VERIFICATION REPORT
CARBON MARKETING AND TRADING LTD.

VERIFICATION OF THE
«WASTE COAL PROCESSING IN LUHANSK REGION OF UKRAINE WITH THE AIM OF REDUCING GREENHOUSE GASES EMISSIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE»

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0839/2012

REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
19/11/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
Carbon Marketing and Trading Ltd.	Mr. Tahir Musavev

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the initial verification of the «Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere», project of Small Private Commercial Production Company "SLAVUTICH" located 5 km east of Molodohvardiysk town Krasnodon district, 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 2268183 tonnes of CO2 equivalent for the monitoring period from 14/03/2008 to 30/06/2010. 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.:	Subject Group:
Ukraine-ver/0839/2012	JI
Project title:	
«Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere»	
Work carried out by:	
Svitlana Gariyenchyk - Team Leader, Lead Verifier Sergii Verteletskyi – Team member, Verifier Dmytro Balyn – Technical Specialist	
Work reviewed by:	
Ivan Sokolov - Internal Technical Reviewer Vladimir Lukin – Technical Specialist	
Work approved by:	
Ivan Sokolov – Operational Manager	
Date of this revision:	**Rev. No.:** / **Number of pages:**
19/12/2012	02 / 25

Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Carbon Marketing and Trading Ltd. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project «Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere » (hereafter called "the project") located 5 km east of Molodohvardiysk town Krasnodon district, 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:

Svitlana Gariyenchyk
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Sergii Verteletskyi
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

Dmytro Balyn
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier, Technical Specialist

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolv
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

Vladimir Lukin
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 Carbon Marketing and Trading Ltd. and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), and/or 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 01 dated 05/11/2012, version 02 dated 19/12/2012 and project as described in the determined PDD.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 16/11/2012 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 Carbon Marketing and Trading Ltd. and Small Private Commercial Production Company “SLAVUTICH” were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Small Private Commercial Production Company "SLAVUTICH"	Project implementation status Organizational structure Responsibilities and authorities Personnel training Quality management procedures and technology Records of equipment installation Control of metering equipment Metering record keeping system, database Cross-check of the information provided in the MR with other sources
Carbon Marketing and Trading Ltd.	Baseline methodology Monitoring plan Monitoring report Deviations from PDD

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 06 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

Not applicable. This verification is initial

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approvals by Ukraine and The Netherlands involved in the JI project have been issued by the DFP of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest.
A letter of approval from the Ukrainian Designated Focal Point was received for the proposed project, reference No. 3484/23/7, dated 15/11/2012.

A letter of approval from the Netherlands Designated Focal Point was received for the proposed project, reference 2012JI54, dated 19/12/2012.

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

The proposed project is an innovative project that envisages works on the installation of a technological complex for the extraction and processing of waste coal at the plant.
This Project is aimed at coal extraction from the waste heaps of the Krasnodon Districts of Luhansk Region of Ukraine. These waste heaps have been accumulated some time before the start of the project activity from the mining waste of underground mines. Project activity will prevent greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere during combustion of the heaps and will contribute an additional amount of coal, without the need for mining. The Project activities include installation of the equipment for coal extraction and beneficiation near the processing waste heaps and applying special machinery

that will perform preparation, loading and transportation of the rock from the waste heaps to the beneficiation factory. After purifying of the matter, the extracted coal will be sold for heat and power generation and the remaining bare rock will be utilized for land engineering and road building.

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

The monitoring occurred 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.

For calculating the emission reductions, key factors, such as additional electricity consumption, amount of used diesel fuel, amount of coal extracted from waste heaps, ash content and moisture of fractions, 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 invoices of diesel fuel and coal, measuring equipment (electric meter, automobile scale) are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Data unit	kWh
Producer	Actaris
Type	SL761B071
Serial number	35011678
Accuracy class	1.0
Calibration	13/11/2007
Calibration frequency	6 yr
Validity	"Lugansk Energy Union" Ltd.

Emission factors, including default emission factors, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.
The calculation of emission reductions is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

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. These procedures are mentioned in the section “References” of this report.

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

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner.

The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan:
The operational and management structure (as shown in below the figure) and the responsibilities of the principals are as follows. Ultimate responsibility for the project rests with the JI Project Manager.

JI Project Management Team		
Internal Audit Department (Director)	Monitoring Staff	Operation and Maintenance Staff

The JI Project Manager is responsible for:

- Checking and signing off all project operational-related activities
- Appointing and liaising with the accredited independent entity (AIE)
- Identifying an audit team leader to be appointed by the Chief Engineer or a delegated authority
- Appointing a JI technical team to undertake the operational activities
- Organizing training and refresher courses
- Preparing and supervising a Health and Safety Plan for the JI technical team
- Supervising the work of the JI technical team
- Cross checking reported volumes and sales receipts

Internal Audit Department (Director)

The project owner - Small Private Commercial Production Company “SLAVUTICH” implement provisions of this monitoring plan into its organizational and quality management structure. For monitoring, collection, registration, visualization, archiving, reporting of the monitored data and periodical

checking of the measurement devices the management team headed by the Director of the company is responsible.

The monitoring staff is responsible for:
- Monitoring and recording of the relevant parameters

The operation and maintenance staff are responsible for:
- Operation and maintenance of the project infrastructure
- Service and maintenance equipment is performed by technical personnel beneficiation plant.

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

Not applicable

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial, 1st initial verification of the «Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere» Project in 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 Private Commercial Production Company “SLAVUTICH” is 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 Plan indicated in the final PDD version. 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 02 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design document. 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 14/03/2008 to 31/12/2008		
Baseline emissions	: 734463	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 2746	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakage	: -223788	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 955505	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

Reporting period: From 01/01/2009 to 31/12/2009		
Baseline emissions	: 765748	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 2766	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakage	: -232349	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 955331	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

Reporting period: From 01/01/2010 to 30/06/2010		
Baseline emissions	: 243518	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 1000	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakage	: -74829	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 317347	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

Total emission reduction: From 14/03/2008 to 30/06/2010

Emission Reductions	: 2268183	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by Carbon Marketing and Trading Ltd. and Small Private Commercial Production Company "SLAVUTICH" that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Project Design Document «Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere»version 2.0 dated 23/10/2012

/2/ Monitoring Report «Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere» version 01 dated 05/11/2012

/3/ Monitoring Report «Waste coal processing in Luhansk region of Ukraine with the Aim of Reducing Greenhouse Gases Emissions into the Atmosphere» version 02 dated 19/12/2012

/4/ Excel file "Calculation_Slavutich_2_v1_mr140308-300610" version 01 dated 05/11/2012

/5/ Excel file "Calculation_Slavutich_2_v2_mr140308-300610" version 02 dated 19/12/2012

/6/ Letter of Approval # 2012JI54 issued by the NL Agency Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation dated 19/12/2012

/7/ Letter of Approval # 3484/23/7 dated 15/11/2012, issued by State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine

/8/ Determination and Verification Manual, version 01

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

/1/ Document for consumed electricity for period of obligations (2008-2012)

/2/ Detailed project design of the equipment

/3/ The contract of sale and purchase № 157 dated 15.05.2006

/4/ Consignation agreement dated 14.03.2008

/5/ Acts of acceptance and transfer of coal, for May 2008

/6/ Acts of acceptance and transfer of coal, for July 2009

/7/ Acts of acceptance and transfer of coal, for September 2010

/8/ Acts of acceptance and transfer of coal, for October 2011

/9/ Acts of acceptance and transfer of coal, for June 2012

/10/ Loading sheets, for April 2008

/11/ Loading sheets, for April 2009

/12/ Loading sheets, for April 2010

/13/ Loading sheets, for April 2011

/14/ Loading sheets, for April 2012

/15/ Order № 14P to establish a working group for the implementation of the joint implementation project from 03.07.2012

/16/ Contract delivery and installation of equipment number 19/06 of 19.06.2006

/17/ Act number 22/11 commissioning of equipment for extraction and processing of coal slurry dated 22.11.2007

/18/ Quality certificate on coal # 602

/19/ Quality certificate on coal # 360

/20/ Quality certificate on coal # 970

/21/ Quality certificate on coal # 543

/22/ Quality certificate on coal # 472

/23/ Quality certificate on coal # 400

/24/ Quality certificate on coal # 293

/25/ Quality certificate on coal # 850

/26/ Quality certificate on coal # 803

/27/ Quality certificate on coal # 701

/28/ Quality certificate on coal # 205

/29/ Quality certificate on coal # 154

/30/ Quality certificate on coal # 580

/31/ Quality certificate on coal # 391

/32/ Quality certificate on coal # 790

/33/ Quality certificate on coal # 552

/34/ Quality certificate on coal # 470

/35/ Quality certificate on coal # 420

/36/ Quality certificate on coal # 304

/37/ Quality certificate on coal # 700

/38/ Quality certificate on coal # 660

/39/ Quality certificate on coal # 615
/40/ Quality certificate on coal # 235
/41/ Quality certificate on coal # 180
/42/ Quality certificate on coal # 690
/43/ Quality certificate on coal # 450
/44/ Quality certificate on coal # 925
/45/ Quality certificate on coal # 604
/46/ Quality certificate on coal # 573
/47/ Quality certificate on coal # 500
/48/ Quality certificate on coal # 395
/49/ Quality certificate on coal # 903
/50/ Quality certificate on coal # 812
/51/ Quality certificate on coal # 705
/52/ Quality certificate on coal # 310
/53/ Quality certificate on coal # 205
/54/ Quality certificate on coal # 95
/55/ Quality certificate on coal # 87
/56/ Quality certificate on coal # 83
/57/ Quality certificate on coal # 812
/58/ Quality certificate on coal # 404
/59/ Quality certificate on coal # 701
/60/ Quality certificate on coal # 600
/61/ Quality certificate on coal # 363
/62/ Quality certificate on coal # 311
/63/ Quality certificate on coal # 865
/64/ Quality certificate on coal # 255
/65/ Quality certificate on coal # 220
/66/ Invoice on diesel for May 2008
/67/ Invoice on diesel for July 2009
/68/ Invoice on diesel for September 2010
/69/ Invoice on diesel for October 2011

/70/ Invoice on diesel for June 2012
/71/ Invoice on diesel for March 2008
/72/ Invoice on diesel for April 2008
/73/ Invoice on diesel for May 2008
/74/ Invoice on diesel for June 2008
/75/ Invoice on diesel for July 2008
/76/ Invoice on diesel for August 2008
/77/ Invoice on diesel for September 2008
/78/ Invoice on diesel for October 2008
/79/ Invoice on diesel for November 2008
/80/ Invoice on diesel for December 2008
/81/ Invoice on diesel for March 2009
/82/ Invoice on diesel for April 2009
/83/ Invoice on diesel for May 2009
/84/ Invoice on diesel for June 2009
/85/ Invoice on diesel for July 2009
/86/ Invoice on diesel for August 2009
/87/ Invoice on diesel for September 2009
/88/ Invoice on diesel for October 2009
/89/ Invoice on diesel for November 2009
/90/ Invoice on diesel for December 2009
/91/ Invoice on diesel for March 2010
/92/ Invoice on diesel for April 2010
/93/ Invoice on diesel for May 2010
/94/ Invoice on diesel for June 2010
/95/ Invoice on diesel for July 2010
/96/ Invoice on diesel for August 2010
/97/ Invoice on diesel for September 2010
/98/ Invoice on diesel for October 2010
/99/ Invoice on diesel for November 2010
/100/ Invoice on diesel for December 2010

/101/ Invoice on diesel for March 2011

/102/ Invoice on diesel for April 2011

/103/ Invoice on diesel for May 2011

/104/ Invoice on diesel for June 2011

/105/ Invoice on diesel for July 2011

/106/ Invoice on diesel for August 2011

/107/ Invoice on diesel for September 2011

/108/ Invoice on diesel for October 2011

/109/ Invoice on diesel for November 2011

/110/ Invoice on diesel for December 2011

/111/ Invoice on diesel for April 2012

/112/ Invoice on diesel for May 2012

/113/ Invoice on diesel for June 2012

/114/ Invoice on diesel for July 2012

/115/ Invoice on diesel for August 2012

/116/ Invoice on diesel for September 2012

/117/ Invoice on diesel for October 2012

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/ V. Kumonok – director of Small Private Commercial Production Company "SLAVUTICH"

/2/ V. Holodnik – Head of production department

/3/ V. Kornuhov – cheef engineer of Small Private Commercial Production Company "SLAVUTICH"

/4/ Tahir Musayev - representative of the project Developer CARBON MARKETING AND TRADING LTD

/5/ Valentina Bubenok - representative of the project Developer CARBON MARKETING AND TRADING LTD

Please do *not* delete the Bookmark named "numPages" on this last page in the report.

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION HOLDING SAS

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?	CAR01 Please provide LoA from the Netherland Designated Focal Point. CAR02 Please provide LoA from the Ukrainian Designated Focal Point.	CAR01 CAR02	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, all the written projects approvals by Parties involved 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?	Yes, the project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website.	OK	OK
93	What is the status of operation of the	Project has been in operation during all monitoring	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	project during the monitoring period?	period.		
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?	Yes, the monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and so is listed on the UNFCCC JI website.	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 associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?	For calculating the emission reduction all key factors were taken into account as appropriate.	OK	OK
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	CAR03 In determined PDD there are references from NIR 1990-2010 only. Meanwhile both MR and excel calculation spreadsheet contain references from NIR 1990-2009. Please use latest version. CAR04 Please provide invoices on diesel for the monitoring period.	CAR03 CAR04 CAR05 CAR06	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		CAR05 Average emission reductions provided in excel file should be estimated within monitoring period stated in the MR. Please make appropriate corrections. CAR06 Total emission reductions should be in line with those stated in MR.		
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?	CEF for the electricity from the grid by consumers of electricity, mined coal and diesel are CEF's used in this project. They are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.	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?	Yes, the calculation of emission reductions is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.	OK	OK
Applicable to JI SSC projects only				
96	Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring period on an annual	N\A	N\A	N\A

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	average basis? If the threshold is exceeded, is the maximum emission reduction level estimated in the PDD for the JI SSC project or the bundle for the monitoring period determined?			
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	N\A	N\A	N\A
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	N\A	N\A	N\A
98	If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report? Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?	N\A	N\A	N\A
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an	N\A	N\A	N\A

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	appropriate justification for the proposed revision?			
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?	N\A	N\A	N\A
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?	Yes, the implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures.	OK	OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	Yes, the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order.	OK	OK
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	Yes, the evidence 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?	Yes, the data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to	N\A	N\A	N\A

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the JI PoA not verified?			
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	N\A	N\A	N\A
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	N\A	N\A	N\A
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	N\A	N\A	N\A
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	N\A	N\A	N\A
Applicable to sample-based approach only				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable, taking into account	N\A	N\A	N\A

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as: − The types of JPAs; − The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used; − The geographical location of each JPA; − The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified; − The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified; − The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and − The samples selected for prior verifications, if any?			
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?	N\A	N\A	N\A
108	Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections	N\A	N\A	N\A

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then does the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?			
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC ex ante assessment? (Optional)	N\A	N\A	N\A
110	If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?	N\A	N\A	N\A

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 LoA from the Netherland Designated Focal Point.	90	LoA from the Netherland Designated Focal Point is provided to the verification group.	The issue is closed
CAR02 Please provide LoA from the Ukrainian Designated Focal Point.	90	LoA from the Ukrainian Designated Focal Point is provided to the verification group.	The issue is closed
CAR03 In determined PDD there are references from NIR 1990-2010 only. Meanwhile both MR and excel calculation spreadsheet contain references from NIR 1990-2009. Please make appropriate corrections.	95(b)	Appropriate corrections are made.	The issue is closed
CAR04 Please provide invoices on diesel for the monitoring period.	95(b)	All invoices on diesel for the monitoring period is provided to the verification group.	The issue is closed

CAR05 Average emission reductions provided in excel file should be estimated within monitoring period stated in the MR. Please make appropriate corrections.	95(b)	Value of average emission reductions is provided in section A MR.	The issue is closed
CAR06 Total emission reductions should be in line with those stated in MR.	95(b)	Total emission reductions are in line with those stated in MR. The difference in values is due to rounding. All values of emission reductions in the monitoring report are specified according to the rules of rounding and presented as integers.	The issue is closed