VERIFICATION REPORT
SIA "VIDZEME EKO"

VERIFICATION OF THE
WASTE HEAPS DISMANTLING NEAR HRYSTOFORIVKA VILLAGE

INITIAL AND FIRST PERIODIC FOR 18/12/2008-31/10/2012

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0880/2012

REVISION NO. 01

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

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the initial, 1st periodic verification of the "Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village", project of SIA "Vidzeme Eko" located in Hrystoforivka village, Antratsyt 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 5 127 097 tonnes of CO_2 equivalent for the monitoring period from 18/12/2008 to 31/10/2012 (112790 tCO2eq for 18/12/2008-31/12/2008, 1293394 tCO2eq for 01/01/2009-31/12/2009, 1330639 tCO2eq for 01/01/2010-31/12/2010, 1323110 tCO2eq for 01/01/2011-31/12/2011, 1067164 tCO2eq for 01/01/2012-31/10/2012).
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.:	Subject Group:
Ukraine-ver/0880/2012	JI
Project title:	
Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village	
Work carried out by:	
Svitlana Gariyenchyk – Team Leader, Lead Verifier Vyacheslav Yeriomin – Team Member, Verifier	
Work reviewed by:	
Ivan Sokolov - Technical Reviewer Vasyl Kobzar – Technical Specialist	
Work approved by:	
Ivan Sokolov - Operational Manager	
Date of this revision:	**Rev. No.:** / **Number of pages:**
17/12/2012	01 / 21

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

SIA “Vidzeme Eko” has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project “Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village” (hereafter called “the project”) at Hrystoforivka village, Antratsyt 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
Vyacheslav Yeriomin Bureau Veritas Certification	Climate Change Verifier

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov Bureau Veritas Certification,	Internal Technical Reviewer

Vasyl Kobzar
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/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(s) 2.0 and project as described in the determined PDD.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 01/12/2012 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 "Kompaniya "Persha Yurydychna" Ltd 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
"Kompaniya "Persha Yurydychna" Ltd	• 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 3 Corrective Action Requests, 1 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 #3785/23/7 dated 07/12/2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine. Letter of Approval 12.2-02/15067 dated 15/11/2012 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 project provides complete dismantling of the waste heaps #1,2 of former “Lvivskyi Komsomolets” mine and waste heap of former Kolpakivska mine with further reclamation of the area by restoring its fertile layer. During dismantling of the dump, the rocks will be divided into fractions, which will be used for blending with steam coal and subsequently supplied to heat power plants and boiler houses for burning as fuel. After sorting, the large fractions will be used for building and repairing of roads. As the result, rock mass of the dump will be fully utilized, and the received coal will replace coal, which otherwise would have had to be mined. As the result of the project, the opportunity of self-ignition of heap will be eliminated. An important component of the project is its second phase – complex reclamation of the area by restoring its fertile layer and full restoration of natural ecological community. This part

of the project is required, but totally expensive, due to this mechanism of joint implementation was one of the prominent factors of the project from the beginning, and financial benefits as part of this mechanism considered one of the reasons of the project implementation.

The project provides the assemblage and installation of sorting rock mass complex of abovementioned dumps consisting of:

- Point of loading rock mass on Conveyor SP-202MS;
- Point of sorting rock mass in classes 0-30 mm and 30 mm (vibrating inertial sifter GIL-52);
- Point of storage class 0-30 mm (sheds).

Class +30 mm is expected (as required under discharging tray of sifter) to be loaded in transports and delivered to customers for building and repairing of category 4-5 roads. Class 0-30 mm is expected to be loaded in transports, undergoes a mandatory procedure of weighting and is sent to the consumer for blending and subsequent combustion in the thermal power plants or boiler houses. Blending of fraction (0- 30) with a steam coal allows to realize the fine finishing of quality the energy coal to the requirements of Standard 4083-2002, without compromising the quality of fuel on the one hand, but resulting in saving valuable energy coal on the other hand

Technological scheme of the complex is described as follows:
The rock mass, after been dismantled bulldozers is delivered to the feeding conveyor by frontal loader. Before the delivery of rock mass on the belt conveyor, the moisture is applied (humidity of raw materials does not exceed 8%) with sprinklers.
After bulldozers, layer by layer, get to the height, where the entrance road can be made- the combined method is used for the dump dismantling; further dismantling is made by excavator with the direct rock loading on the conveyor, or on the intermediate site, where, with the help of the loader, the rock is delivered to the scraper conveyor.

Product of sorting class 0-30 through handling unit of sifter supplied on belt conveyor. From the belt conveyor rock mass of class 0-30 mm through the handling unit of conveyor with built-in nozzles for humidification, emptied on the intermediate platform without significant accumulation, where loader loads it in trucks or on a platform (warehouse) for storage. Warehouse is used if necessary without long-term storage. From storage the rock mass 0-30 mm by loader is loaded into trucks.

Data on waste heaps such a geographical coordinates, mass value of containing rocks, physical measures are provided in the section A.4.1.4.

Main work characteristics of heavy transporting vehicles and equipment of coal beneficiation plant are provided in the section A.4.2 of the PDD.

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.

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, CL01)

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.

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 "Tandem 2006" LLc laboratory and sorting unit of "Ksintorg" 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 CAR03)

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

"Not applicable"

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial, 1st periodic, verification of the "Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village" Project in Hrystoforivka village, Antratsytskyi District, 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" 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 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 18/12/2008 to 31/10/2012

Baseline emissions	: 3896445	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 169376	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -1400028	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 5 127 097	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

From 15/12/2008 to 31/12/2008

Baseline emissions	: 87364	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 3734	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -29160	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 112790	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

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

Baseline emissions	: 980088	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 43446	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -356752	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 1293394	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

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

Baseline emissions	: 1007158	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 42585	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -366066	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

Emission Reductions	: 1330639	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
From 01/01/2011 to 31/12/2011		
Baseline emissions	: 1007982	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 43424	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -358552	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 1323110	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
From 01/01/2012 to 31/10/2012		
Baseline emissions	: 813853	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 36187	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -289498	tonnes of CO2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 1067164	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/ Project Design Document "Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village" mine" version 2.0 dated 03/12/2012
/2/ Monitoring Report "Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village" version 1.0 dated 09/12/2012
/3/ Monitoring Report "Waste heaps dismantling near Hrystoforivka village" version 2.0 dated 17/12/2012
/4/ ERUs calculation Excel-file "Calculation _T40.xls"
/5/ Letter of Approval #3785/23/7 dated 07/12/2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine
/6/ Letter of Approval # 12.2-02/15067 dated 15/11/2012 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 #4009 from 20/11/08 between "Remstroyproekt 2002" Ltd and "SMU" Ltd.
/2/ Subcontract of works # 4010 from 20/11/2008 between "Remstroyproekt 2002" Ltd and "Ksintorg" Ltd for waste heap dismantling.
/3/ Contract of works# 138 from 17/11/2008 between "Kompaniya 'Persha Yurydychna" Ltd (customer) and "Remstroyproekt 2002" (performer) for waste heap dismantling.
/4/ Attestation Certificate of "Tandem 2006" Ltd.
/5/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 25/07/08.
/6/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 25/08/09.
/7/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 10/09/10.
/8/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 27/10/11.
/9/ Verification certificate of working measuring electronic scales ANG – 200C, valid till 27/12/12.
/10/ Passport and certificates of electronic scales ANG – 200C
/11/ Diary of equipment and SIEVES for coal - chemical laboratory "TANDEM" Ltd.
/12/ Passport and certificates of vibratory mill 75T-DRM.
/13/ Passport and certificates of laboratory furnace SNOL 7,2/1100.
/14/ Passport and certificates of laboratory sieve.
/15/ Passport and certificates of drying box SNOL 58/350.
/16/ Passport and certificates of drying box SNOL 100/350.

/17/ Passports on dismantled waste heaps
/18/ Sale invoices on coal mass 0-30 mm, December 2008-October 2012
/19/ Sale invoices on diesel fuel, December 2008-October 2012
/20/ Statements on electricity consumption, December 2008-October 2012
/21/ Weighting acts December 2008-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/ Gints Klavinsh - SIA "Vidzeme Eko" JI Project Manager
/2/ Stah Yuri Mykhailovych - SIA "Vidzeme Eko" JI Consultant
/3/ Olena Mykolaivna Petrenko - PE "Tandem 2006" Ltd. Head of Laboratory
/4/ Volodymyr Mykhailovych Yakubenko - manager of TCD "Ksyntorg" Ltd.
/5/ Mykola Stepanovych Yukhymchuk - record keeper at weigh station, "Ksyntorg" Ltd.
/6/ Vladyslav Klymenko – Director of "Kompaniya "Persha Yurydychna"

APPENDIX A: 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 Parties Involved. Letter of Approval #3785/23/7 dated 07.12.2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine Letter of Approval #12.2-02/15067 dated 15/11/2012 has been issued by Ministry of Environment protection and Regional development of Republic Latvia.	OK	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	The abovementioned 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 check length of monitoring period *CL01* Please clarify if project equipment was changed during the monitoring period	CAR01 CL01	OK OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	The project was in operation during the monitoring period. The main decisive factors are provided in the MR	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 determined PDD	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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?	The key factors listed in the sections 23 (b) (i)-(vii) of DVM are taken into account	OK	OK
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 emission reduction calculations 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?	Emission factors used for calculating the emission reductions are in line with National GHG Inventory Report, approved by Ukrainian DFP	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 most plausible scenarios and conservative assumptions in a transparent manner	OK	OK
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	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
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 accordance 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?	*CAR02* The table 2 indicates only data for initial and last calibration. Please add	CAR02	OK
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The evidences and records are used for monitoring in a traceable manner	OK	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	The data collection and management system in in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
Applicable to sample-based approach only				

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 check length of monitoring period	92	Monitoring period is from 18/12/2008 till 31/10/2012	The issue is closed
CAR02 The table 2 indicates only data for initial and last calibration. Please add	101 (b)	Data on the intermediate calibrations is added in Table 2, Section B.1.2.	The issue is closed
CL01 Please clarify if project equipment was changed during the monitoring period	92	Large amount of mining equipment is involved in waste heaps dismantling. During project implementation number and models of machinery can be changed and it doesn't significantly affect the project indicator. Other equipment changes didn't take place.	The issue is closed