TÜV Rheinland Group

DETERMINATION REPORT

DETERMINATION OF THE JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE # 22 "LISOVA"

Report No.TRU047JI - DR
Revision No. 02

Customer: SIA "Vidzeme Eko"

DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 13/04/2012	Project No: TRU047JI
Executor: TÜV Rheinland Group	Organizational unit: Ltd. TÜV Rheinland Ukraine
Customer: SIA "Vidzeme Eko"	Client ref.: Gennadiy Ivanenko

Summary:

TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine has performed a determination of the project "Dismantling of waste heap # 2 at mine # 22 "LISOVA"" in Ukraine. The determination was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The determination serves as project design objective and complete assessment, and is a requirement of all projects. It consists of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design documents including analysis of the baseline justification and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders including on site visit; iii) the 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 TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine internal procedures.

To address TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine corrective action and clarification requests SIA "Vidzeme Eko" revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 03/05/2012 as version 2.0.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version 2.0 dated 03/05/2012.

In summary, it is TÜV Rheinland's Group/TÜV Rheinland's Ukraine opinion that the project complies with the criteria for baseline setting and monitoring methodology according to developed specific approach, and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.: TRU047JI - DR	Subject Group: JI	
Project title: "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE #22 "LISOVA"		
Work carried out by: Mr. Dmitry Rakovich – Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier Ms. Ganna Zadnipriana - Climate Change Verifier		☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
Work verified by: Ms. Iryna Nikolaieva - Internal technical reviewer, Climate Change Verifier		☐ Limited distribution
Determination Report approved by: Prof., dr. Valery Yakubovsky – Technical Reviewer		☐ Unrestricted distribution
Date of this revision: 03/05/2012	Revision No.: 02	Number of pages: 80

Abbreviations

AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CL	Clarification Request
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
DCC	Designated Coordination Committee
DR	Document Review
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ERU	Emission Reduction Unit
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
I	Interview
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
LLC	Limited Liability Company
LoA	Letter of Approval
LoE	Letter of Endorsement
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
OSV	On Site Visit
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Private enterprise
STHS	Stakeholder Survey
t	Tonne
tCO_2e	Tonnes of CO_2 equivalent
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Table of Contents **Page**

1 DETERMINATION OPINION

The determination team of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine has performed a determination of the JI project "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 MINE #2 "LISOVA" in Ukraine (Track 1). 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 document (PDD) including analysis of the baseline justification and monitoring plan;

ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders including on site visit;

iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion.

The project participants of the JI project "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE #22 "LISOVA" selected the JI specific approach for identifying the baseline, defined in paragraph 22 (a) of the "Determination and Verification Manual" (DVM).

A baseline for the project was set in accordance with criteria stated in Appendix B to decision 9/CMP.1 (JI guidelines). The JI specific approach is provided in paragraph 9 (a) of the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03.

The PDD version 2.0 dated 03/05/2012 provides a description of the chosen baseline in a clear and transparent manner according to "Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form", version 04, as well as a justification per the "Guidance on Criteria for Baseline Setting and Monitoring" (paragraphs 23 - 29), version 03.

Project participants used the following approach defined in paragraph 28 (b) of the DVM: Provision of traceable and transparent information that the AIE has positively determined that comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances (the same measures to mitigate GHG emissions, the same country, similar technology, the same sector) will lead additional reductions of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an increase in net anthropogenic removals by sinks and the reasons why the determination is relevant to this project.

The JI project is likely to result in reductions of GHG emissions in accordance with the project description. An analysis of the investment and prevailing practice demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely 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 review of the project design documentation (2.0 dated 03/05/2012) and the subsequent interviews have provided TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for JI projects and the relevant host country criteria.

The determination is based on the information made available to the determination team of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine and the engagement conditions detailed in this report.

2 INTRODUCTION

SIA "Vidzeme Eko" has commissioned TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine to determinate its JI project "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE #22 "LISOVA" (hereinafter called "project") at Donetsk region, Ukraine.

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

2.1 Objective

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 JISC, as well as the host country criteria.

2.2 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.

2.3 JI Project Description

The brief information regarding the project is provided in table 1.

Table 1 - JI project brief information

Project Parties involved:	1.Ukraine (host Party); 2. Republic of Latvia.
Title of the project:	"DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE # 22 "LISOVA"
Type of JI activity:	Large-scale
Baseline and monitoring methodology:	JI specific approach
Project entity participant:	LLC " Trading House "Metalprom"
Other project participants:	SIA "Vidzeme Eko"
Location of the project:	Urban village Pelagyivka, Torez district, Donetsk region,
Starting date of the project:	23/10/2009
Crediting period:	From 23/10/2009 to 31/12/2012

Proposed project provides a complete dismantling of the dump at mine # 22 "LISOVA", followed by reclamation of land by restoring the fertile layer. During dismantling of dump the rock mass of dump will be fully utilized, and the received coal will replace coal, which must be produced by mine way. As the result of project, the opportunity of self - ignition of heap will be eliminated.

During dismantling of dump it will be dismantling of the rock mass by special technics, loading into trucks, and transportation to the benefication factory LLC "PC" Donetsk coal fuel" for further enrichment, in which the coal concentrate will be obtained. This product is further directed to boiler houses for burning as fuel. Thus, rock mass of dump will be fully utilized, and the received coal will replace coal, which must be produced by mine way. As the result of project, the opportunity of self-ignition of heap will be eliminated. An important component of the project is its second phase - complex reclamation of area by restoring its fertile layer and the full restoration of natural ecological community.

The proposed project is aimed at reducing anthropogenic emissions created by:
- Eliminate sources of greenhouse gases associated with burning waste heaps, by extracting coal from the rock dumps;
- Reduce uncontrolled emissions of methane due to replacement of coal that would have been extract mine way;
- Reduce electricity consumption at waste heap dismantling in comparison with electricity consumption at coal mine.

3 METHODOLOGY

The determination consists of the following three phases:

I) a desk review of the project design documents including analysis of the baseline justification and monitoring plan;

II) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders including on site visit;

III) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

3.1 Desk Review of the Project Design Documentation

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by SIA "Vidzeme Eko" and additional background documents related to the project design to be checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The list of submitted documentation is provided below.

To address TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine corrective action and clarification requests SIA "Vidzeme Eko" revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 03/05/2012 as version 2.0.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD 2.0 dated 03/05/2012.

The following tables outline the documentation reviewed during the determination. Documents provided by SIA "Vidzeme Eko" that relate directly to the components of the project are indicated in table 2. Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents are provided in table 3.

Table 2 - Category 1 Documents

#	Name of the document
/1/	PDD "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP #2 AT MINE #22 "LISOVA", version 1.0 from 23/03/2012.
/2/	PDD "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP #2 AT MINE #22 "LISOVA", version 1.1 from 23/03/2012.
/3/	PDD "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP #2 AT MINE #22 "LISOVA", version 2.0 from 03/05/2012.
/4/	GHG emission reduction calculation spreadsheet and investment analysis of the project in Excel format (Calculation1_Lisova).
/5/	GHG emission reduction calculation spreadsheet and investment analysis of the project in Excel format (Calculation2_Lisova).
/6/	"Guidelines for users of the Joint implementation project design document form", version 04.

/7/	"Guidance on Criteria for Baseline Setting and Monitoring", version 03, JISC.
/8/	"Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", version 06.0.0.
/9/	Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention On Climate Change.
/10/	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities.
/11/	JI guidelines. Annex II to decision 9/CMP.1.
/12/	"Joint implementation determination and verification manual", version 01, JISC.
/13/	"Glossary of JI terms", version 03, JISC.

Table 3 - Category 2 Documents:

#	Name of the document
/1/	Delivery and Acceptance act from 23/10/2009 between LLC "GP"Environmental Safety" and LLC " Trading House "Metalprom"
/2/	Contract # 2009-10-196 from 23/10/2009 between LLC "GP"Environmental Safety" and LLC " Trading House "Metalprom"
/3/	Contract # 2009-10-201 from 23/10/2009 between PE "Stroymehanizatsiya" and LLC " Trading House "Metalprom"
/4/	Supply Agreement from 10/11/2009 between LLC " Trading House "Metalprom"and LLC "PROMEKORESURS"
/5/	Contract of service providing # 183-14/10/2009 from 26/10/2009 weighing between PE "Stroymehanizatsiya" and LLC " Trading House "Metalprom"
/6/	Passport of the waste heap at mine "Lisova" n / c "Torezantratsyt."
/7/	Contract # 24/10/09P 24/10/2009 between LLC " Trading House "Metalprom" and "PC "Donetsk coal fuel"
/8/	Sales invoice # 215 from 04/12/09 for 22813.075 tons of coals, brand A.
/9/	Delivery and Acceptance act # 150 on the works in November 2009 from 01/12/09 to the contract #2009-10-201 from 23/10/09 at 13814224.31 UAH and costing of the act of the works.
/10/	The act of performed weighing work in November 2009 from 01/12/09 to the contract # 183-14/10/2009 from 26/10/09 for 22813.08 tons of coal containing rocks.
/11/	Sales invoice # 117 from 04/07/10 for 17986.215 tons of coal,

#	Name of the document
	brand A
/12/	Delivery and Acceptance act # 82 on the works in June 2010 from 01/07/10 to the contract # 2009-10-201 from 23/10/09 for 10639828.21 UAH and costing of the act of the works.
/13/	The act of performed weighing work for June 2010 from 01/07/10 to the contract # 183-14/10/2009 from 26/10/09 for 17658.33 tons of coal containing rocks.
/14/	Sales invoice #126 from 05/10/10 for 18102.305 tons of coal, brand A
/15/	Delivery and Acceptance act # 135 on the works for September 2010 from 01/10/10 to the contract #2009-10-201 from 23/10/09 for 7952175.81 UAH and costing to the act of the performed works.
/16/	The act of performed weighing work for September 2010 from 01/10/10 to the contract # 183-14/10/2009 from 26/10/09 for 18102.31 tons of coal containing rocks.
/17/	Sales invoice # 111 from 06/06/11 on 18965.145 tons of coal, brand A.
/18/	Delivery and Acceptance act # 68 on the works for May 2011 from 01/06/11 to the contract # 2009-10-201 from 23/10/09 on 11935727.31 UAH and costing to the act of the works.
/19/	The act of performed weighing work for May 2011 from 01/06/11 to the contract # 183-14/10/2009 from 26/10/09 on 18965.15 tons of coal containing rocks.
/20/	Sales invoice # 193 from 05/12/11 on 18886.455 tons of coal, brand A.
/21/	Delivery and Acceptance act # 173 on the works for November 2011 from 01/12/11 to the contract # 2009-10-201 from 23/10/09 on 19342199.30UAH and costing to the act of the works.
/22/	The act of performed weighing work for November 2011 from 01/12/11 to the contract # 183-14/10/2009 from 26/10/09 on 18886.46 tons of coal containing rocks.

3.2 Interviews with project stakeholders

TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of SIA "Vidzeme Eko" and LLC "Trading House "Metalprom" were interviewed are summarized in Table 4. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 5.

Table 4 - Persons interviewed

No.	Name	Position	Organization
/1/	Ivanenko Gennady V.	Project Developer	SIA "Vidzeme Eko"
/2/	Timofeev Sergei	Consultant	SIA "Vidzeme Eko"
/3/	Stakhiv Yuri	Consultant	SIA "Vidzeme Eko"
/4/	Melnikov Mikhail	Chief engineer	LLC "Trading House "Metalprom"
/5/	Zhukov Cyril	Chief vet	LLC "Trading House "Metalprom"
/6/	Chernuh Vitaly	Head of production area	LLC "Trading House "Metalprom"
/7/	Hrechuh Vladislav	Chief mechanic	PE" Stroymehanizatsiya "
/8/	Horoshkevych Anton	Weigher	PE "Stroymehanizatsiya"

Table 5 - Interview topics

No.	Data	Interviewed organization	Interview topics
/1/	03/04/2012	LLC "Trading House "Metalprom"	➢ The legislative regulations relating to the project ➢ Technical equipment ➢ Monitoring Plan ➢ Procedures Training ➢ Organizational System ➢ Environmental impact assessment ➢ Stakeholders Comments
/2/	03/04/2012	PE "Stroymehanizatsiya"	➢ Technical equipment ➢ Monitoring Plan ➢ Procedures Training ➢ Organizational System
/3/	03/04/2012	SIA "Vidzeme Eko"	➢ Project Development ➢ The legislative regulations relating to the project ➢ Additionality of the project ➢ Crediting period ➢ Monitoring Plan ➢ Stakeholders Comments

3.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The overall determination, from Contract signing to Determination Report and Opinion, was conducted using TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine internal procedures. 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 TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine positive conclusion on the project design.
In order to ensure transparency, a determination protocol (Annex A to the Determination report) was customized for the project, in accordance with the Annex to "Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual", version 01. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of verification 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 verifier will document how a particular requirement has been determined and the result of the determination.

The determination protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in

below.

To guarantee the transparency of the determination process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the determination protocol (Annex A to the Determination report).

The PDD, final version 2.0 dated 03/05/2012, was submitted to the determination team for final determination. The final version of the PDD (version 2.0 dated 03/05/2012) was revised based on the determination protocol (Annex A to the Determination report) with the issued corrective action requests and clarification requests. The major changes include: starting date of project activity and crediting period; monitoring plan; estimate of GHG emission reductions.

Determination Protocol Table 1: Mandatory Requirement for Joint Implementation (JI) Project Activities			
Requirement	**Reference**	**Conclusion**	**Cross reference**
The requirements the project must meet.	Gives reference to the legislation or agreement where the requirement is found.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (OK), a Corrective Action Request (CAR), a Clarification Request (CL) or a Forward Action Request (FAR) of risk or non-compliance with stated requirements. The CAR's, CL's and FAR's are numbered and presented to the client in the Determination Report.	Used to refer to the relevant protocol questions in Tables 2, to show how the specific requirement is determined. This is to ensure a transparent determination process.

Determination Protocol Table 2: Requirements checklist				
Checklist Question	**Reference**	**Means of verification (MoV)**	**Comments**	**Draft and/or Final Conclusion**
The various requirements in Table 1 are linked to checklist questions the project should meet. The checklist is organized in several sections. Each section is then further sub-divided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question.	Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.	Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I). N/A means not applicable.	The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached.	This is either acceptable based on evidence provided **(OK)**, or a **Corrective Action Request (CAR)** due to non-compliance with the checklist question. (See below). **Clarification Request (CL)** is used when the determination team has identified a need for further clarification. **Forward action request (FAR)** informs the project participants of an issue that needs to be reviewed during the verification.

Determination Protocol Table 3: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Report clarifications and corrective action requests	**Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2**	**Summary of project owner response**	**Determination team conclusion**
If the conclusions from the Determination are a Corrective Action Request, a Clarification Request or a Forward action request, these should be listed in this section.	Reference to the checklist question number in Tables 2 where the Corrective Action Request, Clarification Request or a Forward action request is explained.	The responses given by the Client or other project participants during the communications with the determination team should be summarized in this section.	This section should summarize the determination team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should also be included in Tables 2, under "Final Conclusion".

Figure 1 Determination protocol tables

3.4 Internal Technical Review

The determination report including the determination findings underwent a technical review before requesting registration of the project activity. The technical review was performed by an internal technical reviewer qualified in accordance with TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine qualification scheme for JI project determination and verification.

3.5 Determination team

The determination team consists of the following personnel indicated in Table 6 below:

Table 6 - Determination team

TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine	
Mr. Dmitry Rakovich	Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier
Ms. Ganna Zadnipriana	Climate Change Verifier
Ms. Iryna Nikolaieva	Internal technical reviewer, Climate Change Verifier
Prof., dr. Valery Yakubovsky	Technical Competence

	Centre Director

4 DETERMINATION FINDINGS

In the following subsections the determination findings are stated as follows:

1) the findings from the desk review of the original project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are summarized. A more detailed record of these findings can be found in the Determination Protocol (Annex A to the Determination report);
2) in case TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine had identified issues that needed clarification or that represented a risk to the fulfillment of the project objectives, a Clarification or Corrective Action Request, respectively, have been issued. The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following subsections and are further documented in the Determination Protocol (Annex A to the Determination report). The determination of the Project resulted in 21 Corrective Action Requests (CARs), 4 Clarification Requests (CLs) and 1 Request for further action
3) the conclusions for determination subject are presented in each subsection.

The considerations, findings and means of verification for areas of determination are provided below in accordance with the Determination and Verification Manual (DVM). All information indicated in the following subsections relates to the PDD version 2.0 dated 03/05/2012 (hereinafter called "PDD").

4.1 Project approval by Parties Involved

In accordance with paragraphs 19 - 20 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on whether the designated focal points (DFPs) of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD have provided written project approvals. It also should be assessed whether the written project approvals referred to above are unconditional.

As stated in the PDD version 2.0 from 03/05/2012 description of project idea (PIN) was submitted to the designated Coordinating Center (State Environmental Investment Agency) March 23, 2012. Letter # 1154/23/7 of support was provided 28/04/2012 by State Environmental Investment Agency that supports further development of the proposed project.

To obtain a written project approval by the host Party (Ukraine) a final Determination Report should be submitted to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine. Written project approval by Republic of Latvia (Party involved in the project, other than the host Party) will be obtained at the first verification.

The FAR 01 was raised. It will be closed after issuing written project approvals by Parties involved.

Identified problem areas for project approval, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A to the Determination Report (refer to FAR 01).

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved

In accordance with paragraph 21 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on whether each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD is authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: a written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly stating the name of the legal entity; or any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly stating the name of the legal entity.

The following legal entities were listed as project participants in the PDD:

- LLC "Trading House "Metalprom";
- SIA "Vidzeme Eko".

The detailed information on project participants was indicated in section A.3. of the PDD. The contact information on project participants, explicitly stating the name of the legal entities, was provided in Annex 1 to the PDD.

Identified problem areas for authorization of project participants by Parties involved, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A to the Determination Report (refer to FAR 01).

4.3 Baseline Setting

In accordance with paragraphs 22 - 26 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on various aspects of the baseline setting by project participants.

The paragraph 22 of the DVM defines two following approaches selected for identifying the baseline:
(a) By using a methodology for baseline setting and monitoring developed in accordance with Appendix B of the JI guidelines (hereinafter referred to as JI specific approach);
(b) By using a baseline and monitoring methodology approved by the CDM Executive Board in its totality (hereinafter referred to as approved CDM methodology approach).

The project participants of the project "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE # 22 "LISOVA" selected the JI specific approach for identifying the baseline.

A baseline for the project was set in accordance with criteria stated in Appendix B to decision 9/CMP.1 (JI guidelines). The JI specific approach is provided in paragraph 9 (a) of the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03.

The PDD provides a description of the chosen baseline in a clear and transparent manner according to "Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form", version 04, as well as a justification per the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03 (paragraphs 23 - 29).

The desk review of the PDD and follow-up interviews provided enough reasons for TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine to assess that the baseline for this JI project is established:

a) **By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one.**
Plausible future scenarios are listed below:

- Scenario 1. Continuation of existing situation (coat not removed from the dumps):
  i) spontaneous self-heating and subsequent fire rock dumps;

  ii) mine production activities cause emissions of volatile methane and formation of new dumps.

Existing laws and legal norms of Ukraine review dumps as possible sources of hazardous emissions. In general, burning piles must be repaid, and appropriate measures should be taken to prevent burning in the future. It is governed by "Rules of safety at mines". Enforcement of this document rather weak, the maximum fine for such violations is very low, which is negligible for the company. However, because of the many rock piles and their large size, coupled with the limited resources of the owners, they usually do not make even the minimum required monitoring. Even when you receive information about dumps, burning, and applicable law to take action, most often the choice is rather in favor of paying a fine for polluting the air, than in favor of measures to extinguish the same dump that caught fire. Under such circumstances it is clear that the baseline scenario does not contradict existing laws and legal norms, taking into account their performance in Ukraine.

- Scenario 2. Direct energy production from the heat energy of burning waste heap:
  i) burning dumps, used for energy production by direct input of heat exchangers in the dumps;

ii) Mining of coal, which causes uncontrolled emissions of gas and the formation of even more dumps.

Technological barriers: This scenario is based on experimental technology that has not even used in a pilot project. It is also not suitable for all dumps, as the project owner will have to balance the availability of energy resources (location of dumps) and location of the consumer of energy. Electricity production at the site addresses this issue, but the need for additional work on the electrical connection. Generally, you must still prove the feasibility of this technology. In addition, it allows you to control and manage the emissions of gases. This technology was offered only as a theoretical model that has not yet entered the phase of implementation. Studies suggest that the development of real existing heat pump that uses heat from the rock piles, further complicated by the large number of serious technical problems

Investment barriers: Investments in technology feasibility has not proved very risky. In the case of Ukraine, which is a country with high risk investments such unfounded energy projects are unlikely to interest investors more than some other investment opportunities in the energy industry with higher profitability. Innovative nature of the project may be interested in program support and government incentives, but the cost of energy produced is likely much higher than the alternatives.

- Scenario 3. Production of construction materials from rock dumps.
  i) coal dumps burned during the sintering process;
  ii) Mining production, resulting in uncontrolled release of gas and the formation of even more dumps.

Technological barriers: This scenario is based on existing technology but the technology is currently available in Ukraine, and there is no evidence that such projects will be implemented in the near future. It is also not suitable for all types of dumps, because the contents of dumps must be predictable to the project owner was able to produce quality materials. A large number of sulfur and moisture can reduce the suitability dumps for development. Before you start a project, we need a large amount of research. Pilot projects of this type are implemented only with the support of public funding.

- Scenario 4. Coal extraction from waste heaps without JI incentives.
  i) a smaller number of coal extracted from underground mines in the region;
  ii) piles are developed to extract coal and its use in the energy sector (the project does not benefit from the possible development of a JI project)

Investment barriers: This scenario is financially unattractive and has obstacles. Investment climate in Ukraine is risky and unfavorable, private capital from domestic or international sources, are not available or

accessible by excessively high price because of real and perceived risks of doing business in Ukraine.

- Scenario 5. Systematic monitoring of waste heaps condition and regular fire prevention and extinguishing measures.
  (i) the regular monitoring of dumps and study their thermal condition.
  ii) Regular activities of extinguishing the fire.

Investment barriers: This scenario does not include any income, but includes additional costs for owners dumps. Monitoring of dumps is not conducted systematically, and all activities are at the discretion of the owner dumps. Basically dumps are mines or regional association with coal. Coal mines of Ukraine are suffering due to the limited amount of investment, which often leads to security problems due to the severe conditions of production and financial difficulties. In this case dumps are considered as an additional burden, but mine usually do not make even minimum measures required. Ignition and burning piles are very common, and investigated 176 of the dumps in the Luhansk region, only 51 relatively precisely known, they are not burned to the same exact data are not always available. From a commercial point of view of penalties, which are usually issued by governments, are lower than the cost of necessary measures covered in this scenario.

The variants of baseline do not include such options that would:
• Do not meet the legal and regulatory requirements;
• Depend on key resources such as fuel, materials and technologies that are not available in hotels of the project.

All scenarios, except Scenario 1 - Continuation of the current situation, faced with the presence of obstacles. Thus, the continuation of the current situation is the most likely future scenario and was selected as the baseline for the project.

Analysis of plausible future scenarios shows that the proposed project activities are not likely baseline scenario. The emission reductions achieved through the implementation of this project is additional to any that would have occurred in the absence of activity on this project. If the project is implemented and carried out under his plan, the result will achieve the expected amount of emission reductions.

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 TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine assessed whether the key factors that affect a baseline were taken into

account. The project participants established the baseline taking into account the following key factors:

- sectoral reform initiatives;
- local fuel availability;
- power sector expansion plans;
- economic situation in the project sector.

c) **In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors.**

The project participants applied the selected approach with transparency. Necessary information on approaches, assumptions, parameters, data sources and key factors is available in the PDD.

d) **Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservativeness assumptions.**

Project participants used default values to the extent possible in order to reduce uncertainty and provide conservative data for emission calculations:

- If possible, use the same approach to calculate levels of baseline emissions and emissions from the project, as in the national inventories of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases in the Ukraine. The National emissions inventories used country-specific emission factors that meet the established value of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC);
- To calculate the baseline emissions using lower values and to calculate emissions from the project - top values;
- If possible, apply default values to reduce uncertainty and provide conservative estimates data.

e) **In such a way that emission reduction units (ERUs) cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure.**

According to the proposed approach emission reductions will be earned only within the project activity, so no emission reductions can be earned due to any changes outside the project activity or due to force majeure.

f) **By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate.**

The PDD draws on the list of standard variables contained in Appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03 as appropriate.

As the result of this analysis TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine can confirm that the baseline for this project is established in

accordance with criteria stated in the Appendix B of the JI guidelines and justified in accordance with paragraphs 23 - 29 of the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03.

Identified problem areas for baseline and additionality proofs, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex.

4.4 Additionality

In accordance with paragraphs 27 - 31 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on whether a project provides "a reduction in emissions by sources, or an enhancement of net removals by sinks, that is additional to any that would otherwise occur" in accordance with Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol.

The paragraph 28 of the DVM defines three approaches used to demonstrate additionality – items (a), (b), (c) for JI specific approach.

Participants used the following approach, which is defined in paragraph 28 (b) DVM: Provision of traceable and transparent information that the AIE has done positively determination that comparable project implemented under comparable circumstances (same mitigation measures effects of GHG emissions, the same country, similar technology, the same sector) will lead to additional reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources or an increase in net anthropogenic removals by sinks and the reasons why the determination is relevant to this project.

The project "Waste heaps dismantling with the aim of decreasing the greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere" is selected as the comparable JI project. It has received a positive determination by an independent accredited body with the conclusion that the result of its implementation will reduce anthropogenic emissions by sources or enhancing anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHG emissions that are additional to those that would be the absence of the project. This determination JISC has recognized the final. Demonstration that the said project is comparable and implemented (implemented) in similar circumstances:
1) Both projects offer the same measures to reduce emissions: proposed measures to reduce emissions by two projects - a removal of coal from mine dumps. This will not be allowed greenhouse gases to the atmosphere during the burning piles, and will provide an additional amount of coal without mining at its mines.
2) Both projects are implemented in the same country: the proposed project and determined comparable project located in Ukraine.
3) Both projects use similar technology: technology that uses the proposed project and determined comparable project is similar. Both projects dealt piles using standard excavators and bulldozers. From dump

site to the place of enrichment delivered by trucks. Both projects have coal enrichment plant that uses several techniques to separate coal from other material. Both technologies used method of gravity separation. Gravity separation - an industrial way of separating two components, suspension or any other homogeneous mixtures for which separation of components by means of gravity is quite practical. Therefore, both technologies are similar.
4) Both projects have similar sector: Both projects are large-scale JI projects. In both projects by recycling dumps of comparable magnitude. The proposed project consists of a platform that works over a period of time, whereas a comparable project consists of two areas, which will be a very short period of simultaneous operation. Nominal capacity of processing facilities for processing dumps over the project - 100,000 tons of material per month, ie 1.2 million tonnes per year. Install over the project does not work at full capacity, so the resulting coal (100,000 tons per month) less than the proposed project (400,000 tons per month), but these figures the same order. The scale of remote coal limited content in coal dumps and dumps and size similar to the proposed and comparable projects.

As it is mentioned above, the project "Waste heaps dismantling with the aim of decreasing the greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere" relates to this project and implementation under comparable circumstances would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of net anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur. Therefore, this project is additional.

The following steps are performed in section B.2. of the PDD:
Step 1: Identify comparable project where an accredited independent entity has already positively determined that it would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of net anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur.
Step 2: Demonstrate that the identified project is a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances.
Step 3: Provide justification why determination for a comparable project is relevant for the project at hand.

The sufficient additionality proofs were provided to the AIE in the PDD and supporting documents.

The desk review of submitted documentation and follow-up interviews enabled TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine to assess that all explanations, descriptions and analyses in the demonstration of additionality were made in accordance with the selected version of the "Tool". The proposed JI activity provides the reductions in emissions by sources that are additional to any that would otherwise occur.

Identified problem areas for additionality of the project, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A to the Determination report (refer to CAR 13).

4.5 Project boundary

In accordance with paragraphs 32 - 33 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on correct and complete delineation of the project boundary, inclusion and exclusion of any sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) related to the baseline or the project.

It was assessed through the desk review of submitted documentation and follow-up interviews that project participants used the JI specific approach towards baseline setting in this project and establishing the project boundary.

The details on the project boundary were provided in section B.3. of the PDD. The desk review of submitted documentation enabled TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine to assess that the project boundary defined in
the PDD encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are:
• under the control of the project participants;
• reasonably attributable to the project; and
• significant.

The baseline emission sources of GHGs that are included in the project boundaries are listed below.
1) Emissions of carbon dioxide due to:
- waste heap burning;
- consumption of coal for energy production (excluded).

The project emission sources of GHGs that were included in the project boundaries are listed below.
1) Emissions of carbon dioxide due to:
- consumption of fossil fuel (diesel fuel) due to extracting coal from dump;
- consumption of coal for energy production (excluded).

All gases and sources included in the project boundary were explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified.

The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using figures 9 – 10 and the details were provided by table 12 in section B.3. of the PDD.

Identified problem areas for project boundary, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A.

4.6 Crediting period

In accordance with paragraph 34 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on correct and complete provision of information on the projects

starting date, expected operational lifetime and the length of the crediting period.

It was assessed through the desk review of submitted documentation and follow-up interviews that the project participants had correctly stated in the PDD:

- the starting date of the project that is 23/10/2009. The starting date of the project is after the beginning of 2000.

- the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months that is 3 years and 2 months or 38 months.

- the length of the crediting period (23/10/2009 - 31/12/2012) in years and months is 3 years and 2 months or 38 months.

The starting date of the crediting period is after the date the first emission reductions are generated by the project.

Project participants stated crediting period in years and months in the PDD for this project that are:
Crediting period 23/10/2009- 31/12/2012
Length of the part of crediting period after the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol is 3 years and 2 months or 38 months.

The desk review of submitted documentation and follow-up interviews enabled TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine to assess that all information on the projects starting date, expected operational lifetime and the length of the crediting period is correct and complete.

Identified problem areas for crediting period, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A.

4.7 Monitoring plan

In accordance with paragraphs 35 - 39 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on assessing the completeness and correctness of the

established monitoring plan and whether it meets the necessary requirements.

The paragraph 35 of the DVM defines two following approaches selected for establishment of the monitoring plan:
(a) JI specific approach;
(b) Approved CDM methodology approach.

The project participants of the project "DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP # 2 AT MINE # 22 "LISOVA"" selected the JI specific approach for establishment of the monitoring plan.

The monitoring plan was established in accordance with criteria stated in Appendix B to decision 9/CMP.1 (JI guidelines). JI specific approach is defined in paragraph 9 (a) of the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03.

The information indicated below, that refers to the components of monitoring plan, was assessed by TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine through the desk review of the submitted documentation and follow-up interviews.

I. The chosen monitoring plan includes all procedures necessary for accurate and conservative calculation of emission reductions, 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.

II. The established monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable and provide consistent and accurate values; are valid and clearly connected with the effect to be measured, and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions to be monitored. The default values which were used in the monitoring plan were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness. These values originate from recognized sources, are supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels and are presented in a transparent manner in the PDD.

III. For those values that are to be provided by the project participants it is clearly indicated, how the values are to be selected and justified by explanation of what types of sources are to be used and the vintage of data to be used. For all values the precise references from which these values are taken are clearly indicated in section D of the PDD and the conservativeness of the values is justified. The sources from which the data are obtained do not foresee the situations where the expected data are not available.

IV. The International System Units (SI units) are used for values provided by the project participants.

V. Any parameters, coefficients, variables that are used to calculate baseline emissions but are obtained through monitoring are noted. The desk review of the documentation showed that the consistency between the baseline and monitoring plan is ensured.

VI. The project activity will include monitoring of GHG emissions in the baseline and project scenarios. Variables to be monitored in the baseline and project scenarios include the parameters listed in section D of the PDD.

VII. The monitoring plan draws on the list of standard variables contained in Appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03, as appropriate.

VIII. The established monitoring plan described the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording. This information is provided in the tabular format in section D.2. of the PDD. The monitoring plan also elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the calculation of baseline emissions and project emissions. The underlying rationale for the algorithms and formulae is sounded and explained as necessary. The project participants used consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc.; numbered all equations throughout the PDD; defined and indicated all variables and constants with units.

IX. The conservativeness of the algorithms and procedures is justified and methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters are included, to the extent possible. References for all parameters are provided as necessary. It is clearly stated in the PDD which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed. The desk review of the documentation showed that the consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions of the baseline is ensured.

X. The national and international monitoring standards are not applied to monitor certain aspects of the project.

XI. A clear management structure will be identified to establish the division of responsibilities for gathering monitoring data. LLC "Trading House "Metalprom" is responsible for performance of monitoring, data collection, registration, visualization, storage and reporting of data that were monitored, and periodic inspection of measuring instruments.

XII. The monitoring plan, on the whole, reflects good monitoring practices: the structure of data collection is clearly defined; all data concerning the greenhouse gas emissions within the project boundaries is monitored and used in calculations appropriately.

Identified problem areas for monitoring plan, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A to the Determination report.

4.8 Leakage

In accordance with paragraphs 40 - 41 of the DVM this area focuses on checking of the assessment of the potential leakage in the project.

The project "DISMANTLING OF WASTE # 2 HEAP AT MINE # 22 "LISOVA"" used the JI specific approach for baseline setting.

The result of this project is reduce uncontrolled methane emissions as a result of mines and reduce CO_2 emissions by reducing electricity consumption. As in the baseline scenario continue to burn waste heaps and coal revenue is solely mine, it causes uncontrolled emissions of methane and great use of electricity for the product. Methane emissions are calculated by applying the default emission factor for the country to the amount of coal produced, and monitoring of coal extracted from the rock piles in the project scenario. Reducing energy consumption will be included with the State Statistics Committee of the specific costs of electricity in coal production in Ukraine, and using the same amount of coal that was mined from the waste heaps. These sources are significant and will be included in the monitoring plan and calculating emission reductions for the project.

To the sources also refer power consumption enrichment plant LLC "PC" Donetsk coal fuel. '" These sources are taken into account for calculating the GHG emissions during project activities. These sources are significant and were included in the plan for monitoring and calculating emissions on the project. Energy consumption and related greenhouse gas emissions parsing used refused to be taken into account in calculating the leakage in the implementation of project-based payment processing factory in electricity consumption per tonne of coal received at the processing rock to dump and use the same amount of coal that was mined from the waste heaps.

Leakages:

1) fugitive emissions of methane in the mining activities;
2) consumption of electricity from a grid at coal mine.
3) consumption of electricity for enrichment breeding weight on factory LLC "PC" Donetsk coal fuel. '"

Identified problem areas for leakage, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A .

4.9 Estimation of emission reductions

In accordance with paragraphs 42 - 47 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on checking the completeness and correctness of the provided methods and results of emission reduction estimates in the JI project.

The paragraph 42 of the DVM defines two following approaches to estimate the emission reductions or enhancement of net removals generated by the project selected the JI specific approach:
(a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario; or
(b) Direct assessment of emission reductions.

As per JI specific approach project participants chose the following approach to estimate the emission reductions generated by the project: assessment of emissions in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario. According to this approach **emission reductions** were calculated as follows:

$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$

Where:
ER_y - GHG emission reductions in year y [tCO_2e];
BE_y - Sum of GHG emissions in baseline scenario in year y [tCO_2e];
PE_y - Sum of GHG emissions in project scenario in year y [tCO_2e];
LE_y - Leakages of GHG emissions due to Project activity in year y [tCO_2e].

Ex ante estimates of emissions for the project scenario (within the project boundary), emissions for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary) and emission reductions are provided in section E of the PDD. These estimates in the PDD are given on a periodic basis, from the beginning until the end of the crediting period, in tonnes of CO_2 equivalent, using appropriate emission factors. The formula used for calculating these estimates are consistent throughout the PDD.

The baseline emissions of the project are calculated under the formula:

$BE_y = BE_{WHBP,y}$

where:
BE_y - baseline emissions in the year y (tCO_2e),
$BE_{WHB,y}$ - baseline emissions due to burning of the waste heaps in the year y (tCO_2e).

The detailed algorithms and formulae for estimating emissions in the baseline scenario of the project are described under sections B.1 and D.1.

of the PDD. The details of the calculation are provided in the GHG emission reductions calculation spreadsheet in Excel format.

The **project emissions** of the project are calculated under the formula:

$PE_y = PE_{Diesel,y}$

where:
PE_y - project emissions due to project activity in the year y (tCO_2e),

$PE_{Diesel,,y}$ - project emissions due to consumption of diesel fuel by the project activity in the year y (tCO_2e).

$$PE_{Diesel,y} = \frac{FC_{PJ,Diesel,y}}{1000} \cdot NCV_{Diesel} \cdot OXID_{Diesel} \cdot k^{C}_{Diesel} \cdot {}^{44}\!/_{12}$$

$FC_{pj,\ diesel,\ y}$ - amount of diesel fuel, consumed in prolect in year y, t;
NCV_{Diesel} - Net Calorific Value of diesel fuel, TJ/kt;
$OXID_{Diesel}$ - carbon Oxidation factor of diesel fuel, d/l;
k^{C}_{Diese} - carbon content of diesel, tC/TJ;
${}^{44}\!/_{12}$ - stoichiometric relationship between the molecular weight of carbon dioxide and carbon, d /l.

Leakages are calculated under the formula:

$LE_y = LE_{B,y} + LE_{P,y}$,

where:
LE_y - Leakages of the year y, (t SO2e);
$LE_{b,\ y}$ - roots in the baseline scenario in year y, (t SO2e);
$LE_{p,\ y}$ - Sources in the project scenario in year y, (t SO2e).

Leakages in the baseline scenario in the year to be calculated as follows:

$LE_{V,\ y} = LE_{CH4,\ y} + LE_{B,\ EL,\ y}$,

where:
$LE_{V,\ y}$ - sources in the baseline scenario in year y, (t SO2e);
$LE_{CH4,\ y}$ - sources associated with the uncontrolled emissions of methane in coal mines in the year y, (t SO2e);
$LE_{B,\ EL,\ y}$ - sources related to the consumption of electricity from the grid at coal mines in the year y, (t SO2e);

Leakages due to fugitive emissions of methane in the mining activities in the year calculated as follows:

$LE_{CH4,y} = FC_{BE,Coal,y} \cdot EF_{CH4} \cdot \rho_{CH4} \cdot GWP_{CH4}$

where;
$FC_{BE,Coal,y}$ - amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use, equivalent to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heaps because of the project activity in the year y (t);
EF_{CH4} - emission factor for fugitive methane emissions from coal mining (m^3/t);
ρ_{CH4} - methane density (standard, at room temperature 20˚C and 1 atm) (t/m^3);
GWP_{CH4} - global warming potential for methane (tCO_2/ tCH_4).

Leakages due to consumption of electricity in the mining activities in the year y calculated as follows:

$$LE_{EL,y} = FC_{BE,Coal,y} \cdot N^{E}_{Coal,y} \cdot EF_{CO2,EL,y}$$

where:
$FC_{BE,Coal,y}$ - amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use, equivalent to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heaps because of the project activity in the year y (t);
$N^{E}_{Coal,y}$ - average electricity consumption per tonne of coal, produced in Ukraine in the year y (MWh/t);
$EF_{CO2,EL,y}$ - specific indirect carbon dioxide emissions in power consumption by consumers of electricity (tCO_2/MWh).

Leakages in project scenario year y are calculated as follows:

$$LE_{P,y} = LE_{P,EL,y}$$

where:
$LE_{P,EL,y}$ - leakages due to consumption of electricity from a grid at benefication plant in a year y,(t CO2e).

Leakages due to consumption of electricity from a grid at benefication plant in a year y are calculated as follows:

$$LE_{P,EL,y} = FC_{BE/coat,\,y} \cdot N_{E/P,\,coat,y}\, EF_{CO2,EL};$$

where:
$FC_{BE/coat,\,y}$ - amount of coal that has been mined in the baseline scenario and combusted for energy use, equivalent to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heaps because of the project activity in the year y, t;
$N_{E/P,\,coat,y}$ - average electricity consumption per tonne of coal for the processing technology of rock on the benefication plant;
$EF_{CO2,E}$ - specific carbon dioxide emissions due to production of electricity at TPP and by its consumption, tCO2/ MWh.

The detailed algorithms and formulae for estimating emissions in the project scenario are described under section D.1. of the PDD. The details of the calculation are provided in the GHG emission reductions calculation spreadsheet in Excel format.

It was assessed by the desk review of submitted documentation, especially GHG emission reductions calculation spreadsheet in Excel format that key factors influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account. Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred above are clearly identified, reliable and transparent. Emission factors used for calculating the estimates referred to above, were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and the choice is appropriately justified. The estimation referred to above is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner. The estimates of emission reductions are consistent throughout the PDD version 2.0 dated 03/05/2012. The annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

According to the PDD and GHG emission reductions calculation spreadsheet in Excel format the emissions for the project scenario, emissions for the baseline scenario and emission reductions are provided in tables 9 and 10 below.

Table 9 – Estimated emission reductions generated by the project over the crediting period

Period:	**23/10/2009 – 31/12/2012**
Emissions for the project scenario:	27 117 tCO_2e
Emissions for the baseline scenario:	1 045 814 tCO_2e
Leakages	- 289 106 tCO_2e
Emission reductions:	1 307 743 tCO_2e
Annual average of estimated emission reductions:	412 971 tCO_2e

Identified problem areas for calculation of GHG emission reductions, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A to the Determination report.

4.10 Environmental impacts

In accordance with paragraph 48 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on checking the completeness and correctness of the provided information on the assessment of the environmental impacts of the JI project.

The host Party for the project is Ukraine. The conclusions and all references to supporting documentation of environmental impacts are provided in section F of the PDD.

Identified problem areas for environmental impacts, project participants' responses and conclusions of TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine are described in Annex A to the Determination report.

4.11 Stakeholder consultation

In accordance with paragraph 49 of the DVM the assessment of this area focuses on checking if stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party.

The host Party for the project is Ukraine. The project meets the applicable standards and requirements, set forth in Ukraine. The Host Party does not put forward the requirement to consult with stakeholders to JI projects.

4.12 Other areas

In accordance with paragraphs 50 - 73 of the DVM the assessment of the areas such as additional elements for assessment in determination regarding small-scale projects, determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects, determination regarding programmes of activities is not applicable to this JI project.

5 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES

According to paragraph 32 of the JI Guidelines, the AIE shall make the project design document publicly available through the secretariat, subject to confidentiality provisions set out in paragraph 40 of the JI Guidelines, and receive comments from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers on the project design document and any supporting information for 30 days from the date the project design document is made publicly available.

TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine published the project design document (version 1.1 dated 23/03/2012) on the website TÜV Rheinland Ukraine (http://www.tuv.com.ua) on 24/03/2012 and invited comments within 25/04/2012 by Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organizations.

There were no comments from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers received.

ANNEX A: JI PROJECT DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 Mandatory Requirements for Joint Implementation (JI) Project Activities

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference/Comment
1. The project shall have the approval of the Parties involved.	Kyoto Protocol Article 6.1 (a)	Unresolved issue **FAR 01**	Table 2, section A.5. The project has been officially presented for endorsement to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine. According to the legislation of Republic of Latvia, no LoE is needed. After AIE completes the determination report, the PDD and the Determination Report will be presented to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine to obtain a Letter of Approval from Ukraine. LoA from other side will be obtained not later than the first verification. The project does not have an approval of the host Party and an investor country. Verifiers note: JISC Glossary of joint implementation terms, version 03 defines the following: a) At least the written project approval(s) by the host Party(ies) should be provided to the AIE and made available to the secretariat by the AIE when submitting the determination report regarding the PDD for publication in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines; b) At least one written project approval

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference/Comment
			by a Party involved in the JI project, other than the host Party(ies), should be provided to the AIE and made available to the secretariat by the AIE when submitting the first verification report for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest. **FAR 01.** The project has not received the approval from the participating Parties. Provide letters of approval to the AIE to complete determination process
2. Emission reductions, or an enhancement of removal by sinks, shall be additional to any that would otherwise occur.	Kyoto Protocol Article 6.1 (b)	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section B.2.
3. The sponsor Party shall not acquire emission reduction units if it is not in compliance with its obligations under Articles 5 & 7.	Kyoto Protocol Article 6.1 (c)	OK	Article 5 requires: “Each Party included in Annex I shall have in place, no later than one year prior to the start of the first commitment period, a national system for the estimation of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases”. According to the Article 7: “Annex I Parties to submit annual greenhouse gas inventories, as well as national communications, at regular intervals, both including supplementary information to demonstrate compliance with the Protocol”.
4. The acquisition of emission reduction units shall be supplemental to domestic actions for the purpose of	Kyoto Protocol Article 6.1 (d)	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section B.2.

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference/Comment
meeting commitments under Article 3.			
5. Parties participating in JI shall designate national focal points for approving JI projects and have in place national guidelines and procedures for the approval of JI projects.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §20	OK	Ukraine has designated its Focal Point. National guidelines and procedures for approving JI projects have been published. Contact data in Ukraine: State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine 35 Urytskogo St, Kyiv, P.O. 03035 Phone: +380 44 594 91 11 Fax: +380 44 5949115 Ukrainian national guidelines and procedures for the approval of JI projects are available on the web-site www.neia.gov.ua. On February 22, 2006 the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine adopted the Regulation № 206, which established assessment and implementation procedures for JI projects within the Kyoto Protocol.
6. The host Party shall be a Party to the Kyoto Protocol.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §21(a)/24	OK	The Ukraine is a Party (Annex I Party) to the Kyoto Protocol and has ratified the Kyoto Protocol on February 4th, 2004.
7. The host Party's assigned amount shall have been calculated and recorded in accordance with the modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §21(b)/24	OK	The assigned amount of emissions for Ukraine is 100% of its emissions in 1990. In the Initial Report (Ukraine's Initial Report Under Article 7, Paragraph 4, Of The Kyoto Protocol) submitted by

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference/Comment
			Ukraine to the UNFCCC Secretariat, on 26 May 2006 the AAUs are quantified as follows: 925 362 174.39 (x 5) = 4 626 810 872 tCO_2e http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/initial_reports_under_the_kyoto_protocol/application/pdf/ukraine_aa_report.pdf Currently Ukraine has submitted its fifth national communication on climate change under the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC.
8. The host Party shall have in place a national registry in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 4.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §21(d)/24	OK	The designed system of the national registry has been described in the Initial Report: http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/initial_reports_under_the_kyoto_protocol/application/pdf/ukraine_aa_report.pdf
9. Project participants shall submit to the independent entity a project design document that contains all information needed for the determination.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §31	OK	Project participant SIA "Vidzeme Eko" has submitted to the Accredited Independent Entity TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine project's PDD that contains all information needed for the determination.
10. The project design document shall be made publicly available and Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited observers shall be invited to, within 30 days, provide comments.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §32	OK	The PDD has been made publicly available through http://www.tuv.com.ua website from 24th of March till 25th April, 2012 for receiving comments and remarks to the JI project.

REQUIREMENT	REFERENCE	CONCLUSION	Cross Reference/Comment
11. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party shall be submitted, and, if those impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, an environmental impact assessment in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party shall be carried out.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §33(d)	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section F.
12. The baseline for a JI project shall be the scenario that reasonably represents the GHG emissions or removal by sources that would occur in absence of the proposed project.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, Appendix B	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section B.
13. A baseline shall be established on a project-specific basis, in a transparent manner and taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, Appendix B	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section B.
14. The baseline methodology shall exclude to earn ERUs for decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, Appendix B	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section B.
15. The project shall have an appropriate monitoring plan.	Marrakech Accords, JI Modalities, §33(c)	OK	Please refer to Table 2, section D.
16. A project participant is a legal entity authorized by a Party involved to participate in the JI project.	"Glossary of Joint Implementation Terms", Version 03.	**FAR 01**	Please refer to Table 2, section A. The Ukrainian project participant will be authorized by the Host Party through the issuance of the approval for the project.

Table 2 - Requirements Checklist

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
A.General description of the project					
A.1. Title of the project					
1.1. Is the title of the project activity presented?	PDD	DR	Dismantling of waste heap #2 at mine #22 "LISOVA"	OK	OK
1.2. Is(are) the sectoral scope(s) to which the project pertains presented?	PDD	DR	Sectoral scope: 8 - Mining/mineral production	OK	OK
1.3. Are the version number and date of the document presented?	PDD	DR	Yes, the version number of the document and the date are presented as: PDD version: 1.0 Date of the PDD: 23th of March 2012. The re-submitted final version of the PDD is provided as: PDD version: 2.0 Date of the PDD: 3th of May 2012.	OK	OK
A.2. Description of the project					
2.1. Is the purpose of the project indicated (with the concise, summarizing explanation of the situation existing prior to the starting date of the project, baseline scenario and project scenario)?	PDD	DR	Emission reductions due to the implementation of this project will come from three major sources: - Removing the source of green-house gas emissions from the combustion of waste heaps by the extraction of coal fraction from the waste-heaps; - Reducing fugitive emissions of	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			methane due to the replacement of coal that would have been mined, by the project; - Reducing electricity consumption for coal production from the mines by replacing its waste heaps coal. The purpose of this project is extraction of coal component from waste heap, for further blending with steam coal and burning with aim of heat and electricity production. **CAR 01.** At p. 1 PDD correct words "in most cases have little power (0.6 - 1.2 m)."		
2.2. Is the history of the Project including its JI component summarized?	PDD	DR	Yes, the history of the project including its JI component is summarized in section A.2. of the PDD.	OK	OK
2.1.1. Is it clarified how the proposed project activity reduces emissions GHG that would occur in the baseline scenario?	PDD	DR	The proposed project is aimed at the extraction of coal from the waste heaps for subsequent combustion in power plants or boiler. Also one of the stages of the project is to restore the fertile soil layer on the territory where the waste heap situated is located. **CAR 02.** Provide an explanation	**CAR 02** **CAR 03**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			of who owns the heap and ERUs from project implementation. Provide appropriate supporting documents. **CAR 03.** Give to the AIO the contract with a benefication plant for the process of enriching rock mass from heap for the extracting of coal.		
A.3. Project participants					
3.1. Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	PDD	DR	Section A.3 Table 1 of the PDD names two project participants: - LLC " Trading House "Metalprom", and - SIA "Vidzeme Eko"	OK	OK
3.2. Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD that is indicated in section A.3?	PDD	DR	The contact information of project participants is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
3.3. Is it indicated, if the Party involved is a Host Party?	PDD	DR	Ukraine is indicated as a Host Party.	OK	OK
3.4. Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved wishes to be considered as a project participant?	PDD	DR	Parties involved don't wish to be considered project participants.	OK	OK
A.4. Technical description of the project					
A.4.1. Location of the project					
4.1.1. Host Party(ies)	PDD	DR	Ukraine	OK	OK
4.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.	PDD	DR	Project's waste heaps processing	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			facilities are located in Torez district of Donetsk region, East Ukraine. See section A 4.1.4 of the PDD.		
4.1.3. City/Town/Community etc.	PDD	DR	See section A 4.1.4 of the PDD.	OK	OK
4.1.4. Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project (maximum one page)					
4.1.4.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s) (this section should not exceed one page)?	PDD	DR	Waste heap that processed in the project clearly indicated and has all the necessary information about its location. However, not all objects that are directly and participate in project activities listed in section A.4. **CAR 04.** Indicate in Section A.4 the information about processing factory LLC "PC" Donetsk coal fuel. "'	**CAR 04**	OK
A.4.2. Technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project					
4.2.1. Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project described?	PDD	DR	The project provides the implementation of the following measures and activities for utilization of waste heap: mining equipment loaded on vehicles and on transporting to processing factory, where the coal mass breeding of waste heaps. Detailed description of technologies and measures used in this project are	**CL 01**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			described in the PDD. Please see section A.4.2 PDD. **CL 01.** Explain what dump is used for shipment of waste after enrichment.		
4.2.1.1. Does the project design engineering reflect current good practices?	PDD	DR	Engineering project development represents the fastest and the easiest way to work with rock waste heap using the modern technology of coal extraction. Description of project development is presented in Section A.4.2. of the PDD.	OK	OK
4.2.1.2. Does the project use state of the art technology or would the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	PDD	DR	The processing facility presented in project use gravity separation method for separation coal from the rest of the matter. That same method used in the project, which is the comparable to this project and has already passed the final determination.	OK	OK
4.2.1.3. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	PDD	DR	Since the project ends in 2012, and heap dismantle is in its final stages, the introduction of new equipment for the waste heap sorting is unlikely. **CL 02.** Please provide clarification of whether there is on-site project transporting equipment	**CL 02**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			(conveyor). The picture from satellite shows that at the site there is a transporting conveyor.		
4.2.2. Are all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule indicated?	PDD	DR	Technical data partly reflected in the section A.4.2. of the PDD.	OK	OK
A.4.3. 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					
4.3.1. Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page).	PDD	DR	Waste heaps are frequently spontaneously igniting and burning, causing emissions green-house gases and other pollutants. The proposed project aims to extract coal from waste heap created during underground coal mines activities and burning of the entire volume of coal for electricity or heat production. It also will partially help to avoid methane emissions from coal mines, because the coal from waste heap will replace the coal of mines. More detailed information in Section A.4.3 presents an overview of national policies and circumstances, and gives a summary of the reasons why the reduction did not occur in	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			the absence of the proposed project. The amount of information does not exceed one page.		
A.4.3.1. Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period					
4.3.1.1. Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO2e?	PDD	DR	Yes. Section A.4.3.1. of the PDD provides the tables indicating estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO_2e. Annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period from 23/10/2009 till 31/12/2012 is 403 960 tones of CO_2 equivalent. **CAR 05**. Correct the length of crediting period, since October 2009 cannot be counted as a full month. Make the appropriate transfer.	**CAR 05**	OK
A.5. Project approval by the Parties involved					
5.1. Are written project approvals by the Parties involved attached? Are they unconditional?	PDD	DR	As indicated in Section A.5 of the PDD, the project received a the Letter of Endorsement from NEIA of Ukraine. Project approval by the Host Country where the project is implemented and Investor Country are obtained after the end of Determination process.	**FAR 01**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			See FAR 01.		
B. Baseline					
B.1 Description and justification of the baseline chosen					
1.1. Is it indicated in PDD: - a detailed theoretical description of the baseline in a complete and transparent manner, as well as a justification of chosen baseline using the step-wise approach; - a justification of baseline setting; - references on regulations according to baseline setting.	PDD	DR	The baseline for this JI project was established in accordance with Appendix B, Guidelines for Implementation and paragraphs 23 - 29 "Guidance on Criteria For Baseline Setting And Monitoring " Version 03. Detailed theoretical description of the baseline is presented in Section B.1. of the PDD. For baseline selection, project participants have used JI specific approach.	**OK**	OK
1.2. Is it indicated in the PDD that baseline was established:					
1.2.1. by listing and describing plausible (alternative) future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one?	PDD	DR, I	Plausible future scenarios are listed and described on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one in the context of this project. All scenarios, except - continuation of existing situation, face prohibitive barriers. Therefore, continuation of existing	**CAR 06**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			situation is the most plausible future scenario and is the baseline scenario. Analysis of the barriers is given in Section B.1. **CAR 06.** Please provide information for doing business in Ukraine for 2009, when the developed project and make the appropriate conclusions.		
1.2.2. on a project-specific basis and/or using a multi-project emission factor?	PDD	DR	Yes. The explanation and references of carbon emission factor is indicated in Section D.1 of the PDD. Emission sources in the project scenario: - Carbon dioxide emissions from the use of fuel to run part of the project equipment (motor cars).	OK	OK
1.2.3. in a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors?	PDD	DR	JI specific approach is used for baseline setting. The baseline was identified by listing and analysing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions are clearly traced and clearly related to the project. **CAR 07**. Please explain the difference between the values of "probability of waste heap	**CAR 07**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			burning" in comparative and this project.		
1.2.4. 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?	PDD	DR	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. It is demonstrated by the above analysis that the baseline chosen clearly represents the most probable future scenario given the circumstances of modern day Donbas coal sector.	OK	OK
1.2.5. in such a way that emission reduction units (ERUs) cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure?	PDD	DR	Development of the Project in Section B.1. of the PDD provides that ERUs are refering only to the amount of coal extracted from the waste heap, considering its power characteristics. If decreases in activity levels outside the project activity or due to force majeure, will decreasing the volume of coal extraction from waste heap. Application of this approach to calculating the ERU ensure that they are obtained by reducing the activity of the project or due to force majeure.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
1.2.6. taking account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions.	PDD	DR	Baseline was established taking into account uncertainties and using conservative assumptions which described in section B.1. of the PDD version 2.0 from 03/05/2012.	OK	OK
1.3. Does the PDD explicitly indicate the approach used for identifying the baseline with references on regulations?	PDD	DR	In Section B.1. of the PDD states that project participants have chosen a specific approach to identify the JI baseline in accordance with paragraph 9 of the latest version of "Guidelines on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" (Version 03, adopted JISK 26th m eeting in September 2011).		OK
1.4. Are number, name and version of the methodology clearly indicated in the context of the project?	PDD	DR	Project participants have applied the JI specific approach to identify the basiline.	OK	OK
1.5. Is the applied version of the CDM methodology the most recent one and/or is this version still applicable?	PDD	DR	Project participants have applied the JI specific approach to identify the basiline.	OK	OK
1.6. Is it described how the chosen approach is applied in the context of the project?	PDD	DR	JI specific approach applied in the context of the project is completely and clearly described in section B.1. of the PDD. .	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
1.7. Are the key information and data used to establish the baseline (variables, parameters, data sources etc.) indicated in tabular form?	PDD	DR	Yes, the necessary information and coefficients in tabular form is provided in section B.1. of the PDD. **CAR 08.** Please provide evidence that the coal obtained after enrichment has NCVcoal not less than the value specified in the PDD.	**CAR 08**	OK
1.8. Are all regulations and sources clearly referenced?	PDD	DR	Yes. All regulations and sources clearly referenced.	OK	OK
B.2. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the JI project					
2.1. Is the step-wise approach used for the demonstration of project additionality indicated and described?	PDD	DR	In order demonstrate additionally of the project, project participants used stepwise approach in accordance with paragraph 44(b) of Annex 1 "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring". This approach is described in Section B.2. of the PDD.	OK	OK
2.2. Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description with relevant reference on regulations?	PDD	DR	Approach (b) was enacted in accordance with paragraph 44 of Annex 1 "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" version 03.	OK	OK
2.3. Is it described how the chosen approach is applied in the context of the project?	PDD	DR	Yes, section B.2. of the PDD provided the description how the	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			chosen approach is applied in the context of the project.		
2.4. Are additionality proofs provided?					
2.4.1. If the application of the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	PDD	DR	Yes, section B.2. of the PDD includes all explanations, descriptions and analyzes.	OK	OK
2.4.2. Is an analysis showing why the emissions in the baseline scenario would likely exceed the emissions in the project scenario included?	PDD	DR	Detailed analysis provided in sections A.4.3., B.1. and B.2. of the PDD demonstrates that emissions in the baseline scenario would likely exceed the emissions in the project scenario by the implementation of project activities. Comparative analysis of investment used and included in the PDD, in Section B.2. and supporting Excel file.	OK	OK
2.4.3. Is it demonstrated that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline scenario?	PDD	DR	Yes, it is clearly demonstrated scenario in sections A.2., B.1. and B.2. of the PDD that the project activity itself is not a likely baseline. **CAR 09.** Please provide AIO documents justifying investments and investment.	**CAR 09**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
2.5. Are national policies and circumstances relevant to the baseline of the proposed project activity summarized?	PDD	DR	Baseline is set by taking into account relevant national policies and circumstances (please refer to sections B.1. and B.2. of the PDD). None of listed in section B.1. alternatives does not contradict Ukrainian legislation. The selected alternative is the most realistic future scenario without implementation of the project.	OK	OK
B.3. Description of how the definition of the project boundary is applied to the project					
3.1. Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: - under the control of the project participants; - reasonably attributable to the project; - significant?	PDD	DR	All sources of emissions identified in the PDD and not under the control of all project participants and outside the project. Please see section B.3. of the PDD. **CAR 10.** Exclude from the list of emission sources in the baseline and project scenario in Table 12 emissions attributable to the leakages. **CAR 11.** In Section B.3 exclude from the list of emissions in baseline and project scenario those, which are not involved in the calculation and are not taken	**CAR 10** **CAR 11**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			into account.		
3.2. Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 3.1. above?	PDD	DR	Project boundaries are determined based on assessment of each case. The limits include a baseline set of sorting and transport. However, methane emissions and electricity consumption by mine were also included in the project. **CAR 12.** Please, in Section B.3 emissions, referred to the leakages, describe by separate item.	**CAR 12**	OK
3.3. 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?	PDD	DR	Project boundaries and emission sources of relevant gases are indicated in section B.3. of the PDD as figure 9 and 10.	OK	OK
3.4. Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?	PDD	DR	All gases and sources within the project are listed in Table 4 and presented in Section B.3. of the PDD. **CAR 13** Please, in Section B.3 emissions, referred to the leakages, describe by separate item.	**CAR 13**	OK
B.4. Further baseline information, including the date of baseline setting and the name(s) of the person(s)/entity(ies) setting the baseline					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
4.1. .Is the date of the baseline setting presented (in DD/MM/YYYY)?			Date of completion of the baseline study: 23/03/2012	OK	OK
4.2. .Is the contact information of persons setting the baseline provided?			Ivanenko Gennadiy from SIA "Vidzeme Eko" the person who established the baseline. Contact information is provided in Section B.4. and Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
4.3. .Is the person/entity also a project participant listed in Annex 1 of PDD?	PDD	DR	SIA "Vidzeme Eko" is listed as a project participant in Annex 1.	OK	OK
C. Duration of the project/crediting period					
C.1. Starting date of the project					
1.1. Is the project's starting date clearly defined?	PDD	DR	The project's starting date is clearly defined in section C.1. of the PDD - 23/10/2009.	OK	OK
1.2. 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?	PDD	DR	The starting date of the project starts from the date of signing of the contract. **CAR 14.** Was specified the start date of the project - 23 October 2009, when began the dismantling of rock dump began. Please fix the date of commencement of the project in accordance with the Guidelines for Members on JI PDD form (version 04). "The date of	**CAR 14**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			commencement of the JI project is the date when the introduction, construction or real action of the project begins".		
1.3. Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	PDD	DR	Yes. The starting date is after the beginning of 2000.	OK	OK
C.2. Expected operational lifetime of the project					
2.1. Is the project's operational lifetime clearly defined in years and months?	PDD	DR	The implemented measures provided proper maintenance could be operational at least till the end 2015.	OK	OK
C.3. Length of the crediting period					
3.1. Is the length of the crediting period specified in years and months?	PDD	DR	The crediting period: from 23/10/2009 until 31/12/2012 (3 years and 2 months)	OK	OK
3.2. 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?	PDD	DR	Yes, please refer to section C.3. of the PDD.	OK	OK
3.3. 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?	PDD	DR	Yes, it is indicated in section C.3. of the PDD that the end of the crediting period is scheduled for 2012. Estimate of emission reductions for the crediting period is presented in section A.4.3.1. of the PDD.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
D. Monitoring Plan					
D.1. Description of monitoring plan chosen					
1.1. Is it indicated in PDD a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner, as well as a justification of chosen monitoring plan using the step-wise approach?	PDD	DR	The detailed theoretical description and the justification of chosen monitoring plan with step-wise approach is sufficient and transperant and are indicated in section D.1. of the PDD.	OK	OK
1.2. Does the PDD explicitly indicate the chosen approach used for monitoring with references on regulations?	PDD	DR	The project participant has chosen the JI specific approaches regarding monitoring according to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”, version 03. Step-wise approach is used to describe the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
1.3. Is the applied methodology considered being the most appropriate one?	PDD	DR	In this project CDM methodologies are not applied. To establish a monitoring plan a JI specific approach is used.	OK	OK
1.4. If national or international monitoring standart has to be applied to monitor certain aspects of the project, is this standart identified and is the reference as to where a detailed description of the standart can be found provided?	PDD	DR	Yes, all the references to national and international standards for monitoring are listed in Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK
1.5. Are the description of the assumptions, formulas, parameters, data sources and key factors indicated?	PDD	DR	Assumptions, formulas, parameters, data sources and key factors are described in Section D of the PDD.	**CAR 15** **CAR 16** **CAR 17**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			CAR 15. Please provide the scheme and the principle of calculating the power consumption for benefication plant and provide the appropriate documents. **CAR 16.** Please describe details that diesel fuel costs are included in the monitoring of project emissions**.** **CAR 17.** Correct link to the source data for the constants used for calculation in Table 13 (Section D).		
1.5.1. Is it stated how uncertainties are taken into account and conservativeness is safeguarded?	PDD	DR	In Section D of the PDD it is described how uncertainty is taken into account and how conservativeness was provided.	OK	OK
1.6. Is it described how the chosen approach is applied in the context of the project?	PDD	DR	In Section D of the PDD it is described how chosen approach was used in the project. Monitoring for the projects will be assessed using option (a) of Annex 2 of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", version 03.	OK	OK
1.7. Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish:	PDD	DR	The monitoring plan clearly and accurately separates:	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
1) data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination regarding the PDD; 2) data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination regarding the PDD; 3) data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?			1) Data and parameters that are not checking during the crediting period, (and, therefore, set only once and remain constant over the crediting period) and are available at the stage of determination of the PDD; 2) Data and parameters that are not checked during the crediting period (and therefore remain constant throughout the crediting period), but are not available at the stage of determination of the PDD; 3) Data and parameters that will be checking during the crediting period.		
1.8. Are alternative tables used instead of the tables provided in sections D.1.1.1., D.1.1.3., D.1.2.1., D.1.3.1. and D.2. in line with the approach regarding monitoring chosen for all data/parameters?	PDD	DR	Not applicable.	OK	OK
1.8.1. Are all the required data / parameters according to the used methodology indicated?			Not applicable.	OK	OK
1.8.2. Fill in the required amount of sub checklists for fixed data and comment any line answered with “No” (items may be added depending on the number of data parameters).					
1.10.1. Parameter Title Data Check list / Yes/No	PDD	DR	Not applicable.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Is the title in line with methodology?					
Are data unit correctly expressed?					
Is the appropriate description of parameter indicated?					
Is the time of monitoring clearly indicated?					
Is the source clearly referenced?					
Is the correct value provided?					
Has this value been verified?					
Is the choice of data correctly justified or is the measurement method correctly described?					
Are quality control and quality assurance procedures indicated?					
D.1.1. Option 1 – Monitoring of the emissions in the project scenario and the baseline scenario					
1.1.1. Is the option 1 used for monitoring of the emissions in the project scenario and the baseline scenario?	PDD	DR	Monitoring using Option 1 is applied for project scenario and the baseline scenario in accordance with Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK
D.1.1.1. Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project, and how these data will be archived					
1.1.1.1. Are the data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project described?	PDD	DR	Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project are described by Parties in Section D.1.1.1. of the PDD. However, not all measuring devices are described in the PDD.	**CAR 18. CL 03. CL 04.**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			CAR 18. Add in Section D.1 to the list of parameters that will be collected and recorded during the monitoring - Quantity of electricity consumed by an enrichment plant for the extraction of coal**.** **CL 03.** Explain how coal obtained after enriching of rock mass separated from the coal obtained from other sources. **CL 04.** Explain is the diesel consumption accounted for transporting waste to the flat dump and coal to consumers in monitoring project emissions.		
1.1.1.2. Is it indicated how the data will be archived?	PDD	DR	In accordance Section D.1.1.1. of the PDD all data will be archived on electronic and hard copy. **CAR 19.** Correct in Tables D.1.1.3, D.1.2.1 and D.1.3.1 information on the quantity of coal produced in mines in the baseline scenario, namely: - Method of data receiving; - Frequency of registration.	**CAR 19**	OK
1.1.1.3. Is it indicated that data monitored are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	PDD	DR	Documents and other data monitored and required for determination and verification, as	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			well as any other data that are relevant to the operation of the project will be kept for at least two years after the last transfer of ERUs.		
D.1.1.2. Description of formulae used to estimate project emissions (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent)					
1.1.2.1. Are the formulae clearly and consistently indicated throughout the PDD?	PDD	DR	The formulae are clearly and consistently indicated in section D.1.1.2. of the PDD.	OK	OK
D.1.1.3. Relevant data necessary for determining the baseline of anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources within the project boundary, and how such data will be collected and archived					
1.1.3.1. Are the data necessary for determining the baseline of anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources within the project boundary described?	PDD	DR	The table D.1.1.3. of the PDD indicates data to be collected in order to determine the baseline emissions within the project borders. **CAR 20**. Correct the table D.1.3.1 information on the average electricity consumption data per tonne of enriched coal factory, namely: - Method of data receiving	**CAR 20**	OK
1.1.3.2. Is it indicated how data will be archived?	PDD	DR	In accordance to Section D.1.1.3. of the PDD all data will be archived on electronic and paper form (hard copy).	OK	OK
D.1.1.4. Description of formulae used to estimate baseline emissions (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent)					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
1.1.4.1. Are the formulae clearly and consistently indicated throughout the PDD?	PDD	DR	The formulae are clearly and consistently indicated in section D.1.1.4. of the PDD.	OK	OK
D.1.2. Option 2 Direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project (values should be consistent with those in section E.)					
1.2.1. Is the option 2 used for monitoring of the emissions in the project scenario and the baseline scenario?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.1.2.1. Data to be collected in order to monitor emission reductions from the project, and how these data will be archived					
1.2.1.1. Are the data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project described?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.2.1.2. Is it indicated how the data will be archived?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.2.1.3. Is it indicated that data monitored are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.1.2.2. Description of formulae used to calculate emission reductions from the project (for each gas, source etc.; emissions/emission reductions in units of CO2 equivalent):					
1.2.2.1. Are the formulae clearly and consistently indicated throughout the PDD?	PDD	DR	The formulae are clearly and consistently indicated in the PDD.	OK	OK
D.1.3. Treatment of leakage in the monitoring plan					
1.3.1. Are data and information that will be collected in order to monitor leakage effects of the project described, if applicable?	PDD	DR	Emissions from electricity consumption by the enrichment plant are attributed to project emissions. Information on collecting and monitoring this data and is described in Section D.1.3.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
1.3.2. Are formulae used to estimate leakage (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO2 equivalent) described?	PDD	DR	Yes. The formulae for each source of leakage are described in Section D.1.3.2. and listed in CO_{2} - equivalent.	OK	OK
D.1.4. Description of formulae used to estimate emission reductions for the project (for each gas, source etc.; emissions/emission reductions in units of CO_2 equivalent)					
1.4.1. Are the formulae clearly and consistently indicated throughout the PDD?	PDD	DR	Yes. The formulae clearly and consistently indicated throughout the PDD	OK	OK
D.1.4. Where applicable, in accordance with procedures as required by the host Party, information on the collection and archiving of information on the environmental impacts of the project					
1.4.1. Is information on the collection and archiving of information on the environmental impacts of the project?	PDD	DR	Collection and archiving of the information on the environmental impacts of the project will be done based on the approved EIA in accordance with the Host Party legislation.	OK	OK
1.4.2. Is reference to the relevant host Party regulation(s) provided?	PDD	DR	All references presented in section F.1	OK	OK
1.4.3. If not applicable is it stated so?	PDD	DR	-	OK	OK
D.2. Quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) procedures undertaken for data monitored					
2.1. Are the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process established? This includes, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available on request?	PDD	DR	Quality control and quality assurance procedures undertaken for data monitored are indicated in tabular format in section D.2. of the PDD.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
2.2. Are data corresponded with those in section D.1?	PDD	DR	Yes. Data are corresponded with those in section D.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
D.3. Please describe the operational and management structure that the project operator will apply in implementing the monitoring plan					
3.1 Is it described briefly the operational and management structure that the project participants(s) will implement in order to monitor emission reduction and any leakage effects generated by the project?	PDD	DR	The project owner – "TH Metalprom" LLC" has made all the required actions to implement provisions of this monitoring plan into its organizational and quality management structure. The operational and management structure are presented in section D.3. of the PDD in figure 11.	OK	OK
3.2. Are responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly provided?	PDD	DR	In Section D.3. PDD clearly represented commitment and organizational arrangements for data collection and storage. General control of the monitoring system is carried out by company management of the "TH Metalprom" LLC within the existing system of monitoring and reporting.	OK	OK
3.3. Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type?	PDD	DR	Monitoring plan, on the whole, reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.	OK	OK
D.4. Name of person(s)/entity(ies) establishing the monitoring plan					
4.1. Is the contact information of	PDD	DR	Gennadiy Ivanenko, Project manager at SIA "Vidzeme EKO"	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
person(s)/entity(ies) establishing the monitoring plan provided?			Required information is provided in the Annex 1 of the PDD.		
4.2. Is the person/entity also a project participant listed in Annex 1 of PDD?	PDD	DR	SIA "Vidzeme EKO" is a project participant. The required information is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
E. Estimation of greenhouse gases emission reductions					
E.1. Estimated project emissions					
1.1. Are described the formulae used to estimate anthropogenic emissions by source of GHGs due to the project (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent)?	PDD	DR	The formulae used to estimate anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHG within the project (for each gas, source etc.; emissions are presented in units of CO_2-equivalent) are described in Section D.1.1.2 of the PDD.	OK	OK
1.1.1. Is there a description of calculation of GHG project emissions in accordance with the formula? (supporting documentation)	PDD	DR	The description of calculation of GHG project emissions is provided in section B 1.1.2 and in EXCEL electronic files as supporting documentation.	OK	OK
1.1.2. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate project GHG emissions?	PDD	DR	Assumptions which were used to calculate project GHG emissions are conservative.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
E.2. Estimated leakage					
2.1. Are described the formulae used to estimate leakage due to the project activity where required (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent)?	PDD	DR	The formulae used to estimate leakage are described in Section D.1.3.2.	OK	OK
2.1.1. Is there a description of calculation of leakage in accordance with the formula? (supporting documentation)	PDD	DR	Description of calculation and supporting documentation are provide and can be easily traced to the source of origin	OK	OK
2.2. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate leakage?	PDD	DR	To secure a conservative approach to leakages calculations the following actions has been taken: – Usage of typical values where possible – Emissions from a consumption of energy sources (except electricity) are excluded	OK	OK
2.3. If not applicable, is it stated in the PDD?	PDD	DR	-	OK	OK
E.3. Sum of E.1 and E.2.					
3.1. Does the sum of E.1. and E.2. represent the project activity emissions?	PDD	DR	Yes. The sum of E.1. and E.2. represents the project activity emissions.	OK	OK
E.4. Estimated baseline emissions					
4.1. Are the formulae used to estimate the anthropogenic emissions by source of GHGs in the baseline using	PDD	DR	The formulae used to estimate	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
the baseline methodology for the applicable project category described (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent)?			anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs in the baseline scenario using the basic methodology for the appropriate category of projects (for each gas, source etc.; emissions are presented in units of CO_2 - equivalent) are described in Section D.1.1.4 of the PDD.		
4.1.1. Is there a description of calculation of GHG baseline emissions in accordance with the formula? (supporting documentation)	PDD	DR	Explanation of calculation of project emissions conducted in accordance with the formulae provided in Section D.1.1.4 of the PDD and electronic Excel files as supporting information. However, the basis for assessment of calculations should be explained.	OK	OK
4.2. Have conservative assumptions been used to calculate baseline emissions?	PDD	DR	Conservative assumptions were used to calculate baseline emissions.	OK	OK
E.5. Difference between E.4. and E.3. representing the emission reductions of the project					
5.1. Does the difference between E.4. and E.3. represent the emission reductions due to the project during a given period?	PDD	DR	Difference between E.4. and E.3. represents emission reductions under the project in this period.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
E.6. Table providing values obtained when applying formulae above					
6.1. Is the data provided under this section in consistency with data as presented by other chapters E of the PDD?	PDD	DR	The data provided under section E.6. is in consistency with data as presented by other chapters of the PDD.	OK	OK
6.2. Is there a table providing the total value of emission reductions?	PDD	DR	Yes. A table which providing the total value of emission reductions located in section E.	OK	OK
F. Environmental impacts					
F.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party					
1.1. Has an analysis of the possible environmental impacts of the project been sufficiently described?	PDD	DR	In Section F of the PDD, project participants have provided description of the possible environment impacts. According to this analysis, the negative environment impact in the project scenario is much lower than in the baseline scenario. To determine the completeness of the analysis some explanation is required.	OK	OK
1.2. Are there any host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)?	PDD	DR	The Host Party for this project is Ukraine. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is the part of the Ukrainian project planning and permitting procedures.	**CAR 21**	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
			Implementation regulations for EIA are included in the Ukrainian State Construction Standard DBN A.2.2.-1-2003. **CAR 21.** Please indicate whether is carried out the development of EIA for this project, if yes specify the number of EIA.		
1.3. Are transboundary environmental impacts considered in the analysis?	PDD	DR	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.	OK	OK
1.4. Are all regulations and sources clearly referenced?	PDD	DR	Yes. All regulations and sources clearly referenced.	OK	OK
F.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, provision of conclusions and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party					
2.1. Is viewpoint regarding significant environmental impacts of the project participants or the host Party indicated?	PDD	DR	In general, the project is environmentally beneficial because it causes less pollution than in the case of the baseline scenario.	OK	OK
2.2. Have conclusions and all references to the supporting documentation on the analysis of the	PDD	DR	Yes. All references and conclusions to the supporting	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
environmental impacts been indicated?			documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts have been indicated.		
G. Stakeholders' comments					
G.1. Information on stakeholders' comments on the project, as appropriate					
1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted and how?	PDD	DR	According to the modalities for the Determination of JI projects, the independent entity shall make publicly available the project design document and receive, within 30 days, comments from Parties, stakeholders and UNFCCC accredited non-governmental organizations and make them publicly available. TÜV Rheinland Group/TÜV Rheinland Ukraine published the project design documents on the website TÜV Rheinland Ukraine (http://www.tuv.com.ua) on 24/03/2012 and invited comments till 25/04/2012 and invited comments within by Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organizations.	OK	OK
1.1.1. Have appropriate media been used	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
to invite comments by local stakeholders?					
1.2. Is there a list of stakeholders from whom comments on the project have been received?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.3. Is the nature of comments provided?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.4. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	PDD	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Annexes					
Annex 1. Contact information on project participants					
1.1. Is the information provided in consistency with the one given under section A.3?	PDD	DR	The information provided in Annex 1 is in a consistency with the one given under Section A.3.	OK	OK
1.2. Are the mandatory fields for each organisation listed in section A.3. of the PDD filled notably organisation, name of contact person, street, city, postal code, country, telephone number(s) and fax number or e-mail address?	PDD	DR	Yes. The mandatory fields for each organization listed in section A.3. of the PDD are filled.	OK	OK
Annex 2. Baseline information					
2.1. Is a table containing the key elements of the baseline (including variables, parameters and data sources) provided?	PDD	DR	Baseline information is provided in Section B of this PDD.	OK	OK
2.2. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: is this information in consistency with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	PDD	DR	Baseline information provided in Annex 2, consistent with other sections of the PDD.	OK	OK
Annex 3. Monitoring plan					
3.1. Is the detail description of all key elements of	PDD	DR	All necessary information is	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.*	MoV**	COMMENTS	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
monitoring plan provided?			presented in Annex 3 of the PDD.		
3.2. Is the provided information on monitoring plan in consistency with data presented in section D of the PDD?	PDD	DR	The information on monitoring plan is in a consistency with the one given under Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK

Ref.* - gives reference to Category 1 and Category 2 documents (see section 3.1. of the Determination Report) where the answer to the checklist question or item is found.
MoV** - Explains how conformance with the checklist question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are document review (DR) or interview (I).

Table 3 - Resolution of Corrective Actions and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
FAR 01. The project has not received the approval from the participating Parties. Provide letters of approval to the AIE to complete determination process	Table 1, issue a checklist 1	Letters of approval will be given in preparing of the monitoring Report	**FAR 01** will be closed after the parties will provide letters of approval.
CAR 01. At p. 1 PDD correct words "in most cases have little power (0.6 - 1.2 m)."	Table 2, control question A.2.1.	The thickness of the layer, or "power" - a conventional term.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 02. Provide an explanation of who owns the heap and ERUs from project implementation. Provide appropriate supporting documents.	Table 2, control question A.2.1.1.	Given	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 03. Give to the AIE the contract with a beneficiation plant for the process of enriching rock mass from heap for the extracting of coal.	Table 2, control question A.2.1.1.	Given	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 04. Indicate in Section A.4 the information about processing factory LLC "PC" Donetsk coal fuel. ""	Table 2, control question A.4.1.4.1.	Specified - Donetsk region .. t.Dimitrov , Lenin Street - 12, 48 ° 18'08" north latitude, 37 ° 15'41" East longityde	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 05. Correct the length of crediting period, since October 2009 can not be counted as a full month. Make the	Table 2, control question A.4.3.1.	The duration of the crediting period of 39 months fixed for 38 months. Done appropriate recalculation of expected average annual	**The issue is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
appropriate transfer.		emission reductions over the crediting period	
CAR 06. Please provide information for doing business in Ukraine for 2009, when the developed project and make the appropriate conclusions.	Table 2, control question B.1.2.1.	Comparative data are taken from an interim report of the National Bank, which describes the five-year period, in this regard, data presented in the draft is the most modern.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 07. Please explain the difference between the values of "probability of waste heap burning" in comparative and this project.	Table 2, control question B.1.2.3.	. In this project are reporting data of analysis the fire danger of dumps in Donetsk Region by Research Institute "Respirator", Donetsk, 2012 Compared to the report of 2009, which is based on data comparable project "Dismantling of dumps for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gases to the atmosphere ", in this study examined a much more heaps of Donetsk Region (624), allowing more accurate values lead the probability of ignition heaps of Donetsk region.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 08. Please provide evidence that the coal obtained after enrichment has NCVcoal not less than the value specified in the PDD.	Table 2, control question B.1.6.	In benefication factory under terms the contract of processing it is reseived product - coal first class quality grade A (ISO 4083-2002) with a lower heat of combustion of fuel in working condition no less than 21.772 MJ / kg (5200 kcal / kg), exceeding the value of 21.6 kJ / kg, listed in the inventory for 1990-2010 was used in the project.	**The issue is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
CAR 09. Please provide AIO documents justifying investments and investment.	Table 2, control question B.2.4.3.	Supporting materials (calculated in the form of Excel) and the initial documentation provided to AIO.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 10. Exclude from the list of emission sources in the baseline and project scenario in Table 12 emissions attributable to the leakages	Table 2, control question B.3.1.	InTable 12 added the term "leakages", in which all leakages are moved.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 11. In Section B.3 exclude from the list of emissions in baseline and project scenario those, which are not involved in the calculation and are not taken into account.	Table 2, control question B.3.1.	Emissions, that are not taken into account, included in the list, because it had to explain their exclusion from the calculation. This was done reference on research that concludes their insignificance.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 12. Please, in Section B.3 emissions, referred to the leakages, describe by separate item.	Table 2, control question B.3.2.	Description of the sources was made by a separate item.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 13. Correct description of the sources of GHG emissions related to Scheme 9 and 10.	Table 2, control question B.3.4.	Description was corrected.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 14. Was specified the start date of the project - 23 October 2009, when began the dismantling of rock dump	Table 2, control question C.1.2.	"Introduction, construction or real action on the project" began with the beginning of the parse dump, because, according to the scheme of the project it was not the original investment,	**The issue is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
began. Please fix the date of commencement of the project in accordance with the Guidelines for Members on JI PDD form (version 04). "The date of commencement of the JI project is the date when the introduction, construction or real action of the project begins ."		capital investments, or preparatory works.	
CAR 15. Please provide the scheme and the principle of calculating the power consumption for benefication plant and provide the appropriate documents.	Table 2, control question D.1.5.	Scheme and the principle of calculating the power consumption for benefication plant was given in Annex 4 PDD.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 16. Please describe details that diesel fuel costs are included in the monitoring of project emissions.	Table 2, control question D.1.5.	In the monitoring of project emissions it is included diesel fuel costs while working of mining equipment on the dismantling of dump, the cost of diesel fuel when transporting rocks at benefication factory and the transport of end products on Buyers storage - Donetsk enterprise JSC "Oblpalyvo"	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 17. Correct link to the source data for the constants used for calculation in Table 13 (Section D).	Table 2, control question D.1.5.	Link corrected due National Inventory Report of Ukraine 1990- 2010 yy	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 18. Add in Section D.1 to the list of parameters that will be collected and recorded during the monitoring - Quantity of electricity consumed by an enrichment	Table 2, control question D.1.1.1.1.	This parameter can be calculated as the leakages, because the benefication process is not under legal control of project participants and not subject to monitoring.	**The issue is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
plant for the extraction of coal.			
CAR 19. Correct in Tables D.1.1.3, D.1.2.1 and D.1.3.1 information on the quantity of coal produced in mines in the baseline scenario, namely: - Method of data receiving; - Frequency of registration.	Table 2, control question D.1.1.1.2.	D.1.2.1 – direct monitoring is not filled, D.1.1.3 and D.1.3.1 - fixed: "To measure this parameter using commercial data. Quantity of coal confirmed by receipts and acts of acceptance from customers Frequency - monthly, Method - is measured. "	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 20. Correct the table D.1.3.1 information on the average electricity consumption data per tonne of enriched coal factory, namely: - Method of data receiving	Table 2, control question D.1.1.3.	Fixed, method to get data - calculated.	**The issue is closed.**
CAR 21. Please indicate whether is carried out the development of EIA for this project, if yes specify the number of EIA.	Table 2, control question F.1.2.	EIA "Assessment of the environmental impact of the projected construction of coal benefication process line class 3-13 mm, 0-3 mm, and the sorting and loading site" Industrial Company "Donetsk coal fuel".Developed by the Project Office "Ekoservis" in 2007 (AB number License112 756).	**The issue is closed.**
CL 01. Explain what dump is used for shipment of waste after enrichment.	Table 2, control question A.4.2.1.	Flat dump, which used at benefication plant in the technological cycle of enrichment.	**The issue is closed.**
CL 02. Please provide clarification of	Table 2, control	. There is, but not used because the	**The issue is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in tables 1, 2	Summary of project owner response	Determination team conclusion
whether there is on-site project transporting equipment (conveyor). The picture from satellite shows that at the site there is a transporting conveyor.	question D.4.2.1.3.	technology of dismantling does not provide sorting of rock mass. Participants refused to sort rocks on the site of dismantling.	
CL 03. Explain how coal obtained after enriching of rock mass separated from the coal obtained from other sources.	Table 2, control question D.1.1.1.1.	According to the agreement with the benefication plant, there is a standard calculation (agreement with the formula of calculation is attached) of coal grade A, which is obtained after enrichment. In each consignment of products there is given balance of processing, in which the input parameters (species), source (coal) and waste are specified. Thus, the problem of department of coal from other sources do not exist.	**The issue is closed.**
CL 04. Explain is the diesel consumption accounted for transporting waste to the flat dump and coal to consumers in monitoring project emissions.	Table 2, control question D.1.1.1.1.	To transport of waste on a flat dump, there are used conveyor belts that consume electricity. This power is taken into account when calculating the unit cost of electricity per tonne of coal received.	**The issue is closed.**