VERIFICATION REPORT
SIA "VIDZEME EKO"

VERIFICATION OF THE
DISMANTLING OF WASTE HEAP OF "UTP INVEST" LTD.

INITIAL AND FIRST PERIODIC FOR PERIOD 05/05/2008-31/08/2012

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0765/2012

REVISION NO. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Date of first issue: 12/10/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: SIA "Vidzeme Eko"	Client ref.: Victor Tkachenko

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the initial and 1st periodic verification of the "Dismantling of waste heap of "UTP Invest" ltd.", project of SIA "Vidzeme Eko" located in Dzerzhynskyi urban village, Rovenki borough council, Luhansk Region, Ukraine, and applying JI specific approach, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against 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 verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the verification process is a list of Clarification, Corrective Actions Requests, Forward Actions Requests (CR, CAR and FAR), presented in Appendix A.

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions, or misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 2482710 tonnes of CO2 equivalent for the monitoring period from 05/05/2008 to 31/08/2012 (353954 tonnes of CO2 eq. from 05/05/2008 to 31/12/2008, 573999 tonnes of CO2 eq. from 01/01/2009 to 31/12/2009, 565769 tonnes of CO2 eq. from 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010, 554099 tonnes of CO2 eq. from 01/01/2011 to 31/12/2011, 434889 tonnes of CO2 eq. from 01/01/2012 to 31/08/2012).

Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.

Report No.: UKRAINE-ver/0765/2012	Subject Group: JI	
Project title: Dismantling of waste heap of "UTP Invest" ltd.		
Work carried out by: Vyacheslav Yeriomin – Team Leader, Lead Verifier Vasyl Kobzar – Team Member, Verifier		
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov- Technical Reviewer Dmytro Balyn – Technical Specialist		☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov - Operational Manager		☐ Limited distribution
Date of this revision: 25/10/2012	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 21
		☐ Unrestricted distribution

Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

SIA "Vidzeme Eko" has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Dismantling of the waste heap of "UTP-Invest" Ltd" (hereafter called "the project") at Dzerzhynskyi urban village, Rovenki borough council, Luhansk Region, Ukraine.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification 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

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Independent Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period.

The objective of verification can be divided in Initial Verification and Periodic Verification.

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

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.

1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Vyacheslav Yeriomin
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Vasyl Kobzar
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer
Dmytro Balyn
Bureau Veritas Certification, Technical Specialist

2 METHODOLOGY

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

In order to ensure transparency, a verification 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 verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) submitted by SIA "Vidzeme Eko" and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD) and Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report version(s) 2.0 and project as described in the determined PDD.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 25/09/2012 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 "UTP-Invest" LLC and SIA "Vidzeme Eko" were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
"UTP-Invest" LLC	• Organizational structure • Responsibilities and authorities • Roles and responsibilities for data collection and • processing • Installation of equipment • Data logging, archiving and reporting • Metering equipment control • Metering record keeping system, database • IT management • Training of personnel • Quality management procedures and technology • Internal audits and check-ups
CONSULTANT SIA "Vidzeme Eko"	• Baseline methodology • Monitoring plan • Monitoring report • Excel spreadsheets

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification 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 GHG emission reduction calculation.

If the Verification Team, in assessing the monitoring report and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to the monitoring requirements, it should 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 that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;

(b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the Verification Team to assess compliance with the monitoring plan;

(c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

The Verification 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 verification.

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

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 7 Corrective Action Requests, 0 Clarification Requests, and 0 Forward Action Requests.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

There is no FAR available from determination process, provided by Bureau Veritas Certification.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

The project was approved by both Parties Involved. Letter of Approval #2925/23/7 dated 05/10/2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine. Letter of Approval 12.2-02/13629 dated 12/10/2012 issued by Ministry of Environment protection and regional development of Republic Latvia

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

Proposed JI project foresees implementation of waste heaps dismantling with following beneficiation of coal containing rock mass with the aim of GHG emissions reduction.

The project owner "UTP INVEST" LLC buys coal containing rock mass at waste heap of State Enterprise named after Dzerzhynskyi mine №57 of SE "Rovenkyantracite", waste heap was transmitted to SE

"UkrDonbasekologiya", and benefices it on enrichment plant "Tandem 2006" in Torez town, Donetsk Region.

"Arsenal-Don" Llc is subcontractor of "UTP-Invest" LLC for works of dismantling the waste heap and transportation of coal containing rock mass to the enrichment plant

Dismantling of waste heaps is provided in line within NPAOP 10.0-5.21-04 "Instruction to prevent spontaneous combustion, fire and dismantling dumps" and may be described as follow.

Dismantling of waste heaps is provided with bulldozers T-170 which square top of the heap. After decline by bulldozers to lower layer height, the entrance road can be constructed. Further dismantling is carried out by excavators EO-5126 charge dump tracks KAMAZ-55111, which transported coal containing rock mass to enrichment plant "Tandem-2006".
Enrichment plant "Tandem-2006" is working with "UTP INVEST" LLC on sub-contractor basis.
Coal containing rock mass is supplied to the inertial screening sifter, which remove class +100 mm in the off-corn.
Coal containing rock mass after pre-classification is humidified and moved to the inertial sifter GIL-52, which divided coal containing mass on 3-13 mm and +13 mm classes. Enrichment of heavy class +13 mm is provided in heavy media separator STK 32-550, and enrichment of small class 3-13 mm in hydrocyclone GTsM-630. Next, washing of the suspension of beneficiation products and dehydrating products by dressing screens and centrifuge take place, regeneration suspension at electromagnetic separator. Thus the water in this process is used in closed loop. Beneficiation products (coal concentrate) are transported by conveyor belt into bins for further shipment to the consumer. Waste is transported to the flat dump.

The project capacity of the complex allows to process 900 000 m3 of the rocks per year.

Data on waste heaps such a geographical coordinates, mass value of containing rocks, physical measures, main work characteristics of heavy transporting vehicles and equipment of coal beneficiation plant are provided in the PDD.

Waste heap dismantling and coal benefication was started in April 2008. Crediting period for ERUs generation started 05/05/2008.

Level of project activity is depended by coal demand at Ukrainian market. Project owner doesn't keep coal at warehouses and produce beneficiated rock mass as when necessary.

Project boundaries described in the determined PDD are kept; coal from another waste heaps doesn't uses in project.

Difference between estimated emission reductions indicated in the PDD and provided in the Monitoring report is not observed. Factually PDDs calculations are performed ex-post for monitoring.

Identified problem areas for project implementation status, project participants' responses and conclusions of Bureau Veritas Certification are described in Annex A (refer to CAR01-CAR04)

3.4 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)

For calculating the emission reductions, key factors, such as availability of work power and financing, seasonal coal requirement on Ukraine inside market, prices of diesel fuel and electric energy, 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 emission reductions, such as work forecasts, bookkeepers invoices, laboratory analysis samples, work logbooks are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, including default emission factors, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice. Default emission factors, such as emission factor for electricity consumption, carbon content in diesel fuel and coal, are in line with Ukraine National GHG Inventory report for 1990-2010 years.

The calculation of emission reductions is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

Identified problem areas for compliance of the monitoring plan with the , project participants' responses and conclusions of Bureau Veritas Certification are described in Annex A (refer to CAR05)

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

"Not applicable"

3.6 Data management (101)

The data and their sources, provided in monitoring report, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

The implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures.

The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order.

Consumption of diesel fuel is accounting by bookkeeper invoices.

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner. Initially data on value and quality of produced coal, track's load, diesel fuel consumption, waste heap mass quantity is obtained from logbooks of relevant work suppliers. The data on electricity consumed is obtained from monthly reports of Regional Electric Network.

The data required to monitor JI project is routinely collected within the normal operations of the "Arsenal-Don" LLc and "Tandem-2006" LLC therefore JI monitoring is integral part of routine monitoring

The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan. Data monitoring and collection system described in the monitoring report is adequate and working.

Identified problem areas applicable for project data management, responses of project participants, Bureau Veritas Certification conclusions are listed in the Annex A Verification protocol (see CAR07, CAR08)

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

"Not applicable"

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial and 1st periodic, verification of the "Dismantling of waste heap of "UTP Invest" Ltd" Project in Dzerzhynskyi urban village, Rovenki Borough council, Luhansk Region, Ukraine, which applies JI specific approach. The verification 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 verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against 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 verification report and opinion.

The management of SIA "Vidzeme Eko" responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 2.0. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 2.0 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is accurately calculated and is free of material errors, omissions, or misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm, with a reasonable level of assurance, the following statement:

Reporting period: From 05/05/2008 to 31/08/2012

Baseline emissions	: 1959560	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 40286	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -563436	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 2482710	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

From 05/05/2008 to 31/12/2008

Baseline emissions	: 279481	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 6250	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -80723	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 353954	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

From 01/01/2009 to 31/12/2009

Baseline emissions	: 452646	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 8810	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -130163	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 573999	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

From 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions	: 444971	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 8875	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -129673	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 565769	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

From 01/01/2011 to 31/12/2011

Baseline emissions	: 438295	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 9040	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -124844	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 554099	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

From 01/01/2012 to 31/08/2012

Baseline emissions	: 344167	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 7311	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -98033	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 434889	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

.

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by SIA "Vidzeme Eko" that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Monitoring Report ""Dismantling of waste heap of "UTP Invest" Ltd"" version 1.0 dated 12/10/2012
/2/ Monitoring Report ""Dismantling of waste heap of "UTP Invest" Ltd"" version 2.0 dated 24/10/2012
/3/ ERUs calculation Excel-file "Calculation Rovenky.xls"
/4/ Letter of Approval #2925/23/7 dated 05/10/2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine
/5/ Letter of Approval 12.2-02/13629 dated 12/10/2012 issued by Ministry of Environment protection and regional development of Republic Latvia

Category 2 Documents:
Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

/1/ Delivery Agreement of industrial products # 14/04-08 from 14/04/2008 between "Arsenal-Don" Ltd and "The Prom" Ltd
/2/ Delivery Agreement of industrial products # 12/04-08 from 12/04/2008 between "Arsenal-Don" Ltd and "Invest- Program" Ltd
/3/ Subcontract of works #17/04 from 17/04/08 between "Ukrprombud 2007" Ltd and "Arsenal-Don" Ltd
/4/ Agreement of work completion # 15/04 from 15/04/08 between "Arsenal-Don" Ltd and "Tandem" Ltd
/5/ Contract on work completion # 15/04 from 14/04/08 between "Arsenal-Don" Ltd (Customer) and "Tandem" Ltd(Performer)
/6/ Agreement of waste heap dismantling# 15/04/01 from 15/04/08 between "Arsenal-Don" Ltd (Customer) and "Tandem" Ltd (Performer)
/7/ Agreement of work completion # 15/04/02 from 15/04/08 between "Tandem" Ltd and "Arsenal-Don" Ltd
/8/ Certificate of weighing completion for 2008-2012
/9/ Delivery and acceptance certificate of work completion and costs calculations of works for completion certificate
/10/ Sale invoices for 2008-2012

/11/ Certificate of coal quality 2009-2012.

/12/ Attestation certificate of "Tandem 2006" Ltd.

/13/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 25/07/08.

/14/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 25/08/09.

/15/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 10/09/10.

/16/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 27/10/11.

/17/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 27/12/12.

/18/ Passport and certificates of electronic scales ANG – 200C

/19/ Diary of IO and SIEVES for coal - chemical laboratory "TANDEM" Ltd.

/20/ Passport and certificates of vibratory mill 75T-DRM.

/21/ Passport and certificates of laboratory furnace SNOL 7,2/1100.

/22/ Passport and certificates of laboratory sieve.

/23/ Passport and certificates of drying box SNOL 58/350.

/24/ Passport and certificates of drying box SNOL 100/350.

Persons interviewed:

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

/1/ Viktoriya Volodymirivna Malyukina - Head of Laboratory, "Tandem – 2006"

/2/ Mykola Sergiyovych Kondratyuk – Manager of TCD, "Arsenal Don" Ltd.

/3/ Sergiy Petrovych Zhurba – Manager of the industrial site, "Arsenal Don" Ltd.

/4/ Maksym Viktorovych Oleynyk - power engineering specialist, "UTP INVEST" Ltd.

/5/ Zinchenko Tatiana Mykolaivna - Chief Accountant, "UTP INVEST" Ltd.

/6/ Yuriy Vyacheslavovych Pyankov – Director, "UTP INVEST" Ltd.

/7/ Gints Klavinsh - project developer, SIA "Vidzeme Eko"

/8/ Sergiy Petrovych Tymofeev - SIA "Vidzeme Eko" JI Consultant

/9/ Yuri Mykhailovych Stah - SIA "Vidzeme Eko" JI Consultant

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Check list for verification, according to the JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL (Version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	The project was approved by both Parties involved. Letter of Approval #2925/23/7 dated 05/10/2012 has been issued by State Environment Investment Agency. Letter of Approval #12.2-02/13629 has been issued 12.10.2012 by Respublic Latvia	OK	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	The written project approvals are unconditional	OK	OK
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	*CAR01* Please provide reference on PDD published at UNFCCC website *CAR02* The MR indicates in the section A.7 table 1 that values of ERUs obtained in 2012 year is differ than indicated in the PDD by difference in monitoring period duration. This is not fully reasonably, because values in PDD for 2012 year are obtained on the basis of ex-post estimations and data for 8	CAR01 CAR02 CAR03 CAR04	

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		months of 2012 is factual. Please provide adequate explanation *CAR03* Please add in the MR description of implemented project measures and note if any additional equipment was installed during the monitoring period *CAR04* Please add more detailed information on roles and responsibilities of the third parties involved in the project		
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	The project is in operation during the monitoring period	OK	OK
Compliance with monitoring plan				
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	The monitoring was provided in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD which is published at UNFCCC website and which determination has been deemed final	OK	OK
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks	Key factors listed in the section 23 (b) (i)-(vii) of DVM influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project, as well as the risks associated with the project are taken into account	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?			
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	The data sources used for calculating the emission reduction are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.	OK	OK
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	The emission factors used for emission reduction calculations are used in line with National GHG Inventory Report for 1990-2010 years, approved by SEIA	OK	OK
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	The calculation of emission reductions are based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible future scenarios *CAR05* Please correct designation of units in the section B.2.1 and B.2.3	CAR05	
Applicable to JI SSC projects only_Not applicable				
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only_Not applicable				
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	the project participants doesn't revise the monitoring plan	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	Not applicable	OK	OK
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	The implementation of data collection procedures is in line with the monitoring plan, including quality control and quality assurance procedures	OK	OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	*CAR06* Please provide full list of project measuring equipment with data on calibrations and replacement of measuring devices	CAR06	
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The evidences and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner	OK	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	*CAR07* Please note in the MR reference on order describing data keeping and archiving procedures	CAR07	
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)_Not applicable				
Applicable to sample-based approach only_Not applicable				

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarification and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CAR01 Please provide reference on PDD published at UNFCCC website	92	Provided, Section A.7: reference on PDD published at UNFCCC website : http://ji.unfccc.int/JIITLProject/DB/EHY9OOIL0O5Q57OU01M1TFR5ZFOQ9M/details	The issue is closed
CAR02 The MR indicates in the section A.7 table 1 that values of ERUs obtained in 2012 year is differ than indicated in the PDD by difference in monitoring period duration. This is not fully reasonably, because values in PDD for 2012 year are obtained on the basis of ex-post estimations and data for 8 months of 2012 is factual. Please provide adequate explanation	92	Project participants during the first 8 months in 2012 used actual data for calculations, and for the last 4 months - predictable. Therefore, in the monitoring report, which covers 8 months in 2012, the difference between values of emission reductions from the data in the PDD consists only of predictable reductions during the last 4 months in 2012.	The issue is closed

CAR03 Please add in the MR description of implemented project measures and note if any additional equipment was installed during the monitoring period	92	Added, Section B.1: For the measurement in the project the equipment is used, listed in Table 2, Section B.1.2. Project equipment used for the rock mass sorting has not been replaced during the monitoring period and additional equipment has not been installed.	The issue is closed
CAR04 Please add more detailed information on roles and responsibilities of the third parties involved in the project	92	Noted, Section B.1.4: Centers of metrology and standardization: SC "Luhanskstandartmetrologiya" Contractors of waste heap dismantling: "Arsenal-Don" Ltd Contractors of coal benefication, conducting the chemical analysis and the landlord of weighing: Benefication plant "Tandem 2006" Ltd. Expert reports Scientific Research Institute of Mine-Rescue and Fire Safety"Respirator" Licenced designer, PSPE"Ekosfera".	The issue is closed
CAR05 Please correct designation of units in the section B.2.1 and B.2.3	95(d)	Corrected, Section B.2.1:Designation of units: tCO_2/MWh	The issue is closed

CAR06 Please provide full list of project measuring equipment with data on calibrations and replacement of measuring devices	101(b)	Table 2 Section B.1.2: full list of project measuring equipment with data on calibrations and replacement of measuring devices is provided	The issue is closed
CAR07 Please note in the MR \reference on order describing data keeping and archiving procedures	101(d)	Noted, Section B.3.: Documents and other data monitored and required for determination and verification, as well as any other data that are relevant to the operation of the project, will be kept for at least two years after the last transfer of ERUs.	The issue is closed