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

DETERMINATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES AND REDUCTION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE AT SS "COAL MINE "TORETSKA", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL"

REPORT NO. URRAINE-DET/0606/2012

REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: UKRAINE-det/0606/2012

DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
20/08/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
«CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.»	Fabian Knodel

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the "Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS "Coal mine "Toretska", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" project of CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A. located in Donetsk region, Ukraine on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

The determination scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study, monitoring plan and other relevant documents, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion. The overall determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the determination process is a list of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests (CL and CAR), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.

In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
UKRAINE-det/0606/2012	JI

Project title:
"Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS "Coal mine "Toretska", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL"

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

Work approved by:
Ivan Sokolov – Operational Manager

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
24/08/2012	02	51

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

The Company «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.» has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project "Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS "Coal mine "Toretska", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" (hereafter called "the project") at address of project.

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

1.1 Objective

The determination serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The determination is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are determined in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Determination is a requirement for all JI projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of emission reduction units (ERUs).

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

1.2 Scope

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

The determination is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

1.3 Determination team

The determination team consists of the following personnel:

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 determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

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

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.», and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form, Approved CDM methodology and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Determination Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.» revised the PDD and resubmitted it as version 2.0 dated 22/08/2012.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD versions 1.0 dated 11/07/2012, 2.0 dated 22/08/2012.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 18/07/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed on-site interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of «CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.» and SS "Coal mine "Toretska", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL"	➢ Implementation schedule ➢ Organizational structure ➢ Responsibilities and authorities ➢ Data collection and processing responsibilities and authorities ➢ Equipment installation ➢ Data recording, archiving and reporting system ➢ Rehabilitation/Implementation of equipment (records) ➢ Metering equipment control ➢ Metering record keeping system, database ➢ IT control ➢ Training of personnel ➢ Quality management procedures and technology ➢ Internal audits and checks
CEP CARBON EMISSIONS PARTNERS S.A.	➢ Baseline methodology ➢ Applicability of methodology ➢ Monitoring plan ➢ Conformity of PDD to JI requirements

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the project design.

If the determination team, in assessing the PDD and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to JI project requirements, it will raise these issues and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

(a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake in the published PDD that is not in accordance with the (technical) process used for the project or relevant JI project requirement or that shows any other logical flaw;

(b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the determination team to assess compliance with the JI project requirement in question;

(c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to project implementation but not project design, that needs to be reviewed during the first verification of the project.

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

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

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The JI project “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS “Coal mine “Toretska”, SE “DZERZHINSKUGOL" is aimed at quenching and stabilization of the waste heaps that are under the control of mines “Pivnichna” and “Pivdenna” that are managed by SE “DZERZHINSKUGOL” located in the town Dzerhynsk in Donetsk region. Project activity will reduce the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Project activity lies in stabilization of waste heap applying vermiculite material.

Situation at the beginning of the project activity

Coal is found in the area of Donbas at the average depth of 400-800 m. The average thickness of coal-bed is 0.6-1.2 m. Therefore coal in Donbas is produced mostly by mining. Most mines operate on the depth of 400-800 m but there are 35 mines in Donbas that extract coal from the 1000-1300 m level. Coal-beds in Donetsk basin are interleaved with rock and are usually found every 20-40 m. Mining activities in such conditions result in vast amounts of matter being extracted and brought to the surface. Coal is separated from rock and this non-coal matter forms huge waste heaps of tailings found almost everywhere in Donbas. Separation process on the mines was not and sometimes is not entirely efficient. For a long period of time it was not economically feasible to extract 100% of coal from the rock that had been mined. That is why waste heaps of Donbas contain considerable masses of coal. In the course of time those

waste heaps are vulnerable to spontaneous ignition and slow combustion. According to different estimates the rock that is mined contains only up to 65-70% of coal only, the rest is barren rock. Up to 60% of this rock is put into waste heaps. Waste heaps that are burning or are close to spontaneous ignition are sources of uncontrolled greenhouse gas and hazardous substances emissions. The latter include sulphurous anhydride that transforms into sulphur acid and is the reason for acid rains, hydrogen sulphide and carbon oxide. Erosion can lead overtime to the total destruction of a waste heap in a massive landslide that is dangerous both in terms of direct hazard to population and property and massive emissions of particles and hazardous substances into the atmosphere. Erosion also helps to intensify the process of spontaneous combustion. Combustion of coal in the waste heap is rather long-term and lasts up to 15 years.

Despite the dangers caused by the burning waste heaps, it is common in the area of Donbas to not extinguish the fires. The owners that are responsible for the waste heaps receive relatively small fines for the air pollution, therefore there is little incentive for them to deal with the problem, and extinguishing those heaps that are currently alight may not be postponed.

Project scenario

Waste heap extinction and adjustment of the system of condition monitoring and system of urgent extinction are expected to make it impossible that the waste heap continues or re-starts burning. Project emissions due to waste heap burning are to be nil. However, the waste heap condition will be permanently controlled. If, because of an emergency, temperature readings indicate that there are hot spots, the related emissions will be taken into account in emission reduction calculations. This parameter is used to understand whether there are hot spots. The temperature of the waste heap is under strict control. Monitoring of the parameter is done once per month. The measurement results are entered in Waste heap temperature registering books, and the company's management is informed. Based on the data, coefficient "k" is estimated. The coefficient is used for emission reduction calculation (if there are signs that the waste heap is burning, coefficient "k" is considered equal to 1; if there are no signs, coefficient "k" is equal to 0). If temperature survey is impossible to conduct over a month (according to the requirements under instructions as to how to carry out the survey), the survey data for the following month will be allowed for. If there are signs of burning, it will be agreed that the signs were present also in the previous month. This will be taken into account when calculations of GHG emission reduction under the project are done.

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. The baseline envisages the continuation of the existing practice on waste heap 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 GHG emissions and other pollutants into the atmosphere. For detailed baseline justification see Section B of the PDD.

History of the project

Brief project history:

- Project was initiated 01/09/2005.
- Installation and construction activities were started in September 2005.
- Stabilization of waste heap was finished at the end of November 2005.
  Joint Implementation mechanism was one of the drivers for the project from the start and financial benefits provided by the JI mechanism were considered as one of the reasons to start the project and are crucial in the decision to start the operations.
- Project design document was finished in 2012.

Benefits of the project

Besides the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, implementation of measures described in the investment plans has the following benefits:

- Increase of employment opportunities due to the introduction of new equipment into service, construction and renovation of enterprise’s facilities;
- Reduction of hazardous pollutants emission;
- Production cost reduction.

The identified areas of concern as to the project description, project participants response and BVC’s conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 01-CAR 08, CAR 30).

4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A. The determination of the Project resulted in 26 Corrective Action Requests and 04 Clarification Requests.

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

4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)

After issuing the Determination Report by AIE, project documentation will be submitted to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine and Federal Department of the Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications of Switzerland for receiving the Letter of Approval.

The identified areas of concern as to the project approval by Parties involved, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 09).

The project has not been approved by the parties involved thus CAR 09 is pending. The issue will be closed after the Letter of Approval is issued by the Host Party.

The identified areas of concern as to Project approvals by Parties involved, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 09, CL 01).

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The official authorization by the Parties Involved will be provided in the written approvals of the project by the relevant parties indicating the designated body.

The identified areas of concern as to the authorization of project participants by Parties involved, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 09).

The project has not been approved by the parties involved thus CAR 09 is pending. The issue will be closed after the Letter of Approval is issued by the Host Party.

4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD explicitly indicates that JI specific approach was the selected approach for identifying the baseline.

Baseline scenario was developed according to the Annex B to JI Guidelines, Guidelines on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, also methodological tool “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”.

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

(a) By listing and describing the following plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one:

a. Continuation of the existing situation
b. Implementation of the proposed project activity without the project registration as JI project

As the process of coal production and preparation is complex and involves all administrative and technical resources and means of SE “DZERZHINSKUGOL”, it is impossible to classify the modernization works done at the company. Therefore, this scenario cannot be considered as an alternative to the proposed project activity.

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

a. State policy and legislation in the mining sector;
b. Economic situation in the mining sector of Ukraine and demand forecast for agricultural products;
c. Technical aspects of equipment operation;
d. Availability of capital (including investment barriers);
e. Local availability of technology / equipment;
f. Price and availability of fuel.

JI specific approach and “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” were chosen by the project participants for setting the baseline.

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology and the baseline is identified appropriately.

The identified areas of concern as to the baseline setting, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 10 - CAR 13).

4.4 Additionality (27-31)

Traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances (same GHG mitigation measure, same country, similar technology, similar scale) would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources that is additional to any that would otherwise occur and a justification why this determination is relevant for the project at hand was provided.

None of the existing methodologies can be applied for the proposed project aimed at the reduction of energy consumption and waste heap extinction at SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL". The project participant has chosen a JI-specific approach in accordance with paragraph 9 (a) of the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", Version 03.

The most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" approved by the CDM Executive Board was used. All explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected tool or method.

Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the steps mentioned above.

The identified areas of concern as to the additionality, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 14).

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

The project boundary defined in the PDD, encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that are:

(i) Under the control of the project participants;

(ii) Reasonably attributable to the project.

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

The AIE determined the project boundary by:

a) Detailed analysis of corresponding documentation (the list of assessed documents is provided in the Table "Category 2 Documents" below).

b) Interview and observations made during the site visit to SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" 18/07/2012 (the list of persons interviewed is provided in the Table "Persons interviewed" below).

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

No outstanding issues concerning the Project boundary were raised.

4.6 Crediting period (34)

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began, and the starting date is 20/08/2005, which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 15 years or 180 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 15 years or 180 months, and its starting date as 01/01/2006, which is on the date the first emission reductions generated by the project.

The PDD states that the crediting period for the issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.

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

The identified areas of concern as to Crediting period, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 15 – CAR 17 and CL 02 – CL 03).

4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)

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

The monitoring plan describes all relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored, and the period in which they will be monitored, in particular also all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance, such as fuel economy.

The monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable (i.e. provide consistent and accurate values), valid (i.e. are clearly connected with the effect to be measured), and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions to be monitored such as:

1. Actual flows of power supply into the grid
2. Total coal consumption in the course of technological process of coal mining
3. CO_2 emission factor in UES of Ukraine

The monitoring plan draws on the list of standard variables indicated in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" developed by the JISC, as appropriate PE_y; BE_y.

The monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguishes:

(i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination. Not applicable.

(ii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period, such as $EC^{y}_{p,ELEC}$, $EF^{y}_{p,CO2,ELEC}$, $FC^{y}_{p,coal}$, $NCV^{y}_{p,coal}$, $EF^{y}_{p,C,coal}$, $OXID^{y}_{p,coal}$.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording.

The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate:

Project emissions

Greenhouse gases emissions which included in the project scenario:

$$PE_y = \sum PE_{PO}^{j}$$

Studies have shown that the period of waste heaps burning is 15 years [*], which means that the entire amount of coal of waste heap completely burned during this period. Project monitoring of waste heap condition allows for the control the condition of the heap and prevention of its burning, and if the latter occurs, to take measures for its rapid quenching, provides for the monthly monitoring of waste heap. Based on the conditions of the monitoring program of waste heap condition, the formula for calculation of GHG emissions from waste heap burning of the baseline was adapted to the activities of the monthly monitoring of heap condition.

$$PE_{PO}^{y} = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{FC_{p,PO,coal} \cdot NCV_{p,coal}^{y} \cdot k_i^{y} \cdot EF_{p,CO2,coal}^{y}}{180} + PE_{p,PO,disel}^{y},$$

PE_{PO}^{y} - GHG emissions generated in the process of repeated flickering of waste heap after quenching measures, during period «y» in the project scenario (tCO_2eq);

$PE_{p,PO,disel}^{y}$ - GHG emissions from diesel fuel combustion, which is used in technological process of waste heaps quenching in monitoring period «*y*», in the project scenario, (t CO_2-eq);

$FC_{p,PO,coal}$ - total quantity of coal in waste heap at the beginning of performance of quenching works (ths t);

$NCV_{p,coal}^{y}$ - net calorific value of coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the project scenario, (TJ/ths. t);

$EF_{p,CO_2,coal}^{y}$ - default CO_2 emission factor for stationary coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the project scenario, (t CO_2 /TJ);

k_i^{y} – waste heap burning factor in month and year "*y*" (in case of waste heap burning were found in the reporting month is assumed to be k = 1, if the burning were not found, as it provided under the project, then is taken k = 0.).

180 - number of months in fifteen years (15 years is the period of complete burning of waste heap).

$[disel]$ - index relating to diesel fuel;

$[y]$ - index corresponding to montoring period;

$[i]$ - index corresponding to sequence number of month, year «*y*» ;

[*] http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/natural/Pb/2010_17/Statti/10.pdf

$[p]$ - index corresponding to the project scenario;

$[n]$ - index corresponding to density;

$[coal]$- index relating to coal.

Emissions from diesel fuel consumed by technological equipment during waste heap quenching arise only in case of repeated burning of waste heap, and are less than 1% of the emissions generated in the process of waste heap burning because of it these emissions can be neglected. Thus:

$$PE_{PO}^{y} = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{FC_{p,PO,coal} \cdot NCV_{p,coal}^{y} \cdot k_{i}^{y} \cdot EF_{p,CO2,coal}^{y}}{180},$$

$$FC_{p,PO,coal} = \frac{V_{PO} \cdot \rho_{n} \cdot C_{coal}}{1000000},$$

$FC_{p,PO,coal}$- total quantity of coal in waste heap at the beginning of performance of quenching works (t);

$V_{PO.}$ – waste heap volume, m^3;

C_{coal}– coal consist in waste heap, %;

ρ_n - waste heap density, kg/m^3;

$[PO]$ - index relating to waste heap;

$[n]$ - index corresponding to density;

$\left[\frac{1}{1000000}\right]$ - index relating to kg to thousand tonnes conversion.

$[coal]$- index relating to coal.

$$EF_{p,CO2,coal}^{y} = EF_{p,C,coal}^{y} \cdot OXID_{p,coal}^{y} \cdot 44/12,$$

$EF_{b,C,coal}^{y}$ - carbon emission factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the project scenario, (t C/TJ);

$OXID_{b,coal}^{y}$ - carbon oxidation factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the project scenario, (relative unit);

$44/12$ - stoichiometric ratio of CO_2 and C molecular masses, (t CO_2 /t C);

$[y]$ - index corresponding to the monitoring period;

$[p]$ - index corresponding to the project scenario;

$[coal]$- index relating to coal.

Baseline emissions

Baseline GHG emissions:

$$BE_y = \sum BE_{PO}^{j}$$

Studies have shown that the period of waste heaps burning is 15 years [*], which means that the entire amount of coal of waste heap completely burned during this period. Project monitoring of waste heap condition allows for the control the condition of the heap and prevention of its burning, and if the latter occurs, to take measures for its rapid quenching, provides for the monthly monitoring of waste heap. Based on the conditions of the monitoring program of waste heap condition, the formula for calculation of GHG emissions from waste heap burning of the baseline was adapted to the activities of the monthly monitoring of heap condition.

$$BE_{PO}^{y} = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{FC_{b,PO,coal} \cdot NCV_{b,coal}^{y} \cdot k_i^{y} \cdot EF_{b,CO2,coal}^{y}}{180},$$

$FC_{b,PO,coal}$ - total coal production in the waste heap at the beginning of performance of quenching works (ths t);

$NCV_{b,coal}^{y}$ - net calorific value of coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the baseline scenario, (TJ/ths. t);

$EF_{b,CO_2,coal}^{y}$ - default CO_2 emission factor for stationary coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the baseline scenario, (t CO_2 /TJ);

k_i^{y} – waste heaps burning factor for month «*i*» year «*y*» (in case of waste heap burning were found in the reporting month is assumed to be k = 1, if the burning were found, as it provided under the project, then is taken k = 0. Because under the baseline scenario the waste heap continues to burn, k = 1 for all months of the monitoring period).

$[PO]$ - index relating to the waste heap;

$[b]$ - index corresponding to the baseline scenario;

$[coal]$- index relating to coal.

$[i]$ - index corresponding to the sequence number of the month, year «*y*».

$$FC_{b,PO,coal} = \frac{V_{PO} \cdot \rho_n \cdot C_{coal}}{1000000},$$

$FC_{b,PO,coal}$ - total quantity of coal in waste heap at the beginning of performance of quenching works (ths t);

V_{PO}. – waste heap volume, m^3;

[*] http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/natural/Pb/2010_17/Statti/10.pdf

C_{coal} – consist of coal in the waste heap, %;
ρ_n - waste heap density, kg/m^3;
$[PO]$ - index relating to the waste heap;
$[b]$ - index corresponding to the baseline scenario;
$[n]$ - index corresponding to density;
$[coal]$- index relating to coal.
$\left[\frac{1}{1000000}\right]$ - index relating to kg to thousand tonnes conversion.

$$EF^{y}_{b,CO2,coal} = EF^{y}_{b,C,coal} \cdot OXID^{y}_{b,coal} \cdot 44/12,$$

$EF^{y}_{b,C,coal}$ - CO_2 emission factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the baseline scenario, (t C/TJ);
$OXID^{y}_{b,coal}$ - carbon oxidation factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period «y», in the baseline scenario, (relative unit);
$44/12$ - stoichiometric ratio of CO_2 and C molecular masses, (t CO_2 /t C);
$[y]$ - index corresponding to the monitoring period;
$[b]$ - index corresponding to the baseline scenario;
$[coal]$- index relating to coal.

Emissions Reduction

Quantity of Emission Reduction Units (ERU), t CO_2e:

$$ER_y = BE_y\text{-}PE_y$$

where:
BE_y - baseline emission in period y (tCO_2e);
PE_y - project emission in period y (tCO_2e);
$[y]$ - index corresponding to monitoring period;
$[b]$ - index corresponding to baseline scenario;
$[p]$ - index corresponding to project scenario.

The monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process. Information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available on request.

The monitoring plan clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities.

On the whole, the monitoring plan reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.

The monitoring plan provides, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources (e.g. official statistics, expert judgment, proprietary data, IPCC, commercial and scientific literature etc.) but not including data that are calculated with equations.

The monitoring plan indicates that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.

The identified areas of concern as to monitoring plan, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 18 – CAR 28, CL 04).

4.8 Leakage (40-41)

The PDD appropriately describes an assessment of the potential indirect leakages of CO_2, CH_4 which occur in the coal production and transportation process and appropriately explains which sources of leakage can be neglected.

In the PDD indicated that leakage in the project activity is expected.

No outstanding issues were raised.

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

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

The PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:

(a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary), CO_2eq:

- project emissions for the period of 01/01/2006 – 31/12/2007

Years	Project emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)

2006	0
2007	0
Total project emissions in 2006-2007 (t CO_2 equivalent)	**0**

- project emissions for the period of 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2012

Years	Project emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0
2012	0
Total project emissions in 2008-2012 (t CO_2 equivalent)	**0**

- project emissions for the period of 01/01/2013 – 31/12/2020

Years	Project emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2013	0
2014	0
2015	0
2016	0
2017	0
2018	0
2019	0
2020	0
Total project emissions in 2013-2020 (t CO_2 equivalent)	**0**

(b) Leakage, as applicable, which are 0 tonnes of CO2eq;

(c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), CO2eq:

- baseline emissions for the period of 01/01/2006 – 31/12/2007

Years	Estimated baseline emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2006	569 535
2007	577 275
Total baseline emissions in 2006-2007 (t CO_2 equivalent)	**1 146 810**

- baseline emissions for the period of 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2012

Years	Estimated baseline emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2008	527 345
2009	533 587
2010	530 063
2011	530 063
2012	530 063
Total baseline emissions in 2008-2012 (t CO_2 equivalent)	**2 651 121**

- baseline emissions for the period of 01/01/2013 – 31/12/2020

Years	Estimated baseline emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2013	530 063
2014	530 063
2015	530 063
2016	530 063
2017	530 063
2018	530 063
2019	530 063
2020	530 063
Total baseline emissions in 2013-2020 (t CO_2 equivalent)	**4 240 504**

(d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), CO2eq.

- emission reductions for the period from 01/01/2006 – 31/12/2007

Year	Estimated project emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)	Estimated leakage (t CO_2 equivalent)	Estimated baseline emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)	Estimated emission reductions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2006	0	0	569 535	569 535
2007	0	0	577 275	577 275
Total estimated emission reductions (t CO_2 equivalent)	**0**	**0**	**1 146 810**	**1 146 810**

- emission reductions for the period from 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2012

Year	Estimated project	Estimated leakage (t CO_2	Estimated baseline	Estimated emission

	emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)	equivalent)	emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)	reductions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2008	0	0	527 345	527 345
2009	0	0	533 587	533 587
2010	0	0	530 063	530 063
2011	0	0	530 063	530 063
2012	0	0	530 063	530 063
Total estimated emission reductions (t CO_2 equivalent)	**0**	**0**	**2 651 121**	**2 651 121**

- emission reductions for the period from 01/01/2013 – 31/12/2020

Year	Estimated project emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)	Estimated leakage (t CO_2 equivalent)	Estimated baseline emissions (t CO_2 equivalent)	Estimated emission reductions (t CO_2 equivalent)
2013	0	0	530 063	530 063
2014	0	0	530 063	530 063
2015	0	0	530 063	530 063
2016	0	0	530 063	530 063
2017	0	0	530 063	530 063
2018	0	0	530 063	530 063
2019	0	0	530 063	530 063
2020	0	0	530 063	530 063
Total estimated emission reductions (t CO_2 equivalent)	**0**	**0**	**4 240 504**	**4 240 504**

The estimates referred to above are given:

(a) On a periodic basis;

(b) From 01/01/2006 to 31/12/2020, covering the whole crediting period;

(c) On a source-by-source basis;

(d) For each GHG gas, which is CO_2;

(e) In tonnes of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol;

The formula used for calculating the estimates referred above are consistent throughout the PDD.

Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred to above are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

The estimation referred to above is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

The estimates referred to above are consistent throughout the PDD.

The annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

No outstanding issues concerning the estimated emission reduction were raised.

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

The full scope EIA in accordance with the Ukrainian legislation has been conducted for the proposed project in 2005. Key findings of this EIA are summarized below:

- Impact on air is the main environmental impact of the project activity. Dust emissions due to the erosion and project activity such as loading and offloading operations of input rock and processed coal will be limited. Also emissions from transport will be present during the project operation stage. The impact will not exceed maximum allowable concentration at the edge of the sanitary zone
- Impact on water is minor. The project activity will use water in a closed cycle without discharge of waste water. The possible discharge of the processed water will not have negative impact on the quality of water in the surface reservoirs;
- Impacts on flora and fauna are insignificant. No rare or endangered species will be impacted. Project activity is not located in the vicinity of national parks or protected areas
- Noise impact is limited. Main source of noise will be located at the minimum required distance from residential areas, mobile noise sources (automobile transport) will be in compliance with local standards;
- Transboundary impacts are not observed. There are no impacts that manifest within the area of any other country and that are caused by

a proposed project activity which wholly physically originates within the area of Ukraine.

No outstanding issues concerning the environmental impact were raised.

4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)

SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" informed the community through mass media. All comments relating to the project implementation were positive. No negative comments were received.

No comments on the project have been received from stakeholders.

No outstanding issues concerning the stakeholder consultation were raised.

4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)

Not applicable

4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)

Not applicable

4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)

Not applicable

5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES

No comments, pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI Guidelines, were received.

6 DETERMINATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a determination of the Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS "Coal mine "Toretska", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" project at the SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" facilities in city Dzerzhynsk in Donetsk region, Ukraine. The determination was performed on the basis of UNFCCC

criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

Project participants used the latest tool for demonstration of the additionality. In line with this tool, the PDD provides investment analysis, technological and organizational barriers analysis, as well as common practice analysis, to determine that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario.

Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented and maintained as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The determination revealed two pending issues related to the current determination stage of the project: the issue of the written approval of the project and the authorization of the project participant by the host Party. If the written approval and the authorization by the host Party are awarded, it is our opinion that the project as described in the Project Design Document, Version 2.0 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.

The review of the project design documentation (version 2.0) and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

The determination is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report.

7 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by 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 SS “Coal mine “Toretska”, SE “DZERZHINSKUGOL” version 1.0 dated 11/07/2012
/2/ Emissions reduction calculation Excel spreadsheet «Toretska_v_1.xls»
/3/ Project Design Document “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS “Coal mine “Toretska”, SE “DZERZHINSKUGOL” version 2.0 dated 22/08/2012
/4/ Investment analysis Excel spreadsheet «Suprovid_2_T.xls»
/5/ Letter of Endorsement # 2260/23/7 dated 17/08/2012 of JI project “Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS “Coal mine “Toretska”, SE “DZERZHINSKUGOL”

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

/1/ Passport waste heap Mine «Toretska»
/2/ Report on Air Protection (form # 2-TP (air) for 2011 Mine «Toretska»
/3/ Report on Air Protection (form # 2-TP (air) for 2010 Mine «Toretska»
/4/ Report on Air Protection (form # 2-TP (air) for 2009 Mine «Toretska»
/5/ Report on Air Protection (form # 2-TP (air) for 2008 Mine «Toretska»
/6/ Report on Air Protection (form # 2-TP (air) for 2007 Mine «Toretska»
/7/ Report on Air Protection (form # 2-TP (air) for 2006 Mine «Toretska»
/8/ Report on the use of fuel, heat and electricity (form # 11-MTP) for 2007 Mine «Toretska»
/9/ Report on the use of fuel, heat and electricity (form # 11-MTP) for 2008 Mine «Toretska»
/10/ Report on the use of fuel, heat and electricity (form # 11-MTP) for 2009 Mine «Toretska»
/11/ Report on the use of fuel, heat and electricity (form # 11-MTP) for 2010 Mine «Toretska»

/12/ Report on the use of fuel, heat and electricity (form # 11-MTP) for 2011 Mine «Toretska»
/13/ EIA Work project "Operation and formation waste heap Mine «Toretska» measures against spontaneous combustion»

Persons interviewed:

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

/1/ Zanin Gennady, Acting Technical Director
/2/ Koryak Sergey, chief engineer
/3/ Palukaytis Juozas, chief power
/4/ Kukuishko Evgeny, chief heating engineer
/5/ Winda Viktor, chief markshreider
/6/ Petr Fomenko, chief geologist
/7/ Kulinich Anatoly, Director of Production
/8/ Medlenova Viktoria, ecologist
/9/ Syschikova Lyubov, Director for Economics and Finance
/10/ Elena Bondarenko, director of business
/11/ Gert Vladimir, Director of Social Affairs
/12/ Valentina Kachan, chief accountant

APPENDIX A. DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

Check list for determination, according JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL (Version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
General description of the project				
Title of the project				
-	Is the title of the project presented?	Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at SS "Coal mine "Toretska", SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL"	OK	OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	Sector 8 – Mining/mineral production	OK	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	PDD version 2.0	OK	OK
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	Date of completion: 22/08/2012 Corrective Action Request 01 Please correct the date format.	CAR 01	OK
Description of the project				
-	Is the purpose of the project included with a concise, summarizing explanation (max. 1-2 pages) of the: a) Situation existing prior to the starting date of the project; b) Baseline scenario; and c) Project scenario (expected outcome, including a technical description)?	Corrective Action Request 02 Please add a brief description of the baseline and theoretical description of the chosen baseline. Corrective Action Request 30 Please pass the theoretical description of the baseline scenario.	CAR 02 CAR 30	OK
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	Corrective Action Request 03 Please specify the project start date and provide a document confirms it.	CAR 03	OK
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	The list of the parties involved and project participants is provided in the tabular format in Section A3 of the PDD.	CAR 04	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		Parties involved: Ukraine (Host country) the legal entity DC "DZERZHINSKUGOL" Other Parties: Switzerland, a legal entity CEP Carbon Emissions Partners SA. <u>Corrective Action Request 04:</u> Please specify whether Parties involved are listed in the table section A.3 of the PDD project participant. The information listed in the table section A.3 does not correspond to that given in section D.4.		
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	The data of the project participants is presented in tabular format.	OK	OK
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	The contact information is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Ukraine, the Party involved, is the host Party.	OK	OK
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	Ukraine	OK	OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Donetsk region	OK	OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Dzerzhynsk town	OK	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	Mine «Toretska»: 37º52´12" E 48º24´36" N. Corrective Action Request 05: Please section A.4.1.4. describe in accordance the format as provided version 04 "Guidelines for users of the PDD for JI projects."	CAR 05	OK
Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project				
-	Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be	A list and brief description of the measures to be implemented under the project are given in Section A.4.2 of	CAR 06	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	PDD. Corrective Action Request 06: Please adjust the schedule for implementation of the project according to a summary of actions performed on the project.		
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	Yes the PDD explain how is achieved the anthropogenic emissions of GHG by the proposed project provided.	OK	OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	The estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period is provided. Corrective Action Request 07: Please provide a link to the file «Excel» with calculations	CAR 07	OK
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO2e?	The estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period is provided in tCO_2e.	OK	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Yes, the data is presented in tabular format.	OK	OK
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	Yes, the duration of the crediting period is 15 years (180 months). Corrective Action Request 08: Please justify the chosen duration of the crediting period, with the justification of the term, and make the appropriate corrections to the PDD.	CAR 08	OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes	The estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO_2 equivalent are	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	of CO2 equivalent provided?	provided in section A.4.3.1 of the PDD.		
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine issued a letter of support from 17/08/2012 # 2260/23/7 for this project. Approval of the project, according to the PDD, will be provided after the approval of the determination by the AIE. Clarification Request 01: Section A.5 PDD must contain the name of DFP's (Parties involved) that will approve the project.	CL 01	OK
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	Yes, Ukraine is the host Party.	OK	OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	Corrective Action Request 09: The Letters of Approval from parties involved are absent.	CAR 09	OK
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Refer to CAR 09 above.	OK	OK
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved				
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: − A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity? or − Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?	Refer to CAR 09 above. Participants will be authorized after the relevant project approvals.	OK	OK
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? − JI specific approach	The PDD describes the JI specific approach which is used for setting the baseline. Corrective Action Request 10:	CAR 10 CAR 11	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− Approved CDM methodology approach	During the analysis of the PDD it was revealed that the project developer used JI specific approach for setting the monitoring plan, but it is not explicitly indicated. Please clearly describe in the PDD the approach chosen. Corrective Action Request 11: Please indicate the baseline setting date in accordance with the established format DD/MM/YYYY.		
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Yes, the PDD provides a detailed theoretical description of the project in a complete and transparent manner.	OK	OK
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established: (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one? (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? − Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account? (c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, date sources and key factors? (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions? (e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure? (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables	The PDD provides justification that the baseline is established by listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate?			
24	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements or combinations together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 23 above?	To identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality was used "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03. Also taken into consideration the recommendations the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 06.0.0). Corrective Action Request 12: The PDD (section B.1) is given by the reference to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03, but with different names of this document. Please correct. Corrective Action Request 13: Please provide a current link to the document that was used, "Tools for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 06.0.0)	CAR 12 CAR 13	OK
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	Not used	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only_Paragraphs 26(a) – 26(d)_Not applicable				
Additionality				
JI specific approach only				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used? (a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that	In section B.1 PDD provides analysis additionality of project whose purpose is to demonstrate that the design scenario is not part of a particular baseline, and that project will reduce GHG emissions compared to baseline. The analysis was performed based on the latest version of the "Tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality", which	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions or enhancements of removals; (b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; (c) Application of the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board".	was approved by the CDM Executive Board and is completely usable for JI.		
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	According to the document "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 05.2) proving additionality performed by investment analysis	OK	OK
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	The additionality proofs are provided in the Section B.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	To prove additionality was applied investment analysis of the project activity. Corrective Action Request 14: Please provide links to the file «Excel» with calculations investment analysis for the project activity.	CAR 14	OK
30	If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	All explanations, descriptive materials and analytical conclusions was presented in accordance with the chosen method.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only_ Paragraphs 31(a) – 31(e)_Not applicable				
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
JI specific approach only				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (i) Under the control of the project participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	Yes, project boundary is defined according to the all requirements.	OK	OK
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?	Yes, the project boundary is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above.	OK	OK
32 (c)	Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate?	Yes, the project boundary is provided in the Figure 5 and Figure 6 and in tabular format in Table 5.	OK	OK
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?	All gases and sources included are explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only_Paragraph 33_ Not applicable				
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	Starting date of the project is 20/08/2005, when management of SE «DZERZHINSKUGOL» decided to develop Joint Implementation project. Corrective Action Request 15: Please correct the date format of the project. Clarification Request 02: Please provide confirmatory information about the beginning of the project.	CAR 15 CL02	OK
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	15 years (180 months). Clarification Request 03: Please specify the expected term of the project life cycle and provide documented evidence of the term.	CL 03	OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	15 years (180 months).	OK	OK
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	The starting date of the crediting period is on the date of the first emission reductions generated by the project.	OK	OK
34 (d)	Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?	Corrective Action Request 16: Please state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.	CAR 16	OK
34 (d)	If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval? Are the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012?	Corrective Action Request 17: Please specify that the extension of the crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval.	CAR 17	OK
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	To develop a monitoring plan was used JI specific approach.	OK	OK
JI specific approach only				
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe: − All relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored? − The period in which they will be monitored?	The monitoring plan describes: - Data to be monitored - The frequency of monitoring annual / monthly - All important factors for monitoring and reporting on project	CAR 18 CL 04	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− All decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance?	activities - Reports on project activities, structure control, which will be introduced in implementing the monitoring plan. <u>Corrective Action Request 18:</u> During the inspection of the project have been identified, as well as in PDD that monitoring will occur periodically (smallest interval - monthly). The units for the parameters are to be presented this month, not per year. Please check it out and make the appropriate adjustments. <u>Clarification Request 04:</u> Please explain why the calculations do not take into account emissions by stage of events described in the PDD, for example, emissions of vehicles during stewing waste heap.		
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?	Yes, the monitoring plan identifies parameters constant and variables, and whether they are reliable, valid and those that allow to obtain a clear picture of emission reductions that are subject to monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (b)	If default values are used: − Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? − Do the default values originate from recognized sources? − Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels? − Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?	<u>Corrective Action Request 19:</u> For some parameters (for example, $OXID^{y}_{b,coal}$ - Carbon oxidation factor for coal combustion) values used in accordance with the approved CDM methodology ACM0009, but its use in the text of PDD is not justified. Please correct.	CAR 19	OK
36 (b) (i)	For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan	Yes. All procedures for the selection and justification required values described.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?			
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, − Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? − Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	Corrective Action Request 20: Please indicate parameters used from NIR is conservative.	CAR 20	OK
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	Corrective Action Request 21: Please indicate in the PDD procedure that must be used if the expected data with any source are not available.	CAR 21	OK
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?	Yes, the emission factors for projects on power loss reduction in power supply networks of Ukraine are used in calculations and are obtained through monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Yes, the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. Is consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan.	OK	OK
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”?	The monitoring plan is developed in accordance with the “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”.	OK	OK
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are	Yes, all the relevant parameters are described (refer to the Section D.1 of the PDD).	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination? (iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?			
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	The Table in the Section D.1.1 of the PDD defines the frequency of monitoring and data sources for all parameters and data to be monitored. Corrective Action Request 22: Please provide documented information on how to collect and order of records as well as their storage, archiving and recovery if necessary.	CAR 22	OK
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?	The PDD describes all algorithms and formulae used for the calculation of baseline and project emissions.	OK	OK
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	The underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae is explained.	OK	OK
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Yes, consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. are used. Corrective Action Request 23: Please indicate the source of data for the parameters used for the calculations in these formulas	CAR 23	OK
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	Corrective Action Request 24:	CAR 24	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		Please correct the numbering above formulas.		
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	Yes, documentation analysis confirming conservative algorithms / procedures for monitoring	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	The level of data uncertainty is provided in the quality control and assurance table (refer to the section D.2 of the PDD). Taking into account that almost all data and parameters are based on the statistical data and calibrated measuring equipment recordings of a certain class of accuracy and tested by the official energy resources supplier and state bodies, their level of uncertainty is considered as low.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline ensured?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	Any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident are explained.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	Yes, it is justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	All the references are provided as necessary.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	Used assumptions and procedures do not have any significant uncertainty associated with them.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or	Level of uncertainty is indicated as low.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	enhancements of net removals provided?			
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project? Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found?	The monitoring plan identifies national and international monitoring standards used for the proposed project. All relevant references are provided.	OK	OK
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	n/a	OK	OK
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available upon request?	Control procedures and quality assurance monitoring process described in section D.2 of the PDD. Corrective Action Request 25: Please provide documented information about the internal QA/QC Enterprise. Corrective Action Request 26: Please provide AIE schedule calibration of measuring equipment.	CAR 25 CAR 26	OK
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	Yes, the monitoring plan in the Section D.3 of the PDD clearly identifies the responsibilities and authorities regarding the monitoring activities.	OK	OK
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type? If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?	Corrective Action Request 27: The Section D.1.5 of the PDD requires from the project participants to indicate the information on data collection and archivation concerning environmental impact and to provide references on the relevant regulations of the host country. Please provide all the necessary information.	CAR 27	OK
36 (l)	Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular	Yes all the parameters are provided in Sections D.1.1.1 and	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources but not including data that are calculated with equations?	D.1.1.3 of the PDD.		
36 (m)	Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	Methodology the monitoring described in the PDD requires that all information collected during monitoring was for archived electronically and kept at least 2 years after the crediting period. Corrective Action Request 28: Please provide documented information how to store the information collected during monitoring.	CAR 28	OK
37	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?	No elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used in the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only_Paragraphs 38(a) – 38(d)_Not applicable				
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach_Paragraph 39_Not applicable				
Leakage				
JI specific approach only				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	No leakages are envisaged by the proposed project activity.	OK	OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	No leakages are envisaged by the proposed project activity.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Approved CDM methodology approach only_Paragraph 41_Not applicable				
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions	Emissions baseline scenario and in the project scenario were assessed.	OK	OK
43	If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary)? (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	The PDD provides ex ante estimates of the project and baseline scenarios, and also emissions reduction. The estimated results are provided in the Section E of the PDD, and also in the Excel spreadsheets.	OK	OK
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	Not applicable	OK	OK
45	For both approaches in 42 (a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given: (i) On a periodic basis? (ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? (iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? (iv) For each GHG?	The estimates are provided on a periodic basis in tones CO_2 equivalent. The formulas used are consistent throughout the PDD.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(v) In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? (b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (c) For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate? (d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent? (e) Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice? (f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner? (g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (h) Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the			

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
46	If the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions or net removals calculation?	Yes, the PDD includes an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation. Preliminary calculations of emission reductions performed in table Excel, which is available to the AIE. Errors in calculations were not found.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only_Paragraphs 47(a) – 47(b)_Not applicable				
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?	Corrective Action Request 29: Information regarding transboundary impacts, which are included in the PDD should put transparent and justified.	CAR 29	OK
48 (b)	If the analysis in 48 (a) indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?	As stated in the PDD significant environmental impact associated with the implementation of the project is not expected. Therefore, a separate environmental impact assessment is not necessary.	OK	OK
Stakeholder consultation				
49	If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide: (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	The procedures of Ukraine don't require any stakeholder consultation concerning the proposed project.	OK	OK
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)_Paragraphs 50 - 57_Not applicable				
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects _Paragraphs 58 – 64(d)_Not applicable				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Determination regarding programmes of activities_Paragraphs 66 – 73_Not applicable				

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Determination team conclusion
Corrective Action Request 01 Please correct the date format.	-	Date Format is checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 02 Please add a brief description of the baseline and theoretical description of the chosen baseline.	-	Summary baseline added in section A.2. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 03 Please specify the project start date and provide a document confirms it.	-	Starting date of the project is 20/08/2005, when management of SE «DZERZHINSKUGOL» decided to develop Joint Implementation project. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 04: Please specify whether Parties involved are listed in the table section A.3 of the PDD project participant. The information listed in the table section A.3 does not correspond to that given in section D.4.	-	Checked. Parties involved are listed in Table A.3 of the PDD are project participants. The information in the table section A.3 consistent with the information in Section D.4	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 05: Please section A.4.1.4. describe in accordance the format as provided version 04 "Guidelines for users of the PDD for JI projects."	-	Checked. Corrected Section A.4.1.4. presented in the format as provided in version 04 "Guidelines for users of the PDD for JI projects." See PDD version 02	The issue is closed

Corrective Action Request 06: Please adjust the schedule for implementation of the project according to a summary of actions performed on the project.	-	Checked. Corrected. Schedule the project meets the list of activities that are performed on the project. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 07: Please provide a link to the file «Excel» with calculations	-	Checked. Corrected. Links provided throughout the text PDD. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 08: Please justify the chosen duration of the crediting period, with the justification of the term, and make the appropriate corrections to the PDD.	-	Corrected. Studies have shown that the period of waste heaps burning is 15 years *, which means that that the entire amount of coal of waste heap completely burned during this period. Project monitoring of waste heap condition allows for the control the condition of the heap and prevention of its burning, and if the latter occurs, to take measures for its rapid quenching, provides for the monthly monitoring of waste heap. Based on the conditions of the monitoring program of waste heap condition, the formula for calculation of GHG emissions from waste heap burning of the baseline was adapted to the activities of the monthly monitoring of heap condition. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Clarification Request 01: Section A.5 PDD must contain the name of DFP's (Parties involved) that will approve the project.	19	Corrected. After determination of the project PDD and Determination Report will be submitted for consideration to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine in order to obtain a Letter of Approval. See PDD version 02	Pending resolution

* http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/natural/Pb/2010_17/Statti/10.pdf

Corrective Action Request 09: The Letters of Approval from parties involved are absent.	19	Letters of approval from Parties involved will be obtained after successful passage of the determination, in accordance with the applicable rules of the Parties. See PDD version 02	Pending resolution
Corrective Action Request 10: During the analysis of the PDD it was revealed that the project developer used JI specific approach for setting the monitoring plan, but it is not explicitly indicated. Please clearly describe in the PDD the approach chosen.	22	Corrected. For the proposed project, aimed at upgrading production and boiler equipment, and monitoring of programs and operational stewing waste heaps on SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" and, consequently, reduce GHG emissions to the atmosphere, none of the existing methodologies can not be applied. Project participant has chosen a specific approach based on the requirements of JI projects in accordance with paragraph 9 (a) Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation, Version 03 (JI Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Version 03). See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 11: Please indicate the baseline setting date in accordance with the established format DD/MM/YYYY	22	Corrected. Baseline date specified in the specified format DD/MM/YYYY. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 12: The PDD (section B.1) is given by the reference to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03, but with different names of this document. Please correct.	24	Checked and corrected. The PDD provides a link to the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 13: Please provide a current link to the document that was used, "Tools for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 06.0.0)	24	Checked and corrected. Was used "Tools for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 06.0.0) with true links See PDD version 02	The issue is closed

Corrective Action Request 14: Please provide links to the file «Excel» with calculations investment analysis for the project activity.	29 (c)	Investment analysis of project activities is provided in Accompanying document 2. (file Excel). Links provided throughout the text PDD. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 15: Please correct the date format of the project.	34 (a)	The starting date of the project is 28/09/2007, when the company SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" started implementation of activities to modernize production equipment under the Joint Implementation Project. Fixed. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Clarification Request 02: Please provide confirmatory information about the beginning of the project.	34 (a)	Project starting date is 28/09/2007. Proof of "Acceptance act in operation of belt conveyors." Scanned copy of the document sent to the group with determination	The issue is closed
Clarification Request 03: Please specify the expected term of the project life cycle and provide documented evidence of the term.	34 (b)	See. response to CAR 08.	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 16: Please state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.	34 (d)	Corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 17: Please specify that the extension of the crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval.	34 (d)	If after the first commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol to be continued, crediting period will be extended to 31/12/2020 year. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed

Corrective Action Request 18: During the inspection of the project have been identified, as well as in PDD that monitoring will occur periodically (smallest interval - monthly). The units for the parameters are to be presented this month, not per year. Please check it out and make the appropriate adjustments.	36 (a)	Monitoring waste heap will occur periodically (smallest interval-month). Calculation of GHG emissions resulting from the re-fire waste heap after his stewing measures are calculated for the year. Parameters are for the month indicated in the temperature shooting waste heaps on stage monitoring. Documented evidence of this was provided by determination team during the site-visit in a spreadsheet monitoring the thermal state waste heap.	The issue is closed
Clarification Request 04: Please explain why the calculations do not take into account emissions by stage of events described in the PDD, for example, emissions of vehicles during stewing waste heap.	36 (a)	Emissions from diesel fuel used process equipment in the stewing heap arise only in the event of a re-fire satiety, and less than 1% of the emissions generated during combustion waste heap, so they in the process of calculation can be neglected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 19: For some parameters (for example, $OXID^{y}_{b,coal}$ - Carbon oxidation factor for coal combustion) values used in accordance with the approved CDM methodology ACM0009, but its use in the text of PDD is not justified. Please correct	36 (b)	Checked and corrected. Select data according to the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" See PDD version 02	The issue is closed

Corrective Action Request 20: Please indicate parameters used from NIR is conservative.	36 (b) (ii)	National inventories of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases in Ukraine is the official report submitted to the secretariat of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Used parameters selected from NIR designed to reflect the situation of Ukraine and selected indicators for Ukraine. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 21: Please indicate in the PDD procedure that must be used if the expected data with any source are not available.	36 (b) (iii)	If due to force majeure to perform temperature measurements are not possible, the results of the temperature shooting missed last month accepted such as in the month recovery measurements of temperatures. In SE "DZERZHINSKUGOL" under normal operation the measures envisaged to prevent force-majeure circumstances that may affect the production, as well as measures to address the consequences of possible force majeure. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 22: Please provide documented information on how to collect and order of records as well as their storage, archiving and recovery if necessary.	36 (e)	Documents and reports the data to be monitored will be archived and stored by the project participants. This documentation and other monitoring data required for the determination and verification, as well as any other information relevant to the operation of the project must be kept at least two years after the last transfer of ERUs. Scanned copy of the order is attached.	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 23: Please indicate the source of data for the parameters used for the calculations in these formulas	36 (f) (ii)	Corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed

Corrective Action Request 24: Please correct the numbering above formulas.	36 (f) (iii)	Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 25: Please provide documented information about the internal QA/QC Enterprise.	36 (i)	Documented information was provided by group determination during site visit.	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 26: Please provide AIE schedule calibration of measuring equipment.	36 (i)	Scanned copy of the schedule of calibration of measuring equipment attached.	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 27: The Section D.1.5 of the PDD requires from the project participants to indicate the information on data collection and archivation concerning environmental impact and to provide references on the relevant regulations of the host country. Please provide all the necessary information.	36 (k)	Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 28: Please provide documented information how to store the information collected during monitoring.	36 (m)	Corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 29: Information regarding transboundary impacts, which are included in the PDD should put transparent and justified.	48 (a)	Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
Corrective Action Request 30 Please pass the theoretical description of the baseline scenario.	-	Corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed