JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION REPORT

FINAL

"Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera"
in
Bulgaria

Report N° 2011-DG-MD-95

Revision N° 1.2

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION REPORT

Project Title: Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera JSC	Country: Bulgaria	Estimated ERUs (tCO2e): 16,196 annual average
Client: Vinprom Peshtera JSC	Client contact: Mr. Yavor Yanev	
Report No.:2011-DG-MD-95	Revision: 1.2	Date of this report: 14/10/2011
Approved by (Final Report – DCI Director approval): Roberto Cavanna		Date of approval: 14/10/2011

Methodology

Number:	Version:	Title:	Scale: Small	SS(s): (1)
AMS-I.C	19 of 17/06/2011	"Thermal energy production with or without electricity"		

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA), commissioned by Vinprom Peshtera JSC has performed the determination of the project activity "Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera" in Bulgaria, with regard to the relevant UNFCCC requirements for JI activities.

The GHG emission reductions are calculated on the basis of the approved Methodology presented in the latest PDD, ver. 03 dated on 03/10/2011.

In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity "Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera", in "Bulgaria", as described in the PDD version 3 of 03/10/2011, meets all relevant requirements for JI activities and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity" version 19 of 17/06/2011.

Work carried out by:
Konstantin RACHEV
Viktor MILKOV

Work verified by (Final Report – CRT person responsible approval)
Paolo Teramo

Keywords:
Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, Joint Implementation, Determination

Abbreviations

BE	Baseline Emissions
PE	Project Emission
JI	Joint Implementation Mechanism
LE	Leakages
VER(s)	Verified Emission Reduction(s)
CH_4	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CAR	Corrective action request
CO_2	Carbon dioxide
CO_2e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CRT	Coordination and Technical Control Staff
DCI	Certification Division of RINA Services Spa
DFP	Designated Focal Point
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
ER	Emission Reductions
GHG(s)	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LoA	Letter of Approval
MoV	Means of Verification
MR	Monitoring Report
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
PP(s)	Project Participant(s)
Ref.	Document Reference
RINA	RINA Services Spa
SS(s)	Sectoral Scope(s)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
PIN	Project Idea Note
MOEW	Ministry of Environment and Water

RINA

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION REPORT

Table of Contents Page

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

Vinprom Peshtera JSC has commissioned RINA to carry out the determination of the "Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera" project in Bulgaria .
This report summarizes the findings of the determination of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

The determination serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The determination is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are determined in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Determination is a requirement for all JI projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of emissions reductions units (ERUs).
UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

1.2 Scope

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

Determination is not meant to provide any consultancy towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may have provided input for improvement of the project design.

2 METHODOLOGY

The overall determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report, was conducted using RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA) internal procedures.

The determination consisted of the following three phases:

- Document review;
- Follow-up actions;
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report.

The following sections outline each step in more detail.

2.1 Document Review

The PDD, version 01 of 20/06/2011,ver. 02 of 15/08/2011 and ver. 03 of 03/10/2011 /01/ and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form, Approved CDM methodology and Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Determination Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The following table lists the documentation that was reviewed during the determination.

/01/	PDD for project activity "Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera" in Bulgaria, version 01 of 20/06/2011,ver. 02 of 15/08/2011 and ver. 03 of 03/10/2011
/02/	AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19 of 17/06/2011
/03/	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 05.2

/04/	Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, ver. 02
/05/	Guidelines for users of the Joint Implementation project design document form for small-scale projects and the form for submission of bundled joint implementation small-scale projects, ver. 4
/06/	Provisions for Joint Implementation small-scale projects, ver. 3
/07/	Additional Information to Annex 2 - Project Emission Reduction Calculations PDD V.P.B.B-.xls.
/08/	Additional Information to Annex 3 - Monitoring Plan Tables PDD-V.P.B.B .xls.
/09/	Financial Statement of the Project
/10/	Construction Permit №55 dated on 23/06/2010 issued by Sadovo Municipality, Plovdiv district
/11/	EIA Decision № OVOS-201/24.08.2010 issued by MOEW
/12/	Heavy Metals Soil Pollution, present by the PP
/13/	Letter of Support by Energy Utilization Biomass Association (EUBA) dated on 10/06/2011
/14/	Notification Letter for an investment plan to MOEW dated on 01/04/2010
/15/	Letter from Regional Inspectorate for protection and control of public health – Plovdiv dated on 20/05/2010
/16/	Letter from Katunitsa village council, Sadovo Municipality, Plovdiv district dated on 30/06/2010
/17/	Letter from Sadovo Municipality, Plovdiv district dated on 29/06/2010
/18/	Publication in Maritsa newspaper concerning information of people of Sadovo Municipality for its investment plan dated on 26/06/2010
/19/	Letter of Support issued by the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Water, dated on 24 February 2011
/20/	Air emission measurement Protocol dated on 29/08/2011 issued by MOEW, Laboratory Pazardzik
/21/	Straw purchase agreements with company Maks dated on 01/08/2011; Tejka Mechanizaciq dated on 14/07/2011 and Vega dated on 08/07/2011
/22/	Tool for calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumptions, ver. 01

2.2 Follow-up actions

On 02/08/2011, RINA visited village Katunitsa, Sadovo Municipality, Plovdiv district to resolve questions and issues identified during the document review and to perform interviews with relevant stakeholders in the host country.

The key personnel interviewed and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below.

	Date	Name and Role	Organization	Topic
/a/	02/08/2011	Yavor Yanev – Technical Manager	Vinprom Peshtera JSC	JI project details; Biomass production and technical details; JI project financial aspects; JI project Environmental details and stakeholder issues
/b/	02/08/2011	Stefan Manev – Executive Director, JI consultant	CoGen Engineering LTD	JI project details and JI project financial aspects;
/c/	02/08/2011	Georgi Galabov – new projects engineer	Vinprom Peshtera JSC	Biomass production and technical details

2.3 Resolution of outstanding issues

The objective of this phase of the determination is to resolve any outstanding issues which need to be clarified for RINA's positive conclusion on the project design.

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

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

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

- A corrective action request (CAR) is raised if the following occurs:

mistake in the published PDD that is not in accordance with the (technical) process used for the project or relevant JI project requirement or that shows any other logical flaw

- A clarification request (CL) is raised if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable JI requirements have been met.
- A forward action request (FAR) is raised during determination to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity.

2.4 Internal quality control

The Final Determination Report before being submitted to the client was subjected to an independent internal technical review to confirm that all determination activities had been completed according to the pertinent RINA instructions.

The technical review was performed by a technical reviewer(s) qualified in accordance with RINA's qualification scheme for JI determination and verification.

2.5 Determination team and the technical reviewer(s)

The determination team and the technical reviewers consist of the following personnel:

Role	Last Name	First Name	Country
Team Leader JI	RACHEV	Konstantin	Bulgaria
JI Determiner	MILKOV	Viktor	Bulgaria
Technical Reviewer 1	SEVERINO	Laura	Italy
Technical Reviewer 2	TERAMO	Paolo	Italy

3 DETERMINATION FINDINGS

The findings of the determination related to the project, as described in the PDD version 01 of 20/06/2011, ver. 02 of 15/08/2011 and ver. 03 of 03/10/2011 /01/, are stated in the following sections.

The determination requirements, the means of determination and the results from determining the identified criteria are documented in more detail in the determination protocol in Appendix A.

3.1 Approvals (19-20)

A Letter of Support issued by the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Water has been received, dated 24 February 2011 /19/. After positive determination and approval by MOEW the project will receive a Letter of Approval.

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA) has received this Letter from the project participants and does not doubt its authenticity.
RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA) considers the Letter is in accordance with paragraphs 19 - 20 of the DVM.

3.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The participation for 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.

3.3 Project design

Up to the moment, the steam used for technological purposes in Katunitsa village Distillery is produced by two steam boilers burning fossil fuel (natural gas). In order to achieve higher productivity of spirit and to reduce energy costs in the final product, Vinprom Peshtera has decided to implement project for construction of biomass waste burning steam boiler. The Project comprises implementation and operation of steam boiler for biomass burning /mainly straw/. The boiler will be located in the reconstructed for this purpose building that is a part of existing workshop for CO_2 liquefaction. The inlet fuel power of the boiler is 11.2 MWt or 2.7 t/h of straw. The boiler can operate also with different biomass fuels as wood chips and other biomass residues. The produced steam will be used entirely for the plant technological purposes. The project construction has started in 2010 when all needed permissions had been obtained. During the on-site visit of the company held on 02/08/2011 the determination team visited the project site to inspect the current developments and the equipment installation progress. The team found out that the boiler system, combustion chamber, straw feeding devices and all auxiliary equipment has been erected inside the boiler room and ready for operation. Single equipment tests have been performed successfully. 72-hours commissioning tests of the whole installation will be performed in a week time. The tests will be supervised by manufacturer's representative who was present in the time of the site visit. The installation of the monitoring equipment, i.e. outlet process steam meters, inlet feed water meters and electricity consumption meters is pending. The equipment is available on site and will be installed before starting of the commercial operation. All work parameters will be monitored by plant operators on a computerized system with software supplied by the manufacturer of the plant, the Danish company Weiss. The team concludes that despite certain delay in the implementation of the project it will be successfully started.

3.4 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD ver. 1 dated on 20/06/2011 and amended ver. 02 dated on 15/08/2011 and ver. 03 dated on 03/10/2011 explicitly indicates that the PP uses a baseline and monitoring Methodology approved by the CDM Executive Board in its totality (AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19 of 17/06/2011 /02/).

The PDD ver. 1 dated on 20/06/2011 and amended ver. 2 dated on 15/08/2011 and ver. 03 dated on 03/10/2011 uses Methodology AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19 of 17/06/2011 /02/, which is the most recent determined version when the PDD was submitted for publication on the UNFCCC JI website, allowing for a grace period of two months.

The PDD provides a description of why the referenced approved CDM Methodology is applicable to the project.

Applicability condition:

- The project is not a cogeneration unit. The project will produce steam for own use only.
- Emission reductions from a biomass cogeneration system can accrue from one of the following activities: thermal energy (steam) production for on-site consumption
- The total installed/rated thermal energy generation capacity of the project equipment is less than 45 MW thermal.
- This project is not a co-fired system
- The following capacity limits apply for biomass cogeneration units: less than 45 MW thermal and the maximal limit is of 15 MW(e)
- The capacity limits specified in the above paragraphs are applied to new facilities

- The Project activity does not seek to retrofit or modify an existing facility
- The project is a new facility and it's complying with the related and relevant requirements in the General Guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies.
- The project does not use solid biomass fuel
- The project does not recover and utilize biogas
- The project is not Charcoal based biomass energy generation

RINA hereby confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring Methodology AMS-I.C, "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19 of 17/06/2011 /02/ is previously approved by the CDM Executive Board, and is applicable to the project activity, which, complies with all the applicability conditions therein.

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

3.5 Additionality (27-31)

The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring Methodology used, as per items above.

The PDD provides a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM Methodology is applicable to the project, as per items above.

All explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality are made in accordance with the selected Methodology.

Additionality of the project is proven using the CDM "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" Ver.05.2/3/ as approved by the CDM Executive Board. Five alternatives to the project activity consistent with current laws and regulations in the PDD are identified. The realization of the project is not required by the Bulgarian legislation and it is not subject to special Host country decision. The defined alternatives are fully in consistency with the mandatory Host country laws and regulations. In the Step 2 "Investment analysis" the PP proved that the proposed project activity, without the additional revenues from the sale of the ERUs is unlikely to be economically and financially attractive to investors. For this project activity Barrier analysis is also applied. Despite of the existing policies and regulations designed to promote development of energy production from renewable sources, the proposed project activity is not attractive for lenders/investors due to perceived risks/barriers associated to energy production from straw biomass in Bulgaria. As it is mentioned in the PDD there are strong technological barriers that prevent wide usage of straw as a fuel in production of energy. Known difficulties in operation of such plants as advanced technology to keep parameters of the straw combustion process in foreseen limits in combination with hard logistics, force the investors to search for other technological solutions to supply their thermal needs. In Step 4 Common practice analysis is applied. Currently there are few investment projects, based on straw combustion, but none of these projects is completed and operational yet.
Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the steps mentioned above. The project is additional.

3.6 Project boundary (32-33)

RINA determined the project boundary by:
a) Detail the documentation assessed (e.g., a commissioning report and implementation plan).
b) Describe observations during any site visit undertaken (i.e., observations of the physical site or equipment used in the process).
The project boundary is defined like physical and geographical site of the project activities, and the spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project boiler house, straw collecting zone (the transportation

roundtrip is below 200 km), distillery installation that consumes the produced heat and electricity energy system of Bulgaria, from where the boiler auxiliary needs are supplied.
Based on the above assessment, RINA hereby confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity.

3.7 Crediting period (34)

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began, and the starting date is 01/04/2010, which is after the beginning of 2000.
The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 15 years and 0 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 01 year and 07 months, and its starting date as 01/06/2011, which is on the date the first emission reductions are generated by the project.

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

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

3.8 Monitoring plan (35-39)

The PDD, in its monitoring plan section, explicitly indicates that Approved CDM Methodology approach was selected.

The PDD provides the title, reference number and version of the baseline and monitoring Methodology used, as per items above.

The PDD provides a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project, as per items above.

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD are made in accordance with the selected Methodology - AMS-I.C “Thermal energy production with or without electricity”, ver. 19 of 17/06/2011 /02/.

The monitoring plan is established appropriately as a result.

3.9 Leakage (40-41)

The leakage and the procedure for its estimation are defined in accordance with the Approved CDM Methodology - AMS-I.C “Thermal energy production with or without electricity”, ver. 19 of 17/06/2011 /02/.

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

The estimation of emission reductions is made in accordance with the approved CDM Methodology AMS-I.C “Thermal energy production with or without electricity”, ver. 19 of 17/06/2011 /02/.

The estimates referred to above are given:

(a) On a continuously and monthly basis;

(b) From 01/06/2011 to 31/12/2012, covering the whole crediting period;

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

(d) For each GHG gas, this is only CO_2

(e) In tonnes of CO_2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol;

The formulae used for calculating the estimates referred above, are consistent throughout the PDD and they are:

Project emissions include CO2 emissions from electricity consumption by the project activity
*PEy = ECPJy * (1+TDLgrid,y/100) * EFgrid,CM ,y.*

Baseline emissions for heat production
*BEt,y = (EGt,y /*h *t,y) * EFNG*
EGt,y = EGtgo,y - EGtFw,y

Emission reductions are calculated as follows
ERy = BEt,y - PEy – Ley

The estimates referred to above are consistent throughout the PDD.

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

3.11 Environmental impacts (48)

The PDD lists and attaches documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party, such as Notification Letter for an investment plan to MOEW dated on 01/04/2010 /14/ and the response by the MOEW documented as EIA decision № OVOS-201/24.08.2010 issued by MOEW /11/, stated that no EIA is required for this kind of investment.

The PDD provides conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party.
#

3.12 Stakeholder consultation (49)

The PDD provides information that Vinprom Peshtera JSC has submitted information to the public for intentions for project idea implementation in various ways: firstly was informed the surrounding authorities as Regional Inspectorate for protection and control of public health – Plovdiv; Katunitsa village; Sadovo Municipality, Plovdiv district, secondly was informed the Energy Utilization Biomass Association (EUBA) and thirdly a press publication was made in Maritsa newspaper. As a result of this notification all of them have issued official Letters which was sent to the Vinprom Peshtera JSC (please refer to /13/; /15/; /16/; /17/; /18/. As a result no stakeholder's comments on the project have been received.

The project activity PDD had been published for stakeholders consultations on RINA`s website on 25 July 2011.

3.13 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)

The PDD appropriately specifies and justifies the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under:
Renewable energy projects with a maximum output capacity of up to 15 megawatts (MW) of JI SSC projects as defined in "Provisions for Joint Implementation small-scale projects" developed by the JISC, ver. 03.
The SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled component of a large project by explaining that there is no a JI (SSC) project with a publicly available determination in accordance with the JI guidelines:

(a) Which has the same project participants; and

(b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and

(c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and

(d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point.

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

Not applicable

3.15 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)

Not applicable

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

No comments, as per JI Guidelines during stakeholder consultation were received.

5 DETERMINATION OPINION

RINA Services Spa (RINA) has performed determination of the project activity "Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera" in Bulgaria, with regard to the relevant requirements for JI activities.
The review of the project design document ver.1 dated on 20/06/2011and amended version 02 dated on 15/08/2011 and ver. 03 dated on 03/10/2011 and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided RINA with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of the stated criteria.
The monitoring plan provides for the monitoring of the project's emission reductions. The monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design and it is RINA's opinion that the project participants are able to implement the monitoring plan.
In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity "Biomass Steam Boiler at Vinprom Peshtera" in Bulgaria, as described in last version of the PDD, version 03 of 03/10/2011, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and all relevant host Party criteria.

APPENDIX A:
DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

TABLE 1 REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
PDD				
12-13	Do the PDD and any supporting documentation comply with the applicable requirements?	The PP uses the correct JI PDD form for Small-Scale Projects, ver. 01.1. The documented PDD is reliable. All required data, records and information at the stage of determination are available. All annexes are available and reliable. Confidential information listed in Annex 5 was received and treated correspondingly. Please also refer to the documented CARs and CLs. Deviation between the given installed power in EIA decision and in the PDD is still not official resolved, that is documented as FAR and should be checked at a later stage.	~~FAR 1~~ ~~CL 9~~	OK
Description of the project				
-	Is the purpose of the project included with a concise, summarizing explanation (max. 1-2 pages) of the: a) Situation existing prior to the starting date of the project; b) Baseline scenario; and c) Project scenario (expected outcome, including a technical description)?	The purpose and description as well as technical description of the project is provided. Baseline and project scenario is also described.		OK
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	The history of the project and Vinprom Peshtera plant throughout the PDD are presented.		OK
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	The host party is Bulgaria.		OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Region Plovdiv		OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Katunitsa village, Sadovo Municipality		OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	The identification and physical location in the PDD is well shown.		OK
Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
-	Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	The Biomass boiler as well as his main parts is well documented. All technical parameters are also described. However clarification requests are documented.	~~CL 1~~ ~~CL 8~~	OK
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	Yes, the PDD provide sufficient information concerning how an anthropogenic GHG emission reduction is achieved.		OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	Yes, the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period is provided. However a CL is documented.	~~CL 2~~	OK
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO2e?	Yes, estimate annual reduction for the chosen crediting period in tCO2e is provided. However CLs are documented.	~~CL 3~~ ~~CL 4~~	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Yes, the information is presented in the table format.		OK
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	The length of the crediting period is not well provided in the PDD. Please refer to CL 3 and CL 4.		OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO2 equivalent provided?	Yes, all estimate reductions for the chosen credit period in tCO2e are provided.		OK
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as “Parties involved” in the PDD provided written project approvals?	Written Letter of Support by Republic of Bulgaria is received. The Letter of Support from the Ministry of Environment and Water was issued on 24 February 2011 /19/.		OK
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a “Party involved”?	Yes, the required information is provided in point A.3. Republic of Bulgaria is the Host Party.		OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	For this project activity a Letter of Support issued by Republic of Bulgaria is received. The Letter of Support by the Ministry of Environment and Water was issued on 24 February 2011 /19/. After determination process and project approval by the MOEW the PP will receive a Letter of Approval. CLs are documented.	~~CL 6~~ ~~CL 7~~	OK
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, the Letter of Support is unconditional.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project participants				
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved				
21	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	Yes, project participants and parties involved in the PDD, section A.3 are listed. However a CL is documented	~~CL 5~~	OK
21	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Yes, contact information is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.		OK
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: − A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity? Or − Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?	Yes, the project participant (Vinprom Peshtera) is authorized by the Host party which is the Ministry of Environment and Water. The Ministry had issued a Letter of Support /19/. After successful determination and approval of the project from MOEW the PP will receive a Letter of Approval.		OK
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	The PDD gives information that the PP uses Approved CDM methodology approach. A discrepancy was documented.	~~CAR 1~~	OK
JI specific approach				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	N/A		
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established: (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one? (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? − Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account? I In a transparent manner with regard to the	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, date sources and key factors? (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions? I In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure? (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate?			
24	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements or combinations together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 23 above?	N/A		
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	N/A		
Approved CDM methodology approach				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Yes, the PP uses approved CDM Methodology AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19.		OK
26 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Yes this is the latest version of the approved Methodology.		OK
26 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Yes, the applicability conditions in the PDD are described. The chosen Methodology comprises renewable energy technologies that supply industrial facilities with thermal energy that displaces fossil fuel use. However a CL is documented.	~~CL 10~~	OK
26 I	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses	Yes, all explanations and analyses in the PDD are well		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	pertaining to the baseline in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	documented.		
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a result?	Yes, the baseline is appropriately described. See also documented CLs and CARs.		OK
Additionality				
JI specific approach				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used? (a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions or enhancements of removals; (b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that RINA has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; I Application of the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board".	N/A		
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	N/A		
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	N/A		
29 I	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	N/A		
30	If the approach 28 I is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	method?			
Approved CDM methodology approach				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Yes, the PP uses approved CDM Methodology AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19.		OK
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Yes, the applicability conditions in the PDD are described. The chosen Methodology comprises renewable energy technologies that supply industrial facilities with thermal energy that displaces fossil fuel use. Please also refer to CL 10		OK
31 l	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?	Yes, the explanations and analysis concerning the additionality in the PDD are documented. In addition to that two CLs are documented.	~~CL 11~~ ~~CL 12~~	OK
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Yes, the project is additional, please also refer to the documented CARs and CLs.		OK
31 l	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	Yes, the additionality is appropriately demonstrated, please also refer to the documented CARs and CLs.		OK
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects)				
JI specific approach				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (12) Under the control of the project participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	N/A		
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?	N/A		
32 l	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?	N/A		
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	appropriately justified?			
Approved CDM methodology approach				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	The project boundary is descried in the PDD with some discrepancies.	~~CAR 2~~ ~~CL 13~~	OK
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	The project starting date is documented in the PDD in point C.1. The starting date of the project is the date of official notification to MOEW for an investment intention which is 01/04/2010.		OK
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes, the starting date is after the beginning of 2000.		OK
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	No, the PP does not present the information in years and months which is documented as CAR. A CL is also documented.	~~CAR 3~~ ~~CL 14~~	OK
34 l	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	No, the PP does not present the information in years and months which is documented as CAR.	~~CAR 4~~	OK
34 l	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	The starting date of the crediting period is before the first emission reduction generated by the project.		OK
34 (d)	Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?	Yes, the information is provided in the PDD in section C.		OK
34 (d)	If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval? Are the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012?	Yes, the information is provided in the PDD in relevant sections. The ERUs are estimated for applicable crediting period up to 2012 and from 2013 to 2020. If the crediting period extends beyond 2012 it is not correctly written that this is subject to the host party approval, documented as CL 7.		OK
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	Yes, the PP uses Approved CDM methodology approach.		OK
JI specific approach				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe: − All relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored? − The period in which they will be monitored? − All decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance?	N/A		
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?	N/A		
36 (b)	If default values are used: − Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? − Do the default values originate from recognized sources? − Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels? − Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?	N/A		
36 (b) (i)	For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?	N/A		
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, − Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? − Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	N/A		
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	N/A		
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	N/A		
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?			
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	N/A		
36 l	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring"?	N/A		
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (12) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination? (iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?	N/A		
36 l	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	N/A		
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?	N/A		
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	N/A		
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	N/A		
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	N/A		
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	N/A		
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	N/A		
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline ensured?	N/A		
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	N/A		
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	N/A		
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	N/A		
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	N/A		
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	N/A		
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals provided?	N/A		
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project? Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	standard can be found?			
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	N/A		
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available upon request?	N/A		
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	N/A		
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type? If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?	N/A		
36 (l)	Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources but not including data that are calculated with equations?	N/A		
36 (m)	Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	N/A		
37	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?	N/A		
Approved CDM methodology approach				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Yes, the PP uses approved CDM Methodology AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19.		OK
38 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Yes, the approved CDM methodology is the most recent version.		OK
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Yes, the applicability conditions are provided in the PDD. The project will produce thermal energy for on-site consumption.		OK
38 l	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Yes, all explanations and analysis are documented as per the approved methodology.		OK
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	The monitoring plan is well established and documented except with some discrepancies.	~~CL 15 17~~ ~~CAR 5~~ ~~CAR 9~~	OK
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach				
39	If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period: (a) Is the underlying project composed of clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently? (b) Can monitoring be performed independently for each of these components (i.e. the data/parameters monitored for one component are not dependent on/effect data/parameters to be monitored for another component)? l Does the monitoring plan ensure that monitoring is performed for all components and that in these cases all the requirements of the JI guidelines and further guidance by the JISC regarding monitoring are met? (d) Does the monitoring plan explicitly provide	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?			
Leakage				
JI specific approach				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	No leakage emissions pertain to this project. Please also refer to project boundary and corresponding discrepancies.		OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	No leakage emissions pertain to this project. Please also refer to project boundary and corresponding discrepancies.		OK
Approved CDM methodology approach				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	No leakage emissions pertain to this JI project as per the approved Methodology (they are assessed as negligible). Please also refer to project boundary and corresponding discrepancies.		OK
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
JI specific approach				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions	N/A		
43	If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? I Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary)? (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	N/A		
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? I Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?			
45	For both approaches in 42 (a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given: (i) On a periodic basis? (ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? (iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? (iv) For each GHG? (v) In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? (b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? I For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate? (d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent? I Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice? (f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner? (g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (h) Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
46	If the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions or net removals calculation?	N/A		
Approved CDM methodology approach				
47 (a)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	The PP uses approved CDM Methodology AMS-I.C "Thermal energy production with or without electricity", ver. 19. The estimations are done as per it.		OK
47 (b)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented in the PDD: − On a periodic basis? − At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? − On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? − For each GHG? − In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? − Are the formula used for calculating the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? − Are the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? − Is the annual average of estimated emission	The estimations of the CO_2 equivalent will be done on a periodic basis during the crediting period. All required formulae throughout the PDD are documented and numbered. However some discrepancies are documented.	~~CAR 6~~ ~~CAR 7~~ ~~CAR 8~~	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?	No environmental impact assessment is requested for this JI project from the host party competent authority. This is documented in an official Letter from MOEW dated on 24/08/2010 /11/. A CL is documented.	~~CL 18~~	OK
48 (b)	If the analysis in 48 (a) indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?	No significant environmental impact is expected.		OK
Stakeholder consultation				
49	If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide: (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? I A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	During stakeholders consultations the following authorities were consulted: Energy Utilization Biomass Association /13/; Regional inspectorate for protection and control of public health – Plovdiv /15/; Katunitsa village council /16/; Sadovo municipality /17/ and publication in Maritsa newspaper /18/. As a result no comments were received. No comments were received during the time of uploading the PDD in RINA web site.		OK
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)				
50	Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under: (12) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in .Provisions for	The PDD appropriately specifies and justifies the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under: Renewable energy projects with a maximum output capacity of up to 15 megawatts (MW) of JI SSC projects as defined in “Provisions for Joint Implementation small-scale projects” developed by the JISC, ver. 03.		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	joint implementation small-scale projects.? If the project contains more than one JI SSC project type component, does each component meet the relevant threshold criterion? (b) One of the SSC project categories defined in the most recent version of appendix B of annex II to decision 4/CMP.1, or an additional project category approved by the JISC in accordance with the relevant provision in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects"?			
51	Does the SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled component of a large project by explaining that there does not exist a JI (SSC) project with a publicly available determination in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines: (a) Which has the same project participants; and (b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and I Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and (d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point?	The SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled project. This is also verified during the on-site visit of the project.		OK
Applicable to bundled JI SSC project – NOT APPLICABLE				
52 (a)	Do all projects in the bundle: (12) Have the same crediting period? (ii) Comply with the provisions for JI SSC projects defined in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects", in particular the thresholds referred to in 50 (a)	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	above? (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.)?			
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?	N/A		
52 l	Has RINA received (from the project participants): (12) Information on the bundle using the form developed by the JISC (F-JI-SSCBUNDLE)? (ii) A written statement signed by all project participants indicating that they agree that their individual projects are part of the bundle and nominating one project participant to represent all project participants in communicating with the JISC? (iii) Indication by the Parties involved that they are aware of the bundle in their project approvals referred to in 19 above?	N/A		
53	If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category? (b) Apply the same technology or measure? l Located in the territory of the same host Party?	N/A		
54	If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (12) Have SSC PDDs been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle? (b) Does each SSC PDD contain a single JI SCC project in the bundle?	N/A		
55	If the projects in the bundle use the same baseline, does the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provide	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle?			
56	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan? (a) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects; (b) By preparing an overall monitoring plan including a proposal of monitoring of performance of the constituent projects on a sample basis, as appropriate.	N/A		
56 (b)	If the approach 57 (b) above is used, (12)Are all the JI SSC projects located in the territory of the same host Party? (ii) Do all the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category? (iii) Do all the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure? (iv) Does the overall monitoring plan reflect good monitoring practice appropriate to the bundled JI SSC projects and provide for collection and archiving of the data needed to calculate the emission reductions achieved by the bundled projects?	N/A		
Applicable to all JI SSC projects				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	No leakage emissions pertain to this project. Please also refer to project boundary and corresponding discrepancies.		OK
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment) – NOT APPLICABLE				
58	Does the PDD appropriately specify how the LULUCF project conforms to: (a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying good practice guidance for LULUCF as decided by the CMP, as appropriate? (b) In the case of afforestation, reforestation	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	and/or forest management projects, the definition of "forest" selected by the host Party, which specifies: (i) A single minimum tree crown cover value (between 10 and 30 per cent)? And (ii) A single minimum land area value (between 0.05 and 1 hectare)? And (iii) A single minimum tree height value (between 2 and 5 metres)?			
JI specific approach – NOT APPLICABLE				
59	Baseline setting – in addition to 22-26 above Does the PDD provide an explanation how the baseline chosen: − Takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC? − Ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?	N/A		
60	Project boundary – alternative to 32-33 (a) Does the project boundary geographically delineate the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants? (a) If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land, (i) Does each discrete area of land have a unique geographical identification? (ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area? (ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land? (b) Does the project boundary encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are: (i) Under the control of the project participants; (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and (iii) Significant?	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	I Does the project boundary account for all changes in the following carbon pools: − Above-ground biomass; − Below-ground biomass; − Litter; − Dead wood; and − Soil organic carbon? I Does the PDD provide: (12) The information of which carbon pools are selected? (ii) If one or more carbon pools are not selected, transparent and verifiable information that indicates, based on conservative assumptions, that the pool is not a source? (d) Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria in (b) above?			
61 (a)	Project boundary – alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included appropriately described and justified in the PDD?	N/A		
61 (b)	Project boundary – alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are all gases and sources/sinks included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline or the LULUCF project appropriately justified?	N/A		
62	Monitoring plan – in addition to 35-39 Does the PDD provide an appropriate description of the sampling design that will be used for the calculation of the net anthropogenic removals by sinks occurring within the project boundary in the project scenario and, in case the baseline is monitored, in the baseline scenario, including, inter alia, stratification, determination of number of plots and plot distribution etc.?	N/A		
63	Does the PDD take into account only the	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?			
Approved CDM methodology approach – NOT APPLICABLE				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	N/A		
64 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	N/A		
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	N/A		
64 l	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	N/A		
64 (d)	Are the baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage established appropriately as a result?	N/A		
Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment) – NOT APPLICABLE				
66	Does the PDD include: (a) A description of the policy or goal that the JI PoA seeks to promote? (b) A geographical boundary for the JI PoA (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all JPAs included in the JI PoA will be implemented? l A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including: − The maintenance of records for each JPA?	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)? − Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA? (d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used? l The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA?			
67	*Project approvals by Parties involved – additional to 19-20* Are all Parties partly or entirely within the geographical boundary for the JI PoA listed as "Parties involved" and indicated as host Parties in the PDD?	N/A		
68	*Authorization of project participants by Parties involved – additional to 21* Is the coordinating entity presented in the PDD authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA?	N/A		
69	*Baseline setting – additional to 22-26* Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?	N/A		
70	*Additionality – additional to 27-31* Does the PDD indicate at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated? (a) For the JI PoA (b) For each type of JPA	N/A		
71	*Crediting period – additional to 34* Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?	N/A		
72	*Monitoring plan – additional to 35-39* Is the monitoring plan established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA?	N/A		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?	N/A		
73	For each real JPA listed, does the PDD provide the information of: (a) Name and brief summary of the JPA? (b) The type of JPA? I A geographical reference or other means of identification? (d) The name and contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the JPA? I The host Party(ies)? (f) The starting date of the JPA? (g) The length of the crediting period of the JPA? (h) Confirmation that the JPA meets all the eligibility requirements for its type, including a description of how these requirements are met? (i) Confirmation that the JPA has not been determined as a single JI project or determined under a different JI PoA?	N/A		

TABLE 2 RESOLUTION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

Clarifications and corrective action requests	Ref. to table 1	Response by project participants	Determination team conclusion
Clarification request № 1 Please include the implementation schedule (doc 5.6 from Annex 5) in p. A.4.3 and Project Investment Analysis (doc 5.4 from Annex 5) of the project in the content of the PDD. Please exclude them from Annex 5.	12-13	Yes, the Implementation plan of the project is moved from Annex 5.6 to A.4.3 page 9 in PDD. Document Annex 5.4 is with confidential information and can't be moved to PDD. Instead this on page 60 is added the next remark: ***Remark:*** 1. The documents in Annex 5 are and will be presented to all official authorities that have an attitude to the present PDD (Validation and Verification Companies, Host Country Authorities /MOEW etc./, UNFCCC and etc.). 2. The documents will be available on request of any stakeholder , with exception of the documents No. 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.9 that have a confidential character. Decision on presenting of these documents will be taken from Vinprom Peshtera.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.

Clarification request № 2 Please provide total reduction estimation in p. A.4.4	12-13	See CL 3. In addition, information for total reduction estimation of the project over first and second crediting period was included.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 3 Table A.4.3.1.1 "Total emission reductions in the period to 2012"- Table shall not be altered. The caption of the table shall be exactly as given in the form. The length of the crediting period is put wrongly as 5 years. The length of the crediting period is registered from the start of the project activity till the end of 2012. Show the length of the crediting period in years and months. Please estimate the average annual emission reduction respectively (p. A.4.4.1).	12-13	Table A.4.4.1.1 was corrected to be in line with JI SSC PDD form. All values were corrected accordingly.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 4 The length of the post-Kyoto crediting period is put wrongly as 5 years. Please correct (table A.4.3.1.2 – p. A.4.4.1)	12-13	Table A.4.4.1.2 was corrected to be in line with JI SSC PDD form. All values were corrected accordingly.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 5 Please clarify is the company CoGen Engineering Ltd is project participant throughout the hole text.	12-13	Clarifications were added on pages 4, 11, 25 and in Annex I.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 6 Please clarify that the LoA will be received from MoEW at a later stage after positive determination and project approval by MOEW (p.A.5).	12-13	Clarification was added on page 11	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 7 Please clarify that extension of the Kyoto Protocol is subject to the Host country approval in sections A.4.4.1; C.3 and E.6	12-13	Clarifications were added on pages 10, 24 and 37.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.

Clarification request № 8 Please clarify in the PDD in point A.2 that during the period when the straw boiler is out of operation will be strictly register and no emission reductions will be claimed for that period.	12-13	Clarification was added on page 3. In fact, the steam flow meter of the straw boiler measures only its output. In case of straw boiler is not operational, for this period the readings of its steam meter as per the "Journal of the Measurement Device" will be 0, the steam will be supplied by NG boilers and will be counted by their steam meters. It would not be possible to claim for emission reductions for this period.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 9 Please insert the version number of the used approved Methodology AMS-I.C (A.4.2). The written methodology is not the latest version.	12-13	Actually, the AMS-I.C Version 19 was used in the PDD (See Section B, page 12). In Section A.4.2. a previous version was wrongly referenced. This section now is corrected accordingly.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 10 B.1. Step 1: Please provide information about the SSC methodology used (title, reference No and version). Describe why it is applicable. Please provide all explanations, descriptions and analysis pertaining to the baseline in accordance with the approved methodology selected.	26 (b)	The PDD section B.1 was revised in accordance to the request. Applicability of the project to the SSC methodology was moved from B.2 to B.1 and also revised.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 11 Step 2, table with parameters – please describe proper equipment for measuring of the thermal energy at the outlet. Steam flow meter alone is not sufficient for that purpose.	31 (l)	Additional explanations were added in the table with parameters on page 14 and also on page 29.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 12 B.2. Step 1b – Please identify clearly realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) to the project activity that are in compliance with mandatory legislation as an outcome of Step 1b.	31 (l)	In Section B.2. Step 1b a clear identification of the realistic and credible alternatives was added.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 13 There is not used the latest version of the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring". Please clarify.	33	Section B.3 is revised to correspond to the latest version of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" Version 2.0.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.

Clarification request № 14 Please clarify the expected lifetime of the project (15 or 20 years) throughout the whole document.	34 (b)	Section C.2 is revised to conform to the expected lifetime of the straw boiler of 15 years.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 15 Please clarify the version number of used "Tool for calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumptions" in section D (page 25) and section E (page 34).	38 (d)	The Tool has Version 01. The wrong reference in the Section E is corrected.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 16 Please describe in the Monitoring plan for all data sources, what procedures should be followed if expected data are unavailable (section D)?	38 (d)	In general, the procedures in case of data missing or inconsistency are described in Section D2.1.1 (QA/QC procedures) and also in Ann.5 Doc.5.3. "Journal of the Measurement Device" (spreadsheet "Procedures in case of replacing"). Normally, the exact procedures shall be established on a later stage when the installation is commissioned and the exact measurement devices with their serial numbers and QA/QC procedures are in place. These detailed procedures should be presented in the first Monitoring Report at the next stage of the project.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Clarification request № 17 The calibration procedure of used monitoring equipment (№1 to №3) is not presented in the Monitoring plan. Please specify the period of archiving of the monitoring data and calibration protocols of used monitoring devices as per the Host country requirements.	38 (d)	See CL 16. The detailed calibration procedures and protocols should be presented in the first Monitoring Report at the next stage of the project. The period for archiving is set to 2 years after the end of the crediting period as per the requirement of "Guidance on criteria for Baseline setting and Monitoring" Ver.02. This term is pointed in Section D.1 Step 2 Page 26 of PDD. The information for calibration intervals as per the Host country requirements is added in Annex 3 of PDD – page 60.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.

Clarification request № 18 Please clarify in which annex the EIA decision in the PDD can be seen?	48 (a)	EIA Decision can be found in Annex 5, Doc.5.7. All references are corrected accordingly.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CL.
Corrective action request № 1 There is not followed the required steps from the latest version of the "Guidelines for users of the JI SSC PDD form", point B.1 – Step 1.	22	Section B.1 is revised. See CL 10 for details.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 2 Please include in the project boundary the 200 km zone (distance) concerning leakage emissions.	33	Section B.3 is revised.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 3 Please present the information in years and months (C.2).	34 (b)	Section C.2 is revised.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 4 Please correctly state the length of the crediting period in years and months (C.3).	34 (l)	Section C.3 is corrected.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 5 The form used is altered in Section D.2. Please follow the structure of the JI PDD Form - Version 01.1. Please erase the sub items from section D.2	38 (d)	Section D.2 is revised according to the recommendations.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 6 Please follow the requirements of the Guidelines for Users of the Joint Implementation Project Design Document Form for Small-scale projects. Provide estimates of the emissions in Section E.1	47 (b)	Section E.1 is revised according to the recommendations.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.

Corrective action request № 7 Please follow the requirements of the Guidelines for Users of the JI PDD Form for Small-scale projects. Provide estimates of the emissions in Section E.4	47 (b)	Section E.4 is revised according to the recommendations.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 8 Please provide a table with values obtained when applying formulae in the format required by the Guidelines for Users of the JI PDD Form for Small-scale projects in Section E.6	47 (b)	Section E.6 is revised according to the recommendations.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.
Corrective action request № 9 Throughout the whole document is not used the international standard format (e.g 1,000 representing one thousand and 1.0 representing one).	38 (d)	The decimal point sign is corrected in the PDD where is possible. Unfortunately some of the attached data is obtained only as pictures and such modification is not possible. For example Table An.2-1 is officially published in non-standard format from MOEW.	The determination team checked the provided additional information present in the revised PDD, ver. 2/15.08.2011 and considered that the information is correct and closed this CAR.

TABLE 3 FORWARD ACTION REQUEST

Forward action request	Ref. to table 1	Response by project participants	Determination team conclusion
Forward action request №1: During the determination process was found that the noise measurement in the environment is not yet performed and the deviation between the given installed power in EIA decision and in the PDD is still not official resolved. The PP should present the evidences to the above open issues to the determination team before the verification process.	12-13	The required activities should be performed after receiving Commissioning Protocol (ACT 16) from the competent authority. Evidences will be immediately present to the team.	OK