



DETERMINATION REPORT LLC “MT-INVEST CARBON”

DETERMINATION OF THE “IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPLEX OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES AND WASTE DISPOSAL AT PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-DET/0558/2012

REVISION No. 03

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 12/10/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: LLC "MT-Invest Carbon"	Client ref.: Yaroslav Falendysh
<p>Summary:</p> <p>Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" project of LLC "MT-Invest Carbon" located in Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiv regions of 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies JI specific approach and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.</p>	

Report No.: UKRAINE-det/0558/2012	Subject Group: JI	Indexing terms
Project title: "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE"		
Work carried out by: Vyacheslav Yeriomin – Team Leader, Lead Verifier Iuliia Pylnova – Team Member, Lead Verifier Kateryna Zinevych – Team Member, Lead Verifier Denys Pishchalov – Team Member, Financial Specialist		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit <input type="checkbox"/> Limited distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov - Internal Technical Reviewer Borys Kostyukovskyi - Bureau technical specialist		
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov - Operational Manager		
Date of this revision: 14/11/2012	Rev. No.: 03	Number of pages: 94



Table of Contents		Page
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.....	9
4.1	Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)	9
4.2	Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)	10
4.3	Baseline setting (22-26)	10
4.4	Additionality (27-31)	11
4.5	Project boundary (32-33)	12
4.6	Crediting period (34)	12
4.7	Monitoring plan (35-39)	13
4.8	Leakage (40-41)	15
4.9	Estimation of emission reductions (42-47)	15
4.10	Environmental impacts (48)	18
4.11	Stakeholder consultation (49)	19
4.12	Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)	19
4.13	Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)	19
4.14	Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)	19
5	SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES	19
6	DETERMINATION OPINION.....	19
7	REFERENCES	21
	APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL	27



1 INTRODUCTION

LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project “Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” (hereafter called “the project”) located in Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv regions.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

1.2 Scope

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

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

1.3 Determination team

The determination team consists of the following personnel:

Vyacheslav Yeriomin

Team Leader, Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Lead Verifier

Iuliia Pylnova

Team Member, Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Lead Verifier



Kateryna Zinevych
Team Member, Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Lead Verifier

Denys Pishchalov
Team Member, Bureau Veritas Certification Financial Specialist

This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov

Bureau Veritas Certification Internal technical reviewer

Borys Kostyukovskyy

Bureau Veritas Certification Technical specialist

2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by the LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” 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.



 DETERMINATION REPORT

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, the LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” revised the PDD and resubmitted it as version 04 on 12/11/2012.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD versions 01, 02, 03 and 04.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 14/09/2012 and 16/09/2012 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 “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” and the LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Organizational structure ➤ Responsibilities and authorities ➤ Responsibilities and authorities on data recording and processing ➤ Equipment implementation ➤ Data recording, archiving and reporting system ➤ Metering equipment control ➤ Metering record keeping system, database ➤ IT management ➤ Training of personnel ➤ Quality management procedures and technology ➤ Internal audits and checks
LLC “MT-Invest Carbon”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Baseline scenario methodology ➤ Monitoring plan ➤ PDD

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

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

If the determination team, in assessing the PDD and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or



improved with regard to JI project requirements, it will raise these issues and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

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

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

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

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

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

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

For more than 10 years PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" is the undisputed leader of the Ukrainian beer market. This is a young and dynamic company that is an heir and deserved successor of centuries-old traditions of the world's largest brewer Anheuser-Busch InBev on the Ukrainian market.

In Ukraine, the company joins three breweries: Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiv branch of PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE". In 1996 Chernihiv brewery «Desna» first became part of the InBev. Mykolayivska brewery «Yantar» joined the group in 1999. Kharkiv brewery «Rogan» joined the companies in 2000. This was the last phase of the «SUN InBev Ukraine» organization.

The merger of brewery «Desna», JSC «Brewery» Rogan and JSC «Brewery «Yantar», and foundation of the legal entity OJSC «SUN InBev Ukraine» took place in 2006. These breweries were reorganized in the Branch offices of OJSC «SUN InBev Ukraine». At an extraordinary



DETERMINATION REPORT

shareholder general meeting of OJSC «SUN InBev Ukraine» the decision on changing the name to PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” was taken.

The company employs more than 2500 people.

The principles of openness and integrity to the consumers, partners, and the whole society are the basics of company activity. One of the main goals of the company within the Better World global initiative is the improvement of beer consumption culture in the country, its characteristics and impact on human health.

Internal auditing system controlling the conformity to the requirements and standards on ecology and safe production of the Anheuser-Busch InBev company was implemented in order for PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” to assess safe production characteristics and general environmental efficiency.

During the audit the specialists on health, safety and environmental protection study the enterprise’s performance, detect probable inconsistencies and specify further steps of improving the production in the field of health, safety and environmental protection. In order to assess the condition of health, safety and environmental protection system PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” enlists the services of worldwide-known independent experts both on the assessment of health, safety and environmental protection system and personnel training.

The main goal of the JI project is to upgrade the production process which will lead to the reduction of electricity and heat consumption in the beer production process, and implementation of the production organic wastes (brewer draff) utilization system, which will allow to avoid methane emissions released as the result of landfill wastes allocation.

The history of the project started when, assuming the possibility of Kyoto Protocol mechanisms involvement, the specialists of PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” made a decision on the start of implementation of the production organic wastes (brewer draff) utilization system and large-scale beer production modernization:

- Technical department meeting minutes dated 09/10/2003 (PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Chernihiv branch);
- Order # 240 dated 05/11/2003 of the CEO (InBev Ukraine PJSC Kharkiv branch);
- Technical department meeting minutes dated 15/11/2003 (PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Mykolaiiv branch).

Assuming the possibility of Kyoto Protocol mechanisms involvement for the attraction of funds on enterprise modernization, the actual activity within “Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and



DETERMINATION REPORT

waste disposal at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” JI project started 01/01/2004. The first step of the project realization was signing the agreement with cattle-breeding economies on production organic wastes (brewer draff) allocation that, after the relevant processing, is added to the fodder. PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” management enlisted to the services the specialists of the LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” for the successful project implementation. The LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” is a consultant on the JI projects design and, hence, is not the project participant. The LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” main responsibilities are the design of PIN, PDD, supporting PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” during the determination process, obtaining of the Letter of Endorsement, Letter of Approval, consulting during the final determination stage.

Without JI project activity baseline scenario for PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” would consist in maintaining the existing on 2004 production equipment in working condition and production organic wastes (brewer draff) allocation at the landfill, where they are subject to anaerobic decay leaving energy resources specific consumption during beer production at the level of 2003 and thus without GHGs emission reduction.

The project activity is aimed at reducing GHGs emissions generated by the enterprise activity as the result of 2 subprojects implementation:

1. Reduction of energy resources specific consumption during the beer production process – the aim of modernization is to install highly efficient equipment and to optimize production processes leading to the reduction of electricity and heat consumption. The reduction of electricity consumption will lead to the reduction of electricity consumption from the United Energy System of Ukraine (further referred to as UESU) resulting in reduction of fuel consumption needed for electricity generation and thus GHGs reduction at the power enterprises of Ukraine. Reduction of heat consumption during the beverage production process will allow to reduce GHGs emissions in the result of reduction of natural gas combustion needed for heat generation.

2. Production wastes utilization – the aim of this subproject is production wastes utilization which will allow to reduce GHGs emissions, i. e.: reduction of methane emissions by preventing production wastes allocation at the landfill site and thus their anaerobic decay.

The implementation of the abovementioned activities at the regional branches of PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” will lead to the reduction of energy resources during the production process and elimination of production wastes anaerobic decay at the landfill sites. All the mentioned above will lead to the GHGs emissions into the atmosphere.



The identified areas of concern as to project description, project participants response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CL 01, CL 02, CL 04, CAR 03, CAR 04, CAR 05, CL 05, CAR 06, CAR 07, CAR 08, CL 06, CL 09, and CAR 23).

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 23 Corrective Action Requests, 19 Clarification Requests and 0 Forward Action 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)

Project idea note on possible JI project was provided to State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine to obtain Letter of Endorsement. State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine issued the Letter of Endorsement # 3176/23/7 dated 25/10/2012

After the finalization of determination process, the final versions of the PDD and Determination Report will be submitted for receiving Letters of Approval.

Bureau Veritas Certification would consider the letters as unconditional in accordance with paragraphs 19 - 20 of the DVM.

The identified areas of concern as to project approvals by Parties involved, project participants response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CAR 01 and CAR 10). CAR 01 is pending and will be closed after Letters of Approval are provided.



4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The participation for each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD is authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through the Letters of Approval.

4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD explicitly indicates that the 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 (complying with valid legislation, requirements and regulations of Ukraine) on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one:
 - a. Continuation of the current situation at the enterprise without energy efficiency activities
 - b. Project activity implementation without JI mechanisms

In the result of financial and technological barriers analysis, the continuation of the current situation without modernization activities envisaged by the project was identified as the baseline scenario for the proposed JI project.

- (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. Boiler-house energy efficiency;
 - b. Baseline heat specific consumption during beer production at the Chernihiv branch;
 - c. Baseline heat specific consumption during beer production at the Kharkiv branch;
 - d. Baseline heat specific consumption during beer production at the Mykolaiv branch;
 - e. The amount of beer produced within the project per year at the Chernihiv branch;
 - f. The amount of beer produced within the project per year at the Kharkiv branch;
 - g. The amount of beer produced within the project per year at the Mykolaiv branch;
 - h. Carbon oxidation factor during natural gas combustion;
 - i. The amount of carbon in natural gas;
 - j. The emission factor for UESU;



- k. Baseline electricity specific consumption during beer production at the Chernihiv branch;
- l. Baseline electricity specific consumption during beer production at the Kharkiv branch;
- m. Baseline electricity specific consumption during beer production at the Mykolaiv branch
- n. Global warming potential;
- o. The amount of brewer draff to be transported to the landfill without project activity at the Chernihiv branch;
- p. The amount of brewer draff to be transported to the landfill without project activity at the Kharkiv branch;
- q. The amount of brewer draff to be transported to the landfill without project activity at the Mykolaiv branch;
- r. Methane flow correction factor;
- s. The amount of destructive carbon;
- t. Destructive organic carbon fraction;
- u. Methane fraction in landfill gas;
- v. Methane fraction utilized at the landfill site;
- w. Oxidation factor.

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are sound and reasonable, and the baseline is justified appropriately.

The identified areas of concern as to baseline setting, project participants response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CL 07, CL 08, CL10, CL 11, CAR 11, and CAR 13).

4.4 Additionality (27-31)

Sources of emissions of this project were determined separately for each sub-project. The sources of greenhouse gas emissions are: reduction of specific energy consumption in the beer production and production waste disposal.

Additionality of the proposed project was assessed under the requirements of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" (version 03). The JI specific approach was applied to assess the additionality of the proposed project, according to which the additionality was evaluated under the "Tool for demonstration and assessment of additionality" (version 06.0.0). This method provides a step-by-step assessment of the project's additionality (step 1: identification of alternatives to the project activity consistent with current laws and regulations; step 2: barrier analysis; step 3: investment analysis; step 4: common practice analysis). The outcome of the analysis using the method mentioned above is the following: the project implementation will reduce greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere that could not be achieved

without this project. Any reduction of harmful emissions into the atmosphere that is achieved within this project will be additional.

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

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

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

- (i) Under the control of the project participants;
- (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and
- (iii) Significant, i.e., as a rule of thumb, would by each source account on average per year over the crediting period for more than 1 per cent of the annual average anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs, or exceed an amount of 2,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, whichever is lower.

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

The identified areas of concern as to the project boundary, project participants response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CAR 02, and CAR 12).

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 09/10/2003, which is after the beginning of 2000. As the project starting date the date on which the first decision concerning the project was made as per the Technical department meeting minutes at the PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Chernihiv branch.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 22 years or 264 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 22 years (264 months), and its starting date as 01/01/2004, which is on the date of the first emission reductions generated by the project.

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

The PDD states that the extension of its crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval, and the estimates of emission reductions 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 Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CAR 09, CAR 17 and CAR 18).

4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)

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

The monitoring plan describes all relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored, and the period in which they will be monitored, in particular also all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance, such as forms of statistical reports, quality control and quality assurance procedures, organizational and management structures, which are/will be established for the monitoring plan.

The monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable (i.e. provide consistent and accurate values), valid (i.e. are clearly connected with the effect to be measured), and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions to be monitored such as project heat specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch; boiler-house efficiency; carbon oxidation factor during natural gas combustion; the amount of carbon in natural gas; project electricity specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch; the emission factor for UESU;

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

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, such as baseline heat specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch, baseline electricity specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch;
- (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, such as project heat consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch; boiler-



DETERMINATION REPORT

house efficiency; carbon oxidation factor during natural gas combustion; the amount of carbon in natural gas; project electricity specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch; the emission factor for UESU; amount of beer produced within the project per year at the relevant local branch; methane global warming potential; amount of brewer draff to be transported to the landfill without project activity at the relevant local branch; methane flow correction factor; amount of destructive carbon; destructive organic carbon fraction; methane fraction in landfill gas; methane fraction utilized at the landfill site; oxidation factor.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording, such as usage of metering equipment, calculations with annual registration, hard and electronic copies of the records. The relevant information concerning the monitoring of each parameter is described in details in the Section D of the PDD.

The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions and project emissions.

The monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process.

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

The monitoring data to be measured is read off by the process team from the relevant measuring equipment. The operational monitoring data (data readings) is registered by the process team in the technological logbooks. Summarized data on energy resources consumption and the amount of produced goods per year are reflected in the Reports on fuel, heat and electricity consumption (Form # 11-MTП); data on the amount of brewer draff to be transported to the landfill site within project activity per year is reflected in the Form on wastes handling (form # 1-wastes). These are the documents of official reporting. The copies of annual reports are handed to the monitoring team. Annual reports are the main data sources for calculation of ERUs and writing annual monitoring reports. All monitoring data are subject to processing and storage in hard copies and electronic format.

CEO of the PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" relevant local branch appoints the personnel responsible for the project technical equipment operation and maintenance. These personnel are also responsible for registration of all data needed for monitoring. Technological managers are in charge of the monitoring teams of PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" relevant local branches. Monitoring is to be performed in correlation with process team and envisages the monitoring itself, as well as analysis and archiving of all the data mentioned in the Section above. Monitoring team responsibilities also include organization of the emissions reduction calculation. Emissions reduction calculation is performed by the project developer as per the instruction of the monitoring team leader. In



order to prove credibility of the periodic monitoring data, they are analyzed against the registered by process team parameters. In case of any process data discrepancies, the reason of that must be found. In case of any monitoring data discrepancies, the monitoring system of the relevant parameter must be altered.

All information on monitoring data and any corrective actions is to be archived for further verification of emissions reduction. Monitoring team leader is responsible for preparing and archiving of the Monitoring Reports. CEO of the relevant local branch analyzes summarized monitoring data and relevant documents on a periodic basis. JI project developer will assist in monitoring management, if required.

The monitoring plan presents 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 monitoring plan, on the whole, 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 Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CAR 19, CAR 21 and CAR 22).

4.8 Leakage (40-41)

The project doesn't envisage any activity that would cause leakages.

4.9 Estimation of emission reductions (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 generated by the project.

The PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:



 DETERMINATION REPORT

(a) Emissions for the project scenario (within the project boundary), which are 478 563 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2004-2007, 785 629 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2008-2012 and 2 080 117 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2013-2025;

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

(c) Emissions for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are 1 077 231 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2004-2007, 1 846 065 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2008-2012 and 4 931 472 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2013-2025;

(d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), which are 598 668 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2004-2007, 1 060 436 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2008-2012 and 2 851 355 tonnes of CO₂eq for the period 2013-2025.

The estimates referred to above are given:

(a) On a periodic basis;

(b) From 01/01/2004 to 31/12/2025, covering the whole crediting period;

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

(d) For each GHG gas (CO₂ та CH₄)

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

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

The annual emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y,$$

where:

ER_y – emission reduction under JI project per year, t CO_{2e};

BE_y – baseline emissions per year, t CO_{2e};

PE_y – project emissions per year, t CO_{2e}.

y – year for which the calculation is made.

$$BE_y = \sum_{l=1}^3 BE_{l,y}$$

BE_y – total amount of Baseline GHG emissions, t CO_{2e};

 DETERMINATION REPORT

$BE_{i,y}$ – total amount of Baseline GHG emissions for the corresponding regional branch, t CO_{2e};

i – regional branch;

$i=1$ – Chernihiv branch of PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE";

$i=2$ – Kharkiv branch of PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE";

$i=3$ – Mykolaiv branch of PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE".

$$PE_{i,y} = PE_{heat,i,y} + PE_{elec,i,y},$$

where:

$PE_{i,y}$ – total amount of emissions under the project scenario for the corresponding regional branch, t CO_{2e};

$PE_{heat,i,y}$ – emissions caused by heat consumption in the beer production for the corresponding regional branch, t CO_{2e};

$PE_{elec,i,y}$ – emissions caused by electricity consumption in the beer production for the corresponding regional branch, t CO_{2e}.

For calculating the estimates referred to above, key factors (e.g. boiler-house efficiency; baseline heat specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch; carbon oxidation factor during natural gas combustion; the amount of carbon in natural gas; the emission factor for UESU; baseline electricity specific consumption during beer production at the relevant local branch; methane global warming potential; amount of brewer draff to be transported to the landfill without project activity at the relevant local branch; methane flow correction factor; amount of destructive carbon; destructive organic carbon fraction; methane fraction in landfill gas; methane fraction utilized at the landfill site; oxidation factor), 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, such as production performance estimation, actual statistics, IPCC, National Inventory of Ukraine are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, such as emission factor for UESU, 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 PDD, on its item E, includes an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation.

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



DETERMINATION REPORT

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 identified areas of concern as to the estimation of emission reductions, project participants response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination report (refer to CAR 20).

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

The PDD lists and attaches documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party.

The PDD provides description of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party.

The proposed JI project will have positive impact on the environment due to the reduction of energy resources consumed to meet PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" production needs, and due to the production wastes (brewer draff) utilization system implementation leading to the reduction of GHGs emission into the atmosphere.

Emission reductions will be achieved due to the project implementation, namely:

- Subproject "Reduction of energy resources specific consumption during the beer production process" will allow to reduce electricity and heat specific consumption in the beer production process. The reduction of the mentioned energy resources specific consumption will lead to the reduction of electricity and heat consumption during beer production process resulting in reduction of fossil fuel combustion needed for electricity and heat generation at the power enterprises of Ukraine;
- Subproject "Production wastes utilization" will allow to avoid CH₄ emissions which are released in the result of production wastes (brewer draff) anaerobic decay at the landfill site.

Emission reductions achieved by the project implementation will have positive impact on the environment of Ukraine and doesn't influence GHGs emissions outside the boundaries of Ukraine.

Within the procedures required by the authorities the enterprise reports on environmental parameters on a periodic basis. As per the Order # 108 dated 09/03/2006 issued by the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine after justifying the amount of emissions (according to the



procedure prescribed by the instruction to the Order) State Administrations of Environmental Resources of Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv Regions issues to the PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” relevant local branches the permits on emissions.

The following permits were issued to PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”:

- Permit # 7410136600-86 on stationary sources air pollution (PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Chernihiv branch)
- Permit # 6310138200-138 on stationary sources air pollution (PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Kharkiv branch)
- Permit # 4810136600-4a/П on stationary sources air pollution (PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Mykolaiiv branch)

4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)

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

Stakeholders’ comments will be collected during the publication of the project within determination procedure.

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 complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Project in Ukraine. The



DETERMINATION REPORT

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 participant/s used the latest tool for demonstration 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 04 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.

The review of the project design documentation (version 04) 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 LLC "MT-Invest Carbon" that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ PDD of the project "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE", version 01 dated 17/08/2012.
- /2/ PDD of the project "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE", version 02 dated 01/10/2012.
- /3/ PDD of the project "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE", version 03 dated 09/10/2012.
- /4/ PDD of the project "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE", version 04 dated 12/11/2012.
- /5/ Decree # 206 dated 22/02/2006 issued by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine
- /6/ Guidelines for Users of the JI PDD Form, version 04, JISC.
- /7/ JI PDD Form, version 01.
- /8/ Glossary of Joint Implementation Terms, version 03, JISC.
- /9/ Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, version 03, JISC.
- /10/ Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 06.0.0.
- /11/ "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality", version 04.0.0.
- /12/ "Tool to determine the baseline efficiency of thermal or electric energy generation systems" (version 01) dated 17/07/2009.
- /13/ "Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption" (version 01) dated 16/05/2008.
- /14/ Clarification regarding the Public Availability of Documents under the Verification Procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee, version 03, JISC.
- /15/ Approved CDM methodology ACM0012 "Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions from waste energy recovery projects" (version 4.0.0).
- /16/ Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
- /17/ GHGs emission reduction Excel spreadsheet "OCB SUN InBev PDD"
- /18/ Letter of Endorsement # 3176/23/7 dated 25/10/2012 of the project "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE"

Category 2 Documents:

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

- /1/ Inventory data justifying the implemented project activities (indicating the dates) at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Karkiv branch
- /2/ Photo–new HUPPMANN brew kettle, installed at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /3/ Photo–new HUPPMANN evaporation condenser installed at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /4/ Photo–Alfa Laval MK15-BFGR heat exchanger installed at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /5/ Photo–6 bar compressed air pipeline system at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /6/ Photo–CO₂ Energy saving Evaporator unit -ReVap2000 at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /7/ Photo–ammonia condensation pressure automated control system at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /8/ Photo–wort two-phase boiling system for brew kettle
- /9/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January–December 2001 at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /10/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January–December 2002 at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /11/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January–December 2003 at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /12/ Minutes dated 15/11/2003 to Yantar Brewer technical department meeting
- /13/ Inventory data justifying the implemented project activities (indicating the dates) at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch
- /14/ Statement # 89 dated 02/11/2010 on acceptance-transmitting of provided services (i. e.: vapor condenser heating system mounting)
- /15/ Statement # 6 on acceptance-transmitting of provided services (i. e.: compressed air system modernization at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch)
- /16/ Statement # 2 dated 08/08/2011 on acceptance-transmitting of provided services (i. e.: mounting of system of glycol cooling by carbonic anhydride)
- /17/ Statement # 1 dated 05/09/2011 on acceptance-transmitting of provided services (i. e.: mounting and set-up of ammonia compressors condensing pressure automatic control system)
- /18/ Statement # 0250 dated 28/03/2012 on acceptance-transmitting of executed works (provided services)
- /19/ Order # 111 dated 10/08/2012 on appointing the monitoring team
- /20/ Environmental impact assessment. PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Kharkiv branch cooling department, CO₂ recuperation section, air compressors section
- /21/ Order # 240 dated 05/11/2003 on brewer draff utilization (Kharkiv)
- /22/ Order # 14 dated 06/01/2012 on appointing the personnel responsible for wastes handling (Kharkiv)



DETERMINATION REPORT

- /23/ Order # 152 dated 30/07/2012 on appointing the monitoring team
- /24/ Technical passport on brewery car scales # 3
- /25/ Technical passport of vapor condenser series VXC-S700, registration # 249
- /26/ Technical passport of vapor condenser series VXC-S1010, registration # 92
- /27/ Technical passport of vapor condenser series VXC-S1010, registration # 93
- /28/ Technical passport of vapor condenser series VXC-S700, registration # 89
- /29/ Technical passport of vapor condenser series S1010, registration # 90
- /30/ Technical passport of vapor condenser series VXC, registration # 91
- /31/ Technical passport of vapor condenser # 1 series VXC, registration # 267
- /32/ Technical passport of Baltimore Aircoil VXT-N310 water cooling tower
- /33/ Passport on ETANORM G 100-200 G11 pump
- /34/ Passport on ETANORM C65-160 C11 pump
- /35/ Statement dated 06/02/2011 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not enlisted in the National Archive Fund (Kharkiv)
- /36/ Statement # 1 dated 03/12/2010 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not enlisted in the National Archive Fund (Kharkiv)
- /37/ Statement # 1 dated 29/05/2009 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not enlisted in the National Archive Fund (Kharkiv)
- /38/ Statement dated 09/01/2008 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not being subject to storage (Kharkiv)
- /39/ Statement dated 06/01/2006 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not being subject to storage (Kharkiv)
- /40/ Statement # 3 dated 29/12/2004 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not being subject to storage
- /41/ Statement # 4 dated 12/03/2004 on withdrawal for destruction of documents not being subject to storage
- /42/ Operation manual. Grasso control system. Device for aggregates and cooling machines with screw compressors.
- /43/ Technical documentation on screw Grasso SP1 Large compressor aggregate type YB-2B
- /44/ Instruction on Mounting and Technical Maintenance (IMT). Grasso12 industrial cooling piston-type compressors
- /45/ Operational manual on CO₂ regeneration unit
- /46/ Passport on bright beer tank. CO₂ drying filter Registration # 285, fabrication # 3516/1-1
- /47/ Passport on bright beer tank. CO₂ drying filter Registration # 286, fabrication # 3516/1-2
- /48/ Passport on bright beer tank. CO₂ filter with activated carbon. Fabrication # 3516/2-1, registration # 287
- /49/ Passport on bright beer tank. CO₂ filter with activated carbon. Fabrication # 3516/2-2, registration # 288
- /50/ Agreement # 6422 dated 29/03/2006 on selling of brewer production wastes
- /51/ Supply agreement # 01-03/12 dated 01/03/2012 on selling brewer draff.
- /52/ Agreement # 01-04-03-11 dated 01/03/2011 on brewer draff supply.
- /53/ Agreement # 04-01-/09 dated 26/01/2009 on brewer draff supply
- /54/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-December 2003

DETERMINATION REPORT

- /55/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-June 2003
- /56/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-December 2002
- /57/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-March 2002
- /58/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-December 2001
- /59/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-September 2001
- /60/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-June 2001
- /61/ Operational manual. Pressant Duplex 2 NT K R52-160 pellet discharger
- /62/ Operational manual. Robot FANUC M-410iB/450Kg pelletizer, serial # C/3869
- /63/ Passport on pressure (0,07 MPa (0,7 kgf/cm²) tank # 5. Registration # 253, fabrication # 517
- /64/ Passport on pressure (0,07 MPa (0,7 kgf/cm²) tank # 6. Registration # 252, fabrication # 516
- /65/ Passport on pressure (0,07 MPa (0,7 kgf/cm²) tank # 7. Registration # 251, fabrication # 515
- /66/ Passport on pressure (0,07 MPa (0,7 kgf/cm²) tank # 9. Registration # 255, fabrication # 519
- /67/ Passport on pressure (0,07 MPa (0,7 kgf/cm²) tank. Registration # 250, fabrication # 514
- /68/ Passport on bright beer tank. Registration # 329
- /69/ Minutes dated 09/10/2003 to Desna Brewer technical department meeting
- /70/ Order # 183 dated 13/08/2012 on appointing the monitoring team
- /71/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 30/06/2010 on main equipment. Pipeline insulation, inventory # 1000012167/1 (brewage steam and condensate pipeline)
- /72/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 30/06/2010 on main equipment. Pipeline insulation, inventory # 1000011589/1 (main heat exchanger steam distribution line)
- /73/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 30/06/2010 on main equipment. Pipeline insulation, inventory # 1000018598/1 (main line # 6 technological pipelines)
- /74/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 28/12/2007 on main equipment. Grasso screfw compressor, model TB-1B
- /75/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 30/11/2006 on main equipment. CO₂ recuperation unit on 1200 kg/h
- /76/ Permit # 740058 on stationary sources air pollution. Valid till 31/12/2007 (Chernihiv)
- /77/ Letter # 08-10/1088 dated 27/04/06 to SUN Interbrew Ukraine OJSC Chernihiv branch CEO B. Hrechko
- /78/ Statute of PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE"
- /79/ Letter to PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Chernihiv branch CEO Y. Shevchenko on statistical reports



DETERMINATION REPORT

- /80/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 30/09/2004 on main equipment. Ammonia refrigerating unit
- /81/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 30/11/2004 on main equipment. KC-32-150 pump
- /82/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 29/11/2005 on main equipment. HD-1904 high pressure pump
- /83/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 19/09/2005 on main equipment. Ammonia-compressor shop ventilation unit
- /84/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 19/09/2005 on main equipment. Ammonia-compressor shop ventilation unit
- /85/ Acceptance-transmitting statement dated 28/12/2007 on main equipment. Baltimore vapor condenser, model type VXC-S504
- /86/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-June 2002
- /87/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-December 2002
- /88/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-December 2003
- /89/ Report on results of fuel, heat and electricity consumption for January-June 2003
- /90/ Logbook on electricity consumption by PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Chernihiv branch
- /91/ Letter dated 28/07/2008 on training records



DETERMINATION REPORT

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/ O. Kovalenko – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” specialist on training and development
- /2/ L. Yeromova – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” brewage process manager
- /3/ I. Tsaryk – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” health, safety and environmental protection manager
- /4/ O. Salatska – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” quality manager
- /5/ I. Andrianov – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” package production manager
- /6/ O. Kozmenko – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” technical manager
- /7/ V. Sobkiv – PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” technical service process manager
- /8/ N. Vasylieva – LLC “MT-Invest Carbon” project manager

o0o -



DETERMINATION REPORT

APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION HOLDING SAS

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
General description of the project				
Title of the project				
-	Is the title of the project presented?	The title of the project is "Implementation of complex of energy efficiency measures and waste disposal at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE".	OK	OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	The sectoral scope to which the project pertains is: 1 Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources) and 13 Waste handling and disposal. CAR 23. Please correct orthographic mistakes in the name of project sectoral scope (please refer to the Section A.1 of the PDD).	CAR 23	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	The current version number of the document is presented in the Section A.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		being started. Please specify the date and justify the choice. Please refer to the Section A.2 of the PDD.		
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	Please refer to the Table in the Section A.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	Yes, please refer to the Section A.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Yes, please refer to the Annex 1 to PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Yes, the Party involved, Ukraine, is indicated as a host Party.	OK	OK
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	Host Party – Ukraine.	OK	OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv regions. CAR 02. Please (in the Sections A.4.1.2 and A.4.1.3 of the PDD) use the names of PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” in a relevant case (in Ukrainian	CAR 02	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		version of PDD) as the context requires (this concerns Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv branches).		
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv cities.	OK	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	Yes, please refer to the Section A.4 of the PDD.	OK	OK
Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project				
-	Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	<p>The technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule are described in the Section A.4.2 of PDD.</p> <p>The project activity is aimed at reducing GHGs emissions as the result of 2 subprojects implementation: 1) Reduction of energy resources specific consumption during the beer production process, and 2) production wastes utilization. The subproject measures and activities are described in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD.</p> <p>CL 03. Please clarify whether the project is not a JI programme of activities.</p>	CL 03	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>CAR 03. While describing in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD implemented project activities on modernization at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Chernihiv branch, please, provide more detailed comparing clarification of what was before installation of Haffmans carbon-dioxide unit, and also explain the modernization of steam supply line.</p> <p>CAR 04. While describing in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD (pp. 10-11) implemented project activities on modernization at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Kharkiv branch, please, structure the listing (e. g. instead of <i>installation of 6 new bright beer tanks, installation of 3 new bright beer tanks</i>, etc. please write <i>installation of all bright beer tanks within the project activity</i>). All implemented activities should be stated separately in the Table indicating the dates of project activities implementation.</p> <p>CAR 05. While describing in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD implemented project activities at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv branches, please, provide for each item more</p>	<p>CAR 03</p> <p>CAR 04</p> <p>CAR 05</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>detailed comparing clarification of what was before project equipment installation.</p> <p>CL 05. On the pages 9 and 13 of the PDD (Section A.4.2), please correct the mistake in paragraph 2, as the aim is not to reduce heat, but to reduce heat specific consumption.</p> <p>CAR 06. In the Table on page 9, please, indicate the right date of NF-811 ammonia piston compressor replacement by WB-1A Grasso ammonia screw compressor.</p> <p>CAR 07. Please state in the project implementation schedule at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" branches the brewer draff utilization process, indicating its starting date (because due to that it is not clear why the starting date of the crediting period is 2004).</p> <p>CAR 08. Please grammatically correct sentences containing the clarification on subprojects names (pages 3, 20, 43, 48 of the PDD).</p> <p>CL 06. While describing the subproject on production wastes utilization (Section A.4.2 of the</p>	<p>CL 05</p> <p>CAR 06</p> <p>CAR 07</p> <p>CAR 08</p> <p>CL 06</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>PDD), please, describe in more details where/when brewage draff is supposed to be transported after extraction (how this will be monitored).</p> <p>CAR 21. Please provide the copies of passports on newly installed project equipment at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiv branch.</p> <p>CL 04. Please explain in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD the abbreviation PET bottles (because it has not been explained anywhere in the PDD that these are the bottles made out of polyethyleneterephthalate).</p>	<p>CAR 21</p> <p>CL 04</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	How anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved is stated in the Section A.4.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	<p>Please refer to the Section A.4.3.1 of the PDD.</p> <p>CAR 09. Please note that the starting date of the</p>	CAR 09	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		crediting period in Ukraine cannot be before 01 April 2004 (the date of Kyoto Protocol ratification in Ukraine). Besides it should be clearly stated in the PDD after which first project activity (specifying the date of its implementation) emission reductions generation began. Taking into account the information above, please, make necessary amendments in the Sections A.4.3.1 and C.3 of the PDD.		
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO ₂ e?	Yes. Please refer to the Section A.4.3.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Yes, please refer to the point above.	OK	OK
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	Please refer to CAR 09 of this Table.	Refer to CAR 09	OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent provided?	Yes. Please refer to the Section A.4.3.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	<p>CAR 01. Please provide the Letter of Approval of the project issued by the host Party.</p> <p>CAR 10. Please provide the Letter of Endorsement issued by the State Environmental Investment Agency for the project and indicate in the Section A.5 of the PDD the number and date of its issuance.</p>	CAR 01 CAR 10	Pending OK
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	The Party involved, Ukraine, is indicated as the host Party.	OK	OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	Please refer to CAR 01 of this Table.	Refer to CAR 01	Pending
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	All the written project approvals by Parties involved will be considered unconditional. Please refer to CAR 01	Refer to CAR 01	Pending
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved				
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: – A written project approval by a Party	Please refer to CAR 01 of the Table.	Refer to CAR 01	Pending



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach	CL 07. Please clarify whether the chosen JI specific approach is based on the elements of standard methodology; has it already been used in the previously determined projects? (Section B.1 of the PDD).	CL 07	OK
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	<p>CL 08. Please clearly identify what period was set as the baseline for the project.</p> <p>CL 09. Please state (at least when it is first met) the full name of the relevant ministry of ecology (Minpryrody of Ukraine is shortened form).</p> <p>CL 10. Please pay attention to the spelling mistake in the Section B.1 of the PDD (p. 26, paragraph 2).</p>	<p>CL 08</p> <p>CL 09</p> <p>CL 10</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>CL 11. Starting with page 27 in the Ukrainian version of PDD correct the spelling of word “corrective” and please correct it throughout PDD.</p> <p>CAR 11. Please use the correct name of the TÜV SÜD company (please refer to page 34 of the PDD).</p>	<p>CL 11</p> <p>CAR 11</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
23	<p>Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established:</p> <p>(a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one?</p> <p>(b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance?</p> <p>– Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account?</p> <p>(c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors?</p> <p>(d) Taking into account of uncertainties</p>	<p>CAR 12. Emission sources within baseline and project scenarios, mentioned in PDD, should coincide with the sources indicated in the Table on page 49 of the PDD.</p> <p>CAR 13. Please indicate in the Section B.4 of the PDD the date of baseline setting.</p>	<p>CAR 12</p> <p>CAR 13</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>and using conservative assumptions?</p> <p>(e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure?</p> <p>(f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate?</p>			
24	<p>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?</p>	<p>Please refer to CL 07 of the section 22 of this Table.</p>	<p>Refer to CL 07</p>	<p>OK</p>
25	<p>If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?</p>	<p>An appropriate justification is provided.</p>	<p>OK</p>	<p>OK</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
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
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
Additionality				



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
JI specific approach only				
28	<p>Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used?</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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”.</p>	<p>CAR 14. Please note that <i>Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers</i> (item 6) state that if project participants indicate the investment barrier, they should demonstrate in the PDD that the project was financed involving JI funds only. This should demonstrate that credit granting decision (or main financial decisions) was taken by the creditor taking into consideration the JI benefits. At the same time the developer has not provided any justifying documents, but for the internal documents of PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”. Please provide the relevant justification.</p>	CAR 14	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

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?	CAR 16. Please provide more detailed clarification why no funds were invested exactly for this project by this enterprise (please note that as per <i>Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers</i> (item 1), while demonstrating the barriers, i. e. absence of funds availability, information has to include company description, its structure, owners and financial information). In case of difficulties to justify non-availability of funds. Please perform the investment analysis.	CAR 16	OK
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Please refer to CAR 14 of this Table.	Refer to CAR 14	OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	CAR 15. Unfavourable economic conditions stated by the developer are not a compelling barrier because there were available funds on the market for financing the projects of technical upgrade in industry. Please provide more detailed justification of compelling barriers.	CAR 15	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
30	If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	Please refer to CAR 14 of this Table.	Refer to CAR 14	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
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



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects)				
JI specific approach only				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (i) Under the control of the project participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	Please refer to CAR 12 in the section 23 of this Table.	Refer to CAR 12	OK
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?	Please refer to the Section B.3 of the PDD.	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?	Please refer to CAR 08 of this Table.	Refer to CAR 08	OK
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or	Please refer to the Section B.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the project are appropriately justified?			
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	CAR 17. Please in the Section C.1 of the PDD provide clear justification and documental evidences of the project starting date. In case the date was chosen mistakenly, please, make necessary amendments to this Section of the PDD.	CAR 17	OK
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	The starting date is after the beginning of 2000.	OK	OK
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	The PDD in the Section C.2 states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months. CAR 18. Please justify in the Section C.2 of the PDD why 22 years were set as the expected operational lifetime of the project.	CAR 18	OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	Please refer to CAR 09 of this table.	Refer to CAR 09	OK
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting	Yes, the starting date of the crediting period is on	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	the date 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?	The crediting period does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.	OK	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?	The relevant information on crediting period possible extension beyond 2012 is stated in PDD. Yes, the estimates of emission reductions are presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012.	OK	OK
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach	The PDD explicitly indicates that JI specific approach is used.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
JI specific approach only				
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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? 	The monitoring plan describes all relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored and the period in which they will be monitored.	OK	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?	The monitoring plan specifies the constants and variables used that are reliable and valid.	OK	OK
36 (b)	If default values are used: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? – Do the default values originate from recognized sources? – Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels? – Are the default values presented in a transparent manner? 	Please refer to the Section D.1.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, – Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? – Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	The conservativeness of the values provided is justified in the PDD clearly indicating the precise references from which these values are taken.	OK	OK
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	Mostly International System Units (SI units) are used in the project.	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?	The monitoring plan notes the parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD and the previous section of this table.	OK	OK
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring"?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are 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	Please refer to the previous section of this table.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	period?			
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring.	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?	CAR 19. The necessary formula is absent in the Section D.1.1.4 of the PDD, please, add it.	CAR 19	OK
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	Please refer to the Section D.1.1.4 of the PDD. CAR 20. In the Sections E.1, E.4, E.5, E.6 instead of the subtitle <i>Assigned Amount Units</i> (meaning only the name of emission reductions before 2008, but not the period itself), please, indicate the period <i>2004-2008</i> .	CAR 20	OK
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Please refer to CAR 19 of this table.	Refer to CAR 19	OK
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	All equations are numbered.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Yes, it was defined.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	The conservativeness of the algorithms is justified.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	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?	The consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions of the baseline is ensured.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	Please refer to CAR 19 of this table.	Refer to CAR 19	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	All references are provided as necessary.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Key assumptions are explained in a transparent manner.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	Please refer to the section 36 (f) (vii) of this table.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals provided?	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	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	Please refer to the Section D of the PDD.	OK	OK



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	description of the standard can be found?			
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	Please refer to the section 36 (f) (vii) of this table.	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 monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process. The information on calibration will be provided at the stage of first verification.	OK	OK
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	The monitoring plan clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities.	OK	OK
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type?	The monitoring plan, on the whole, reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?			
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?	Please refer to the Section D 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?	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.	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	Please refer to the section 36 of this table.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	line with 36 above?			
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
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
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	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	appropriately as a result?			
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach				
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</p>	<p>The monitoring plan doesn't indicate overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period.</p>	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?			
Leakage				
JI specific approach only				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	Leakage is not envisaged by the project.	OK	OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	Not applicable. Please refer to the Section E.2 of the PDD.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and	The option (a) was chosen. It was described in the PDD.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions			
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 (a) and (c).	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	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?			
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 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol?</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>The estimates are provided from the beginning until the end of the crediting period.</p> <p>The estimates are provided in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.</p>		



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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?	Please refer to the Section B of the PDD.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – On a periodic basis? – At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? – On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? – For each GHG? – In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of 	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the Kyoto Protocol? – Are the formula used for calculating the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? – Are the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? – Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?	Please refer to the Section F.1 of the PDD. The following permits were issued to PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE": - Permit # 7410136600-86 on stationary sources air pollution (PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Chernihiv branch) - Permit # 6310138200-138 on	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		stationary sources air pollution (PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Kharkiv branch) - Permit # 4810136600-4a/П on stationary sources air pollution (PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch)		
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?	Implementation of the proposed project allowed to reduce pollutants emission from the sources. As per permits issued by the Chernihiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv regions State environmental administrations the environmental impact is not significant and mostly positive. According to the requirements of active legislation, i. e. Law of Ukraine # 1264-XII "On Environmental Protection" dated 25/06/1991 and State Construction Norms DBN A.2.2-1, the project implementation doesn't require environmental ecological expertise and Environmental Impact Assessment development.	OK	OK
Environmental impacts				
49	If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the	Stakeholder consultation was not undertaken as it is not required by the	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide: (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	host party. Stakeholders' comments will be collected during the publication of the project within determination procedure.		
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)				
50	Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under: (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	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the JISC in accordance with the relevant provision in “Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects”?			
51	<p>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:</p> <p>(a) Which has the same project participants; and</p> <p>(b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and</p> <p>(c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and</p> <p>(d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point?</p>	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
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	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>project participant to represent all project participants in communicating with the JISC?</p> <p>(iii) Indication by the Parties involved that they are aware of the bundle in their project approvals referred to in 19 above?</p>			
53	<p>If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects:</p> <p>(a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category?</p> <p>(b) Apply the same technology or measure?</p> <p>(c) Located in the territory of the same host Party?</p>	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
54	<p>If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects:</p> <p>(a) Have SSC PDDs been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle?</p> <p>(b) Does each SSC PDD contain a single JI SCC project in the bundle?</p>	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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? (iii) Do all the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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?			
Applicable to all JI SSC projects				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
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:	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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)?			
Jl specific approach only				
59	Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above Does the PDD provide an explanation how the baseline chosen: – Takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC? – Ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
60	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (a) Does the project boundary geographically delineate the Jl LULUCF project under the control of the project participants?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>(a) If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land,</p> <p>(i) Does each discrete area of land have a unique geographical identification?</p> <p>(ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area?</p> <p>(ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land?</p> <p>(b) Does the project boundary encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are:</p> <p>(i) Under the control of the project participants;</p> <p>(ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and</p> <p>(iii) Significant?</p> <p>(c) Does the project boundary account for all changes in the following carbon pools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Above-ground biomass; - Below-ground biomass; - Litter; - Dead wood; and 			



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	– Soil organic carbon? (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	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	to the baseline or the LULUCF project appropriately justified?			
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 sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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
Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
66	Does the PDD include: (a) A description of the policy or goal	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>that the JI PoA seeks to promote?</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The maintenance of records for each JPA? – A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)? – Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA? <p>(d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used?</p> <p>(e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of</p>			



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	JPA's 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 (b) For each type of JPA	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

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



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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?			



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 conclusion team
<p>CAR 01. Please provide the Letter of Approval of the project issued by the host Party.</p>	19	<p>After the finalization of determination process, the final versions of the PDD and Determination Report will be submitted to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine for receiving Letters of Approval. Letter of Approval will be provided to the verification team during the first stage of verification.</p>	Pending.
<p>CL 01. Please provide in the Section A.2 of the PDD short chronological description of the enterprise name changes (with references to the documents justifying the fact), regarding the change of the status of joint-stock company (e. g. since the starting date of the project OJSC «SUN InBev Ukraine» has been renamed to PJSC «SUN INBEV UKRAINE»).</p>	-	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p> <p>The required document was provided.</p>	The issue is closed based on the information provided.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CL 02. Please clarify in the Section A.2 of the PDD (p. 3, paragraph 3) whether 2004 is the year of project being initiated or actual project activity being started. Please specify the date and justify the choice.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>The issue is closed based on the clarification provided in the Section A.2 of the PDD.</p>
<p>CL 03. Please clarify whether the project is not a JI programme of activities.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Response # 1 to CL 03. This project is not a JI programme of activities.</p> <p>Response # 2 to CL 03. The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Conclusion on response # 1.</p> <p>You should clarify/prove why the project isn't a JI programme of activities. Also this explanation should be added to the PDD.</p> <p>Conclusion on response # 2.</p> <p>The issue is closed, based on the clarification provided in the the PDD.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 02. Please (in the Sections A.4.1.2 and A.4.1.3 of the PDD) use the names of PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” in a relevant case (in Ukrainian version of PDD) as the context requires (this concerns Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv branches).</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Based on the corrections made the issue is closed.</p>
<p>CL 04. Please explain in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD the abbreviation PET bottles (because it has not been explained anywhere in the PDD that these are the bottles made out of polyethyleneterephthalate).</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Based on the corrections made the issue is closed.</p>
<p>CAR 03. While describing in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD implemented project activities on modernization at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Chernihiv branch, please, provide more detailed comparing clarification of what was before installation of Haffmans carbon-dioxide unit, and also explain the modernization of steam supply line.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>CAR 03 is closed based on the information included in the PDD.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 04. While describing in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD (pp. 10-11) implemented project activities on modernization at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Kharkiv branch, please, structure the listing (e. g. instead of <i>installation of 6 new bright beer tanks, installation of 3 new bright beer tanks, etc.</i> please write <i>installation of all bright beer tanks within the project activity</i>). All implemented activities should be stated separately in the Table indicating the dates of project activities implementation.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>CAR 04 is closed based on the corrections made.</p>
<p>CAR 05. While describing in the Section A.4.2 of the PDD implemented project activities at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” Kharkiv and Mykolaiiv branches, please, provide for each item more detailed comparing clarification of what was before project equipment installation.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>All the required changes concerning the replaced project equipment were made in the last version of PDD. The rest of the equipment was installed additionally to the present one. The reason for installing the new equipment is to reduce the usage of old less energy efficient equipment.</p>	<p>Due to the amendments made, CAR 05 is closed.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CL 05. On the pages 9 and 13 of the PDD (Section A.4.2), please correct the mistake in paragraph 2, as the aim is not to reduce heat, but to reduce heat specific consumption.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>The mistake is corrected. The issue is closed.</p>
<p>CAR 06. In the Table on page 9, please, indicate the right date of NF-811 ammonia piston compressor replacement by WB-1A Grasso ammonia screw compressor.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>CAR 06 is closed after amending the PDD.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 07. Please state in the project implementation schedule at PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” branches the brewer draff utilization process, indicating its starting date (because due to that it is not clear why the starting date of the crediting period is 2004).</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>Response # 1 to CAR 07. Information on starting date of this subproject is indicated in the relevant Section on the page 19.</p> <p>Response # 2 to CAR 07. The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Conclusion on response # 1. In such case, please, clearly indicate in the Section concerning process wastes utilization the starting date of project activity providing the references on the relevant documents (meaning not only the documents instructing the start of the activities, but also proving the start of implemented activities).</p> <p>Conclusion on response # 2. CAR 07 is closed based on the information provided in the PDD.</p>
<p>CAR 08. Please grammatically correct sentences containing the clarification on subprojects names (pages 3, 20, 43, 48 of the PDD).</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Due to the amendments made to the PDD, CAR 08 is closed.</p>



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CL 06. While describing the subproject on production wastes utilization (Section A.4.2 of the PDD), please, describe in more details where/when brewage draff is supposed to be transported after extraction (how this will be monitored).</p>	-	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Based on this information the issue is closed.</p>
<p>CAR 09. Please note that the starting date of the crediting period in Ukraine cannot be before 01 April 2004 (the date of Kyoto Protocol ratification in Ukraine). Besides it should be clearly stated in the PDD after which first project activity (specifying the date of its implementation) emission reductions generation began. Taking into account the information above, please, make necessary amendments in the Sections A.4.3.1 and C.3 of the PDD.</p>	-	<p>Several projects with starting date 01/01/2004 were registered in Ukraine that is why the project developer decided to indicate this date as starting.</p> <p>The reference to one of the last registered projects: http://www.carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua/en/publication/content/1039.htm</p>	<p>The clarification was provided. The issue is closed.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 10. Please provide the Letter of Endorsement issued by the State Environmental Investment Agency for the project and indicate in the Section A.5 of the PDD the number and date of its issuance.</p>	<p>19</p>	<p>The Letter of Endorsement was provided to the verification team.</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p>
--	-----------	---	-----------------------------



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CL 07. Please clarify whether the chosen JI specific approach is based on the elements of standard methodology; has it already been used in the previously determined projects? (Section B.1 of the PDD).</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>Response # 1 to CL 07.</p> <p>The chosen JI specific approach is based on the elements of methodological tool “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” (version 04.0.0.) concerning the part on baseline setting and on the elements of approved CDM methodology ACM0012 “Consolidated baseline methodology for GHG emission reductions from waste energy recovery projects” (version 4.0.0) and Revised 1996 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories concerning the part on monitoring plan.</p> <p>Similar approach was used in the determined projects of Obolon company:</p> <p>http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/2FPAKQRH34C6T7BNJEZWG1S9580MIX</p> <p>http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/6PI0M3HASTLOCYRQZVW95JFKN4XGBD</p>	<p>Conclusion on response # 1.</p> <p>Please state in the Section B.1 of the PDD information indicated in the response to this request.</p> <p>Conclusion on response # 2.</p> <p>The issue is closed.</p>
---	-----------	---	---



DETERMINATION REPORT

		<p>Response # 2 to CL 07.</p> <p>The relevant information was added to the Sections B.1 and D.1 of the last version of PDD.</p>	
--	--	---	--



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CL 08. Please clearly identify what period was set as the baseline for the project.</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>Response # 1 to CL 08. As it is indicated in the Tables with key parameters period 2001-2003 was set as the baseline period.</p> <p>Response # 2 to CL 08. The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Conclusion on response # 1. Before stating more detailed description of all data in the tables, one should indicate in the Section B.1 of the PDD what period was set as the baseline for the project.</p> <p>Conclusion on response # 2. The issue is closed based on the clarification provided.</p>
<p>CL 09. Please state (at least when it is first met) the full name of the relevant ministry of ecology (Minpryrody of Ukraine is shortened form).</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>The issue is closed, based on the corrections made in the PDD.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

CL 10. Please pay attention to the spelling mistake in the Section B.1 of the PDD (p. 26, paragraph 2).	23	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	The issue is closed, due to the corrections made.
CL 11. Starting with page 27 in the Ukrainian version of PDD correct the spelling of word “corrective” and please correct it throughout PDD.	23	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	Based on the corrections made, the issue is closed.
CAR 11. Please use the correct name of the TÜV SÜD company (please refer to page 34 of the PDD).	23	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	CAR 11 is closed due to the corrections made.
CAR 12. Emission sources within baseline and project scenarios, mentioned in PDD, should coincide with the sources indicated in the Table on page 49 of the PDD.	23	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	CAR 12 is closed due to the corrections made.
CAR 13. Please indicate in the Section B.4 of the PDD the date of baseline setting.	23	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	Based on the information added to PDD the issue is closed.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 14. Please note that <i>Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers</i> (item 6) state that if project participants indicate the investment barrier, they should demonstrate in the PDD that the project was financed involving JI funds only. This should demonstrate that credit granting decision (or main financial decisions) was taken by the creditor taking into consideration the JI benefits. At the same time the developer has not provided any justifying documents, but for the internal documents of PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”. Please provide the relevant justification.</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>It is stated in the Section B.2 of the PDD: “...PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” regional branches don’t have the right to manage financial resources without approving planned investments with PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” head office, meaning that the management of regional branches has a limited access to the funds. Only the possibility to receive financial means by selling the ERUs generated by the project will convince PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” head office top management to implement all planned project activities...”</p> <p>(Provisions on regional branches are attached).</p>	<p>CAR 14 is closed based on the provided clarifications and corrections made.</p>
--	-----------	---	--



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 15. Unfavourable economic conditions stated by the developer are not a compelling barrier because there were available funds on the market for financing the projects of technical upgrade in industry. Please provide more detailed justification of compelling barriers.</p>	<p>29</p>	<p>Demonstration of unfavourable economic condition was provided to show the limited access to the funds in Ukraine for PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”.</p> <p>Most of the similar projects were realized due to the grants provided by non-commercial financial conditions (e. g. Investments involving JI mechanisms).</p>	<p>CAR 15 is closed based on the provided clarifications and corrections made.</p>
<p>CAR 16. Please provide more detailed clarification why no funds were invested exactly for this project by this enterprise (please note that as per <i>Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers</i> (item 1), while demonstrating the barriers, i. e. absence of funds availability, information has to include company description, its structure, owners and financial information). In case of difficulties to justify non-availability of funds. Please perform the investment analysis.</p>	<p>29 (a)</p>	<p>PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” is the lowest unit in the InBev structure (company structure is attached). All investments have to be approved by higher units of the company (investment approval scheme is attached). Because such information cannot be made publicly available it cannot be included to the PDD.</p> <p>The documents provided justify the limited access to the funds by PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE”.</p>	<p>CAR 16 is closed based on the provided clarifications and investment analysis made.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 17. Please in the Section C.1 of the PDD provide clear justification and documental evidences of the project starting date. In case the date was chosen mistakenly, please, make necessary amendments to this Section of the PDD.</p>	<p>34 (a)</p>	<p>Response # 1 to CAR 17. The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD. The required documents were provided.</p> <p>Response # 2 to CAR 17. The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>Conclusion on response # 1. The project starting date is the date when the first decision on project implementation is taken or the date of first real actions being implemented by the project. Please provide in the Section C.1 documented evidence (with reference to it) of the date (checking before it whether it is correct).</p> <p>Conclusion on response # 2. The issue is closed.</p>
<p>CAR 18. Please justify in the Section C.2 of the PDD why 22 years were set as the expected operational lifetime of the project.</p>	<p>34 (b)</p>	<p>The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p>



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 19. The necessary formula is absent in the Section D.1.1.4 of the PDD, please, add it.</p>	36 (f)	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	The issue is closed.
<p>CAR 20. In the Sections E.1, E.4, E.5, E.6 instead of the subtitle <i>Assigned Amount Units</i> (meaning only the name of emission reductions before 2008, but not the period itself), please, indicate the period <i>2004-2008</i>.</p>	36 (f)(i)	The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.	CAR 20 is closed based on the corrections made in the PDD.
<p>CAR 21. Please provide the copies of passports on newly installed project equipment at PJSC "SUN INBEV UKRAINE" Mykolaiiv branch.</p>	-	The required documents are provided.	CAR 21 is closed based on the documents provided.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p>CAR 22. Please provide the agreements between PJSC “SUN INBEV UKRAINE” and compound fodder producers (or other enterprises which the processed brewer draff is supplied to) proving the fact of brewer draff delivery.</p>	-	<p>The valid agreement is provided. The agreements will be provided during the verification for the relevant monitoring period.</p>	<p>The issue (CAR 22) is closed.</p>
<p>CAR 23. Please correct orthographic mistakes in the name of project sectoral scope (please refer to the Section A.1 of the PDD).</p>	-	<p>Response # 1 to CAR 23. The relevant changes were made in the last version of PDD.</p> <p>Response # 2 to CAR 23.</p> <p>The name of the sectoral scope was indicated as per http://www.carbonunitsregistry.gov.ua/ua/261.htm</p>	<p>Conclusion on response # 1. The mistake has not been corrected.</p> <p>Conclusion on response # 2. The issue is closed.</p>