 2. Installation of a new vacuum system** – Installation of a new vacuum system for the vacuumed steel production. The old vacuum system used heat and electricity. The reconstructed vacuum system uses only electricity.

**Subproject 3. Installation of an arc ladle furnace** – New arc ladle furnace is installed for the steel production. This means that the part of the process of the steel preparation doing in the ladle from which the steel will be cast into the forms. As a result there is reduction of the electricity consumption.

**Subproject 4. Modernization of press equipment** – Replacing the old pump system, serving the 15,000 ton press, with a new one, more effective pump system. The number of old pumps is 24 (with 500 kW



installed capacity each), and the number of new pumps will be 11 (with 800 kW installed capacity each).

Project implementation schedule has faced some delays caused by the global financial crisis. The proposed JI project consists of four interventions to the production cycle. Equipment for the proposed interventions was installed and commissioned in the following order:

- SP1: From 01 January 2008 to 01 November 2009 – 19 furnaces were commissioned (besides 7 furnaces commissioned in 2007);
- SP2: May 2007;
- SP3: April 2007;
- SP4: December 2007;

Therefore the starting date of the project is April 2007.

Project was operational for the whole monitoring period, which is 01.07.2010-30.09.2010.

The project improved efficiency of use of natural gas, electricity and heat at the enterprise and thus led to decrease of harmful emissions. This project by reducing GHG emissions contributes towards a better environment and hence works towards social well-being for all. Project implementation will lead to improvement of ecological climate of the region, increase of payments to the budgets of all levels for social needs, prevention of reduction of working places and better working conditions at EMSS.

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

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

For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, key factors, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, including default emission factors, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.





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

## **Revision of monitoring plan/Determination of the changes from the determined PDD (99-100)**

### *Revision of the monitoring plan*

The monitoring approach in the Monitoring Plan of the PDD version 3.9 requires monitoring and measurement of variables and parameters necessary to quantify the baseline emissions and project emissions in a conservative and transparent way. The same approach is applied in the revised Monitoring Plan revision 1.1 developed for the monitoring period that is not one year.

The parameters that are determined to quantify the baseline and project emissions are presented in the monitoring report.

It should be mentioned that in order to get normalized volume of natural gas combusted at workshop, temperature and pressure data has been used. The temperature and pressure measuring devices were installed after MP was developed as a part of natural gas measuring equipment. The formula for calculation used in MR is specific for vortex flow meter and it is not applicable for other type of gas meter (i.e. orifice flow meter). Decision on the type of flow meter was optional and therefore it was not included into the PDD. For year 2008 calculation was performed manually using formula given in the monitoring report for 2008. For year 2009 the calculation was performed for one furnace automatically using similar devices yielding figures of NG quantity directly in Nm<sup>3</sup> and since second or third quarter of 2010 it is planned to equip all furnaces with such devices and figures will be obtained in Nm<sup>3</sup>.

The list of monitoring equipment, which is used in all the sub-projects is present in the Monitoring Report version 3.0 Tables 2-7. All the monitoring equipment is to be checked and calibrated according calibration plans.

According to the determined monitoring plan project and baseline emissions and emission reductions are calculating on the annual basis for every subproject. In order to make monitoring process for the nine months possible formulas for the calculations has been updated. Updates with compare to determined monitoring plan are presented in the MR version 2.0.

### *Determination of the changes from the determined PDD*



The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed changes from the determined PDD, which is inclusion of one more furnace into the project which was not in the list of reconstructed project in the determined PDD version 3.9. The change during the project implementation constitutes modifying the order of furnaces reconstruction resulting in inclusion of furnaces not mentioned in the determined PDD into the energy efficiency program and postponing reconstruction of those furnaces from the list which have not been modernized yet. In the determined PDD ver.3.9 there are 26 furnaces that were supposed to be commissioned according to Subproject 1. Due to a severe recession and the worsening of the steel market the reconstruction of the furnaces was delayed. As of June 2010 only 21 of them were reconstructed. Also during the course of reconstruction the order of furnaces modernization was changed to meet the Enterprise's need to have efficient furnaces of a specific size available in order to serve the orders for EMSS products. Finally, in 2010 it was decided to channel the investment to reconstruction of the furnaces which were not originally included in the determined PDD while postponing the reconstruction of some of the furnaces that were listed in the determined PDD. The changes from the determined PDD do not lead to the change of project location, emissions source, the baseline scenario, changes correspond to a JI specific approach, according to which project has been determined.

The proposed change during the project implementation does not require any principal changes to procedures and calculation formulae used for baseline setting and monitoring for the project, therefore it is consistent with the JI specific approach applied in the determined PDD.

Changes that have been implemented do not affect conservativeness of the approach to the emission reductions calculations and procedures of the data collection and archiving.

AIE determined that the proposed revisions improve the accuracy and applicability of information collected, compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.

## **Data management (101)**

**Subproject 1. Reconstruction of thermal and heating furnaces.** Each reconstructed furnace has a natural gas flow meter with pressure and temperature sensors in order to calculate normal cubic meters of natural gas burned in the furnace. Information from flow meters, pressure and temperature sensors are transmitting to the control and monitoring computer system where recalculation to the normal cubic meters taking place according to the approved standard.



All information about technological process is saved continuously. The archiving period for the log files is at least one year. Information that corresponds to the natural gas consumption in third quarter 2010 has been burned on CDs. These CDs are stored till the end of the crediting period plus two years.

Every half-finished product that processes through the furnaces has own unique certificate. This certificate reflects all operations performed on the product and the weight on the exit of every workshop. So, the weight of half-finished products that proceed through each furnace could be easily monitored. Information from the certificates is saved in the log books in order to simplify the monitoring process.

A report including natural gas consumption and weight of half finished products is generating on a monthly basis. The report is signing by Head of Energy Saving Department, Head of corresponding workshop and approved by Chief Engineer.

The natural gas meters (flow, pressure, temperature) are used in furnaces' control process. That is why any deviation/failure of the meters would be recognized immediately by disturbance of the heating process and reported to the workshop's head. As a result of disturbance furnace should be shut down fore the checking procedure.

**Subproject 2. Installation of a new vacuum system.** Electricity that is consumed during the vacuum process is metered using dedicated meters for this system. Information from meters is passed to the control and monitoring computer system of the vacuumizator. A computer system records information about every vacuumization session, including melt passport, time and electricity consumption. The archiving period for the log files is at least one year. Information that corresponds to the electricity consumption in the third quarter 2010 has been burned on CDs. These CDs are stored till the end of the crediting period plus two years.

The steel to the vacuum degasser (VD) coming either from ladle furnace (LF) or from the electric arc furnace (EAF) in special ladle. Each ladle with liquid steel has unique certificate of melt.

**Subproject 3. Installation of an arc ladle furnace.** LF is a comprehensive solution for high quality steel melting has been installed in the Steel Making Workshop (SMW). The main electricity consumers of the SMW are powered by the following scheme.

Close Distribution Unit (CDU) #1, 2 are electricity powering points for the EAFs (EAF50 #1, EAF100 #3, EAF100 #5 and EAF12) and LF. CDUs are powered by Transformers (T1, and T2) and Autotransformers (AT1 and AT2). EAFs and LF could be powered from any of the Transformers or Autotransformers. Commercial electricity meters are installed on each of the Transformers and Autotransformer.



The data from electricity meters concerning electricity consumption is transmitted to the control and monitoring computer system continuously. The computer system records information about each melt process, including melt certificate. This certificate includes information about the number of EAF where steel was melted, steel content, amount of electricity consumed during melting and weight of steel. The archiving period for the log files is at least one year. All melt certificates for the third quarter of the year 2010 have been burned to CDs. These CDs are stored until the end of the crediting period plus two years.

#### **Subproject 4. Modernization of press equipment.**

Serving motors of the press pump station are powered from the 6kV line. Substation 110/6 kV has two transformers. Each transformer has a commercial electricity meter. There are some addition consumers on the 6kV line. All data concerning electricity consumption is transmitted to the control and monitoring computer system. The press has a special registry log book, where working time of press is logged, among other data.

In the revised monitoring plan the formulae for calculation of variables are adjusted for the period 1 month instead of period of 1 year that was in the initial monitoring plan determined in the PDD. This allowed to calculated figures for the third 3 months of 2010.

The reporting procedures reflect the revised monitoring plan completely. It is confirmed that the monitoring report does comply with the monitoring methodology described in the PDD and Monitoring Plan revision 1.1.

All parameters were determined as prescribed. The complete data is stored electronically and documented. The necessary procedures have been defined in internal procedures.

In the PDD version 3.9 the amount of emission reduction units in the third three months of 2010 is stated as 54 977 t CO<sub>2</sub>e while in the Monitoring Report version 3.0 the amount of ERU's for the third quarter of 2010 is 73 562 t CO<sub>2</sub>e.

The audit team confirms that emission reduction calculations have been performed according to the Monitoring Plan.

According to the Article 10 paragraph 1 of the Ukrainian Law "On Metrology and Metrological Activity" measurement results can be used in case if appropriate characteristics of errors and uncertainty are known. Characteristics of errors are presented in the passports of the equipment. The level of uncertainty is considered as low which is why it can be neglected in the calculations.



Project consists of the 105 monitoring parameters. Some of the parameters that are used in the calculation of the baseline and project emissions are measured directly with the use of special equipment while others are estimated with the use of appropriate coefficients.

Concerning verification the calculation of emission reductions is based on internal data. The origin of those data was explicitly checked. Further on, entering and processing of those data in the monitoring workbook Excel sheet was checked where predefined algorithms compute the annual value of the emission reductions. All equations and algorithms used in the different workbook sheets were checked. Inspection of calibration and maintenance records for key equipment was performed for all relevant meters.

Necessary procedures have been defined in internal procedures and additional internal documents relevant for the determination of the various parameters on daily basis.

The general management of the monitoring team is implemented by the Deputy Chief Engineer of the EMSS through supervising and coordinating activities of his subordinates, such as the head of Energy Saving Department, the head of Steel Making Shop, Press-Forging Shop and Thermal Shop. On-site day-to-day (operational) management is implemented by the heads of corresponding shops. The technological process data is logged into the PCs continuously. The PCs at reconstructed furnaces, LF, VD, etc., have not only monitoring but control functions as well. Keeping the PCs in a working condition is a responsibility of the Department of the automated control systems.

All data necessary for the CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions calculation is collected in the Energy Saving Department. The head of the Energy Saving Department is making calculations on a monthly basis. The general supervision of the monitoring system is executed by the Deputy Chief Engineer.

For this monitoring period the names of the personnel involved is as follows:

- Deputy Chief Engineer: A. Masyuk
- Head of Energy Saving Department: V. Timoshenko
- Head of the Steel Making Shop: A. Gorkusha
- Head of the Press-Forging Shop: N. Bondar
- Head of the Thermal Shop: V. Stankov

All contracts for the equipment supplying include chapter describing personnel training. Training is providing by equipment producers.

CO<sub>2</sub> emission reductions calculations are performing on the monthly basis by the head of the Energy Saving Department. All energy sources flows (such as electricity and natural gas) are logged on the server in the



Energy Saving Department. Hence the head of Department checks the correctness of measurements by the indirect calculations.

### **Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)**

Not applicable.

### **VERIFICATION OPINION**

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed 6<sup>th</sup> periodic verification of the “Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine” Project in Ukraine, which applies JI specific approach. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

The management of Global Carbon BV is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 3.9. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 3.0 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as per determined changes. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project’s GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/07/2010 to 30/09/2010

Baseline emissions	: 103 172	t CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents.
Project emissions	: 29 610	t CO <sub>2</sub> equivalents.



Emission Reductions : 73 562 t CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents.





## REFERENCES

### Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by Type the name of the company that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ Monitoring Report version 1.0, dated 9<sup>th</sup> of November 2010
- /2/ Monitoring Report version 2.0 dated 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2010
- /3/ Monitoring Report version 3.0 dated 17<sup>th</sup> of December 2010
- /4/ Verification Report by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS dated 16<sup>th</sup> of November 2009
- /5/ Verification Report by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS dated 31<sup>st</sup> of December 2009
- /6/ Verification Report by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS dated 30<sup>th</sup> of March 2010
- /7/ Verification Report by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS dated 29<sup>th</sup> of June 2010
- /8/ Verification Report by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS dated 27<sup>th</sup> of September 2010
- /9/ Project Design Document, version 3.9 dated 31 of August 2008
- / Letter of Approval of National Ecological Investment Agency of Ukraine, № 10/ 48/23/7 from 23.01.2009
- / Approval of Voluntary participation in a Joint Implementation project of Ministry 11/ of Economical Affairs in Netherlands №2009JI01, dated 3 of March 2009
- / Emission reductions Calculation Excel Spreadsheet version 1.0 dated 9<sup>th</sup> of 12/ November 2010

### Category 2 Documents:

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /1/ Permission №1412900000-51 on wastes venting into atmospheric air from stationary sources
- /2/ Report on atmospheric air protection for the 3 quarter 2010
- /3/ Report on atmospheric air protection for the 2 quarter 2010
- /4/ Report on atmospheric air protection for the 1 quarter 2010
- /5/ Act on thermal furnace №1 КПЦ-1 for 01.08.2010
- /6/ Report on plant operation of OJSC "EMSS" on greenhouse gases reduction for September 2010
- /7/ Report on heating furnaces operation for September 2010
- /8/ Report on thermal furnaces operation for September 2010
- /9/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №1 of thermal plant for September 2010





- /10/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №2 of thermal plant for September 2010
- /11/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №4 of thermal plant for September 2010
- /12/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №9 of thermal plant for September 2010
- /13/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №10 of thermal plant for September 2010
- /14/ Report on ДСП-УПК for September 2010
- /15/ Report on vacuum pump for September 2010
- /16/ Report on HAC-1500 т.с. for September 2010
- /17/ Report on plant operation of OJSC "EMSS" on greenhouse gases reduction for August 2010
- /18/ Report on heating furnaces operation for August 2010
- /19/ Report on thermal furnaces operation for August 2010
- /20/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №1 of thermal plant for August 2010
- /21/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №2 of thermal plant for August 2010
- /22/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №4 of thermal plant for August 2010
- /23/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №9 of thermal plant for August 2010
- /24/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №10 of thermal plant for August 2010
- /25/ Report on ДСП-УПК for August 2010
- /26/ Report on vacuumator for August 2010
- /27/ Report on HAC-1500 т.с. for August 2010
- /28/ Report on plant operation of OJSC "EMSS" on greenhouse gases reduction for July 2010
- /29/ Report on heating furnaces operation for July 2010
- /30/ Report on thermal furnaces operation for July 2010
- /31/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №1 of thermal plant for July 2010
- /32/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №2 of thermal plant for July 2010
- /33/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №4 of thermal plant for July 2010



- 2010
- /34/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №9 of thermal plant for July 2010
  - /35/ Report on operation of thermal furnace №10 of thermal plant for July 2010
  - /36/ Report on ДСП-УПК for July 2010
  - /37/ Report on vacuum pump for July 2010
  - /38/ Report on HAC-1500 т.с. for July 2010
  - /39/ Book of accounting of gas losses from modernized thermal furnaces
  - /40/ Book of accounting of gas losses from modernized furnaces
  - /41/ Inspection board decision dated 01.10.2010
  - /42/ Act gas supply system acceptance dated 01.10.2010
  - /43/ Passport on scales and weights (Factory No 0115047) dated 01.07.2010
  - /44/ Certificate on verification of measuring device No 2002 on electronic crane scales BK 1к-50 (Factory No KP 506149) dated 3.06.2010
  - /45/ Certificate on verification of measuring device No 2003 on electronic crane scales BK 1к-80 (Factory No KP 806148) dated 3.06.2010
  - /46/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device No 08-32 Metran 100 ДИ-1131 (factory No 241763) dated 30.08.2010
  - /47/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device No 07-08 Metran 100 ДИ-1131 (factory No 422353) dated 08.07.2010
  - /48/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device Metran 100 ДА (Factory No 442214) dated 07.10.2010
  - /49/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device Metran 100 ДА (Factory No 442216) dated 04.10.2010
  - /50/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device Metran 55 ДА (Factory No 458977) dated 08.10.2010
  - /51/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device Metran 55 ДА (Factory No 461217) dated 14.07.2010
  - /52/ Certificate on calibration of measuring device No 09-08 Metran 100 ДД-1420 (factory No 462213) dated 30.09.2010
  - /53/ Passport on flow meter Elster (Factory No10512270) dated 30.08.2010
  - /54/ Passport on flow meter Elster (Factory No69199960) dated 30.08.2010
  - /55/ Passport on resistance thermometer Metran (Factory No655354) dated 08.08.2010



- /56/ Passport on resistance thermometer Metran (Factory No655355) dated 14.09.2009
- /57/ Passport on Metran 274-05 (Factory No655356) dated 12.08.2010
- /58/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Metran (Factory No655358) dated 14.09.2009
- /59/ Passport on thermal converter Metran (Factory No655359) dated 12.08.2010
- /60/ Passport on Metran 274-05 (Factory No655360) dated 12.08.2010
- /61/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Metran (Factory No655361) dated 16.09.2009
- /62/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Metran 274-05 (Factory No655362) dated 13.08.2010
- /63/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Metran 274-05 (Factory No655363) dated 13.08.2010
- /64/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Metran 274-05 (Factory No750917) dated 13.08.2010
- /65/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Metran 274-05 (Factory No750977) dated 16.08.2010
- /66/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Elmer (Factory No8360) dated 21.09.2009
- /67/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Elmer (Factory No8362) dated 21.09.2009
- /68/ Passport on thermal converter with unificated output Elmer (Factory No8365) dated 21.09.2009
- /69/ Passport on platinum technical thermometer ТПТ 17-2 dated 12.10.2009
- /70/ Certificate on verification of thermal converter ТПТ 17-2 (Factory No10204) dated 12.10.2009
- /71/ Passport on pressure sensor DMP, DMK, LMP, LMK, DMD, DS, DPS, HMP, XACT (Factory No82048897) dated 10.03.2010
- /72/ Passport on flow meters - vortex meters ИРВИС РС-4 (Factory No13398) dated 07.06.2010

**Persons interviewed:**

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

- /1/ Bondar Nikolay, the Head of the Forge Press workshop
- /2/ Anna Vilde, JI Consultant, Global Carbon BV
- /3/ Chubar Oleg, the Head of the environmental safety department
- /4/ Garkusha Aleksandr, the Head of the Steel Making workshop
- /5/ Masyuk Aleksandr, Deputy Chief Engineer



- /6/ Polyachenko Vladimir, Head of the personnel training centre
- /7/ Romanenko Sergey, the Head of the automation department
- /8/ Smirnof Sergey, the Chief metrologist
- /9/ Timoshenko Vadim, Head of the energy saving department
- /10/ Zubkov Aleksandr, the Chief Engineer

**BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION HOLDING SAS**

**VERIFICATION PROTOCOL**

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

<b>DVM Paragraph</b>	<b>Check Item</b>	<b>Initial finding</b>	<b>Action requested to project participants</b>	<b>Review of project Participants' action</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>Project approvals by Parties involved</b>					
90	Has the NFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	The project has been approved by both NFPs. The Letters of Approval were presented to the verification team. Letters of Approval by both Parties were submitted to the secretariat on the final determination stage.	N/a	N/a	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, all the written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional.	N/a	N/a	OK
<b>Project implementation</b>					
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	In 2010 it was decided to channel the investment to reconstruction of the furnaces which were not originally included in the determined PDD while postponing the			OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
		<p>reconstruction of some of the furnaces that were listed in the determined PDD. (Determination of changes to the existing PDD will be described below in this protocol in the appropriate section).</p> <p>CAR 1. New furnace installed is defined as thermal and heating in different parts of the MR version 1.0. Please clarify what kind of the furnace it is and correct appropriately.</p> <p>CAR 2. In the Table A-2 of the MR version 1.0 it is stated that the size of newly launched furnace #1 is 2.5 x 16, while site visit revealed that it is 3 x 24. Please clarify and correct.</p> <p>CAR 3. In the Table A-2 of the MR version 1.0 it is stated that baseline</p>	<p>The new furnace #1 in Forge and Press Shop #1 is thermal. Operation Instruction of the furnace was provided to the Verifier. Corrections were made in the MR version 2.0 appropriately.</p> <p>The correct size of thermal furnace #1 in Forge and Press Shop #1 is 3 x 24. Mistake occurred due to misprint during data collection process. Corrections were made in the MR version 2.0 appropriately.</p> <p>The correct baseline specific consumption of thermal furnace #1 in Forge and Press Shop #1 is 694.4 m<sup>3</sup>/t. The</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p> <p>The issue is closed.</p> <p>The issue is closed.</p>	

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
		specific NG consumption of newly launched furnace #1 is 861.5 m <sup>3</sup> /t, while site visit revealed that it is 694.4 m <sup>3</sup> /t. Please clarify and correct. CAR 4. Please add new furnace to the Figure 2.	mistake occurred as a result of misprinted size of the thermal furnace #1 in Forge and Press Shop #1. Corrections were made in the MR version 2.0 appropriately.  New thermal furnace #1 in Forge and Press Shop #1 was added to Figure 2 in the MR version 2.0.	The issue is closed.	
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	Project has been operational for the whole monitoring period, which is 01.07.2010 – 30.09.2010.	N/a	N/a	OK
<b>Compliance with monitoring plan</b>					
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	There are few deviations to the monitoring plan included in the determined PDD. Detailed descriptions of the deviations are given in the Monitoring Report 002 that has been finally verified (see <a href="http://ji.unfccc.int/JI_Projects/DeterAndVerif/Verif/FinVerif.html">http://ji.unfccc.int/JI_Projects/DeterAndVerif/Verif/FinVerif.html</a> ). A revised	N/a	N/a	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
		<p>monitoring plan has been submitted to the AIE during verification, which received a positive determination.</p> <p>There is also new proposed change to the existing monitoring plan, which concerns addition of new thermal furnace #1 to the existing monitoring plan.</p>			
95 (a)	<p>For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate.</p>			OK



DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
		<p>CAR 5. Please change all the IPCC 2006 data to the IPCC 1996 date since the first one is not still approved for official use.</p>	<p>IPCC 2006 data were not changed to IPCC 1996 data because none of the official documents regulating activities undertaken under Joint Implementation mechanism requires doing so. The project was developed by using JI specific approach in accordance with "Guidelines on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", Version 2, adopted by JISC 18. Paragraph 33 of the Guidelines states that "the default values chosen should originate from recognized sources, be supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels and be presented in a transparent manner". Data sources for the values used for estimation of emission reductions suggested by the Guidelines are "e.g. official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, IPCC, commercial and scientific literature etc." Due to the fact that the exact version of IPCC guidelines is not specified, in order to ensure best quality of calculation the values from</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p>	

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
		CAR 6. Please correct date of the last calibration of the temperature meter at thermal furnace #37.	latest version of IPCC guidelines as the one based on the best science available at the moment of preparation of the MR, were used. Date of the last calibration of the temperature meter at thermal furnace #37 was corrected in the MR version 2.0 appropriately.	The issue is closed.	
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Yes, data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are clearly identified, reliable and transparent	N/a	N/a	OK
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	Yes, emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice	N/a	N/a	OK
<b>Applicable to JI SSC projects only</b>					
96	Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
	monitoring period on an annual average basis? If the threshold is exceeded, is the maximum emission reduction level estimated in the PDD for the JI SSC project or the bundle for the monitoring period determined?				
<b>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only</b>					
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
98	If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report? Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>Revision of monitoring plan</b>					
<b>Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant</b>					
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	Yes, project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision, which was fully described in the Determination of Monitoring Plan Report (see	N/a	N/a	N/a

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
		<a href="http://ji.unfccc.int/JL_Projects/DeterAndVerif/Verif/FinVerif.htm">http://ji.unfccc.int/JL_Projects/DeterAndVerif/Verif/FinVerif.htm</a> . The monitoring of baseline and project emissions and calculation of emission reductions will be performed using same approaches and formulae as in the determined monitoring plan. The relevant changes in terms of monitoring equipment and procedures for monitoring and calculation have been made in the updated monitoring plan.			
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>Data management</b>					
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
	assurance procedures?				
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)</b>					
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
<b>Applicable to sample-based approach only</b>					
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable, taking into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as:	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Action requested to project participants	Review of project Participants' action	Conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The types of JPAs;</li> <li>- The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used;</li> <li>- The geographical location of each JPA;</li> <li>- The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified;</li> <li>- The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified;</li> <li>- The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and</li> <li>- The samples selected for prior verifications, if any?</li> </ul>				
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
108	Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then does the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC.s ex ante assessment? (Optional)	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
110	If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

## **APPENDIX B: VERIFICATION TEAM**

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

### **Ivan G. Sokolov, Dr. Sci. (biology, microbiology)**

Internal Technical Reviewer, Climate Change Lead Verifier, Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS Local Climate Change Product Manager for Ukraine

Acting CEO Bureau Veritas Black Sea District

He has over 25 years of experience in Research Institute in the field of biochemistry, biotechnology, and microbiology. He is a Lead auditor of Bureau Veritas Certification for Environment Management System (IRCA

registered), Quality Management System (IRCA registered), Occupational Health and Safety Management System, and Food Safety Management System. He performed over 140 audits since 1999. Also he is Lead Tutor of the IRCA registered ISO 14000 EMS Lead Auditor Training Course, and Lead Tutor of the IRCA registered ISO 9000 QMS Lead Auditor Training Course. He is Lead Tutor of the Clean Development Mechanism /Joint Implementation Lead Verifier Training Course and he was involved in the determination/verification over 60 JI/CDM projects.

**Kateryna Zinevych, M.Sci. (environmental science)**

Climate Change Verifier

Kateryna Zinevych has graduated from National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy with the Master Degree in Environmental Science. She has experience at working in a professional position (analytics) involving the exercise of judgment, problem solving and communication with other professional and managerial personnel as well as customers and other interested parties at analytical centre “Dergzovnishinform” and “Bureau Veritas Ukraine” LLC. She has successfully completed IRCA registered Lead Auditor Training Course for Environment Management Systems and Quality Management Systems. She has successfully completed Climate Change Verifier Training Course and she participated as verifier in the determination/verification of 26 JI projects.

**Oleg Skoblyk, Specialist (Power Management)**

Climate Change Verifier

Bureau Veritas Ukraine HSE Department project manager.

He has graduated from National Technical University of Ukraine ‘Kyiv Polytechnic University’ with specialty Energy Management. He is a Lead auditor of Bureau Veritas Certification for Environment Management System (IRCA registered). He performed over 10 audits since 2008. He has undergone intensive training on Clean Development Mechanism /Joint Implementation and he is involved in the validation of 20 JI projects.

The report was reviewed by:

**Leonid Yaskin, PhD (thermal engineering)**

Internal Technical Reviewer

Bureau Veritas Certification Rus General Director- Lead Auditor, Lead Tutor, Climate Change Lead Verifier



He has over 30 years of experience in heat and power R&D, engineering, and management, environmental science and investment analysis of projects. He worked in Krrzhizhanovsky Power Engineering Institute, All-Russian Teploelectroproject Institute, JSC Energoperspectiva. He worked for 8 years on behalf of European Commission as a monitor of Technical Assistance Projects. He is a Lead auditor of Bureau Veritas Certification for Quality Management Systems (IRCA registered), Environmental Management System (IRCA registered), Occupational Health and Safety Management System (IRCA registered). He performed over 250 audits since 2002. Also he is a Lead Tutor of the IRCA registered ISO 14000 EMS Lead Auditor Training Course, and a Lead Tutor of the IRCA registered OHSAS 18001 Lead Auditor Training Course. He is an Assuror of Social Reports. He is Lead Tutor of the Climate Change Lead Verifier Training Course and was/is involved in the determination of over 60 JI projects.