Industrie Service

Choose certainty.
Add value.

Determination Report

CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association

DETERMINATION OF THE JI TRACK-1 PROJECT:
"THE ABATEMENT OF N2O EMISSIONS FROM NITRIC ACID PRODUCTION AT CJSC "SEVERODONETSK AZOT ASSOCIATION" (UKRAINE)

REPORT NO. 1325816

March 18th 2010

TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
Carbon Management Service
Westendstr. 199 - 80686 Munich – GERMANY

Report No.	Date of first issue	Revision No.	Date of this revision	Certificate No.
1325816	10-02-2010	1.0	18-03-2010	-

Subject: Determination of a JI Track-1 project

Accredited TÜV SÜD Unit:	**TÜV SÜD Contract Partner:**
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Certification Body "climate and energy" Westendstr. 199 80686 Munich Germany	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH Carbon Management Service Westendstr. 199 80686 Munich Germany TÜV SÜD Russland GmbH 10/2 Krasnoarmeyskaya str. 125167 Moscow Russia
Project Participant(s):	**Project Site(s):**
CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" 5 Pivovarova str. 93400 Severodonetsk, Lugansk reg. Ukraine CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd. 6th Floor, 94 Wigmore str. London, W1U 3RF England	CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" 5 Pivovarova str. 93400 Severodonetsk, Lugansk reg. Ukraine

Project Title: The Abatement of N2O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production at CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" (Ukraine)

Applied Methodology / Version:	AM0034 / version 3.2	**Scope(s):**	5

First PDD Version:		**Final PDD version:**	
Date of issuance:	21-04-2009	Date of issuance:	12-01-2010
Version No.:	01	Version No.:	03
Starting Date of GSP	27-05-2009		

Estimated Annual Emission Reduction (2009-2012): 489,323 tCO2e

Assessment Team Leader:	**Further Assessment Team Members:**
Nikolaus Kröger	Olena Maslova, Andrey Atyakshev, Konstantin Agamirzov

Summary of the Determination Opinion:

☒ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI as well as all the requirements set by host country (Ukraine) for approving projects under JI – Track 1. Hence, TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for further approval and registration by the responsible DFP.

☐ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of all stated criteria. Hence, TÜV SÜD will not recommend the project for registration by the DFP of the host country as a JI Track-1 project and will inform the project participants and the German DFP on this decision.

Abbreviations

AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
AM	Approved Methodology
AOR	Ammonia Oxidation Reactor
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CJSC	Closed Joint Stock Company
CR	Clarification Request
DFP	Designated Focal Point
EF	Emission Factor
EIA / EA	Environmental Impact Assessment / Environmental Assessment
ER	Emission Reduction
ERUs	Emission Reduction Unit(s)
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Greenhouse gas(s)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRL	Information Reference List
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LoA	Letter of Approval
LoE	Letter of Endorsement
MP	Monitoring Plan
NDIR	Non-Dispersive Infrared Spectroscopy
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
PCS	Process Control System
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
Severodonetsk Azot	CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association"
TÜV SÜD	TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVM	Determination and Verification Manual, IETA/World Bank

Table of Contents Page

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

The determination objective is an independent assessment by a Third Party (Accredited Independent Entity, AIE) of a proposed project activity against all defined criteria set for the registration under the Joint Implementation scheme (JI). Determination is also a part of the JI Tack-1 project cycle and will finally result in a conclusion by the executing AIE whether a project activity is valid and should be submitted for registration to the DFP of the host country. The ultimate decision on the registration of a proposed project activity rests at the DFP of the host country and further Parties involved.

The project activity discussed by this determination report has been submitted under the project title:

The Abatement of N2O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production at CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" (Ukraine).

1.2 Scope

The scope of any assessment is defined by the underlying legislation, regulation and guidance given by relevant entities or authorities. In the case of JI project activities the scope is set by:

- The Kyoto Protocol, in particular § 6
- Decision 2/CMP1 and Decision 3/CMP.1 (Marrakech Accords)
- Further COP/MOP decisions with reference to the JI (e.g. decisions 9/CMP.1)
- Decisions by the JI-SC published under http://ji.unfccc.int
- Specific guidance by the JI-SC published under http://ji.unfccc.int
- Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (JI-PDD)
- The applied approved CDM methodology(s)
- The technical environment of the project (technical scope)
- Internal and national standards on monitoring and QA/QC
- Technical guideline and information on best practice

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

Once TÜV SÜD receives an initial PDD version, it is made publicly available in the internet on TÜV SÜD's webpage as well as on the UNFCCC JI webpage. In case of any request a PDD might be revised and the final PDD will form the basis for the final evaluation as presented in this report. Information on the initial and on the final PDD version is presented on page 1.

The only purpose of a Determination is its use during the registration process as part of the JI project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the Determination opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

2 METHODOLOGY

The project assessment applies standard auditing techniques to assess the correctness of the information provided by the PPs. The assessment is based on the VV Manual (2003). The work starts with appointment of team covering the technical scope(s), sectoral scope(s) and relevant host country experience for evaluating the JI project activity. Once the project is made public available, members of the team carry out the desk review, follow-up actions, resolution of issues identified and finally preparation of the determination report. The prepared determination report and other supporting documents then undergo an internal quality control by the CB "climate and energy" before submission to the DFP of the host country.

In order to ensure transparency, assumptions are clear and explicitly stated; the background material is clearly referenced. TÜV SÜD developed methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), the discussion of each criterion by the assessment team and the results from validating the identified criteria. The determination protocol serves the following purposes:

It organises, details and clarifies the requirements the particular JI Track-1 project is expected to meet; it ensures a transparent determination process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the determination and any adjustment made to the project design.

The determination protocol consists of three tables. The different columns in these tables are described in the figure below. The completed determination protocol is enclosed in Annex 1 to this report.

Determination Protocol Table 1: Conformity of Project activity and PDD				
Checklist Topic / Question	**Reference**	**Comments**	**PDD in GSP**	**Final PDD**
The checklist is organised in sections following the arrangement of the applied PDD version. Each section is then further sub-divided. The lowest level constitutes a checklist question / criterion.	*Gives reference to documents where the answer to the checklist question or item is found in case the comment refers to documents other than the PDD.*	*The section is used to elaborate and discuss the checklist question and/or the conformance to the question. It is further used to explain the conclusions reached. In some cases sub-checklist are applied indicating yes/no decisions on the compliance with the stated criterion. Any **Request** has to be substantiated within this column.*	*Conclusions are presented based on the assessment of the first PDD version. This is either acceptable based on evidence provided (☑), or a **Corrective Action Request (CAR)** due to non-compliance with the checklist question (see below). **Clarification Request (CR)** is used when the determination team has identified a need for further clarification. **Forward action request** to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification.*	*Conclusions are presented in the same manner based on the assessment of the final PDD version and further documents including assumptions presented in the documentation.*

Determination Protocol Table 2: Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests			
Clarifications and corrective action requests	**Ref. to table 1**	**Summary of project owner response**	**Determination team conclusion**
If the conclusions from table 1 are either a Corrective Action, a Clarification or a Forward action Request, these should be listed in this section.* ** In the latest revision of this Report **Table 4** serves for summurising of Forward Action Requests that require review during the first verification.*	*Reference to the checklist question number in Table 1 where the issue is explained.*	*The responses given by the client or other project participants during the communications with the determination team should be summarised in this section.*	*This section should summarise the discussion on and revision to project documentation together with the determination team's responses and final conclusions. The conclusions should be reflected in Table 1, under "Final PDD".*

In case of a denial of the project activity more detailed information on this decision will be presented in table 3.

Determination Protocol Table 3: Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests		
Clarifications and corrective action requests	**Id. of CAR/CR 1**	**Explanation of the Conclusion for Denial**
If the final conclusions from table 2 results in a denial the referenced request should be listed in this section.	*Identifier of the Request.*	*This section should present a detail explanation, why the project is finally considered not to be in compliance with a criterion with a clear reference to the requirement which is not complied with.*

2.1 Appointment of the Assessment Team

According to the technical scopes and experiences in the sectoral or national business environment TÜV SÜD has composed a project team in accordance with the appointment rules of the TÜV SÜD certification body "climate and energy". The composition of an assessment team has to be approved by the Certification Body (CB) ensuring that the required skills are covered by the team. The CB TÜV SÜD operates four qualification levels for team members that are assigned by formal appointment rules:

- Assessment Team Leader (ATL)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor (GHG-A)
- Greenhouse Gas Auditor Trainee (T)
- Experts (E)

It is required that the sectoral scope and technical area linked to the methodology as well as host country expertise are covered by the assessment team.

The Determination team was consisting of the following experts (the responsible Assessment Team Leader in written in bold letters):

Name	Qualification	Coverage of technical scope	Coverage of technical area	Host country experience
Nikolaus Kröger	**ATL**	☑	☑	☑
Olena Maslova	A	☑	☑	☑
Andrey Atyakshev	A			☑
Konstantin Agamirzov	T			☑

Nikolaus Kröger is environmental engineer and expert for emissions monitoring and quality assurance at the department "TÜV SÜD Carbon Management Service". He is located in the TÜV SÜD Hamburg office and is also engaged as personally accredited verifier in the EU-ETS serving the Northern German market. Being ghg auditor for sectoral scopes 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and assessment team leader for CDM and JI projects he has already been involved in several CDM/JI activities with a special focus on industrial non-CO_2 projects. Constitutive on 13 years experience at the department "Environmental Service" he verified many metallurgical plants, refineries, chemical plants, waste treatment and power plants and process engineering in many types of facilities. One of his former focal points had been implementation and calibration of complex automatic Environment-Data-Systems. Reflecting on earlier projects he is familiar with political, economical and technical random conditions in host country.

Olena Maslova is an auditor in the "Carbon Management Service" department of TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH in Munich, Germany. She is chemical engineer and host country expert for projects in Ukraine and Commonwealth of Independent States. Olena Maslova specializes in the assessment of CDM / JI projects in the sector of chemical industries and waste handling and disposal. In this project she functioned as project manager and auditor.

Andrey Atyakshev is mechanical engineer in the field of metal forming and expert for metallurgical works and engineering plants, mechanical and chemical testing for metal production. He is located in TÜV SÜD Ukraine, Kiev office and responsible for the carbon business of TÜV SÜD in Ukraine. Being GHG auditor for sectoral scopes 4, 7, 9 for CDM and JI projects, he has already been involved in several of CDM and JI activities with a special focus on industrial projects (N2O, CMM, Associated gas recovery). Being Industrial inspector, he has been involved in many third party industrial inspections and acceptance of products. Also he is appointed ISO 9001 Lead auditor.

Konstantin Agamirzov is an auditor in training in the "Carbon Management Service" department of TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH in Munich, Germany. He is microwave/radio electronic engineer and host country expert for project in Russian Federation, Ukraine and Commonwealth of Independent States in the department. Konstantin Agamirzov specialized in the assessment of JI/CDM projects in energy distribution and manufacturing industry.

2.2 Review of Documents

A first version of the PDD was submitted to the AIE in May 2009. The first PDD version submitted by the PP and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed to verify the correctness, credibility and interpretation of the presented information, furthermore a cross-check between information provided and information from other sources have

been done as initial step of the determination process. A complete list of all documents and proofs reviewed is attached as Annex 2 to this report.

2.3 Follow-up Interviews

In the period of September 22-23, 2009 TÜV SÜD performed interviews and physical site inspection with project stakeholders to confirm relevant information and to resolve issues identified in the first document review. The table below provides a list of all persons interviewed in this context.

Name	Organisation
Dr. Valentin V. Kazakov	Severodonetsk Azot, Chairman of the Board
Mr. Alexandr I. Taratuta	Severodonetsk Azot, Deputy Head of Production Department (JI project coordinator)
Mr. Viktor Kvachenko	Severodonetsk Azot, Head of nitric acid production
Mr. Viktor V. Bezaltichniy	Severodonetsk Azot, Chief Metrologist
Mr. Alexey U. Ivanov	Severodonetsk Azot, Head of IT Department
Dr. Volodymyr K. Ivashchenko	MGM International, Senior Technical Expert
Mr. Srgii Kobus	MGM International, Project Manager

2.4 Further cross-check

During the determination process, the team makes reference to the available information related to similar projects or technologies as the proposed JI Track-1 project activity. The documentation has also been reviewed against the approved methodology(s) applied with several adjustments to confirm the appropriateness of formulae and correctness of calculations.

2.5 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination is to resolve the requests for corrective actions and clarifications and any other outstanding issues which needed to be clarified for TÜV SÜD`s conclusion on the project design. The CARs and CRs raised by TÜV SÜD were resolved during communication between the client and TÜV SÜD. To guarantee the transparency of the determination process, the concerns raised and responses that have been given are documented in more detail in the determination protocol in Annex 1.

2.6 Internal Quality Control

As final step of a determination the final documentation including the determination report and the protocol have to undergo an internal quality control by the Certification Body "climate and energy", i.e. each report has to be finally approved either by the head of the Certification Body or the deputy. In case one of these two persons is part of the assessment team approval can only be given by the other one.

After confirmation of the PP the determination opinion and relevant documents are submitted to the responsible DFP of the host country for final approval.

3 SUMMARY

The assessment work and the main results are described below in accordance with the VVM (2003) reporting requirements. The reference documents indicated in this section and Annex 1 are stated in Annex 2.

3.1 Approval

The dedicated project participants are CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association", Severodonetsk from Ukraine and CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd., London from United Kingdom. The host Party Ukraine meets the requirements to participate in the JI.

Since July 30, 2007 the Ukrainian DFP is National Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine coordinated by the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine. The Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine has issued a LoE (IRL7) in July 8, 2007 indicating that the Ministry supports further development of this particular project.

TÜV SÜD has received this letter from the project participant directly and considers the provided letter as authentic.

Project proponents are going to apply for a LoA from the Host country after receiving this final determination report from TÜV SÜD as according to Ukrainian procedure for approving JI projects a final AIE's determination opinion is needed for a successful official approval by National Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine.

The investor party in this project is United Kingdom (UK). UK has indicated officially its DFP – Department of Energy and Climate Change. According to United Kingdom procedure for approving JI projects in order to apply for a LoA, a LoA from the Host country is required.

3.2 Participation

The dedicated project participants are CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association", Severodonetsk from Ukraine and CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd., London from United Kingdom. The participation of all project proponents as well as their roles in this JI project is confirmed with the contract on buying of ERUs between CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" and CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd. (IRL18)

3.3 Project design document

The PDD is compliant with relevant form and guidance as provided by the UNFCCC JISC.

TÜV SÜD concludes that the guidelines for the completion of the PDD in their most recent version have been followed. Relevant information has been provided by the participants in the applying PDD sections. Completeness was assessed through the checklist included to Annex 1 of this report.

3.4 Project description

The following description of the project as per PDD could be verified during the on-site mission:

Project is going to be implemented at the existing facilities of Severodonetsk Azot located in Severodonetsk town, Lugansk region, Ukraine. The plant has an operation history since 1951. The project activity aims at GHG emissions reduction of nitrous oxide, N_2O, which is an unwanted by-product by the industrial production of nitric acid and at the same time is a green house gas with GWP of 310.

In particular, the installation of the secondary N_2O abatement catalyst system directly in the ammonia oxidation reactor (AOR) underneath the ammonia oxidation catalyst (Pt-Rh catalyst gauze) is

envisaged. The employed secondary catalyst type "MultiComb Greenline" produced by Umicore AG & Co. KG has a warranted abatement efficiency of 75%.

In order to implement the project, Severodonetsk Azot has been equipped in April 2009 with a state of the art AMS according to DIN EN 14181 for continuous monitoring of the project key parameters.

The information presented in the PDD on the technical design is consistent with the actual planning and implementation of the project activity as confirmed by:

- Review of data and information (see Annex 2) using sectoral knowledge and expertise of the assessment team, cross check the same with other sources available in the respective technical literature, official publications, etc.
- The on-site visit has been performed and relevant stakeholders and personnel with knowledge of the project were interviewed, in case of doubt further cross checks through additional interviews have been done.
- Finally information related to similar technologies or projects as the JI project activity have been used if available to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the project description.

In light of the above, TÜV SÜD confirms that the project description as included to the PDD is sufficiently accurate and complete in order to comply with the requirements of the JI Track-1.

3.5 Baseline and monitoring methodology

3.5.1 Applicability of the selected methodology

Compliance with each applicability condition as listed in the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology AM0034, version 3.2 has been demonstrated.

The assessment was carried out for each applicability criteria and included among others the compliance check of the local project setting with the applicability conditions in regard to baseline setting and eligible project measures. This assessment also included the review of secondary sources which sustain that applicability conditions are complied with.

The Methodology specific protocol included to the Annex 1 documents the assessment process, including the steps taken. The outcome on the compliance check as well as the relevant evidences is explicitly presented in Annex 1 and Annex 2.

TÜV SÜD confirms that the chosen baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity.

Emission sources which are not addressed by the applied methodology and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reduction have not been identified.

3.5.2 Project boundary

The project boundary was assessed in the context of physical site inspection, interviews and based on the secondary evidence received on the design of the project.

Conforming to applicable CDM methodology, Severodonetsk Azot plant industrial process covered by the project activity is nitric acid production serving by the existing AORs. The project boundary comprises the complete production process from the inlet to the AORs to the stack, including all compressors and SCR DeNOx unit and covers 4 production lines. There is one common stack for production line No. 1 and 2 and another common stack for production line No. 3 and 4.

Description of emission sources including justification of gases included/excluded in/from the project boundaries is provided in appropriate manner, and can be considered as complete and correct.

The most relevant documentation assessed in order to confirm the project boundary is the following: Process scheme of non-concentrated nitric acid production in the shop No. 5/6 (IRL 11). Detailed flow chart of the process has been seen by Audit team in original but was not provided by Severodonetsk Azot due to confidentiality reasons.

The same have been validated during the determination process using standard audit techniques. For furhter details on TÜV SÜD observations on-site refer to the Annexes 1 and 2.

Hence, TÜV SÜD confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases as documented in the PDD are justified for the project activity.

3.5.3 Baseline identification

Applicable CDM methodology refers to the procedure for identification of the baseline scenario described the latest version of the approved methodology AM0028 "Catalytic N2O destruction in the tail gas of nitric acid plants". This procedure is applied in the PDD and provides for a step-wise approach to identify the baseline scenario.

The list of plausible alternative scenarios to the project activity is complete and no reasonable alternative scenarios have been excluded.

As a result of the baseline identification procedure provided in the final PDD the baseline scenario has been defined as "status quo"- the continuation of the current situation, where there will be no installation of technology for the destruction or abatement of N_2O.

The information presented in the PDD has been validated by a first document review of all the data, further confirmation based on the on-site visit and a final step by cross checking the information with similar relevant projects and/or technologies. The sources referenced in the PDD have been quoted correctly.

Transparent and documented evidences were provided to assessment team within on-site visit. Based on conservative interpretation of collected audit evidences, TÜV SÜD considers that the identified baseline scenario is reasonable.

TÜV SÜD confirms that all relevant JI requirements, including relevant national and / or sectoral policies and circumstances, have been identified correctly taken into account in the definition of the baseline scenario.

A verifiable description of the baseline scenario has been included to the PDD.

In conclusion TÜV SÜD confirms that:

1. All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
2. All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD;
3. Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
4. Relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD;
5. The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed JI project activity.

3.5.4 Algorithm and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions

3.5.4.1 Baseline Emissions

TÜV SÜD has assessed the calculations of project emissions, baseline emissions and leakage and emission reductions. Corresponding calculations were carried out based on calculation spreadsheets as presented via Emissions reductions calculation sheet (IRL69). The parameters and equations presented in the PDD and further documentation have been compared with the information and requirements presented in the methodology and respective tools. The equation comparison has been made explicitly following all the formulae presented in the calculation files.

Essential changes introduced in the updated CDM methodology were taken into account by the final determination of the provided project documentation, i.e. changed procedure for estimation of the baseline emission factor, baseline campaign length, monitoring periods etc.

Due to Severodonetsk Azot has four separate lines, and each of these lines includes AOR, absorption tower, turbine, DeNOx plant and monitoring system and in order to prevent a delay in project implementation and as a result losing the possibility of reducing a considerable amount of GHG emissions, the PPs decided to modify the procedure for baseline monitoring and emission factor estimation of methodology AM0034 version 03.2.

The idea of approach is the following. For some lines baseline monitoring campaign will continue during one single campaign from installation to replacement of the gauze according to requirements of methodology AM0034 and for other lines a baseline monitoring campaign is a summary of two overlapped successive campaigns. In case of overlapping of two campaigns the total period of the baseline monitoring will be completed as soon as the total length of the two campaigns (CL_{BL}) will be equal to the normal campaign length (CL_{normal}).

The TÜV SÜD assessment team considered the approach proposed by PPs is reasonable on the basis of the reviewed documentation, further references and the result of the interviews. However the exact value of the baseline Emission Factor for each line ($EF_{BL,i}$) can only be confirmed after the verification of this particular project is conducted.

Detailed information on the verification of the variations of methodology can be found in the Annex 1.

3.5.5 Project emissions

The project emissions were calculated ex-ante in accordance with formulae set defined in the latest approved version of AM0034 (version 3.2). In doing so following conservative assumptions have been made:

- Baseline emission factor of 4,5 kg N2O/tHNO3 is the conservative IPCC default emission factor;
- The lower secondary catalyst abatement efficiency of 75% was used for project emissions estimation.

All values presented in the PDD are considered reasonable based on the documentation reviewed, further references and the result of the interviews.

The estimated project emissions can be confirmed, as the same have been replicated by the audit team using the information provided. Detailed information on the verification of the parameters used in the equations can be found in the Annex 1.

3.5.6 Leakage

No leakage is expected from the project activity.

3.5.7 Emission Reductions

The calculation of the baseline emissions, project emissions, and the emission reductions, respectively, can be considered as correct. The baseline and project emissions are calculated in the PDD in transparent manner and using conservative assumptions.

Therefore based on the calculations in the project documentation it is expected that the project activity will lead to a reduction of GHG emissions of 1,590,300 tCO_2e in the period from 2009 until 2012.

3.6 Additionality

Simple cost analysis has been used for demonstrating additionality according to the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 05) as it is clearly shown that that there is no economical benefit by the reduction of the nitrous oxide concentration other than the JI revenues.

The approach used in the PDD has been assessed based on a document review and interviews on-site with plant representatives. Furthermore some documents have been reviewed on-site (for details see Annex 2). All audit evidences have been checked using sectoral knowledge and expertise as well as public available information published in the internet and technical literature.

Based on this determination steps, the AIE can confirm that the documentation assessed is appropriate for this project.

3.7 Monitoring plan

The assessment team has checked all the parameters presented in the MP against the requirements of the methodology. The MP presented in the PDD complies with the requirements of the methodology updated to the project case. The changes introduced in the updated CDM methodology were taken into account by the final determination of the provided project documentation. The main changes are:

- Measuring and calculation of volume flow rate of the stack gas (VSG_i). Due to specific design of nitric acid production at Severodonetsk Azot, one common stack for production line No. 1 and 2 and another common stack for production line No. 3 and 4, the mesurring points of tail gas volume from the lines was revised. The gas volume from the lines No. 2 and No. 3 is calculated on the basis of total amount of stack gas flow in the sack (No. 1 + No. 2 or No. 3 + No.4 respectively) and amount of gas flow from the lines which have own flow meter (i.e. No. 1 and No. 4). However there is a risk in correctness of futuer calculations therefore TÜV SÜD issued Forward Action Request (FAR3) in order to check such deviations from applied methodology in calculation routines during the first periodic verification.
- Also due to specific design of nitric acid production at Severodonetsk Azot, project activity covers 4 independant production lines, there is a possibility of overlapping monitoring periods. In this connection during on-site visit the assessment team checked that project is composed of clearly identifiable lines and monitoring can be performed independently for each of line. The assessment team justifies that in case of overlapping of monitoring periods monitoring reports will be executed referring to the JISC 13 "Clarification regarding overlapping periods", Version 01.

The quality assurance procedures have been audited by the assessment team through document review and interviews with the relevant personnel; this information together with a physical inspection allows the assessment team to confirm that the proposed MP is feasible within the project design. The major parameters to be monitored have been discussed with the PPs especially regarding the location of the meters, the data management, and in general the quality assurance and quality control procedures to be implemented in the context of the project.

All the audit evidences proving the appropriateness of monitoring provisions undertaken by the PPs were provided to the AIE and have been considered as sufficient. For details please refer to Annex 2 of this report.

Hence, it is expected that the PPs will be able to implement the monitoring plan and the emission reductions achieved can be reported ex-post and verified.

3.8 Local stakeholder consultation

In accordance the order No. 33 of June 25, 2008 "On Approval of JI Project Preparation Requirements" issued by the National Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine Severodonetsk Azot has invited the relevant local stakeholders by means of newspapers, local and regional information editions, via local Chamber of Commerce and Industry as well as Severodonetsk Azot informed Lugansk branch of Ministry of Environmental Protection that the project implementation will not violate any environmental protection requirements. The evidence of these invitations is IRL 28, 57-59.

Furthermore on November 13, 2008 Severodonetsk Azot held a meeting with the employees and informed them about the JI project and its impact on improvement of environmental conditions (IRL 56).

The PPs have received positive comments and decisions from local and state government bodies. The assessment team has review the documentation in order to validate the inclusion of relevant stakeholders and using the local expertise can confirmed that the communication method used to invite the stakeholders can be considered appropriate. The summary of comments presented in the PDD has been cross check with the documentation of the stakeholder consultation and it is found to be complete. Hence, the local stakeholder consultation has been adequately performed according to the Host country requirements.

3.9 Environmental impacts

The document with EIA was not developed by PPs since the State Environmental Authority in Lugansk region have officially informed Severodonetsk Azot by Letter (IRL28), that this project is outside the scope of state environmental control rules, therefore it is not necessary to develop an EIA in this case. TÜV SÜD assessment team remarks that the project has a strong positive environmental impact, since the primary object of the project is reduction of N_2O emissions. So far TÜV SÜD host country expert assessment team members are familiar with local laws and regulations the project complies with environmental legislation in Ukraine.

4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOs

TÜV SÜD published the project documents on TÜV SÜD's own website and invited comments by the Parties, stakeholders and non-governmental organisations during a period of 30 days.

The following table presents all key information on this process:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Webpage:
http://www.netinform.net/KE/Wegweiser/Guide22.aspx?ID=6148&Ebene1_ID=50&Ebene2_ID=1982&mode=5</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Starting date of the global stakeholder consultation process:
2009-05-27</td></tr>
<tr><td>Comment submitted by:
None</td><td>Issues raised:
-</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Response by TÜV SÜD:
-</td></tr>
</table>

Industrie Service

5 DETERMINATION OPINION

TÜV SÜD has performed a determination of the following proposed JI project activity:

The Abatement of N2O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production at CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" (Ukraine).

Standard auditing techniques have been used for the determination of the project. Methodology-specific checklists and protocol customised for the project have been prepared to carry out the audit and present the outcome in a transparent and comprehensive manner.

The review of the project design documentation, the subsequent follow-up interviews and the further cross check of references have provided TÜV SÜD with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfilment of stated criteria in the protocol. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI as well as all the requirements set by host country (Ukraine) for approving projects under JI – Track 1. Hence, TÜV SÜD will recommend the project for further approval and registration by the DFP of the host country.

An analysis as provided by the applied CDM methodology demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are, hence, additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions as specified within the final PDD version.

The determination is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report. The determination has been performed following the JI requirements. The only purpose of this report is its use during the registration process as part of the JI Track-1 project cycle. Hence, TÜV SÜD cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the determination opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

Munich, 18-03-2010

Certification Body "climate and energy"
TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH

Munich, 18-03-2010

Assessment Team Leader

Annex 1: Determination Protocol

Determination Protocol

Project Title: The Abatement of N2O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production at CJSC “Severodonetsk Azot Association” (Ukraine)
Date of Completion: 2010-03-18
Number of Pages: 64

Industrie Service

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
A. General description of project activity				
A.1. Title of the project activity				
A.1.1.1. Does the used project title clearly enable to identify the unique JI activity?	1, 2	The project title clearly enables the identification of the JI activity. No second JI activity exists with a similar title or at the same site.	☑	☑
A.1.1.2. Are there any indication concerning the revision number and the date of the revision?	1, 2	The revision number and the date of the issuance of this revision is correctly indicated PDD version 1 dated April 21, 2009	☑	☑
A.1.1.3. Is this consistent with the time line of the project’s history?	1, 2, 8, 16	Yes, it is. The date of the issuance is consistent with the time line of project’s history. The Letter of Endorsement for the project was issued at July 06, 2007, the starting day of project activity is May 30, 2008. Starting date of the crediting period is stated to be July 1, 2009. **Clarification Request 1:** Please clarify which actions are the starting date of the project activity and crediting period defined with. In doing so please use the Glossary of JI terms v. 1 JISC 13. PDD should be amended accordingly then.	**CR**	☑
A.2. Description of the project activity				
A.2.1.1. Is the description delivering a transparent overview of the project activities?	1, 2	Yes, it is. The description is delivering a transparent overview of the project activities. **Clarification Request 2:** Section A.2 of the PDD has to briefly summarize the history of the project according to requirements of the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3. Please adjust the PDD accordingly.	**CR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
A.2.1.2. What proofs are available demonstrating that the project description is in compliance with the actual situation or planning?	2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14-21, 30	For demonstrating that the project description is in compliance with the actual situation or planning the following proofs had been provided during on-site mission: - Excerpts from official sources as to design capacity of UKL-7; - Project implementation plan dated 22/09/2009; - Process scheme of non-concentrated nitric acid production in the shop No. 5/6; - Technical regulations of non-concentrated nitric acid production issued by CJSC “Severodonezk Azot Assosiation”; - Annual report of hazardous substances emissions for shop No.5/6 in 2008; - Technical description of the secondary catalyst type “MultiComb Greenline” and contract with supplier Umicore company; - Contracts between CJSC “Severodonezk Azot Assosiation” and ERUs buyer, vendors of equipment and developer of JI project. During the on-site assessment the secondary catalyst technology to be installed in this project has been discussed. Project proponents submitted the technical description of the secondary catalyst “MultiComb Greenline” which is planned to be installed after finishing the baseline measurements. According to this technical description the expected abatement rate of the secondary catalyst is 75-80%. However for ex-ante estimations of emission reductions Severodonetsk Azot use the abatement rate of 80%, furthermore PDD states to use lower end of the abatement proposed by the N2O catalyst manufacturer. Even though the PPs stated to be doing a market research for another secondary catalyst with a	CAR	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		higher N2O abatement rate, the ex- ante ER estimations should be done in a conservative way. **Corrective Action Request 1:** The PDD should be corrected by including the correct abatement efficiency of the applied secondary catalyst according to provided evidence. Furthermore the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions should be re-calculated accordingly.		
A.2.1.3. Is the information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD?	1, 2	Yes, all information provided by these proofs consistent with the information provided by the PDD.	☑	☑
A.2.1.4. Is all information presented consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD?	1, 2	Yes, all information presented is consistent with details provided by further chapters of the PDD.	☑	☑
A.3. Project participants				
A.3.1.1. Is the form required for the indication of project participants correctly applied?	1, 2	Yes, it is.	☑	☑
A.3.1.2. Is the participation of the listed entities or Parties confirmed by each one of them?	1, 2, 18	The participation of CJSC "Severodonezk Azot Assosiation" (Severodonezk Azot) and CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd. (CGT) as the PPs confirmed by the contract on buying of ERUs. **Corrective Action Request 2:** According to PDD version 1 MGM Worldwide LLC (MGM) is project participant. Furthermore the party involved from the project developer side is stated to be the USA, which is not a JI country. However MGM is only project developer and not the project participant that was confirmed by CJSC "Severodonezk Azot Assosiation" and MGM during on-site audit. Please clarify and adjust the	**CAR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		section A.3 and Annex 1 of the PDD.		
A.3.1.3. Is all information on participants / Parties provided in consistency with details provided by further chapters of the PDD (in particular Annex 1)?	1, 2	**Corrective Action Request 3:** There are additional information concerning the program of energy consumption reduction and technology applied by Severodonezk Azot for ammonia production in section A.3 of the PDD version 1. The information as to the program of energy consumption reduction has to be supported by proofs and submitted to the audit team. As regards the applied technology it is not a part of section A.3. Please revise the section A.3 of the PDD.	**CAR**	☑
A.4. Technical description of the project activity				
A.4.1. *Location of the project activity*				
A.4.1.1. Does the information provided on the location of the project activity allow for a clear identification of the site(s)?	1, 2	Yes, it does. The information provided on the location of the project activity allows for a clear identification of the site.	☑	☑
A.4.1.2. How is it ensured and/or demonstrated, that the project proponents can implement the project at this site (ownership, licenses, contracts etc.)?	7, 14, 16-21, 23, 24-28	It is ensured by means of the license on the ammonia and formalin production, ground rent contract between Severodonezk Azot and Severodonezk Town Council.	☑	☑
A.4.2. *Technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project activity*				
A.4.2.1. Does the technical design of the project activity reflect current good practices?	1, 2	Yes, it does.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
A.4.2.2. Does the description of the technology to be applied provide sufficient and transparent input / information to evaluate its impact on the greenhouse gas balance?	1, 2, 8, 69	Yes, it does. The project activity aims to reduce the amount of N_2O emitted by catalytically decomposing the N_2O produced in the undesired side reaction during ammonia oxidation. The part of project activity is installation of secondary catalyst type "MultiComb Greenline" supplied by Umicore company. This type of secondary catalyst does not require additional heat or other energy input (electricity, steam etc.). During on-site audit Severodonezk Azot submitted technical description of the secondary catalyst type "MultiComb Greenline" which confirms that no additional greenhouse gases produced during the N2O decomposition as well as it does not affect NO yield (no influence on the HNO3 production level) and not increase NOx emissions. **Clarification Request 3:** Please add in the section A.4.2. information about implementation schedule of the project as required the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3.	CR	☑
A.4.2.3. Does the implementation of the project activity require any technology transfer from annex-I-countries to the host country(ies)?	1, 2	Yes, the implementation of the project activity requires technology transfer from annex-I-countries and includes secondary catalyst system and monitoring equipment.	☑	☑
A.4.2.4. Is the technology implemented by the project activity environmentally safe?	60	The additional catalyst is made of non-precious metals and does not create significant negative environmental effect. The obsolete catalyst will be recycled according to the prevailing EU standards. **Clarification Request 4:** Please submit to audit team the material safety data sheet to ensure that secondary catalyst for N2O abatement is considered low	CR	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		danger in terms of impact on human safety and environment.		
A.4.2.5. Is the information provided in compliance with actual situation or planning?	1, 2, 14	**Corrective Action Request 4:** In section A.4.2. of the PDD mentioned that Severodonetsk Azot is in the process of selecting the secondary catalyst supplier. But in section D.1.1. of the PDD stated that Severodonetsk Azot has already decided to install a secondary catalyst system from Umicore company. Please clarify and adjust the PDD.	**CAR**	☑
A.4.2.6. Does the project use state of the art technology and / or does the technology result in a significantly better performance than any commonly used technologies in the host country?	1, 2, 11, 15	Yes, it is a state of art technology providing significant N2O emission abatement.	☑	☑
A.4.2.7. Is the project technology likely to be substituted by other or more efficient technologies within the project period?	15	Currently there is no grounds that the project technology likely to be substituted by other technologies.	☑	☑
A.4.2.8. Does the project require extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to be carried out as scheduled during the project period?	1, 2, 37, 47-52	Yes, it does. Every need for training and maintenance efforts will be followed. Extensive training is required in the context of operation of the catalyst, monitoring system, data acquisition and reporting. This is described in the PDD.	☑	☑
A.4.2.9. Is information available on the demand and requirements for training and maintenance?	37, 47-52	During on-site audit PPs submitted to audit team hard proofs concerning trainings and workshop which already done. The programs of training and requirements were submitted to audit team as well.	☑	☑
A.4.2.10. Is a schedule available for the implemen-	2, 8,	Yes, the project implementation plan has been submitted to audit	**CR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
tation of the project and are there any risks for delays?	24, 61	team. At the day of audit on-site there were no possible risks for delay. The AMS for 4 lines have been installed and in operation, the baseline campaigns for 4 lines were started at 23/04/2009. Also the contract on delivery of secondary catalysts with Umicore has been submitted to audit team. **Clarification Request 5:** According to information provided to the audit team on-site the baseline campaigns for 4 lines were started at 23/04/2009 but AMS was commissioned at 30/04/2009 according to the commissioning certificate for AMS submitted by Severodonetsk Azot during on-site audit. The PPs have to explain such situation to audit team.		
A.4.3. *Brief Explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reduction would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances*				
A.4.3.1. Is there a brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reduction would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances?	1, 2	Yes, it is.	☑	☑
A.4.3.2. Is the explanation transparent, feasible and – if based on calculations – mathematical correct calculated?	11, 15, 69	Yes, it is. The explanations are transparent and feasible.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
A.4.4.	*Estimated amount of emission reductions over the chosen crediting period*				
A.4.4.1.	Is the form required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	1, 2	The PDD uses the correct form in chapter A.4.4.	☑	☑
A.4.4.2.	Are the figures provided consistent with other data presented in the PDD?	1, 2	All figures which are presented in the PDD are consistent with other data.	☑	☑
A.4.5.	*Project approval by the participants*				
A.4.5.1.	Is the state of endorsement or approval by the host party clearly defined and a Letter of Endorsement (LoE), Letter of Approval (LoA) or any alternative statement of authorization available?	7	The Letter of Endorsement for the project was issued by Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine in 2007. The LoE was submitted to the audit team. Letter of Approval from the host and buyer country will be applied for after the determination of the project will be finalized.	☑	☑
A.4.5.2.	Is the state of endorsement or approval by any other parties e.g. investing parties clearly defined and a Letter of Endorsement (LoE), Letter of Approval (LoA) or any alternative statement of authorization available?	7	Please refer to comment in A.4.5.1.	☑	☑
B. Baseline					
B.1. Description and justification of the baseline chosen					
B.1.1.1.	Are reference number, version number, and title of the baseline and monitoring methodology clearly indicated?	1, 2	Reference number and version number of the baseline and monitoring methodology are clearly indicated. But the title of the methodology is missed. **Clarification Request 6:** Please indicate the title of the baseline and monitoring methodol-	**CR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		ogy in the PDD.		
B.1.1.2. Is the applied version the most recent one and / or is this version still applicable?	70, 71	The PDD applies AM0034, version 03.2 and refers in the baseline section to AM0028, version 04.2. For both methodologies the referred version is the most recent one.	☑	☑
Justification of the choice of the methodology and why it is applicable to the project activity				
B.1.1.3. Is the applied methodology considered the most appropriate one?	1, 2, 69	AM0034 is solely addressing the destruction of nitrous oxide by secondary measures. Hence it is considered that AM0034 is the appropriate choice for this project activity also applying a secondary technology in the ammonia burner of a nitric acid plant. It has to be highlighted that in the existing project there is approved CDM methodology AM0034 that fits to the baseline and project scenario of this project. Nevertheless it is not directly applicable because of various distinctions between the assumptions of the methodology and the real situation at the plant in Severodonetsk. So AM0034 has to be adjusted due to the distinctions between methodology assumptions and real situation. **Clarification Request 7:** It is necessary to discuss all the deviations of the project from the applied methodology. The on-site audit confirmed that the deviations from AM0034 exist (determination of baseline emission factor, monitoring points of gas flow and concentration, ERs calculations). Hence they have to be well described and documented according to “Guidelines for users of JI-PDD” (ver. 03).	**CR**	☑
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists on the applicability criteria as given by the applied methodology and comment on at least every line answered with “No”;				

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.4. Criterion 1:
The applicability is limited to the existing production capacity measured in tonnes of nitric acid, where the commercial production had began no later than 31 December 2005. Definition of “existing” production capacity is applied for the process with the existing ammonia oxidization reactor where N_2O is generated and not for the process with new ammonia oxidizer. Existing production “capacity” is defined as the designed capacity, measured in tons of nitric acid per year.</td><td>9, 10</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.5. Criterion 2:
The project activity will not result in the shut down of any existing N_2O destruction or abatement facility or equipment in the plant.</td><td>11</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>As obviously there’s no N2O abatement unit in the plant the project activity will not result in the shutdown of any existing N2O destruction or abatement facility or any further emission reduction equipment in the plant.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.6. Criterion 3:
The project activity shall not affect the level of nitric acid production</td><td>15</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>The secondary catalyst applied does not have any impact to level</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>of NO yield. Moreover it is ensured by the secondary catalyst supplier that the project activity will not affect the level of nitric acid production.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.7. Criterion 4:
There are currently no regulatory requirements or incentives to reduce levels of N2O emissions from nitric acid plants in the host country.</td><td>29-32</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>During on-site visit, it was discussed and confirmed that there are currently no regulatory requirements or incentives to reduce levels of N_2O emissions from HNO_3 plants in Ukraine.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.8. Criterion 5:
No N_2O abatement technology is currently installed in the plant.</td><td>11</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>During on-site visit it has been verified that there is no abatement technology installed.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.9. Criterion 6:
The project activity will not increase NOx emissions.</td><td>11, 30</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>The BREF (August 2007, p. 124) confirms that NO yields for the ammonia oxidation reaction remain unchanged when operating</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>secondary N2O abatement catalysts.
NOx is a regulated gas in the Ukraine and it is monitored in the stack gas of line No. 1-4. During on-site visit the annual report of hazardous substances emissions for shop No.5/6 in 2008 was submitted to by Severodonetsk Azot and the audit team confirms that the emissions of NOx are not exceed required limits.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.10. Criterion 7:
NOx abatement catalyst installed, if any, prior to the start of the project activity is not a Non- Selective Catalytic Reduction (NSCR) DeNOx unit.</td><td>11</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>
During on-site visit, it was confirmed that Selective Catalytic Reduction DeNOX unit is installed and prior to the start of the project activity there is not a Non-Selective Catalytic Reduction (NSCR) DeNOx unit at the project site.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.11. Criterion 8:
Operation of the secondary N_2O abatement catalyst installed under the project activity does not lead to any process emissions of greenhouse gases, directly or indirectly.</td><td>15</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>
There is no further impact on greenhouse gas emissions by this kind of technology. According to the BREF submitted by IPPC on August 2007 the application of secondary N2O catalyst does generally not lead to any process emissions of GHG – direct or indirect.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.12. Criterion 9:
Continuous real-time measurements of N_2O concentration and total gas volume flow can be carried out in the stack:
- Prior to the installation of the secondary catalyst for one campaign, and
- After the installation of the secondary catalyst throughout the chosen crediting period of the project activity</td><td>45, 62-65</td><td><table><tr><th>Applicability checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Criterion discussed in the PDD?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance provable?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Compliance verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>
During the on-site audit was verified that the required measurement equipment is installed and N2O concentration and total gas volume flow measurements are conducted continuously.
Please also refer to CR (B.1.1.3)

The installed AMS passed QAL2 and it is confirmed by the report.
<u>Clarification Request 8:</u>
Please submit QAL1 reports for installed AMS according to EN ISO 14956.</td><td>CR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">The baseline scenario shall be identified using procedure for Identification of the baseline scenario described in the approved methodology AM0028 “Catalytic N_2O destruction in the tail gas of Nitric Acid Plants” version 04.2</td></tr>
<tr><td>B.1.1.13. Have all technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1a in AM0028, ver. 04.2) to the project activity been identified and discussed by the PDD? Why can this list be considered as being complete?</td><td>1, 2</td><td><u>Corrective Action Request 5:</u>
According to requirements of AM0028 version 04.2 the PPs should indentify technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives which are realistic and credible. The PDD version 1 in sub-step 1a does not have a clear identification of baseline scenario alternatives. Please clear identify the baseline scenario alternatives.</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
B.1.1.14. Have all technically feasible alternatives (at least all scenarios listed under step 1a in AM0028, ver. 04.2) to handle NOx emissions been identified and discussed by the PDD?	1, 2	Please refer to CAR (B.1.1.13).	**CAR**	☑
B.1.1.15. Does the project identify correctly and exclude those options not in line with regulatory or legal requirements?	1, 2	Yes, it does.	☑	☑
B.1.1.16. Have applicable regulatory or legal requirements been identified?	29, 32	The existing regulation in Ukraine does not require implementation any technologies for N_2O abatement. There are no subsidies or other support available for such technologies. Hence, the installation of different N_2O abatement technologies (other than secondary catalysts) is not feasible as any of the existing N_2O abatement technologies imply additional costs and no revenues outside the JI mechanism.	☑	☑
B.1.1.17. Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent alternatives to occur (step 3a)?	1, 2	**Corrective Action Request 6:** According to requirements of AM0028 version 04.2 the PPs should establish a complete list of barriers that would prevent alternatives to occur in the absence of JI. The PDD version 1 in sub-step 3a does not have a description of barriers. Please provide clear description for each identified barrier.	**CAR**	☑
B.1.1.18. Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?	1, 2	Yes, it does. The existence and significance of these barriers is discussed in the PDD in transparent manner.	☑	☑
B.1.1.19. Is it transparently shown that at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified barriers (step 3b)?	1, 2	Continuation of the status quo is not prevented by the identified barriers. However please refer to (B.1.1.13), (B.1.1.17) and (B.3.1.2).	**CAR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
B.1.1.20. Does the PDD include an appropriate discussion if and how any alternatives generate financial or economic benefits? (step 4)	1, 2	Yes, it does. There is an appropriate discussion on this question. It can be concluded that no alternatives would generate financial or economic benefits.	☑	☑
B.1.1.21. In case of Option I: Is the least costly alternative clearly identified?	1, 2	The continuation of the recent situation is clearly identified as the least costly option.	☑	☑
B.1.1.22. In case of Option II: Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.23. In case of Option II: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indicator correctly done for all remaining alternatives?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.24. In case of Option II: Is the investment analysis presented in a transparent manner providing public available proofs for data?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.25. In case of Option II: Is the sensitivity analysis evidencing the robustness of the financial attractiveness of the selected baseline scenario?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.26. In case of Option II: Have reasonable variations been applied in critical assumptions?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.27. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project lifetime: Are there any new or modified NO_x-emission regulations, which may address the project baseline?	-	N/A	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
B.1.1.28. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project’s lifetime: Have new baseline scenarios been properly discussed reflecting the altered situation?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.29. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project’s lifetime: Are there any new or modified N_2O emission regulations, which may address the project baseline?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.1.1.30. In case of a re-assessment in the course of the project’s lifetime: Have new baseline scenarios been properly discussed reflecting the altered situation?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.2. Description of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are reduced below those that would have occurred in the absence of the JI project (assessment and demonstration of additionality):				
B.2.1.1. In case of applying step 2 / investment analysis of the additionality tool: Is the analysis method identified appropriately (step 2a)?	1, 2	As in chapter B.2 the investment analysis has been selected as the appropriate choice of possible methods.	☑	☑
B.2.1.2. In case of Option I (simple cost analysis): Is it demonstrated that the activity produces no economic benefits other than JI income?	1, 2	It is clearly shown that there is no economical benefit by the reduction of N_2O concentration other than the JI revenues.	☑	☑
B.2.1.3. In case of Option II (investment comparison analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?	1, 2	**Clarification Request 9:** The PDD version 1 has the final statement concerning additionality of project activity and states that “Without the sale of the ERUs generated by the project activity the net present value (NPV) and internal rate of return (IRR) of the project would be negative, no	**CR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		revenue would be generated and the technology would not be installed”. In this connection please submit the calculations of NPV and IRR and support the raw data by proofs.		
B.2.1.4. In case of Option III (benchmark analysis): Is the most suitable financial indicator clearly identified (IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or (levelized) unit cost)?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.2.1.5. In case of Option II or Option III: Is the calculation of financial figures for this indicator correctly done for all alternatives and the project activity?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.2.1.6. In case of Option II or Option III: Is the analysis presented in a transparent manner including publicly available proofs for the utilized data?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.2.1.7. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis) of the additionality tool: Is a complete list of barriers developed that prevent the different alternatives to occur?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.2.1.8. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is transparent and documented evidence provided on the existence and significance of these barriers?	-	N/A	☑	☑
B.2.1.9. In case of applying step 3 (barrier analysis): Is it transparently shown that the execution of at least one of the alternatives is not prevented by the identified bar-	-	N/A	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
riers?				
B.2.1.10. Have other activities in the host country / region similar to the project activity been identified and are these activities appropriately analyzed by the PDD (step 4a)?	1, 2	**Clarification Request 10:** It is necessary to add more up-to-date information about similar types of project activities in the host country. If similar activities exist please demonstrate that in spite of these similarities the project activity would not be implemented without the JI component.	CR	☑
B.2.1.11. If similar activities are occurring: Is it demonstrated that in spite of these similarities the project activity would not be implemented without the JI component (step 4b)?	1, 2	Please refer to CR (B.2.1.10).	CR	☑
B.2.1.12. Is it appropriately explained how the approval of the project activity will help to overcome the economic and financial hurdles or other identified barriers?	1, 2	As there is no other incentive than the JI this criterion is fulfilled.	☑	☑
B.2.1.13. Is it appropriately explained under which conditions a re-assessment of the baseline scenario in course of proposed project activity's lifetime will become necessary (step 5)?	1, 2	Yes, it is. In case of new or modified NO_x or N_2O emission regulations a re-assessment of the baseline scenario should be executed as established in AM0028 (Step 5a: New or modified NO_x emission regulations, and Step 5b: New or modified N_2O regulation).	☑	☑
B.3. Description of how the definition of the project boundary is applied to the project				
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists for sources and gases as given by the methodology applied and comment on at least every line answered with "No"				
B.3.1.1. Source: Waste stream exiting the stack of the Nitric Acid plant (From burner inlet to stack) Gas(es): N_2O	1, 2, 11	Boundary checklist / Yes / No Source and gas(s) discussed in the PDD? Yes Inclusion / exclusion justified? Yes	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
Type: Baseline Emissions and Project Emissions		Explanation / Justification sufficient? Yes Consistency with monitoring plan? Yes		
B.3.1.2. Do the spatial and technological boundaries as verified on-site comply with the discussion provided by / indication included to the PDD?	1, 2, 11	Yes, they do. The boundaries as verified on-site checking compliance with the discussion in the PDD. The project boundary covers 4 production lines from the inlet to the AORs until a monitoring point after last recovery boiler. There is one common stack for production line No. 1 and 2 and another common stack for production line No. 3 and 4. **Corrective Action Request 7:** According to requirements the PDD has to be in English. If any words in other languages exist they have to be translated in English. Also as it is JI project therefore any references on the CDM activity has to be excluded from the PDD (please see sub-step 3b on the page 13). Please revise the PDD on the page 21 accordingly.	**CAR**	☑
B.4. Further baseline information, including the date of baseline setting and the name(s) of the person(s)/entity(s) setting the baseline:				
B.4.1.1. Are the name(s) of the person(s) /entity(ies) who set the baseline available? Does an indication exist that the entity is a PP or not?	1, 2	Yes, the name(s) of the person(s)/entity(ies) who set the baseline are available. **Clarification Request 11:** Please indicate if the person(s)/entity(ies) who set the baseline are also a project participant listed in Annex 1 as required by the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3.	**CR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
B.4.1.2. Is the date of baseline setting available?	1, 2	**Clarification Request 12:** Yes, the date of baseline setting is available however please use the format DD/MM/YYYY as required by the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3.	CR	☑
C. Duration of the project activity / crediting period				
C.1. Starting date of the project:				
C.1.1. Is the project's starting date clearly defined and reasonable?	1, 2	No, it is not. Please refer to A.1.1.3. **Clarification Request 13:** Please make clear the statement in PDD version 1 "date of contract signature with MGM". In additional it should be clear the role of MGM in this JI project as well as a subject of the contract.	CR	☑
C.2. Expected operational lifetime of the project:				
C.2.1. Is the expected operational lifetime of the project clearly defined and reasonable?	1, 2, 4, 5, 53-55	The expected operational lifetime of the project is 21 years. As long as N2O catalyst is replaced regularly, project lifetime is the same as estimated minimum AORs lifetime. The AORs of Severodonezk Azot were commissioned in 1975 (lines No. 1 and 2) and in 1986 (lines No. 3 and 4). Therefore the estimated operational lifetime of the project is reasonable because its common technical approach that AORs are operational for at least 50 years (depending on factors such as production conditions, quality of maintenance, shut frequency and metal stress limits etc.) According to the requirements of construction and safety operating rules for pressure equipment No. НПАОП-0.00.1.07-94. The AORs are under supervision of national inspection company "State Committee of Health and Safety at Work of Ukraine" and every 4 years AORs have to pass the third party inspection.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		Severodonezk Azot submitted to audit team the proofs that AORs regularly pass required inspections.		
C.3. Length of the crediting period:				
C.3.1. Is the assumed crediting period clearly defined and reasonable?	1, 2	The PDD version 1 states that the crediting period has been set from July 01, 2009 until 2019. Please refer to (A.1.1.3). **Clarification Request 14:** The crediting period mentioned in the PDD has been set for the period of 10 years, therefore it will definitely exceed the first commitment period which ends on 31/12/2012. However whether the end of the crediting period can be after 2012 is subject of additional host country approval. The status of ERs generated by the project after the end of the fist commitment period may be then determined by any relevant agreement under the UNFCCC. Furthermore ten years crediting period can only apply defining the timing of the required baseline and additionality re-assessments according to AM0034 stipulations. Please define the timing of the required baseline and additionality re-assessments according to AM0034.	**CR**	☑
D. Monitoring plan				
D.1. Description of monitoring plan chosen:				
D.1.1. Is it explained how the procedures provided in the methodology are applied by the proposed project activity?	1, 2	Due to the plant specific production the monitoring plan in accordance with AM0034 have been adjusted. Please refer to (B.1.1.1) and (B.1.1.3).	**CR**	☑
D.1.2. Is every selection of options offered by the methodology correctly justified and is this	1, 2	Please refer to (B.1.1.1) and (B.1.1.3).	**CR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
	justification in line with the situation verified on-site?				
D.1.3.	Is the operational and management structure clearly described and in compliance with the envisioned situation?	1, 2, 37	**Clarification Request 15:** The PDD version 1 in section D.3 provides the operational and management structure that will monitor the proposed JI project. However from the scheme is not clear the communication between team members and their scope of work and responsibilities in context of proposed JI project. The responsibility chart should be revised.	CR	☑
D.1.4.	Are responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly provided?	1, 2	The PDD stated that the management and operation of the proposed JI project will be responsibility of Severodonetsk Azot. However please refer to CR (D.1.3)	CR	☑
D.1.5.	Does the monitoring plan provide current good monitoring practice?	1, 2	Yes, the monitoring plan provides current good monitoring practice. Please also refer to CR (B.1.1.3).	CR	☑
D.1.6.	Has the monitoring system installed using the European Norm 14181 (2004)?	45, 62-65	The monitoring system has been installed and is operated according to EN 14181 (2004). Please refer to CR (B.1.1.12)	CR	☑
D.1.7.	Will the three quality assurance levels been met by the planned Automated Measuring System (AMS) according to the EN14181?	37, 45, 62-66	**Corrective Action Request 8:** The monitoring manual has been submitted to the audit team however it does not include the QAL3 procedures and instructions for the staff as required EN 14181 section 7. The PPs has to provide the audit team the operation manual for AMS as to QAL3 procedure (zero and span check) and revise the monitoring ma-	CAR CR	FAR

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
			nual as required EN 14181. Please refer to (B.1.1.12).		
D.1.8.	Are the specific performance characteristics of the monitoring system chosen by the project listed in the PDD?	1, 2, 44, 52, 67	Yes, they are. The specific performance characteristics of the monitoring system chosen by the project are listed in the PDD. **Clarification Request 16:** It is necessary to submit proofs that the emission evaluation system EMI3000 in accordance with requirements of AM0034 and taking into account the deviations from applied methodology in calculation routines. Also PDD version 1 does not have information concerning the requirements on the treatment of downtime of AMS in calculation routines. Please provide required information and revise the PDD.	**CR**	**FAR**
D.1.9.	Is information on the margins of errors and the cumulative error for the complete measurement system provided in the PDD?	1, 2	**Clarification Request 17:** Information on the margins of errors and the cumulative error for the complete measurement system of each line is not provided in the PDD.	**CR**	☑
D.1.10.	Is the inclusion of external accredited services providers for calibration and function tests foreseen in the planning of the project?	1, 2	The inclusion of external accredited services providers for calibration and function tests according to the EN14181 is foreseen in the planning of the project.	☑	☑
D.1.11.	Are the requirements on the treatment of downtime of the AMS clearly reflected in the envisioned calculation routines?	1, 2	Please refer to CR (D.1.8)	**CR**	**FAR**

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
D.1.12. If applicable: Does Annex 3 provide useful information enabling a better understanding of the envisioned monitoring provisions?	1, 2	Yes, it does.	☑	☑
Date of completion of the application of the baseline study and monitoring methodology an the name of the responsible person(s)/entity(ies)				
D.1.13. Is there any indication of a date when the baseline was determined?	1, 2, 69	The baseline for the project activity has not been set yet. The PDD under determination presents preliminary estimates of the baseline and project emissions. Also to the date of on-site mission, the baseline study was still in progress.	☑	☑
D.1.14. Is this consistent with the time line of the PDD history?	1, 2	Please refer to D.1.13.	☑	☑
D.1.15. Is the information on the person(s) / entity (ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology provided consistent with the actual situation?	1, 2	Yes, it is. The information is consistent with the actual situation.	☑	☑
D.1.16. Is information provided whether this person / entity are also considered a project participant?	1, 2	The baseline estimate was prepared by MGM. The PDD indicated in section D.4 that MGM is not project participant.	☑	☑
Option 1 – Monitoring of the emissions in the project scenario and the baseline scenario:				
D.1.1. **Data to be collected in order to monitor emissions from the project and how these data will be archived:**				
D.1.1.1. Is the list of parameters collected in order to monitor emissions from the project in chapter D.1.1. considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	1, 2	No, it is not. Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.7).	**CAR**	☑

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.2. Parameter Title:
CL_{BL},
Baseline campaign length
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).

The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD and the value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.3. Parameter Title:
CL_{normal}
Normal campaign length
(of campaign n of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 40-43</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD.
Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).</td><td>CAR</td><td>FAR</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td><u>Corrective Action Request 9:</u>
During on-site audit the logbooks with operating parameters for last 5 champagnes and excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for lines No. 1-4 were provided. The audit team cross-checked the raw data from logbooks and data from excel sheets in the random way and inconsistencies between data were found. Please check and revise excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for lines No. 1-4.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.4. Parameter Title:
NAP_{BC}
Nitric acid (100% concentrated) over baseline campaign
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).

The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD and the value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.5. Parameter Title:
TSG
Temperature of stack gas
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>
The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.6. Parameter Title:
PSG
Pressure of stack gas
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>
The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td><u>Corrective Action Request 10:</u>
All information relating to the parameter (title, data unit, description, source etc.) should be according to requirements of methodology AM0034 version 03.2. Please revise the PDD accordingly.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.7. Parameter Title:
AFR
Ammonia gas flow rate to the AOR
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr></table>
The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.

<u>Corrective Action Request 11:</u>
All parameters required for monitoring of emissions from the project and how these data will be archived has to be presented in table D.1.1.1. Please revise the PDD accordingly.</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.8. Parameter Title:
AIFR
Ammonia to Air ratio
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr></table></td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr>
</table>

Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.7)</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.9. Parameter Title:
OT_h
Oxidation temperature for each hour
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr>
</table>

Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.7).</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.10. Parameter Title:
OT_{normal}
Normal operating temperature
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 40-43</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		Measurement method correctly described? — Yes Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6). The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD. During on-site audit the historical data for the previous 5 campaigns for each line were checked.		
D.1.1.11. Parameter Title: OP_h Oxidation Pressure for each hour (of line i)	1, 2	Data Checklist — Yes / No Title in line with methodology? — No Data unit correctly expressed? — No Appropriate description of parameter? — No Source clearly referenced? — No Correct value provided? — N/A Has this value been verified? — N/A Choice of data correctly justified? — No Measurement method correctly described? — No Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.7)	CAR	☑

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.12. Parameter Title:
OP_{normal}
Normal oxidation pressure
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 40-43</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).

The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD.
During on-site audit the historical data for the previous 5 campaigns for each line were checked.</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.13. Parameter Title:
GS_{normal},
Normal gauze supplier for the operation condition campaigns
(of campaign n of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 38 68</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).</td><td>CAR
CR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD.

<u>Clarification Request 18:</u>
During on-site audit the hard proofs for gauze suppliers for previous 5 campaigns for each line were provided. However there is no clear who is normal gauze supplier for the operation condition campaigns and what is normal gauze composition during the operation campaigns for each line.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.14. Parameter Title:
GS_{BL}
Gauze supplier for baseline campaign
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 68</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD.

Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6) and CR (D.1.1.13).</td><td>CAR
CR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.1.15. Parameter Title:
GC_{normal}
Gauze composition during the operation campaign.
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 68</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>CAR
CR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		Correct value provided? — No Has this value been verified? — No Choice of data correctly justified? — Yes Measurement method correctly described? — Yes The parameter presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD. Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6) and CR (D.1.1.13).		
D.1.1.16. Parameter Title: GC_{BL}, Gauze composition during baseline campaign (of campaign n of line i)	1, 2, 38, 68	Data Checklist — Yes / No Title in line with methodology? — Yes Data unit correctly expressed? — N/A Appropriate description of parameter? — No Source clearly referenced? — Yes Correct value provided? — Yes Has this value been verified? — Yes Choice of data correctly justified? — Yes Measurement method correctly described? — Yes The parameter is presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD. During on-site audit the hard proofs for gauze composition for baseline campaign were provided. Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).	**CAR**	☑
D.1.2. **Description of formulae used to estimate <u>project</u> emissions (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent**				
D.1.2.1. Are the formulae required for the determination of project emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification	1, 2	**<u>Corrective Action Request 12:</u>** The on-site audit confirmed that deviations from AM0034 are exist (determination of baseline emission factor, monitoring points of	**CAR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
	of parameter to be used and / or monitored?		gas flow and concentration). These kinds of deviations have to be taking in to account during calculations and as a results the formulae required for the determination of project emissions have to be revised. Also there are 4 independent lines which should be clear indentified (e.g. by index i) in the formulae.		
D.1.2.2.	Are the formulae required for the derivation of a moving average emission factor correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	1, 2	Please refer to CAR (D.1.2.1).	**CAR**	☑
D.1.2.3.	Are the formulae required for the determination of leakage emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?	1, 2	No leakage calculation is required.	☑	☑
D.1.3.	**Relevant data necessary for determining the baseline of anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources within the project boundary, and how such data will be collected and achieved:**				
D.1.3.1.	Is the list of parameters monitored in chapter D.1.3. considered to be complete with regard to the requirements of the applied methodology?	1, 2	Yes, it is.	☑	☑
D.1.3.2.	Is the data provided in this section in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	1, 2	The data provided in this section are in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD.	☑	☑
Integrate the required amount of sub-checklists for monitoring parameter and comment on any line answered with “No”					

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.3. Parameter Title:
$NCSG_{BC, i}$
N_2O concentration in the stack gas in baseline campaign (of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 45</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>At the time of the audit on-site the AMS has passed QAL2 procedure (QAL2 report was provided to audit team) and baseline campaigns for all lines were in process.
The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.4. Parameter Title:
$VSG_{BC, i}$
Volume flow rate of the stack gas in baseline campaign (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		QA/QC procedures described? Yes QA/QC procedures appropriate? Yes The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.		
D.1.3.5. Parameter Title: $OH_{BC, i}$ Operating hours in baseline campaign (of line i)	1, 2	Monitoring Checklist / Yes / No Title in line with methodology? Yes Data unit correctly expressed? Yes Appropriate description of parameter? Yes Source clearly referenced? Yes Correct value provided for estimation? N/A Has this value been verified? N/A Measurement method correctly described? Yes Correct reference to standards? Yes Indication of accuracy provided? Yes QA/QC procedures described? Yes QA/QC procedures appropriate? Yes The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.	☑	☑

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.6. Parameter Title:
$NAP_{BC, i}$
Nitric Acid production (100% concentrated) in baseline campaign (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.7. Parameter Title:
TSG_i
Temperature of stack gas (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.8. Parameter Title:
PSG i
Pressure of stack gas (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.9. Parameter Title:
$CL_{normal, i}$
Normal campaign length (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>CAR</td><td>FAR</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		QA/QC procedures described? — Yes QA/QC procedures appropriate? — Yes Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.3).		
D.1.3.10. Parameter Title: $CL_{BL, i}$ Baseline campaign length (of line i)	1, 2, 45	Monitoring Checklist — Yes / No Title in line with methodology? — Yes Data unit correctly expressed? — Yes Appropriate description of parameter? — Yes Source clearly referenced? — Yes Correct value provided for estimation? — N/A Has this value been verified? — N/A Measurement method correctly described? — Yes Correct reference to standards? — Yes Indication of accuracy provided? — Yes QA/QC procedures described? — Yes QA/QC procedures appropriate? — Yes At the time of the audit on-site the AMS has passed QAL2 procedure (QAL2 report was provided to audit team) and baseline campaigns for all lines were in process. The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.	☑	☑
D.1.3.11. Parameter Title: $GS_{project, i}$ Gauze supplier for the project campaigns (of line i)	1, 2, 68	Monitoring Checklist — Yes / No Title in line with methodology? — Yes Data unit correctly expressed? — Yes Appropriate description of parameter? — Yes Source clearly referenced? — Yes	CR	☑

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
Please refer to CR (D.1.1.13).

The parameter is presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD.
The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.12. Parameter Title:
$GC_{project,\ i}$
Gauze composition during project campaign (of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 68</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
Please refer to CR (D.1.1.13).

The parameter is presented in Table D.1.1.3 of PDD.
</td><td>CR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.13. Parameter Title:
$OP_{h, i}$
Oxidation Pressure for each hour (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.14. Parameter Title:
$OT_{h, i}$
Oxidation Temperature for each hour (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>

The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.15. Parameter Title:
AFR $_{i}$
Ammonia gas flow rate (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>

The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.16. Parameter Title:
AFR $_{max, i}$
Maximum ammonia gas flow rate
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2, 40-43</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
During on-site audit the historical data for the previous 5 campaigns for each line were checked.
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.17. Parameter Title:
$AIFR_i$
Ammonia to Air Flow Ratio
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
</table>
The value is to be verified later by the verifying entity.
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.18. Parameter Title:
EF_{reg}
Emissions level set by incoming policies or regulations</td><td>1, 2</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>No</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>CAR
CR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>No</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>No</td></tr>
</table>
Please refer to CAR (D.1.1.6).

<u>Clarification Request 19:</u>
It is necessary to add further information about responsibility and research/monitoring frequency (whom and when) of new and/or incoming policies or regulations for emissions level setting.
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.19. Parameter Title:
$EF_{BC, i}$
Emission factor for baseline campaign (of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Monitoring Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr>
<tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct value provided for estimation?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Correct reference to standards?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indication of accuracy provided?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures described?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>QA/QC procedures appropriate?</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table>
N/A
In the absence of any national or regional regulations for N_2O
</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Initial PDD</th><th>Final PDD</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>emissions, the EF_{BL} will be used as the baseline emission factor.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.3.20. Parameter Title:
UNC_i
Overall measurement uncertainty of the monitoring system
(of line i)</td><td>1, 2</td><td><table><tr><th>Data Checklist</th><th>Yes / No</th></tr><tr><td>Title in line with methodology?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Data unit correctly expressed?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Appropriate description of parameter?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Source clearly referenced?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Correct value provided?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Has this value been verified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Choice of data correctly justified?</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Measurement method correctly described?</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table></td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">D.1.4. Description of formulae used to estimate <u>baseline</u> emissions (for each gas, source etc.; emissions in units of CO_2 equivalent)</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.4.1. Are the formulae required for the determination of baseline emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?</td><td>1, 2</td><td>Please refer to CAR (D.1.2.1).</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.4.2. Are the formulae required for the determination of leakage emissions correctly presented, enabling a complete identification of parameter to be used and / or monitored?</td><td>1, 2</td><td>No leakage calculation is required.</td><td>☑</td><td>☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>D.1.4.3. Are the formulae required for the determination of emission reductions correctly</td><td>1, 2</td><td>Please refer to (D.1.2.1).</td><td>CAR</td><td>☑</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
presented?				
E. Estimation of greenhouse gas emission reduction				
E.1. Estimate project emissions:				
E.1.1. Are the GHG calculations documented in a complete and transparent manner?	1, 2, 69	See comments to (A.2.1.2).	**CAR**	☑
E.1.2. Is the data provided in this section consistent with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	1, 2	See comments to (A.2.1.2).	**CAR**	☑
E.1.3. Are the estimated project emissions transparent, feasible and mathematical correct calculated?	69	**Clarification Request 20:** It is necessary to submit the Excel sheets with ERs calculations to the audit team.	**CR**	☑
E.1.4. Is the projection of estimated project emissions based on the same procedures as used for future monitoring?	1, 2, 69	Please refer to (E.1.3) and (A.2.1.2).	**CR** **CAR**	☑
E.2. Estimated leakage:				
E.2.1.1. Is the estimated leakage transparent, feasible and mathematical correct calculated?	1, 2, 70	As established in the approved methodology AM0034, no leakage calculations are necessary for this type of secondary catalyst.	☑	☑
E.2.2. Is the projection of estimated leakage based on the same procedures as used for future monitoring?	1, 2	The projection is done by the same algorithms as used for later monitoring.	☑	☑
E.3. The sum of E.1. and E.2.:				
E.3.1. Is the sum of E.1. and E.2. mathematical correct calculated?	1, 2, 69	As there are no leakage emissions (i.e. E.2. = 0), the sum of E.1. (Estimated project emissions) and E.2. (Estimated leakage)	**CAR**	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
		equals E.1. (Estimated project emissions). However see comments to (A.2.1.2).		
E.4. Estimated baseline emissions:				
E.4.1. Are the estimated baseline emissions transparent, feasible and mathematical correct calculated?	1, 2, 69	Please refer to (E.1.3) and (A.2.1.2).	**CR CAR**	☑
E.4.2. Is the projection based on the same procedures as used for future monitoring?	1, 2, 69	Please refer to (E.1.3) and (A.2.1.2).	**CR CAR**	☑
E.5. Difference between E.4. and E.3. representing the emissions reductions of the project:				
E.5.1. Is the difference between E.4. and E.3. mathematical correct calculated?	1, 2, 69	Please refer to (E.1.3) and (A.2.1.2).	**CR**	☑
E.6. Table providing values obtained when applying formulae above				
E.6.1. Will the project result in fewer GHG emissions than the baseline scenario?	69	The project activity will result in emission reductions.	☑	☑
E.6.2. Is the form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions correctly applied?	1, 2	No, it is not. **Corrective Action Request 13:** The form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions has to be applied according to requirements of the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3. Also as there is no legal framework post 2012 therefore the projected emission reductions have to be indicated in 2 separate tables. One for the 1st commitment period (2008-2012) and second for further commitment periods. Please adjust the PDD accordingly.	**CAR**	☑
E.6.3. Is the projection in line with the envisioned time schedule for the project’s implemen-	1, 2, 8	The projection is in line with the envisioned time schedule.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION		Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
	tation and the indicated crediting period?				
E.6.4.	Is the data provided in this section in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD?	1, 2	The data provided in this section is in consistency with data as presented in other chapters of the PDD.	☑	☑
E.6.5.	Are the obtained values for estimated project emissions, estimated leakage, estimated baseline emissions and estimated emissions reductions provided in the table of E.6. transparent, feasible and mathematical correct calculated when applying formulae submitted in section E.?	1, 2, 69	Please refer to (E.1.3)	CR	☑
F. Environmental impacts					
F.1. Documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts, including transboundary impacts					
F.1.1.	Has the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity been sufficiently described?	1, 2, 28, 33	The PDD stated that according to the letter from State Environmental Authorities in Lugansk region the EIA is not required for this specific project since it does not result in growth of NOx and other hazardous gas emissions. It was discussed and verified during on-site audit.	☑	☑
F.1.2.	Are there any Host Party requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and if yes, has an EIA been approved?	1, 2, 33	**Clarification Request 21:** All relevant environmental laws and regulations have to be referred in PDD.	CR	☑
F.1.3.	Will the project create any adverse environmental effects?	1, 2, 28, 33	No, it will not.	☑	☑
F.1.4.	Were transboundary environmental im-	1, 2	Please see F.1.1.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
pacts identified in the analysis?				
F.2. If environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, please provide conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party				
F.2.1. Have the identified environmental impacts been addressed in the project design sufficiently?	1, 2	No environmental impacts had been identified. TÜV SÜD assessment team remarks that the project has a strong positive environmental impact, since the primary object of the project is reduction of N_2O emissions.	☑	☑
F.2.2. Does the project comply with environmental legislation in the host country?	1, 2	Yes, it does. However please refer to (F.1.2).	**CR**	☑
G. Stakeholders' comments				
G.1. Brief description how comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled				
G.1.1. Have relevant stakeholders been consulted?	1, 2, 56	Yes, the local stakeholder meeting was done at November 13 2009 at Severodonezk Azot. **Clarification Request 22:** Please add in the PDD more information about the requirements for local stakeholder consultation process in Ukraine, topics which were discussed during the local stakeholder meeting at November 13 2009 and a summary of the received stakeholder comments. Also according to the minutes of local stakeholders meeting at Severodonezk Azot it was carried out at 13/11/2009 but not at 22/12/2008 as mentioned in the PDD version 1.	**CR**	☑
G.1.2. Have appropriate media been used to invite comments by local stakeholders?	57-59	Yes, the local newspapers were involved in acquisition of comments of stakeholders.	☑	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
G.1.3. If a stakeholder consultation process is required by regulations/laws in the host country, has the stakeholder consultation process been carried out in accordance with such regulations/laws?	1, 2	Please refer to (G.1.1).	CR	☑
G.1.4. Is the undertaken stakeholder process that was carried out described in a complete and transparent manner?	1, 2	Please refer to (G.1.1).	CR	☑
G.2. Summary of the comments received				
G.2.1. Is a summary of the received stakeholder comments provided?	1, 2	Please refer to (G.1.1).	CR	☑
G.3. Report on how due account was taken of any comments received				
G.3.1. Has due account been taken of any stakeholder comments received?	1, 2	Please refer to (G.1.1).	CR	☑
H. Annexes 1 – 3				
H.1. Annex 1: Contact Information				
H.1.1. Is the information provided consistent with the one given under section A.3?	1, 2	Yes, it is. However please refer to (A.3.1.2).	CAR	☑
H.1.2. Is the information on all private participants and directly involved Parties presented?	1, 2	Yes, it is. However please refer to (A.3.1.2).	CAR	☑

CHECKLIST TOPIC / QUESTION	Ref.	COMMENTS	Initial PDD	Final PDD
H.2. Annex 2: Baseline information				
H.2.1. If additional background information on baseline data is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented by other sections of the PDD?	1, 2	**Corrective Action Request 14:** Ex-ante estimates of key baseline parameters are provided but some of parameters are missing in the provided table (such as tail gas N2O concentration, UNC). Please revise this section of PDD.	**CAR**	☑
H.2.2. Is the data provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	9, 10, 15	Please refer to (H.2.1).	**CAR**	☑
H.2.3. Does the additional information substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?	1, 2	Yes, it does.	☑	☑
H.3. Annex 3: Monitoring information				
H.3.1. If additional background information on monitoring is provided: Is this information consistent with data presented in other sections of the PDD?	1, 2	Yes, it is.	☑	☑
H.3.2. Is the information provided verifiable? Has sufficient evidence been provided to the validation team?	62-65	Please refer to (B.1.1.12) and (D.1.8)	**CR**	**FAR**
H.3.3. Do the additional information and / or documented procedures substantiate / support statements given in other sections of the PDD?	1, 2	Yes, it is.	☑	☑

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
Corrective Action Request 1: The PDD should be corrected by including the correct abatement efficiency of the applied secondary catalyst according to provided evidence. Furthermore the ex-ante estimation of emission reductions should be recalculated accordingly.	A.2.1.2	PDD revised. A.4.3.1., p. 10 D.1.4., p. 43,45 E.1., p. 52 E.6., p. 53	The PDD and ERs calculations have been revised. ☑
Corrective Action Request 2: According to PDD version 1 MGM Worldwide LLC (MGM) is project participant. However MGM is only project developer and it was confirmed by CJSC “Severodonezk Azot Assosiation” and MGM during on-site audit. Please adjust the section A.3 and Annex 1 of the PDD.	A.3.1.2	PDD revised. MGM Worldwide LLC (MGM) is not a project participant. A.3., p.3 Annex 1., p. 56	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Corrective Action Request 3: There are additional information concerning the program of energy consumption reduction and technology applied by Severodonezk Azot for ammonia production in section A.3 of the PDD version 1. The information as to the program of energy consumption reduction has to be supported by proofs and submitted to the audit team. As regards the applied technology it is not a part of section A.3. Please revise the section A.3 of the PDD.	A.3.1.3	PDD revised, see section A.3. Additional information concerning the program of energy consumption reduction and technology applied by Severodonetsk Azot for ammonia production was deleted. A.3., p.3	The PDD has been revised. ☑

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
Corrective Action Request 4: In section A.4.2. of the PDD mentioned that Severodonetsk Azot is in the process of selecting the secondary catalyst supplier. But in section D.1.1. of the PDD stated that Severodonetsk Azot has already decided to install a secondary catalyst system from Umicore company. Please adjust the PDD.	A.4.2.5	PDD revised. A.4.2., p. 8, D.1.1.4., p. 40	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Corrective Action Request 5: According to requirements of AM0028 version 04.2 the PPs should indentify technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives which are realistic and credible. The PDD version 1 in sub-step 1a does not have a clear identification of baseline scenario alternatives. Please clear identify the baseline scenario alternatives.	B.1.1.13	PDD revised. Technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives, which are realistic and credible, were identified. B.1., Sub-Step 1a, p.12	The technically feasible baseline scenario alternatives have been identified. ☑
Corrective Action Request 6: According to requirements of AM0028 version 04.2 the PPs should establish a complete list of barriers that would prevent alternatives to occur in the absence of JI. The PDD version 1 in sub-step 3a does not have a description of barriers only extract form the methodology AM0028 version 04.2. Please provide clear description for each identified barrier.	B.1.1.17	A complete list of barriers that would prevent the alternatives to occur in the absence of JI was provided. B.1., Sub-Step 1a, p.13,14	The list of barriers has been provided. ☑
Corrective Action Request 7:	B.3.1.2	PDD revised.	The PDD has been revised.

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
According to requirements the PDD has to be in English. If any words in other languages are exist they have to be translated in English. Also as it is JI project therefore any references on the CDM activity has to be excluded from the PDD (please see sub-step 3b on the page 13). Please revise the PDD on the page 21 accordingly.		B.1., Sub-Step 3b, p.14 B.3.,p. 21	☑
Corrective Action Request 8: The monitoring manual has been submitted to the audit team however it not contents the QAL3 procedures and instructions for the staff as required EN 14181 section 7. The PPs has to provide the audit team the operation manual for AMS as to QAL3 procedure (zero and span check) and revise the monitoring manual as required EN 14181.	D.1.7	The Monitoring Manual was revised. Additional information regarding QAL3 and instructions for the staff as required by EN 14181, section 7, were added. QAL3 procedure by ABB was submitted to the audit team. The improved Monitoring Manual will be provided at the first verification.	The revised Monitoring Manual will be checked during the first verification. Please refer to **FAR1**.
Corrective Action Request 9: During on-site audit the logbooks with operating parameters for last 5 champagnes and excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for lines No. 1-4 were provided. The audit team cross-checked the raw data from logbooks and data from excel sheets in the random way and inconsistencies between data were found. Please check and revise excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for lines No. 1-4.	D.1.1.3	All the historical verification parameters for 5 campaigns were checked, Excel sheets were corrected accordingly. The data shall be provided at the first verification.	The revised Excel sheets will be checked during the first verification. Please refer to **FAR2**.

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
Corrective Action Request 10: All information relating to the parameter (title, data unit, description etc.) should be according to requirements of methodology AM0034 version 03.2. Please revise the PDD accordingly.	D.1.1.6	PDD revised. D.1.1.1., p. 25-28 D.1.1.3., p. 31-36	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Corrective Action Request 11: All parameters required for monitoring of emissions from the project and how these data will be archived has to be presented in table D.1.1.1. Please revise the PDD accordingly.	D.1.1.7	PDD revised. D.1.1.1., p. 25-28	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Corrective Action Request 12: The on-site audit confirmed that deviations from AM0034 are exist (determination of baseline emission factor, monitoring points of gas flow and concentration). These kinds of deviations have to be taking in to account during calculations and as a results the formulae required for the determination of project emissions have to be revised. Also there are 4 independent lines which should be clear indentified (e.g. by index i) in the formulae.	D.1.2.1	The formulae required for determination of the project emissions was corrected. PDD revised.	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Corrective Action Request 13: The form/table required for the indication of projected emission reductions has to be applied according to requirements of the Guide-	E.6.2	PDD revised, the projected emission reductions are divided into 2 separate tables: one for the 1st commitment period (2008-2012), and the second – for further commitment periods.	The PDD has been revised. ☑

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner's responses	Determination team conclusion
lines for users of the PDD form, version 3. Also as there is no legal framework post 2012 therefore the projected emission reductions have to be indicated in 2 separate tables. One for the 1st commitment period (2008-2012) and second for further commitment periods. Please adjust the PDD accordingly.		A.4.3.1., p. 10-11 D.1.4., p. 45 E.6., p. 53	
Corrective Action Request 14: Ex-ante estimates of key baseline parameters are provided but some of parameters are missing in the provided table (such as tail gas N2O concentration, UNC). Please revise this section of PDD.	H.2.1	PDD revised. Annex 2, p. 58	The information has been provided. ☑
-	-	-	-
Clarification Request 1: Please clarify which actions are the starting date of the project activity and crediting period defined with. In doing so please use the Glossary of JI terms v. 1 JISC 13. PDD should be amended accordingly then.	A.1.1.3	It was clarified in PDD, which actions were the starting date of the project activity and the crediting period defined with. A.2., p. 3 **Second response:** The PDD was revised. Starting date of a JI project identified date, when was signed the financial agreement between "Severodonetsk Azot Association" and "MGM WORLDWIDE LLC" and PDD development was started.	The obtaining of LoE cannot be the starting date of project. The starting date is the date on which the implementation or real action of the project begins. Please revise the PDD. **Second response:** Issue is considered as solved. ☑
Clarification Request 2:	A.2.1.1	A brief summary of the project history was added	The information has been provided.

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
Section A.2 of the PDD has to briefly summarize the history of the project according to requirements of the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3. Please adjust the PDD accordingly.		to PDD. A.2., p. 3	☑
Clarification Request 3: Please add in the section A.4.2. information about implementation schedule of the project as required the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3.	A.4.2.2	Information about implementation schedule of the project was added to PDD. A.4.2., p. 9	The information has been added. ☑
Clarification Request 4: Please submit to audit team the material safety data sheet to ensure that secondary catalyst for N2O abatement is considered low danger in terms of impact on human safety and environment.	A.4.2.4	The Material Safety Data Sheet of Umicore company for the secondary catalyst for N_2O abatement, confirming that the catalyst is considered low danger in terms of impact on human safety and environment was submitted to the audit team.	The information has been provided. ☑
Clarification Request 5: According to information provided to the audit team on-site the baseline campaigns for 4 lines were started at 23/04/2009 but AMS was commissioned at 30/04/2009 according to the commissioning certificate for AMS submitted by Severodonetsk Azot during on-site audit. The PPs have to explain such situation to audit team.	A.4.2.10	The Technical Meeting Minutes of 21.04.2009 specifying that the BL monitoring was started at 23.04.2009 was submitted to the audit team.	The situation has been explained and supported by proof. ☑
Clarification Request 6: Please indicate the title of the baseline and monitoring methodology in the PDD.	B.1.1.1	PDD improved. B.1., p. 11, 17	The title of the baseline and monitoring methodology has been indicated.

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner's responses	Determination team conclusion
			☑
Clarification Request 7: It is necessary to discuss all the deviations of the project from the applied methodology. The on-site audit confirmed that the deviations from AM0034 are exist (determination of baseline emission factor, monitoring points of gas flow and concentration, ERs calculations). Hence they have to be well described and documented according to "Guidelines for users of JI-PDD" (ver. 03).	B.1.1.3	PDD revised. B.1.1.1., p. 18, 19 B.1.1.2., p. 19, 20 **Second response:** PDD revised. The figure. 6-a is shown General schemes of flow from lines (AORs) and monitoring points of gas flow and concentration. B.1.1.4., p. 19	Where in the PDD indicated the deviation of the project from methodology concerning monitoring points of gas flow and concentration, ERs calculations? General schemes of flow from AORs and monitoring points of gas flow and concentration would be helpful as well. **Second response:** Issue is considered as solved. ☑
Clarification Request 8: Please submit QAL1 reports for installed AMS according to EN ISO 14956.	B.1.1.12	QAL1 reports for the installed AMS in accordance with EN ISO 14956 were submitted.	The information has been provided. ☑
Clarification Request 9: The PDD version 1 has the final statement concerning additionality of project activity and states that "Without the sale of the ERUs generated by the project activity the net present value (NPV) and internal rate of return (IRR) of the project would be negative, no revenue would be generated and the technology would not be installed". In this connection please submit the calculations of NPV	B.2.1.3	Since the catalytic N_2O destruction does not generate any financial or economic profit but for the profit connected with the JI project, an simple cost analysis was applied. In this case, NPV and IRR are not required. PDD revised. B.2. p. 21	The PDD has been revised. ☑

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
and IRR and support the raw data by proofs.			
Clarification Request 10: It is necessary to add more up-to-date information about similar types of project activities in the host country. If similar activities are exist, please demonstrate that in spite of these similarities the project activity would not be implemented without the JI component.	B.2.1.10	PDD was edited B.2.4. Step 4. p. 21.	The information has been provided. ☑
Clarification Request 11: Please indicate if the person(s)/entity(ies) who set the baseline are also a project participant listed in Annex 1 as required by the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3.	B.4.1.1	PDD revised. B.4., p. 22	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Clarification Request 12: Yes, the date of baseline setting is available however please use the format DD/MM/YYYY as required by the Guidelines for users of the PDD form, version 3.	B.4.1.2	PDD revised. B.4., p. 23 Section C ., p. 24	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Clarification Request 13: Please make clear the statement in PDD version 1 “date of contract signature with MGM”. In additional it should be clear the role of MGM in this JI project as well as a subject of the contract.	C.1.1	PDD revised. The date of starting the project is considered to be the date when was signed the financial agreement between “Severodonetsk Azot Association” and “MGM WORLDWIDE LLC” on PDD development. The role of MGM in the JI project is development of PDD and project administration at all stages of its implementation. B.4., p. 22 C.1., p. 23	Issue is considered as solved. ☑

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
		A.2., p. 3	
Clarification Request 14: The crediting period mentioned in the PDD has been set for the period of 10 years, therefore it will definitely exceed the first commitment period which ends on 31/12/2012. However whether the end of the crediting period can be after 2012 is subject of additional host country approval. The status of ERs generated by the project after the end of the fist commitment period may be then determined by any relevant agreement under the UNFCCC. Furthermore ten years crediting period can only apply defining the timing of the required baseline re-assessments according to AM0034 stipulations. Please define the timing of the required baseline re-assessments according to AM0034.	C.3.1	In PDD there mentioned possible conditions of a 10-year crediting period application, see page 12. Conditions required for the baseline scenario re-assessment, as specified in AM0034, were added to PDD. A.4.3.1., p. 10-11 B.1., p. 16	The PDD has been revised. ☑
Clarification Request 15: The PDD version 1 in section D.3 provides the operational and management structure that will monitor the proposed JI project. However from the scheme is not clear the communication between team members and their scope of work and responsibilities. Please revise the scheme and make it clear for understanding.	D.1.3	The operational and management scheme was revised in PDD. D.3, p. 54. More detailed information regarding the structure of management, communication between the team members, scope of their work and responsibilities is provided in the Monitoring Manual, which will be available at the first verification of the emission reduction Report.	The revised Monitoring Manual will be checked during the first verification. Please refer to **FAR1**.

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner's responses	Determination team conclusion
Clarification Request 16: It is necessary to submit proofs that the emission evaluation system EMI3000 in accordance with requirements of AM0034 and it takes into account the deviations from applied methodology in calculation routines. Also PDD version 1 does not have information concerning the requirements on the treatment of downtime of AMS in calculation routines. Please provide required information and revise the PDD.	D.1.8	During determination on site, the description of EMI3000 provided to Severodonetsk Azot by the developer ABB-AFRISO was submitted to the audit team. It is clear from the description, that the system meets AM0034. Moreover, there is one more inquiry to ABB to confirm that EMI3000 calculations qualify the requirements of AM0034. Information concerning the requirements on the treatment of downtime of AMS in calculation routines will be provided in the Monitoring Manual in detail. **Second response:** PDD was updated. B.1.1.4., p.19. Approval by ABB-AFRISO and Operating manual will presented during first verification.	Currently still not clear how the emission evaluation system EMI3000 takes into account the deviations from applied methodology in calculation routines. Please provide proofs. **Second response:** ABB-AFRISO and Operating manual will be checked during the first verification. Please refer to **FAR1** and **FAR3**.
Clarification Request 17: Information on the margins of errors and the cumulative error for the complete measurement system of each line is not provided in the PDD.	D.1.9	Based on the QAL2 results, there were calculated the cumulative error for the complete measurement system of each line, and these data will be provided at the first verification.	The information has to be provided during the first verification. ☑
Clarification Request 18: During on-site audit the hard proofs for gauze suppliers for previous 5 campaigns for each line were provided. However there is no clear who is normal gauze supplier for the operation condition campaigns and what is normal	D.1.1.13	A table with information who is the normal gauze supplier for the operation conditions campaigns and what is the normal gauze composition for the operation campaigns for each line was provided to the audit team.	The information has been provided. ☑

Clarifications and corrective action requests by the assessment team	Reference to table 1	Summary of project owner’s responses	Determination team conclusion
gauze composition during the operation campaigns for each line.			
Clarification Request 19: It is necessary to add further information about responsibility and research/monitoring frequency (whom and when) of new and/or incoming policies or regulations for emissions level setting.	D.1.3.18	To the Monitoring Manual there were added information about responsibility and research/monitoring frequency (whom and when) of new and/or incoming policies or regulations for emissions level setting, and it will be provided at the first verification.	The revised Monitoring Manual will be checked during the first verification. ☑
Clarification Request 20: It is necessary to submit the Excel sheets with ERs calculations to the audit team.	E.1.3	Excel sheets with ERs calculations were submitted to the audit team.	Excel sheets with ERs calculations have been submitted. ☑
Clarification Request 21: All relevant environmental laws and regulations have to be referred in PDD.	F.1.2	PDD revised. F.1., p. 55	The information has been provided. ☑
Clarification Request 22: Please add in the PDD more information about the requirements for local stakeholder consultation process in Ukraine, topics which were discussed during the local stakeholder meeting at November 13, 2009 and a summary of the received stakeholder comments. Also according to the minutes of local stakeholders meeting at Severodonezk Azot it was carried out at 13/11/2009 but not at 22/12/2008 as mentioned in the PDD version 1.	G.1.1	To PDD there were added information concerning requirements to the stakeholder consultation process in Ukraine, topics discussed during stakeholder meeting on November 13, 2008 and a summary of the received stakeholder comments. G.1., p. 56-57	The information has been provided. ☑

Table 2* Forward Action Requests (to be solved later by verifying AIE)

Ref. to checklist topic / Objective	Concl.	Comments
Forward Action Request 1: During the first periodic verification the PPs has to provide the revised Monitoring Manual with description of the structure of management, communication between the team members, scope of their work and responsibilities, requirements on the treatment of downtime of AMS in calculation routines as well as QAL3 procedures and instructions for the staff to a verifying entity.		
Forward Action Request 2: During the first periodic verification the PPs has to provide the revised excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for lines No. 1-4 to a verifying entity for checking.		
Forward Action Request 3: During the first periodic verification the PPs has to provide the approval of ABB-AFRISO and Operating manual to a verifying entity and demonstrate that the emission evaluation system EMI3000 complies with requirements of AM0034 and it takes into account the deviations from applied methodology in calculation routines.		

Table 3 Unresolved Corrective Action and Clarification Requests (in case of denials)

Clarifications and / or corrective action requests by validation team	Id. of CAR/CR	Explanation of Conclusion for Denial
-	-	-

Annex 2: Information Reference List

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
		On-site interviews conducted at September 22-23, 2009 in Severodonetsk, Ukraine at Close Joint Stock Company (CJSC) "Severodonetsk Azot Association" by auditing team of TÜV SÜD **Determination Team:** Ms Olena Maslova — TÜV SÜD, GHG Auditor, Project Manager Mr Andrey Atyakshev — TÜV SÜD Russland GmbH, GHG Auditor Mr Konstantin Agamirzov — TÜV SÜD, GHG Auditor trainee **Interviewed persons at Severodononezk:** Dr. Valentin V. Kazakov — CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association, Chairman of the Board Mr. Alexandr I. Taratuta — CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association, Deputy head of production department (JI project coordinator) Mr. Viktor Kvachenko — CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association, Head of nitric acid production Mr. Viktor V. Bezaltichniy — CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association, Chief metrologist Mr. Alexey U. Ivanov — CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association, Head of IT department Dr. Volodymyr K. Ivashchenko — MGM International, Senior Technical Expert Mr. Srgii Kobus — MGM International, Project Manager **Abbreviations:** TÜV SÜD — TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH MGM — MGM International Severodonetsk Azot — CJSC Severodonetsk Azot Association Kontrol — LLC CTS Kontrol AMS — Automated Measuring System MEP — Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine Siemens — DP Siemens Ukraine Umicore — Umicore AG & Co. KG CGT — CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd. Yekaterinburg Plant — OJSC Yekaterinburg Non-Ferrous Metals Processing Plant ABB — ABB Automation GmbH SGS — SGS United Kingdom Ltd. AIRTEC — AIRTEC Gesellschaft für Umweltmessungen mbH AFRISO — AFRISO-EURO-INDEX GmbH		

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
		AOR Ammonia Oxidation Reactor ITBK ITBK Ingenieurgesellschaft für Umweltschutz mbH		
0		UNFCCC homepage http://www.unfccc.int including the Joint Implementation section http://ji.unfccc.int		
1	21/04/2009	Project Design Document of JI project "The Abatement of N2O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production at CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" (Ukraine)", version 1.		PDD for GSP
2	12/01/2010	Project Design Document of JI project "The Abatement of N2O Emissions from Nitric Acid Production at CJSC "Severodonetsk Azot Association" (Ukraine)", version 3.		Final version
3	22-23/04/2009	Participant list of on-site interviews	TÜV SÜD	
4	12/07/2005	Technical regulations of non-concentrated nitric acid production No. 332	Severodonetsk Azot	
5	27/12/2005	Technical regulations of non-concentrated nitric acid production No. 96	Severodonetsk Azot	
6	08/06/2007	Letter, Request to Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine for approval of the project	Severodonetsk Azot	Early JI consideration
7	06/07/2007	LoE, Letter of Endorsement for the project	MEP	Early JI consideration
8	22/09/2009	Project implementation plan	Severodonetsk Azot	
9	1985	Nitric acid production in aggregates with high unit capacity. Moscow: Edited by Olevsky V. M. Chapter 4.	Bonnes M. et al.	
10	1987	Handbook of nitric acid industry worker. Chapter 3.	Karavaev M. et al.	
11	19/12/2005	Process scheme of non-concentrated nitric acid production in the shop No. 5/6. Detailed flow chart	Severodonetsk	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
		of the process has been seen by Audit team in original but wasn't provided by Severodonetsk Azot due to confidentiality reasons.	Azot	
12	18/12/2007	Minutes of meeting concerning development of the JI project at Severodonetsk Azot plant (including proposal to install AMS ABB and of the gauze Umicore).	Severodonetsk Azot, MGM	Early JI consideration
13	05/03/2008	Minutes of meeting concerning AMS supplier.	Severodonetsk Azot, Kontrol, Siemens	
14	11/06/2009	Contract No. 09/1006 between Severodonetsk Azot and Umicore on the delivery of secondary catalyst type "MultiComb Greenline".	Severodonetsk Azot, Umicore	
15	22/09/2009	Technical description of the secondary catalyst type "MultiComb Greenline" supplied by Umicore.	Umicore	
16	30/05/2008	Contract No. 10-PO between MGM and Severodonetsk Azot on the development of JI project.	MGM, Severodonetsk Azot	Starting date of the project activity
17	25/04/2008	Contract No. 29/O-289, delivery contract on the AMS with list of equipment.	Severodonetsk Azot, Kontrol	
18	12/02/2009	Contract on buying of ERUs between Severodonetsk Azot and CGT Chemical General Trading Ltd.	Severodonetsk Azot, CGT	
19	14/12/2007	Contract No. RU/00195200/00719, delivery contract on the precious metal catalyst gauzes between Yekaterinburg Plant and Severodonetsk Azot.	Yekaterinburg Plant, Severodonetsk Azot	
20	18/02/2005	Contract No. RU/00195200/00719, delivery contract on the precious metal catalyst gauzes between Yekaterinburg Plant and Severodonetsk Azot.	Yekaterinburg Plant, Severodonetsk Azot	Old contract with metal composition information
21	01/11/2004	Contract No. 04/3001, delivery contract on the precious metal catalyst gauzes between Umicore and Severodonetsk Azot.	Severodonetsk Azot, Umicore	Old contract with metal composition information

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
22	12/09/2008	Letter of authorization issued by ABB for Kontrol	ABB	
23	11/06/2008	Contract No. 07/08-ОГМет, installation contract on the AMS.	Severodonetsk Azot, Kontrol	
24	30/04/2009	Commissioning certificate for AMS.	Severodonetsk Azot, Kontrol	
25	01/03/2006	License No. 202422 on the ammonia and formalin production issued for Severodonetsk Azot.	Ministry of Industrial Policy of Ukraine	License valid until 01/03/2011
26	08/09/2005	The companies act No. 1985 issued for CGT (company No. 4802141).	Registrar of Companies for England and Wales	
27	13/04/2007	Contract No. 040741900143, ground rent contract between Severodonetsk Azot and Severodonetsk Town Council.	Severodonetsk Azot, Severodonetsk Town Council	
28	28/01/2009	Letter No. 38-ООС/Д-59 concerning EIA of Severodonetsk Azot JI project.	MEP Lugansk branch	
29	13/03/2002	Resolution No. 302 concerning the procedure of issue of permission on hazardous substances emission.	Cabinet Council of Ukraine	
30	2008	Annual report of hazardous substances emissions for shop No.5/6 in 2008.	Severodonetsk Azot	
31	21/08/2009	Notice No. 6438 concerning prolongation of permission No. 9009 on hazardous substances emission until 30/12/2009.	MEP Lugansk branch	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
32	29/11/2001	Resolution No. 1598 concerning hazardous substances which is subject to control.	Cabinet Council of Ukraine	N2O is out of list.
33	22/09/2009	Information letter concerning requirements for EIA in Ukraine and the environmental effect of JI project at Severodonetsk Azot.	Environmental Protection Department of Severodonetsk Azot	
34	09/2006-08/2009	Schedule of campaigns at each line (No. 1, 2, 3 and 4) and information about supplier of the precious metal catalyst gauze of each campaign.	Severodonetsk Azot	
35	16/07/2009	Schedule of campaigns for each line (No. 1, 2, 3 and 4) from March 2009 till December 2012 and information about supplier of the precious metal catalyst gauze of each campaign.	Severodonetsk Azot	
36	22/09/2009	Summary of historical campaigns length.	Severodonetsk Azot	
37	15/05/2009	Monitoring manual.	Severodonetsk Azot	Version available at the day of on-site mission
38	09/2006-08/2009	Acts and invoices as to composition and supplier of the precious metal catalyst gauzes for historic campaigns.	Severodonetsk Azot	
39	27/04/2009	Severodonetsk Azot's ISO 9001:2008 certificate.	SGS	
40	08/07/2009	Excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for line No. 1.	MGM	
41	28/07/2009	Excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for line No. 2.	MGM	
42	08/07/2009	Excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for line No. 3.	MGM	
43	08/07/2009	Excel sheets with calculation of normal operating parameters for line No. 4.	MGM	
44	22/09/2009	AMS location ports reference flow (N2O measurements) for each line No. 1- 4.	Severodonetsk Azot	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
45	07/07/2009	QAL-2 calibration report for lines No. 1-4.	AIRTEC	
46	22/09/2009	Print screen of weekly QAL-3 reports for lines No. 1-4 during baseline campaigns.	Severodonetsk Azot	
47	13/04/2009	Program of training "Continuously monitoring systems for N2O emissions". Training for production staff.	Severodonetsk Azot	
48	20/07/2009	Program of production and technical training for monitoring instruments department.	Severodonetsk Azot	
49	21/04/2009	Protocol of Severodonetsk Azot's qualification committee with results of training "Continuously monitoring systems for N2O emissions"	Severodonetsk Azot	
50	17/06/2009	Contract No. 09/1007, consulting service contract "Operation of the emission evaluation system EMI3000" between Severodonetsk Azot and AFRISO.	Severodonetsk Azot, AFRISO	
51	22/07/2009	Certificates of participation in consulting event "Operation of the emission evaluation system EMI3000" from 14-16 July 2009 at Severodonetsk Azot.	AFRISO	
52	26/11/2009	Presentation of AFRISO company concerning methodology AM0034 and the emission evaluation system EMI3000.	AFRISO	
53	18/10/1994	Construction and safety operating rules for pressure equipment No. НПАОП-0.00.1.07-94. Information concerning the requirements for third party inspection of ammonia oxidation reactors.	Severodonetsk Azot	
54	23/09/2009	Passport of AOR with third party inspection reports, line 1.	Severodonetsk Azot	
55	23/09/2009	Passport of AOR with third party inspection reports, line 1.	Severodonetsk Azot	
56	13/11/2008	Minutes of local stakeholders meeting at Severodonetsk Azot.	Severodonetsk Azot	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
57	14/11/2008	Article "Azot participating in solution of global warming problems"	Newspaper "Severodonezkiy chimik"	Stakeholders comments
58	13/11/2008	Article "Azot – investments to Kyoto protocol"	Newspaper "Nasha gazeta"	Stakeholders comments
59	14/11/2008	Article "Azot participating in solution of global warming problems"	Newspaper "Severodonezkie vesti"	Stakeholders comments
60	29/10/2007	Material Safety Data Sheet for the secondary catalyst, version 1.0	Umicore	
61	21/04/2009	Minutes of technical meeting.	Severodonetsk Azot	Decision to start baseline campaigns.
62	01/06/2009	QAL1 report for AMS installed at the line 1, version 6.0	ABB	
63	01/06/2009	QAL1 report for AMS installed at the line 2, version 6.0	ABB	
64	01/06/2009	QAL1 report for AMS installed at the line 3, version 6.0	ABB	
65	21/10/2009	QAL1 report for AMS installed at the line 4, version 6.0	ABB	
66	18/11/2009	QAL3 manual.	ABB	
67	18/11/2009	Manual of emission evaluation system EMI3000, version 1.14	ITBK	
68	18/11/2009	Information of gauze supplier and gauze composition for the operation condition campaigns and during the operation campaigns for each line.	Severodonetsk Azot	
69	18/11/2009	Excel sheets with ERs calculations, version 01.	MGM	
70	24/11/2008	Approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0034 "Catalytic reduction of N2O inside the ammonia burner of nitric acid plants", version 03.2	UNFCCC	

Ref. No.	Issuance and/or submission date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Title/Type of Document	Author / Editor / Issuer	Additional Information (Relevance in JI Context)
71	02/08/2008	Approved methodology AM0028 "Catalytic N2O destruction in the tail gas of Nitric Acid or Caprolactam Production Plants", version 04.2	UNFCCC	
72	16/05/2008	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 05.	UNFCCC	