



# DETERMINATION REPORT

## "MT-INVEST CARBON" LLC

### DETERMINATION OF THE “IMPLEMENTATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL MODERNIZATION OF PJSC “GOROKHIV SUGAR MILL”

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-DET/0554/2012

REVISION No. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 14/08/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: "MT-Invest Carbon" LLC	Client ref.: Iaroslav Falendysh

**Summary:**  
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the "Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill" project of «MT-Invest Carbon» LLC located in Marianivka Town, Gorokhiv District of Volyn Region, Ukraine, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

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

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

In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.: UKRAINE-det/0554/2012	Subject Group: JI
Project title: "Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill"	
Work carried out by: Kateryna Zinevych – Team leader, lead verifier Volodymyr Kulish – Team member, verifier	
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer	
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov – Operational Manager	
Date of this revision: 30/10/2012	Rev. No.: 01
Number of pages: 60	

**Indexing terms**

- No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- Limited distribution
- Unrestricted distribution

**Bureau Veritas Certification**  
 Operational Manager



<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 Objective	3
1.2 Scope	3
1.3 Determination team	3
2 METHODOLOGY .....	4
2.1 Review of Documents	4
2.2 Follow-up Interviews	5
2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	5
3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	6
4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS.....	7
4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)	8
4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)	8
4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)	8
4.4 Additionality (27-31)	9
4.5 Project boundary (32-33)	10
4.6 Crediting period (34)	10
4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)	11
4.8 Leakage (40-41)	15
4.9 Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (42-47)	16
4.10 Environmental impacts (48)	20
4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)	20
4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)	20
4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)	20
4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)	21
5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES .....	21
6 DETERMINATION OPINION.....	21
7 REFERENCES .....	23
APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL .....	27



## 1 INTRODUCTION

«MT-Invest Carbon» LLC has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project “Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC “Gorokhiv Sugar Mill” (hereafter called “the project”) in Marianivka Town, Gorokhiv District of Volyn Region, Ukraine.

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

### 1.1 Objective

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

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

### 1.2 Scope

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

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

### 1.3 Determination team

The determination team consists of the following personnel:

Kateryna Zinevyh

Team Leader, Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Lead Verifier

Volodymyr Kulish

Team Member, Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier



This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov  
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

## 2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

### 2.1 Review of Documents

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

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, «MT-Invest Carbon» LLC revised the PDD and resubmitted it as version 03.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD versions 01 dated 20/07/2012, 02 dated 08/08/2012, 03 dated 29/10/2012.



## 2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 26/07/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed on-site interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of PJSC “Gorokhiv Sugar Mill” and «MT-Invest Carbon» LLC were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1 Interview topics**

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
PJSC “Gorokhiv Sugar Mill”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Implementation schedule</li> <li>➤ Project management organization</li> <li>➤ Evidence and records on reconstruction and new equipment and its operation</li> <li>➤ Environmental impact assessment</li> <li>➤ Responsibilities and authorities on project monitoring</li> <li>➤ Monitoring equipment</li> <li>➤ Quality control and quality assurance procedures</li> <li>➤ Negative environmental impact</li> <li>➤ Local stakeholders and community comments</li> </ul>
CONSULTANT: «MT-Invest Carbon» LLC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Applicability of methodology</li> <li>➤ Baseline and Project scenarios</li> <li>➤ Barrier analysis</li> <li>➤ Additionality justification</li> <li>➤ Common practice analysis</li> <li>➤ Monitoring plan</li> <li>➤ Conformity of PDD to JI requirements</li> </ul>

## 2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

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

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

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





---

**DETERMINATION REPORT**

---

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

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

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

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

### **3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The project is aimed at improving and modernizing the practice of recycling of organic waste at PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill". The project activity results in decrease of the amount of sugar beet pulp to be disposed in landfills, where due to decomposition of organic matter in the pulp under anaerobic conditions methane is released, which is a greenhouse gas.

#### ***Situation before the project implementation***

Before the project realization, equipment and infrastructure (warehouses, adjusted logistics system) necessary to decrease moisture content in the pulp were absent, wherefore it quickly deteriorated, and this valuable feed resource turned into organic waste, which at first was stored in pulp pits (up to three months) and then transported to landfills. When emptying the pulp pits from deteriorated pulp, 3-5% of its mass left at the pit bottom, containing a large number of microorganisms that rapidly contaminated new pulp and speeded up the pace of its deterioration. Due to the use of this practice, the pulp produced at the JI project plant could not be used for feeding cattle and was disposed at landfills.

#### ***Baseline scenario***

In the baseline scenario in the absence of the project the situation would continue: the company would still store sugar beet pulp in pits in the substance as it was produced, with no additional actions aimed at reduction of its moisture content. After filling the pulp pits with pulp, it



would be transported and disposed at landfills. This scenario foresees decomposition of organic matter with the generation of landfill gas.

### ***Project scenario***

Project scenario provides the reconstruction of obsolete pulp drying equipment and installation of additional presses of deep pulp extraction, which resulted in decreasing of moisture content in the pulp, which allows its beneficial utilization as feed for cattle, thus it is not to be disposed at landfills and methane is not released into the atmosphere in the result of pulp decomposition.

### ***Project history***

The project was initiated at PJSC “Gorokhiv Sugar Mill” in mid 2004. Along with the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, the opportunity to receive additional financial benefits from reducing greenhouse gases has appeared that was an additional reason for project realization. The installation of new equipment and reconstruction of existing drying equipment occurred during 2004-2007.

From the very beginning, the joint implementation mechanism was one of the prominent factors of the project, and financial benefits under this mechanism play an important role in deciding on the start of the operation and are considered to be one of the reasons to launch the project realization.

Project implementation schedule is presented as Table 3 below.

The identified areas of concern as to the project description, project participants response and BVC’s conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 01-CAR 05).

## **4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS**

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

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

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A. The determination of the Project resulted in 18 Corrective Action Requests and 04 Clarification Requests.

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





#### **4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)**

After receiving JI Project Determination Report from the Accredited Independent Entity the project documentation will be submitted to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine for receiving a Letter of Approval.

The identified areas of concern as to the project approvals by Parties involved, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 06 and CL 01).

The project has no approvals by the Parties involved, therefore CAR 06 remains pending. This CAR will be closed after providing the written approvals.

#### **4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)**

The participation of each project participant will be authorized by the Letter of Approval from appropriate party explicitly stating the name of the legal entity.

The project has no approvals by the Parties involved, therefore CAR 06 remains pending. This CAR will be closed after providing the written approvals.

#### **4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)**

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

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

- (a) By listing and describing the following plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one:
  - a. Continuation of the current situation which does not require any investment;
  - b. Utilization of sugar beet pulp along with the production of biogas;
  - c. Preparation of pulp for use as feed for cattle;
  - d. Production of beet pectin, pectin glue or dietary fiber from pulp.



- (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. In this context, the following key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account:
- a. Complex production process
  - b. Prices fluctuation on electricity and natural gas in Ukraine
  - c. Long pay-off period
  - d. The implementation of the proposed project requires sufficient investment and personnel
  - e. Ukraine has one of the lowest tariffs in Europe. Due to this it is hard to invest funds in the reconstruction and repair of equipment

In order to establish the baseline scenario project participants have chosen the use of JI specific approach and “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” (version 04.0.0).

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the identified JI specific approach and the baseline is identified appropriately.

The identified areas of concern as to the baseline setting, project participants response and BVC’s conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 07-CAR 08).

#### **4.4 Additionality (27-31)**

The barrier and common practice analyses were used for the demonstration of additionality. All explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected tool or method.

The additionality was justified by:

1. Identification of four alternatives to the project activity;
2. The identified financial and other barriers may hinder the planned project activity implementation without it being registered as JI project;
3. Common practice analysis that complements the barrier analysis

Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the analysis using the approach chosen.



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

#### **4.5 Project boundary (32-33)**

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

- (i) Under the control of the project participants:
  - CH<sub>4</sub> emissions due to anaerobic fermentation of sugar production waste (pulp)
- (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project:
  - CH<sub>4</sub> emissions due to anaerobic fermentation of pulp (that has not been processed, if this condition is satisfied).

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

The AIE determined the project boundary by:

- a) Detailed analysis of the documentation (the list of all reviewed documentation is provided in the Category 2 Documents below).
- b) Interviews and observations during the site visit to the PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill" dated 26/07/2012-27/07/2012 (The list of persons interviewed is provided in the Persons Interviewed Table below).

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

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

#### **4.6 Crediting period (34)**

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the real action of the project began, and the starting date is 12/07/2004, which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 20 years and 240 months.



The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 20 years, and its starting date as 01/01/2008, which is on the date the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals 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 or enhancements of net removals are presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012 in all relevant sections of the PDD.

The identified areas of concern as to the crediting period, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 01– CAR 05).

#### **4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)**

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

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

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

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

The monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguishes:

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

## DETERMINATION REPORT

throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination, such are not applicable.

(iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period, such as baseline emissions.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording according to the type indicated in the key parameters tables in the Section B of the PDD.

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

**Project emissions:**

Calculation formula for identifying the amount of emissions after the project implementation:

$$PE_y = PE_{biomass,y}, \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

where:

$PE_y$ , Project GHG emissions due to project implementation in period  $y$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e;  
 $PE_{biomass,y}$  Project methane emissions due to the decomposition of organic waste of the plant at the landfill in the period  $y$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

Project methane emissions from decomposition of organic waste at the landfill are calculated as follows:

$$PE_{biomass,y} = \varphi \cdot (1-f) \cdot GWP_{CH_4} \cdot (1-OX) \cdot 16/12 \cdot F \cdot DOC_f \cdot MCF \cdot \sum_{x=1}^y P_x \cdot DOC \cdot e^{-k(y-x)} \cdot (1-e^{-k}), \quad (\text{Equation 2})$$

where:

$PE_{biomass,y}$  Project methane emissions due to the decomposition of organic waste of the plant at the landfill in the period  $y$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e;  
 $P_x$  Amount of sugar production waste (pulp) that was not sold by the plant in period  $x$  and was disposed at the landfill, t;  
 $\varphi$  Correction factor to account for model uncertainties, ratio. (Study on modeling landfill gas formation);  
 $f$  CH<sub>4</sub> fraction captured and utilized at the landfill, fraction;  
 $GWP_{CH_4}$  Global warming potential for methane, tCO<sub>2</sub>e/tCH<sub>4</sub> (According to the UNFCCC decision and the Kyoto Protocol);

## DETERMINATION REPORT

<i>OX</i>	Oxidation factor reflects the amount of CH <sub>4</sub> that is oxidised in other material covering the waste, fraction (2006 IPCC);
<i>F</i>	Fraction of CH <sub>4</sub> , by volume, in generated landfill gas, fraction (2006 IPCC);
<i>DOC<sub>f</sub></i>	Fraction of the degradable organic carbon that decomposes, fraction (2006 IPCC);
<i>MCF</i>	CH <sub>4</sub> correction factor, fraction (2006 IPCC);
<i>DOC</i>	Fraction of the degradable organic carbon in the waste of j-type (pulp), tC/t of pulp (2006 IPCC);
<i>k</i>	Waste (pulp) decomposition factor, fraction (2006 IPCC);
<i>x</i>	Period during the crediting period: $x \in (1; y)$ ;
<i>y</i>	Period for which methane emissions are calculated.

**Baseline emissions:**

The baseline emissions are calculated as follows:

$$BE_y = BE_{biomass,y}, \quad (\text{Equation 3})$$

where:

*BE<sub>y</sub>* Baseline GHG emissions in the period y, tCO<sub>2</sub>e;

*BE<sub>biomass,y</sub>* Baseline CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from degradable organic waste of plant at the landfill in the period y, tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

Baseline CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from degradable organic waste at the landfill are calculated as follows:

$$BE_{biomass,y} = \varphi \cdot (1-f) \cdot GWP_{CH_4} \cdot (1-OX) \cdot \frac{16}{12} \cdot F \cdot DOC_f \cdot MCF \cdot \sum_{x=1}^y W_x \cdot DOC \cdot e^{-k(y-x)} \cdot (1-e^{-k}), \quad (\text{Equation 4})$$

where:

*BE<sub>biomass,y</sub>* Baseline CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from degradable organic waste of plant at the landfill in the period y, tCO<sub>2</sub>e;

*W<sub>x</sub>* Amount of sugar production waste, which would be disposed at the landfill in period x, t;

*φ* Correction factor to account for model uncertainties, ratio (Study on modeling landfill gas formation);



---

 DETERMINATION REPORT
 

---

- f* CH<sub>4</sub> fraction captured and utilized at the landfill, fraction;
- GWP<sub>CH4</sub>* Global warming potential for methane, tCO<sub>2</sub>e/tCH<sub>4</sub> (According to the UNFCCC Decision and the Kyoto Protocol);
- OX* Oxidation factor reflects the amount of CH<sub>4</sub> that is oxidized in other material covering the waste, fraction (2006 IPCC);
- F* Fraction of CH<sub>4</sub> by volume, in generated landfill gas, fraction (2006 IPCC);
- DOC<sub>f</sub>* Fraction of the degradable organic carbon that decomposes, fraction (2006 IPCC);
- MCF* CH<sub>4</sub> correction factor, fraction (2006 IPCC);
- DOC* Fraction of the degradable organic carbon in the waste of j-type (pulp), tC/t of pulp (2006 IPCC);
- k* Waste (pulp) decomposition factor, fraction (2006 IPCC);
- x* Period during the crediting period:  $x \in (1; y)$ ;
- y* Period for which methane emissions are calculated.

**Leakage**

Leakages in the period *y* are calculated in the following way:

$$LE_y = 0, \quad (\text{Equation 5})$$

where

*LE<sub>y</sub>* Leakages due to the project in the period *y*, tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

**Emission Reductions:**

Annual emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - LE_y - PE_y \quad (\text{Equation 12})$$

*ER<sub>y</sub>* emission reductions following the project implementation in the period *y*, tCO<sub>2</sub>e;

$LE_y$  leakage as a result of implementation of the project in the period  $y$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e;

$BE_y$  baseline emissions of the project in the period  $y$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e;

$PE_y$  project emissions in the period  $y$ , tCO<sub>2</sub>e;

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

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

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

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

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

The identified areas of concern as to the monitoring plan, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 11 – CAR 17).

#### **4.8 Leakage (40-41)**

The PDD appropriately describes an assessment of the potential indirect CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O leakage in the process of fuel production and transportation and appropriately explains that sources can be neglected.

There are no outstanding issues concerning the leakage.



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

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

The PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:

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

Estimated project emissions during the first crediting period:

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Project emissions from anaerobic fermentation of pulp, t CO <sub>2</sub> e	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total project emissions during the first crediting period, t CO<sub>2</sub> e</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Estimated project emissions after the end of the first crediting period (2013-2027):

Year	Project emissions due to organic waste decay at landfill, t CO <sub>2</sub> eq
2013	0
2014	0
2015	0
2016	0
2017	0
2018	0
2019	0
2020	0
2021	0
2022	0
2023	0
2024	0
2025	0
2026	0
2027	0
<b>Estimated project emissions after the end of the first crediting period (2013-2027)</b>	<b>0</b>



(b) Leakage, as applicable, which are:

Estimated leakages during the first crediting period:

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
<b>Estimated leakage during the first crediting period, t CO<sub>2</sub> eq</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Estimated leakages after the end of the first crediting period (2013-2027):

Year	Leakages
2013	0
2014	0
2015	0
2016	0
2017	0
2018	0
2019	0
2020	0
2021	0
2022	0
2023	0
2024	0
2025	0
2026	0
2027	0
<b>Estimated leakages after the end of the first crediting period (2013-2027), t CO<sub>2</sub> eq</b>	<b>0</b>

(c) Emissions for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are:

Estimated baseline emissions during the first crediting period:

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total
Baseline emissions from anaerobic fermentation of pulp, t CO <sub>2</sub> e	258 764	304 269	336 556	353 557	377 083	1 630 229
<b>Total baseline emissions during the first crediting period, t CO<sub>2</sub> e</b>	<b>258 764</b>	<b>304 269</b>	<b>336 556</b>	<b>353 557</b>	<b>377 083</b>	<b>1 630 229</b>



Estimated baseline emissions after the end of the first crediting period (2013-2027):

Year	Baseline emissions due to organic waste decay at landfill, t CO <sub>2</sub> eq
2013	396 636
2014	412 886
2015	426 391
2016	437 616
2017	446 944
2018	454 697
2019	461 141
2020	466 496
2021	470 947
2022	474 646
2023	477 721
2024	480 276
2025	482 399
2026	484 164
2027	485 631
<b>Estimated baseline emissions after the end of the first crediting period (2013-2027)</b>	<b>6 858 591</b>

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

Emission reductions during the first crediting period:

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Всього
<b>Emission reductions during the first crediting period, t CO<sub>2</sub> eq</b>	258 764	304 269	336 556	353 557	377 083	<b>1 630 229</b>

Emission reductions after the first crediting period (2013-2027):

Year	Emission reductions due to organic waste decay at landfill after the first crediting period, t CO <sub>2</sub> eq
2013	396 636
2014	412 886
2015	426 391



## DETERMINATION REPORT

<b>2016</b>	437 616
<b>2017</b>	446 944
<b>2018</b>	454 697
<b>2019</b>	461 141
<b>2020</b>	466 496
<b>2021</b>	470 947
<b>2022</b>	474 646
<b>2023</b>	477 721
<b>2024</b>	480 276
<b>2025</b>	482 399
<b>2026</b>	484 164
<b>2027</b>	485 631
<b>Estimated emission reductions after the first crediting period (2013-2027)</b>	<b>6 858 591</b>

The estimates referred to above are given:

- (a) On a periodical basis;
- (b) From 01/01/2008 to 31/12/2027, covering the whole crediting period;
- (c) On a source-by-source basis;
- (d) For each GHG gas, which is CO<sub>2</sub>;
- (e) In tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> 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 formulas used for calculating the estimates referred above are consistent throughout the PDD.

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

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

Emission factors were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

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





The estimates referred to above are consistent throughout the PDD.

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

The PDD includes an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation.

No outstanding issues were raised concerning the emission reductions assessment.

#### **4.10 Environmental impacts (48)**

According to the legislation of Ukraine, a detailed EIA for this project is not needed.

Implementation of the project activity also has a positive social impact through removing of the concentrated odour beetroot pulp storage facilities and improving working conditions at the sugar plant.

Since the project does not lead to negative impacts on the environment, transboundary impacts that occur in any other country, and are caused by implementation of this project, which is physically located entirely within Ukraine, are absent.

The identified areas of concern as to the environmental impacts, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 18).

#### **4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)**

Stakeholder consultation was not undertaken as it is not required by the host party.

#### **4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)**

Not applicable

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

Not applicable



#### **4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)**

Not applicable

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

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

### **6 DETERMINATION OPINION**

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a determination of the “Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC “Gorokhiv Sugar Mill” Project in Marianivka Town, Gorokhiv District, Ukraine. The determination was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

Project participants used the latest Tool for demonstration and assessment of the additionality. In line with this tool, the PDD provides barrier analysis and common practice analysis, to determine that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario.

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

The determination revealed one pending issue related to the current determination stage of the project: the issue of the written approval of the project and the authorization of the project participant by the host Party. If the written approval and the authorization by the host Party are awarded, it is our opinion that the project as described in the Project Design Document, Version 03 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.



The review of the project design documentation (version 03) and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

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



## 7 REFERENCES

### Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by «MT-Invest Carbon» LLC that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ Project Design Document "Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill" version 01 dated 20/07/2012
- /2/ Project Design Document "Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill" version 02 dated 08/08/2012
- /3/ Project Design Document "Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill" version 03 dated 29/10/2012
- /4/ GHG emission reductions calculation spreadsheet "20120724\_Gorokhiv\_ER.xls"
- /5/ Letter of Endorsement #3175/23/7 issued by the State Environmental Investment Agency dated 25/10/2012

### Category 2 Documents:

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /1/ Photo-General view of beet pulp drying department
- '2/ Photo-beet pulp press type GH 2/1, fabrication # 2552
- '3/ Photo-beet pulp press type GH 2/1, fabrication # 2564
- '4/ Photo-beet pulp press type GH 2/1, fabrication # 2555
- '5/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 525
- '6/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 23001860
- '7/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1113
- '8/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1014
- '9/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1013
- '10/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1450
- '11/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1452
- '12/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1448
- '13/ Photo-beet pulp press, fabrication # 1449
- '14/ Photo-scales, fabrication # 9401
- '15/ Order # 42-06/12 dated 16/09/2011 on appointment of working team on enterprise technical rehabilitation with organic wastes utilization improvement, issued by
- '16/ Order # 39/1 dated 12/07/2004 on appointment of working team on enterprise technical rehabilitation with organic wastes utilization improvement, issued by PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill"
- '17/ Inventory card # 98/996 on beet pulp press type ГХ-2, inventory



## DETERMINATION REPORT

- # 98/996
- '18/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/996
- '19/ Inventory card # 98/994 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/994
- '20/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/994
- '21/ Inventory card # 98/984 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/984
- '22/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/984
- '23/ Inventory card # 98/995 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/995
- '24/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/995
- '25/ Inventory card # 98/986 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/986
- '26/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/986
- '27/ Inventory card # 98/990 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/990
- '28/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/990
- '29/ Inventory card # 98/989 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/989
- '30/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/989
- '31/ Inventory card # 98/988 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/988
- '32/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/988
- '33/ Inventory card # 98/987 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/987
- '34/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/987
- '35/ Inventory card # 98/983 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/983
- '36/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/983
- '37/ Inventory card # 98/991 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/991
- '38/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/991
- '39/ Inventory card # 98/992 on beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/992
- '40/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type GX-2, inventory # 98/992



## DETERMINATION REPORT

- '41/ Inventory card # 98/995 on beet pulp press type ГХ-2, inventory # 98/995
- '42/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type ГХ-2, inventory # 98/995
- '43/ Inventory card # 98/993 on beet pulp press type ГХ-2, inventory # 98/993
- '44/ Statement dated 01/10/2004 on acceptance-transmitting of beet pulp press type ГХ-2, inventory # 98/993
- '45/ Inventory card # 1014 on beet pulp drying wheel type А2-ПСА, inventory # 1014
- '46/ Inventory card # 1013 on beet pulp drying wheel type А2-ПСА, inventory # 1013
- '47/ Passport on beet pulp press type GH 2/1, fabrication # 2243
- '48/ Information note on beet pulp drying department operation for the period 2005-2011
- '49/ Agreement # 520 dated 26/08/2011 on providing measuring equipment calibration services
- '50/ Passport on motor-truck scales, fabrication # 7114 (last calibration date—20/09/2011
- '51/ Calibration certificate # 02-142 dated 19/09/2010, valid till 20/09/2011, on motor-truck scales PC-60 Микросим 06А, fabrication # 9242/01, issued by Volyn Scientific and Production Centre for Standardization, Metrology and Certification State Enterprise
- '52/ Certificate # UA2.045.05176-10 dated 21/09/2010 on quality management system, issued by the National Certification Authority of Ukraine
- '53/ Attestation certificate # 186 dated 21/07/2010, valid till 20/07/2013 on Horohivskyi Tsukrovyi Zavod OJSC Laboratory, issued by Volyn Scientific and Production Centre for Standardization, Metrology and Certification State Enterprise
- '54/ Attestation certificate # 182 dated 21/07/2010, valid till 20/07/2013 on Horohivskyi Tsukrovyi Zavod OJSC Laboratory, issued by Volyn Scientific and Production Centre for Standardization, Metrology and Certification State Enterprise
- '55/ Protocol # 42 dated 12/09/2011 on commission session on health and safety knowledge testing





**Persons interviewed:**

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

- /1/ Oksana Andriichuk – Chief economist
- /2/ Oleksandr Chaikovskiy – Chief engineer
- /3/ Liudmyla Vasynok – Acting chief technician
- /4/ Ruslana Suprun – Economist
- /5/ Mukhailo Bunda – Head of the metrology and automatization department

1. o0o -

## DETERMINATION REPORT

## APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<b>General description of the project</b>				
<b>Title of the project</b>				
-	Is the title of the project presented?	"Implementation of technological modernization of PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill"	OK	OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	13. Waste handling and disposal	OK	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	PDD version 3.0	OK	OK
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	Date of completion: 29/10/2012  <u>Corrective Action Request 01:</u> Please correct the data format.	CAR 01	OK
<b>Description of the project</b>				
-	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)?	<u>Corrective Action Request 02:</u> Please add brief summary and technical description of the baseline scenario.	CAR 02	OK
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	<u>Corrective Action Request 03:</u> Please specify the starting date of the project and provide the justifying document.	CAR 03	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<b>Project participants</b>				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	The list of the parties involved and project participants is provided in Section A.3 of the PDD. Parties involved: Ukraine (Host country). The second Party involved will be defined later.	OK	OK
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	Yes, the data of the project participants is presented in tabular format.	OK	OK
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Yes, the contact information is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Yes.	OK	OK
<b>Technical description of the project</b>				
<b>Location of the project</b>				
-	Host Party(ies)	Ukraine	OK	OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Volyn Region	OK	OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Marianivka Town, Gorokhiv District	OK	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	The geographic coordinates of the site are: N 50°26'56.98"E 24°48'59.35".  <u>Corrective Action Request 04:</u> The Section A.4.1.4 has to comply with the format envisaged by the Guidelines for Users of the JI PDD Form, version 04.	CAR 04	OK
<b>Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project</b>				
-	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 summary of activities to be implemented within the project boundary is listed in the section A.4.2 of the PDD.	OK	OK
<b>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</b>				



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	Yes, it is stated in the PDD how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved by the proposed project.	OK	OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	<u>Corrective Action Request 05:</u> Please provide the reference on the relevant Excel spreadsheet with calculations.	CAR 05	OK
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO <sub>2</sub> e?	Yes, the estimated annual reduction for the proposed crediting period is provided in tCO <sub>2</sub> e.	OK	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Yes.	OK	OK
<b>Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period</b>				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	Yes, the duration of the crediting period is 20 years.	OK	OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent provided?	Yes, the estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent are provided in section A.4.3.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
<b>Project approvals by Parties</b>				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	<u>Clarification Request 01:</u> The names of the DFP (of the Parties involved) authorizing the project have to be indicated in the Section A.5.	CL 01	Pending
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	Yes, Ukraine is the host Party.	OK	OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	<u>Corrective Action Request 06:</u> There are no Letters of Approval from the Parties involved.	CAR 06	Pending
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Refer to CAR 06 above.	OK	OK
<b>Authorization of project participants by Parties involved</b>				
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,	Refer to CAR 06 above.	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
<b>Baseline setting</b>				
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 describes the JI specific approach which is used for setting the baseline.  <u>Corrective Action Request 07:</u> The PDD doesn't explicitly state the approach chosen for setting the baseline. Please correct.  <u>Corrective Action Request 08:</u> Please indicate the date of baseline setting as per established format: DD/MM/YYYY.	CAR 07 CAR 08	OK
<b>JI specific approach only</b>				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Yes, the PDD provides a detailed theoretical description of the project in a complete and transparent manner.	OK	OK
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established: (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one? (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? – Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account?	The PDD provides justification that the baseline is established by listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one.	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors? (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions? (e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure? (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables 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?	"Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" (version 04.0.0) was used for baseline setting and demonstration of additionality. <i>Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers</i> (version 01) were also taken into account.	OK	OK
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A





## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
26 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
26 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Additionality</b>				
<b>JI specific approach only</b>				
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 an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; (c) Application of the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board".	The Section B.1 of the PDD provides the analysis of the project additionality showing that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions. The analysis was performed based on the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" (version 03.0.0) approved by the CDM Executive Board and fully applicable for JI projects.	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	The barrier analysis and common practice analysis are used for the demonstration of project activity additionality.	OK	OK
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Yes, the additionality proofs are provided in the Section B.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	<u>Corrective Action Request 09:</u> The PDD doesn't indicate how registration of the project as JI activity will aid to overcoming the barriers.	CAR 09	OK
30	If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	All explanations, descriptions and analyses were made in accordance with "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" (Version 03.0.0).	OK	OK
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (e)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects)</b>				
<b>JI specific approach only</b>				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (i) Under the control of the project	<u>Corrective Action Request 10</u> The defined monitoring plan includes project GHG emissions connected with organic wastes utilization. This parameter, though, is absent in the Table 7 of the PDD. Please make	CAR 10	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	amendments.		
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?	Yes, the project boundary is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above.	OK	OK
32 (c)	Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate?	Yes, the project boundary is provided in the Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2 and in tabular format in the Table 4.	OK	OK
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?	Please refer to the CAR 10 above.	OK	OK
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Crediting period</b>				
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?	12/07/2004 is the starting date of the project. It is the date of making the decision on project implementation aimed at pulp handling process alteration at the PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill".	OK	OK
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes.	OK	OK
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	20 years (240 months). <u>Clarification Request 02:</u> Please specify the expected operational lifetime of the project, also provide the documented evidence of equipment operation.	CL 02	OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	20 years (240 months).	OK	OK
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or	Yes, the starting date of the crediting period is after the date	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	of the first emission reductions generated by the project.		
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?	<u>Clarification Request 03:</u> Please specify 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.	CL 02	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?	<u>Clarification Request 04:</u> Please specify that if the crediting period extends beyond 2012, such extension is subject to the host Party approval.	CL 03	OK
<b>Monitoring plan</b>				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach	JI specific approach was used.	OK	OK
<b>JI specific approach only</b>				
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?	<u>Corrective Action Request 11:</u> Please provide the information on key characteristics and their monitoring during the project activity in tabular format.	CAR 11	OK
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?	Yes, the monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions to be monitored.	OK	OK
36 (b)	If default values are used:	<u>Corrective Action Request 12:</u>	CAR 12	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection?</li> <li>- Do the default values originate from recognized sources?</li> <li>- Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels?</li> <li>- Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?</li> </ul>	There is no reference on source and page for some parameters (e. g. <i>f</i> - share of methane being captured and utilized at the disposal site) used for the ERUs calculation. Please correct.		
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?	Yes. The monitoring plan clearly indicates how the values are to be selected and justified.	OK	OK
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken?</li> <li>- Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?</li> </ul>	<u>Corrective Action Request 13:</u> Please indicate why the data from IPCC 2006 instead of National Inventory are used.	CAR 13	OK
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	<u>Corrective Action Request 14:</u> Please indicate in the PDD the procedure to be followed if expected data are unavailable.	CAR 14	OK
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?	Yes, the <i>amount of sugar production organic waste (pulp), that was not sold within period x and was transported to the disposal site</i> is used in calculations of baseline scenario and are obtained through monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Yes, the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. Is consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan.	OK	OK
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of	The monitoring plan is developed in accordance with the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring".	OK	OK

## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	“Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”?			
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are 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?	Yes, all the relevant parameters are described (refer to the Section D.1 of the PDD).	OK	OK
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	The Table in the Section D.1.1 of the PDD defines the frequency of monitoring and data sources for all parameters and data to be monitored.	OK	OK
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?	The PDD describes all algorithms and formulae used for the calculation of baseline and project emissions.		OK
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	Yes, the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae is explained.	OK	OK
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Yes, consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. are used.	CAR 15	OK

## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<u>Corrective Action Request 15</u> Please indicate data sources for the parameters used in calculations per the provided formulas.		
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	Yes. <u>Corrective Action Request 16</u> Please make amendments in the numbering of formulas, making it consistent.	CAR 16	OK
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	Yes, the documents analysis justifies the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures .	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	The level of data uncertainty is provided in the quality control and assurance table (refer to the section D.2 of the PDD).  Taking into account that almost all data and parameters are based on the statistical data and calibrated measuring equipment recordings of a certain class of accuracy and tested by the official energy resources supplier and state bodies, their level of uncertainty is considered as low.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline ensured?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	No, all the algorithms and formulae are explicitly explained.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	Please refer to CAR 12.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Yes, implicit and explicit key assumptions are explained in a transparent manner.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and	Used assumptions and procedures do not have any	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	significant uncertainty associated with them.		
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?	Level of uncertainty is indicated as low.	OK	OK
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project? Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found?	All the monitoring plans used in the proposed monitoring plan are the common practice for Ukraine on power metering.	OK	OK
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	Refer to CAR 10.	OK	OK
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available upon request?	The quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process are described in the Section D.2 of the PDD.	OK	OK
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	Yes, the monitoring plan in the Section D.3 of the PDD clearly identifies the responsibilities and authorities regarding the monitoring activities.	OK	OK
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type? If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?	<u>Corrective Action Request 17:</u> The Section D.1.5 of the PDD requires from the project participants to indicate the information on data collection and archivation concerning the environmental impact and to provide references on the relevant Host Party regulations.	CAR 17	OK





## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		Please make the relevant corrections.		
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?	Yes, all the parameters are provided in Sections D.1.1.1 and D.1.1.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK
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?	Refer to CAR 12.	OK	OK
37	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?	No elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used in the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
38 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach</b>				
39	<p>If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period:</p> <p>(a) Is the underlying project composed of clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently?</p> <p>(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)?</p> <p>(c) 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?</p> <p>(d) Does the monitoring plan explicitly provide for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?</p>	No overlapping of monitoring periods is envisaged during the crediting period.	OK	OK
<b>Leakage</b>				
<b>JI specific approach only</b>				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the	No leakages are envisaged by the proposed project activity.	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?			
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	No leakages are envisaged by the proposed project activity.	OK	OK
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals</b>				
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	Baseline and project scenario emissions were assessed.	OK	OK
43	If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary)? (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	The PDD provides ex ante estimates of the project and baseline scenarios, and also emissions reduction. The estimated results are provided in the Section E of the PDD, and also in the Excel spreadsheets.	OK	OK
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
45	<p>For both approaches in 42</p> <p>(a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given:</p> <p>(i) On a periodic basis?</p> <p>(ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period?</p> <p>(iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis?</p> <p>(iv) For each GHG?</p> <p>(v) In tones of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol?</p> <p>(b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD?</p> <p>(c) For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?</p> <p>(d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent?</p> <p>(e) Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?</p> <p>(f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on conservative assumptions and the most</p>	Emission reductions calculation provided in the PDD of the proposed project complies with all the requirements envisaged by the DVM section 45.	OK	OK



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?	Yes, the PDD includes an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation.	OK	OK
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
47 (a)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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 CO <sub>2</sub> 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	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>estimates consistent throughout the PDD?</p> <p>– Are the estimates consistent throughout the PDD?</p> <p>– 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?</p>			
<b>Environmental impacts</b>				
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?	<p><u>Corrective Action Request18:</u></p> <p>The information on transboundary impacts of the project provided in the PDD has to be transparent and justified.</p>	CAR 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?	All activities under the project do not envisage any negative impacts on the environment; therefore no EIA was specifically developed for this project.	OK	OK
<b>Environmental impacts</b>				
49	<p>If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide:</p> <p>(a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any?</p> <p>(b) The nature of the comments?</p>	The procedures of Ukraine don't require any stakeholder consultation concerning the proposed project.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?			
<b>Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)</b>				
50	Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under: (a) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in .Provisions for 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"?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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 (c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
<b>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only</b>				
52 (a)	Do all projects in the bundle: (i) 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) above? (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
52 (c)	Has the AIE received (from the project participants): (i) 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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
53	If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects,	Not applicable	N/A	N/A





## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	do(are) all the projects: (a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category? (b) Apply the same technology or measure? (c) Located in the territory of the same host Party?			
54	If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) 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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
55	If the projects in the bundle use the same baseline, does the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provide an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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.	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
56 (b)	If the approach 57 (b) above is used, (i) 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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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?			
<b>Applicable to all JI SSC projects</b>				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)</b>				
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 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)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>JI specific approach only</b>				
59	Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above Does the PDD provide an explanation how the	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
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? (c) 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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(c) Does the PDD provide: (i) 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?	Not applicable	N/A	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?	Not applicable	N/A	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.?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
63	Does the PDD take into account only the increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?			
<b>Approved CDM methodology approach only</b>				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	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)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
64 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
<b>Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)</b>				
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? (c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The maintenance of records for each JPA?</li> <li>– A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)?</li> <li>– Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA?</li> </ul> (d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used? (e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA?			
67	<i>Project approvals by Parties involved - additional to 19-20</i> 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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
68	<i>Authorization of project participants by Parties involved - additional to 21</i> Is the coordinating entity presented in the PDD authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
69	<i>Baseline setting - additional to 22-26</i> Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
70	<i>Additionality - additional to 27-31</i> Does the PDD indicate at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated? (a) For the JI PoA	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(b) For each type of JPA			
71	<i>Crediting period - additional to 34</i> Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
72	<i>Monitoring plan - additional to 35-39</i> Is the monitoring plan established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?	Not applicable	N/A	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? (c) 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? (e) 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?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



## DETERMINATION REPORT

**Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Determination team conclusion
<u>Corrective Action Request 01</u> Please correct the data format.	-	Data format was corrected in the PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 02</u> Please add brief summary and technical description of the baseline scenario.	-	The brief summary of the baseline scenario is provided in the PDD version 03	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 03</u> Please specify the starting date of the project and provide the justifying document.	-	12/07/2004 is the starting date of the project. It is the date of making the decision on project implementation aimed at pulp handling process alteration at the PJSC "Gorokhiv Sugar Mill" and also on coordination of all the aspects connected with it.  This document has been provided to AIE. The relevant information has been added to the PDD, version 03. Please refer to the Section C.1.	The issue is closed





## DETERMINATION REPORT

<u>Corrective Action Request 04</u> The Section A.4.1.4 has to comply with the format envisaged by the Guidelines for Users of the JI PDD Form, version 04.	-	The Section A.4.1.4 was corrected in compliance with the format envisaged by the Guidelines for Users of the JI PDD Form, version 04 Please refer to the PDD version 03	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 05</u> Please provide the reference on the relevant Excel spreadsheet with calculations.	-	The reference on Excel spreadsheet with calculations was added to the Section A.4.3.1 and the Section E. Please refer to the updated PDD version 03	The issue is closed
<u>Clarification Request 01</u> The names of the DFP (of the Parties involved) authorizing the project have to be indicated in the Section A.5.	19	The information will be provided later.	Pending
<u>Corrective Action Request 06</u> There are no Letters of Approval from the Parties involved.	19	As per the procedures of the Parties involved the relevant Letters of Approval will be provided after issuance of the positive determination report.	Pending
<u>Corrective Action Request 07</u> The PDD doesn't explicitly state the approach chosen for setting the baseline. Please correct.	22	Project participants chose an approach for baseline setting and monitoring developed in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines (JI specific approach). The relevant information was added to the Section B.1 of the PDD version 03.	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 08</u> Please indicate the date of baseline setting as per established format: DD/MM/YYYY.	22	The date format was corrected in the PDD, version 03	The issue is closed



## DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request 09</u> The PDD doesn't indicate how registration of the project as JI activity will aid to overcoming the barriers.</p>	29 (c)	<p>As demonstrated in the Section B.2, the main barrier that prevents the project implementation is financial. As a result of selling greenhouse gas emission reductions expected revenues of about 6.9 million euro or 70 million UAH, that is twice as much then the project funds required, that is weighty argument when making decision on the project. Thus, participation in joint implementation mechanism eliminates barriers for the project. Please refer to the PDD version 03</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 10</u> The defined monitoring plan includes project GHG emissions connected with organic wastes utilization. This parameter, though, is absent in the Table 7 of the PDD. Please make amendments.</p>	32 (a)	<p><i>Anaerobic fermentation of pulp</i> parameter both for baseline and project scenario was added to the Table 7 of the PDD. Thus both parameters concerning the ER monitoring are taken into account. Please refer to the PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Clarification Request 02:</u> Please specify the expected operational lifetime of the project, also provide the documented evidence of equipment operation.</p>	34 (b)	The necessary amendments were made to the Section C of the PDD, version 02	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Clarification Request 03:</u> Please specify 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.</p>	34 (d)	The necessary amendments were made to the Section C of the PDD, version 02	The issue is closed.



## DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Clarification Request 04</u> Please specify that if the crediting period extends beyond 2012, such extension is subject to the host Party approval.</p>	34 (d)	The necessary amendments were made to the Section C of the PDD, version 02.	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 11</u> Please provide the information on key characteristics and their monitoring during the project activity in tabular format.</p>	36 (a)	The information on key characteristics and their monitoring during the project activity was provided in tabular format in the PDD version 02	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 12</u> There is no reference on source and page for some parameters (e. g. <i>f</i> - share of methane being captured and utilized at the disposal site) used for the ERUs calculation. Please correct.</p>	36 (b)	In this case, the source for this parameter is the data provided by the project owner. No technologies or units for landfill gas (which contains methane) capture were used at the landfill for pulp utilization Reference on project owner data was added to the PDD version 02	The issue is closed.



## DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request 13</u> Please indicate why the data from IPCC 2006 instead of National Inventory are used.</p>	36 (b) (ii)	<p>Indeed, at the moment of the PDD design, the National Inventory Report contained the values of some variables used for calculations in this project (DOC and MCF parameters). The reasons of using the data from IPCC instead of National Inventory are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data indicated in the National Inventory is the average data for all solid waste landfills assessed based on the average morphological content of solid wastes located at the disposal site. IPCC data is used for the project, because they fully match the type of the project wastes – pulp.</li> <li>2. IPCC data is reliable and conservative data source. Their usage doesn't lead to overestimation of the project ER calculation results which is justified by the huge amount of registered JI projects.</li> </ol>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 14</u> Please indicate in the PDD the procedure to be followed if expected data are unavailable.</p>	36 (b) (iii)	<p>Project implementation is under the control of special appointed team which is responsible for collection, archivation and storage of documentation relevant to the project. All information is stored on hard and electronic copies. Thus it makes the possibility of any data from any sources absence very low.</p>	The issue is closed.



## DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request 15</u> Please indicate data sources for the parameters used in calculations per the provided formulas.</p>	36 (f) (ii)	Data sources were indicated and specified in the PDD	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 16</u> Please make amendments in the numbering of formulas, making it consistent.</p>	36 (f) (iii)	The numbering of formulas was corrected in the PDD version 02	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 17</u> The Section D.1.5 of the PDD requires from the project participants to indicate the information on data collection and archivation concerning the environmental impact and to provide references on the relevant Host Party regulations. Please make the relevant corrections.</p>	36 (k)	<p>There is no negative environmental impact as the result of project implementation. It is not applicable as per the regulations of the host Party.</p> <p>The relevant information was added to the PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 18</u> The information on transboundary impacts of the project provided in the PDD has to be transparent and justified.</p>	48 (a)	<p>Since the project does not lead to negative impacts on the environment, transboundary impacts that occur in any other country, and are caused by implementation of this project, which is physically located entirely within Ukraine, are absent.</p> <p>The relevant information was added to the PDD version 03</p>	The issue is closed.