



# JI VERIFICATION REPORT FORM

(version 03.1)

(to be completed by an AIE requesting the publication of a determination pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines)

Accredited independent entity (AIE) submitting form Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

## JI activity

Reference number and title of JI activity 0104. Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine

Coordinating entity (*applicable to JI PoA only*) n/a

Parties involved in the JI activity Ukraine  
Netherlands

Type of JI activity:     large scale     small scale     LULUCF     PoA

## Emission reductions / Enhancements of removals

Monitoring period(s) (DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY) 01/04/2011 – 30/06/2011

Reference number of JPAs verified  N.A.  
(*applicable to JI PoA only*)

A sampling approach was used to verify the JI PoA  N.A.     Yes     No  
(*applicable to JI PoA only*)

Verification period (DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY)  N.A.  
(*applicable to JI PoA only*)

Verified reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources / enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent) 88229

The present verification is the first with regard to the JI activity  Yes     No

## Statements regarding requirements and possible changes

Please confirm that all requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements defined by the CMP or the JISC with regard to verifications pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines are met:

- Yes  
 No

### Verification opinion

Please provide a verification opinion (or a reference to the verification opinion in one of the documents attached), including a statement regarding materiality and level of assurance, in accordance with the Standard for applying the concept of materiality in verifications:

Verification opinion is stated in the Verification Report "Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine" rev 02 dated 05.09.2011

The project design was revised after the determination has been deemed final  Yes     No

<p>If yes, please <u>list all revisions</u> to the project design and express a determination opinion (or provide a reference to an attached document containing the required information)</p>	<p>The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision, which is inclusion one more furnace into the project which was not in the list of reconstructed project in the determined PDD version 3.9. The change during the project implementation constitutes modifying the order of furnaces reconstruction resulting in inclusion of furnaces not mentioned in the determined PDD into the energy efficiency program and postponing reconstruction of those furnaces from the list which have not been modernized yet. In the determined PDD ver.3.9 there are 26 furnaces that were supposed to be commissioned according to Subproject 1. Due to a severe recession and the worsening of the steel market the reconstruction of the furnaces was delayed. As of June 2010 only 21 of them were reconstructed. Also during the course of reconstruction the order of furnaces modernization was changed to meet the Enterprise's need to have efficient furnaces of a specific size available in order to serve the orders for EMSS products. Finally, in 2010 it was decided to channel the investment to reconstruction of the furnaces which were not originally included in the determined PDD while postponing the reconstruction of some of the furnaces that were listed in the determined PDD. The revision does not lead to the change of project location, emissions source, the baseline scenario, changes correspond to a JI specific approach, according to which project has been determined.</p> <p>The proposed change during the project implementation does not require any principal changes to procedures and calculation formulae used for baseline setting and monitoring for the project, therefore it is consistent with the JI specific approach applied in the determined PDD.</p>
<p>If project design was revised, <u>please confirm</u> that conditions defined by paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines are still met</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N.A.      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>If project design was revised, <u>please confirm</u> that the changes do not alter the original determination opinion</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N.A.      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>If project design was revised, <u>please confirm</u> that:</p> <p>(a) Physical location of the project has not changed</p> <p>(b) If emission sources have changed, they are reflected in an updated monitoring plan</p> <p>(c) Baseline scenario has not changed</p> <p>(d) Changes are consistent with JI specific approach or CDM methodology upon which the determination was prepared for the project</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> N.A.      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.      <input type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N.A.      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N.A.      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>The <u>monitoring plan</u> was revised</p> <p>If yes, please inform for which technologies and measures under each type of JPA the monitoring plan was revised (applicable to JI PoA only)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes      <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

The revisions to the monitoring plan improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected, compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans

Yes

No

N.A.

**List of documents attached to the verification report form**

Please attach relevant documents used in the verification process and check mark below accordingly

- Verification report**
- Written approvals by the Parties involved, if applicable**
- Other documents:**
  - Document listing all revisions to the project design, if applicable**
  - Determination that the revisions to the project design, if applicable, do not alter the original determination opinion and that the conditions defined by paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines are still met** (Verification Report "Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine" No. UKRAINE 0189/2010, revision 03 of 28/01/2011, Verification Report "Improvement of the Energy efficiency at Energomashspetsstal (EMSS), Kramatorsk, Ukraine" No. UKRAINE 0274/2011, revision 03 of 17/06/2011)
  - Revised monitoring plan, if applicable**
  - Determination that the revisions to the monitoring plan, if applicable, improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected, compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans**
- Sampling plan, if applicable (JI PoA only)**
- Any other documents** (please list): Ninth periodic JI monitoring report calculations, version 1.0 of 17/07/2011

The AIE herewith declares that undertaking the verification for the JI activity referred to above does not constitute a conflict of interest which is incompatible with the role of an AIE

Authorized officer signing for the AIE

Flavio Gomes



Date and signature

09/05/2011