VERIFICATION REPORT «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.»

VERIFICATION OF THE

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES AND REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE AT STATE ENTERPRISE "COAL COMPANY "KRASNOLIMANSKA"

INITIAL AND FIRST PERIODIC AND FOR THE PERIOD
01/01/2012 – 30/09/2012

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0755/2012
REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: UKRAINE-ver/0755/2012

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 04/10/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A.	Client ref.: Fabian Knodel

Summary:
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the initial and 1st periodic verification of the "Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" project of «CEP Carbon Emissions Partners S.A.» located in Donetsk region, Ukraine, and applying JI specific approach, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

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

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions, or misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 368 481 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent for the monitoring period from 01/01/2012 to 30/09/2012.

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-ver/0755/2012	Subject Group: JI	
Project title: Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska"		
Work carried out by: Vyacheslav Yeriomin: Team Leader, Lead Verifier Vasiliy Kobzar: Team Member, Technical Specialist		
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer Victoria Legka – Technical Specialist		☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov – Operational Manager		☐ Limited distribution
Date of this revision: 08/10/2012	Rev. No.: 02	Number of pages: 21 ☐ Unrestricted distribution

Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

«CEP Carbon Emissions Partners S.A.» has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" (hereafter called "the project") at Donetsk region, Ukraine.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

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

1.2 Scope

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

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

1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Vyacheslav Yeriomin
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Vasiliy Kobzar
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical Specialist

This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Victoria Legka
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical Specialist

2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) submitted by «CEP Carbon Emissions Partners S.A.» and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Approved CDM methodology, Determination Report of the project issued by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS, No. UKRAINE-det/0599/2012 dated 31/08/2012 and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report for the period of 01/01/2012 – 30/09/2012, version 1.0 dated 02/10/2012 and version 2.0 dated 05/10/2012 and project as described in the determined PDD.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 05/10/2012 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 «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.» and State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska"	Organizational structure Responsibilities and authorities Roles and responsibilities for data collection and processing Installation of equipment Data logging, archiving and reporting Metering equipment control Metering record keeping system, database IT management Training of personnel Quality management procedures and technology Internal audits and check-ups
«CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.»	Baseline methodology Monitoring plan Monitoring report Excel spreadsheets

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

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

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

(a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;

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

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

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

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

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 8 Corrective Action Requests and 1 Clarification Request.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

No FARs were raised during determination.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval by the Ukraine #2894/23/7 dated 04/10/2012 has been issued by the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine.

Written project approval by Switzerland Designated Focal Point was received for the proposed project on 24/08/2012(Letter of Approval #J294-0485).

The abovementioned written approvals are unconditional.

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

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

The main purpose of the Joint Implementation Project (herinafter - JI project) “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska” is improvement of energy efficiency and safety of operations (coal mining), as well as improvement of environmental situation in the region by complex modernization of operatons, implementation of colliery gas (CG) recovery technology, as well as implementation of waste heap monitoring program and urgent extinction technology at Krasnolimanska Mine.

Baseline scenario.
The baseline scenario provides for the continuation of operation of the existing equipment with routine repairs without any major investments, which meets the requirements of the state standards and legislation of Ukraine. Specific energy consumption for electricity supply and heat supply of technological processes remain stable or growing, causing higher GHG emissions into the atmosphere. According to the existing technology, colliery gas, which consists mainly from methane, is deained out into the atmosphere. The baseline envisages the continuation of the existing practice on waste heap No.2 monitoring and extinction if burning spots are detected, in accordance with NPAOP 10.0-5.21-04 “Manual on self-ignition prevention, extinction and demolition of waste heaps”. However, these activities proved to be ineffective, which is evidenced by annual temperature surveys detecting recurrent hot spots in a waste heap. Since waste heaps consist from coal (10-15%), its combustion is accompanied by a great amount of emissions of GHGs and other pollutants into the atmosphere.

Project scenario.
Main project activities aimed at the reduction of GHG emissions into the atmosphere are:

1. complex modernization of coal mining equipment;
2. modernization of heat-generating equipment;
3. implementation of coal mine methane (CMM) recovery technology;
4. implementation of waste heap No.2 extinction technology at SE “CC “Krasnolimanska”.

Implementation of energy-efficient and energy-saving equipment and technologies provided for by a complex modernization within the framework of the JI project, will lead to better coal production and heat generation efficiency and, as a result, lower energy resource consumption in the course of coal mining, which, in turn, will reduce GHG emissions into the atmosphere.
The technology of CG recovery by its combustion in boiler equipment, will substitute for the previous mine gas drainage technology, which provided

for withdrawal of CG (a greenhouse gas with Global Warming Potential of 21) directly to the atmosphere. Thermal energy generated as a result of combustion of coal mine methane (CMM), the main CG component, will substitute heat from combustion of coal which is currently the primary energy carrier at SE "CC "Krasnolimanska". By substituting coal with more environment-friendly fuel, namely CMM, GHG emissions to the atmosphere are reduced.

The project also provides for waste heap No.1 extinction activities by insulation of hot spots and barring oxygen to the burning rock. As a result, burning stops and the possibility of recurrent ignition is minimized. Implementation of the effective waste heap monitoring program providing for monthly waste heap monitoring, as well as urgent extinction activities in the case of emergency (control spots temperature exceeding the permissible level). According to conservative principles, GHG emissions generated in the course of waste heap burning, willl be included into emission reduction calculations in the case of recurrent ignition during the project implementation. Pursuant to the conservative principle, the baseline is set and GHG emissions are calculated using waste heap parameters as of the start of the project, while the volume of waste stacked in the waste heap during the project implementation is not used in calculation. Meantime, project activities embrace the whole waste heap, including the waste stacked in the waste heap after the project implementation started, as well as waste heap No.3, created in 2009.

The identified areas of concern as to the project implementation, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CAR 03, CL 01).

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

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

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

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

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

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

The identified areas of concern as to the compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CAR 04).

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

Not applicable

3.6 Data management (101)

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

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

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

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

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

The identified areas of concern as to the data managemet, project participants responses and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusions are described in Appendix A to this report (refer to CARs 05 - 08).

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

Not applicable

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial and 1st periodic verification of the "Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" Project in Ukraine, which applies JI specific approach. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against the project design and the baseline and

monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

The management of «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.» is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD version. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 2.0 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

Emission reductions achieved by the project for the period from 01/01/2012 to 30/09/2012 differ significantly from the amount predicted for the same period in the determined PDD. Emission reductions predicted in the determined PDD version 2.0 and actual emission reductions stated in the MR version 2.0 are provided in Table 2.0 of this report.

Table 2 Emission reductions predicted in the determined PDD version 2.0 and actual emission reductions stated in the MR version 2.0

Values in t CO_2eq	Emission reductions according to the PDD	Emission reductions according to the monitoring report
Total emission reductions over the monitoring period	**199 205**	**368 481**

At the time of PDD development available data on the quantitative characteristics of the waste heaps of 2005 were taken to calculate the amount of GHG emission reductions. At the stage of monitoring the actual data on the characteristics of the waste heap of 2012 were used in calculations. This explains the difference between the amount of GHG emission reductions specified in the registered PDD (version 2.0) and actually reached values of GHG emission reductions provided in this monitoring report.

For calculating GHG emissions from implementation of CMM recovery measures, ex-post data on CMM combusted and electricity consumed during CMM recovery, provided by SE "CC "Krasnolimanska", were used.

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

Reporting period: From 01/01/2012 to 30/09/2012

For the period from 01/01/2012 to 30/09/2012

Baseline emissions	: 445 817	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 77 336	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 368 481	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by «CEP Carbon Emissions Partners S.A.» that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Project Design Document “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" version 02 dated 17/08/2012
/2/ Monitoring report for JI project “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" version 1.0 dated 02/10/2012
/3/ Monitoring report for JI project “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska" version 2.0 dated 05/10/2012
/4/ ERUs calculation excel file «Супровідний_документ_1.xls»
/5/ Letter of Approval №2894/23/7 dated 04/10/2012 issued by State Agency of ecological investments of Ukraine
/6/ Letter of Approval #J294-0485 issued by the Designated Focal Point of Switzerland on 24/08/2012
/7/ Analysis of waste heap № 2 at State Enterprise “Coal Company "Krasnolimanska”

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

/1/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, April 2012
/2/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, July 2012
/3/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, June 2012
/4/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, May 2012
/5/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, March 2012
/6/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, September 2012
/7/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, February 2012
/8/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, January 2012
/9/ Periodic report on industrial production (goods and services) by types, August 2012

/10/ Reference about accrual premiums for the supply of gas to CH4 for its own needs by PRpoTB for GP "Chervonolymanska" on VNSN number 1 and number 2 VNSN June 2012

/11/ Reference about accrual premiums for the supply of gas to CH4 for its own needs by PRpoTB for State Enterprise “Coal Company "Krasnolimanska” on VNSN number 1 and number 2 VNSN May 2012

/12/ Reference about accrual premiums for the supply of gas to CH4 for its own needs by PRpoTB for State Enterprise “Coal Company "Krasnolimanska” on VNSN number 1 and number 2 VNSN April 2012

/13/ Reference about accrual premiums for the supply of gas to CH4 for its own needs by PRpoTB for State Enterprise “Coal Company "Krasnolimanska” on VNSN number 1 and number 2 VNSN March 2012

/14/ Reference about accrual premiums for the supply of gas to CH4 for its own needs by PRpoTB for State Enterprise “Coal Company "Krasnolimanska” on VNSN number 1 and number 2 VNSN February 2012

/15/ Reference about accrual premiums for the supply of gas to CH4 for its own needs by PRpoTB for State Enterprise “Coal Company "Krasnolimanska” on VNSN number 1 and number 2 VNSN January 2012

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/ Slipenko Oleg - mechanic area "Maintenance work on safety" degassing "SE "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska"

/2/ Kondratyev Alexander - Chief Energy "SE "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska"

/3/ Letyak Valentin - Deputy Chief Engineer "SE "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska"

/4/ Prokhorov Oksana - Senior Engineer Environmental "SE "Coal Company "Krasnolimanska"

/5/ Repinetskyi Sergiy- Consultant of CEP Carbon Emissions Partners S.A. (LLC CEP)

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL
VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	**Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01**. Number and date of a Letter of Approval from Ukraine is not correct. **Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02** Number and date of a Letter of Approval from Switzerland is not correct.	**CAR 01** **CAR 02**	OK OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	See CAR 01 above	OK	OK
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	Project is implemented in accordance with the PDD, determination of which is deemed to be final **Clarification Request (CL) 01** Please clarify, were the measurements of waste heap temperature conducted during the whole monitoring period or were there any conditions interrupting the conduction of survey?	**CL 01**	OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	**Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03** The name of enterprise, where the project is implemented, is not correctly specified in the Section A.6.	**CAR 03**	OK
Compliance with monitoring plan				
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	Yes, the monitoring occurs in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?	Yes, all relevant key factors were taken into account, as appropriate.	OK	OK
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are clearly identified, reliable and transparent	OK	OK
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	**Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04** Value of the coefficient $EF^{y}_{p,CO2,ELEC}$ is not correctly specified in Table 3 MR.	OK	OK
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	Yes, the calculation of emission reductions based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner	OK	OK
Applicable to JI SSC projects only				
96	Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring 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?	N/A	OK	OK
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	N/A	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	N/A	OK	OK
98	If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report? Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?	N/A	OK	OK
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	N/A	OK	OK
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	N/A	OK	OK
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	Yes, the implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures.	OK	OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	**Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05** Please indicate calibration interval for the electricity meter AIR-3AL-C4-T. **Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06**	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		Please indicate the accuracy class for the thermometer. **Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07** Please provide information about training. **Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08** Please check the numeration of all tables in the Monitoring Report		
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The evidences and records used for the monitoring maintained are in a traceable manner	OK	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	N/A	OK	OK
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	N/A	OK	OK
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	N/A	OK	OK
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	N/A	OK	OK
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	N/A		
Applicable to sample-based approach only				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in	N/A	OK	OK

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?			

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarification and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01. Number and date of a Letter of Approval from Ukraine is not correct.	90	Letter of Approval №2894/23/7 dated 04/10/2012 issued by State Agency of ecological investments of Ukraine	Issue is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02 Number and date of a Letter of Approval from Switzerland is not correct.	90	Letter of Approval #J294-0485 issued by the Designated Focal Point of Switzerland on 24/08/2012	Issue is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03 The name of enterprise, where the project is implemented, is not correctly specified in the Section A.6.	93	SE "CC "Krasnolimanska" monitores the waste heap and takes measures to keep it in the state of non-combustion . See MR version 2.0	Issue is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04 Value of the coefficient $EF^{y}_{p,CO2,ELEC}$ is not correctly specified in Table 3 MR.	95 (c)	Corrections were made See MR version 2.0	Issue is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05 Please indicate calibration interval for the electricity meter AIR-3AL-C4-T.	101 (b)	The calibration interval for the electricity meter AIR-3AL-C4-T is 6 years. See MR version 2.0	Issue is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06 Please indicate the accuracy class for the thermometer.	101 (b)	Accuracy class: 0.5. See MR version 2.0	Issue is closed

Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07 Please provide information about training.	101 (b)	If new equipment (not operated before) is installed, the manufacturer is obliged to provide trainings for the personnel; if this condition is not met, company employees shall take professional training on this topic (new equipment or technology); after the professional trainings the employees pass exams followed by certification. See MR version 2.0	Issue is closed
Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08 Please check the numeration of all tables in the Monitoring Report	101 (b)	Corrected. See MR version 2.0	Issue is closed
Clarification Request (CL) 01 Please clarify, were the measurements of waste heap temperature conducted during the whole monitoring period or were there any conditions interrupting the conduction of survey?	92	Temperature measuring of waste heap were conducted i accordance with the internal instruction. See the attached supporting document CL01-Inst_01.pdf	Issue is closed