VERIFICATION REPORT
SIA "VIDZEME EKO"

VERIFICATION OF THE
WASTE HEAPS #9, #11, #17, #25 DISMANTLING OF MINES #4 AND #29 WITH THE AIM OF DECREASING GREENHOUSE GASES EMISSIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0807/2012

REVISION NO. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: UKRAINE-ver/0807/2012

VERIFICATION REPORT: WASTE HEAPS #9, #11, #17, #25 DISMANTLING OF MINES #4 AND #29 WITH THE AIM OF DECREASING GREENHOUSE GASES EMISSIONS INTO THE ATMOSPHERE

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
20/10/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
SIA "Vidzeme Eko"	Victor Tkachenko

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the initial, 1st periodic verification of the "Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere", project of SIA "Vidzeme Eko" located in Antratsyt town, Luhansk Region, Ukraine, and applying JI specific approach, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions, or misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 5 198 339 tonnes of CO2 equivalent for the monitoring period from 14/02/2008 to 30/09/2012 (897910 tCO2eq for 14/02/2008-31/12/2008, 1152032 tCO2eq for 01/01/2009-31/12/2009, 1128761 tCO2 eq for 01.01.2010-31/12/2010, 1143267 tCO2eq for 01/01/2011-31/12/2011, 876369 tCO2eq for 01/01/2012-30/09/2012).
Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
UKRAINE-ver/0807/2012	JI

Project title:
Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere

Work carried out by:
Svitlana Gariyenchyk – Team Leader, Lead Verifier
Vyacheslav Yeriomin – Team Member, Verifier

Work reviewed by:
Ivan Sokolov - Technical Reviewer
Vasyl Kobzar – Technical Specialist

Work approved by:
Ivan Sokolov - Operational Manager

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
12/11/2012	01	21

Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION 3
1.1 Objective 3
1.2 Scope 3
1.3 Verification Team 3

2 METHODOLOGY 4
2.1 Review of Documents 4
2.2 Follow-up Interviews 4
2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests 5

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS 6
3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications 6
3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91) 6
3.3 Project implementation (92-93) 6
3.4 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98) 8
3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100) 8
3.6 Data management (101) 8
3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110) 9

4 VERIFICATION OPINION 9

5 REFERENCES 11

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL 13

1 INTRODUCTION

SIA ”Vidzeme Eko” has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project “Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere” (hereafter called “the project”) at Antratsyt town, Luhansk Region, Ukraine.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

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

1.2 Scope

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

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

1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Svitlana Gariyenchyk Bureau Veritas Certification	Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier
Vyacheslav Yeriomin Bureau Veritas Certification	Climate Change Verifier

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov Bureau Veritas Certification,	Internal Technical Reviewer
Vasyl Kobzar	

2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

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

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

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 16/10/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed (on-site) interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of “PI RUN COMPANY” Ltd. and SIA “Vidzeme Eko” were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

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

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

If the Verification Team, in assessing the monitoring report and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to the monitoring requirements, it should raise these issues and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

(a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;

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

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

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

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

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 3 Corrective Action Requests, 1 Clarification Requests, and 0 Forward Action Requests.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

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

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

The project was approved by both Parties Involved. Letter of Approval #3112/23/7 dated 19/10/2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine. Letter of Approval 12.2-02/14311 dated 30/10/2012 issued by Ministry of Environment protection and regional development of Republic Latvia

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

Proposed project consists in full dismantling of waste heaps with sorting and enrichment of obtained coal containing rock mass.

Boundaries of proposed project cover dismantled waste heaps #9, 11, 17, 25 of former mines #4 and #29 and sorting unit, which is in property of “Artik-Bud” LLC. “PI RUN Kompany” LLC is owner of waste heaps and processes coal containing rock mass at sorting unit of “Artik-Bud” LLC on sub-contract relations basis. Also “Artik-Bud” LLC provides personnel and transporting vehicles for waste heap dismantling and transportation of rock mass to the sorting unit. “GZF Almazna” LLC provides chemical analysis of obtained coal concentrate. “Smartbudresurs” Ltd is the owner of automobile scales, which is used for weighting of obtained sorted fraction.

Contract documents on relations between enterprises involved to the project are listed in the Table Category 2 documents

Technologies employed in the project activity are described below
Bulldozers rise to the top of the dump on its tail section. Dismantling of dump with bulldozers is carried by horizontal layers, after lowering the height of dump to 25-30 m, allowed dismantling by slope (15 °) layers. A combined method for the dump dismantling is used, when after decline by bulldozers to lower layer height, in which entrance road can be constructed, further dismantling is carried out by excavators with direct loading rock into vehicles.
On the second stage, the rock mass is delivered to the sorting unit of "Artik-Bud" LLC for further enrichment. The rock mass is supplied to the inertial screening sifter GIL-52a by dry or wet mode. Beneficiation products (sorting coal) are transported by conveyor belt into bins for further shipment to the consumer. Waste is transported to the flat dump.

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

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

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

Installation of equipment for waste heap dismantling was begun in 15/01/2008. Crediting period for ERUs generation and waste heap dismantling started 14/02/2008.

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

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

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

Identified problem areas for project implementation status, project participants' responses and conclusions of Bureau Veritas Certification are described in Annex A (refer to CAR01, CL01)

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

For calculating the emission reductions, key factors, such as availability of work power and financing, seasonal coal requirement on Ukraine inside market, prices of diesel fuel and electric energy, influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions, such as work forecasts, bookkeepers invoices, laboratory analysis samples, work logbooks are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

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

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

Identified problem areas for compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology, project participants' responses and conclusions of Bureau Veritas Certification are described in Annex A (refer to CAR02)

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

"Not applicable"

3.6 Data management (101)

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

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

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

Consumption of diesel fuel is accounting by bookkeeper invoices.

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner. Initially data on value and quality of produced coal, track's load,

diesel fuel consumption, waste heap mass quantity is obtained from logbooks of relevant work suppliers. The data on electricity consumed is obtained from monthly reports of Regional Electric Network.

The data required to monitor JI project is routinely collected within the normal operations of the "GZF Almazna" LLc and sorting unit of "Artik-Bud" LLC therefore JI monitoring is integral part of routine monitoring

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

Identified problem areas applicable for project data management, responses of project participants, Bureau Veritas Certification conclusions are listed in the Annex A Verification protocol (see CAR03)

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

"Not applicable"

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial, 1st periodic verification of the Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphereЄ Project in Antratsyt town, Luhansk Region, Ukraine, which applies JI specific approach. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

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

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

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

Reporting period: From 14/02/2008 to 30/09/2012

Baseline emissions	: 3939199	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 140664	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	:-1399804	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 5198339	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

From 14/02/2008 to 31/12/2008

Baseline emissions	: 692779	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 26105	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	:-231236	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 897910	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

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

Baseline emissions	: 866980	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 30528	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -315580	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 1152032	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

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

Baseline emissions	: 850224	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 30489	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -309026	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 1128761	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

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

Baseline emissions	: 865927	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 30681	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -308021	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 1143267	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

From 01/01/2012 to 30/09/2012

Baseline emissions	: 663289	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Project emissions	: 22861	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Leakages	: -235941	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 876369	tonnes of CO_2 equivalent.

5 REFERENCES

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

/1/ Project Design Document "Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere" version 2.0 dated 11/10/2012
Monitoring Report "Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere" version 1.0 dated 20/10/2012
Monitoring Report "Waste heaps #9, #11, #17, #25 dismantling of mines #4 and #29 with the aim of decreasing greenhouse gases emissions into the atmosphere" version 2.0 dated 11/11/2012
/2/ ERUs calculation Excel-file "CalculationT30K.xls"
/3/ Letter of Approval # 3112/23/7 dated 19/10/2012 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine
/4/ Letter of Approval #12.2-02/14311 from 30/10/2012 issued by Ministry of Environment Protection and regional development of Republic Latvia

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

/1/ Attestation certificate "GOF 'Almazna" Ltd. # 283 from 22/08/11 valid till 22/08/14
/2/ Attestation certificate "GOF 'Almazna" Ltd. # 206 from 04/09/08 valid till 04/09/11
/3/ Verification Certificate of thermocouple # 6 August 2012
/4/ Verification Certificate of thermocouple # 7 August 2012
/5/ Verification Certificate of thermocouple # 8 August 2012
/6/ Verification Certificate of millivoltmeter # 0126885 June 2011
/7/ Verification Certificate of millivoltmeter # 0055129 June 2011
/8/ Verification Certificate of millivoltmeter # 09094303 June 2011
/9/ Verification Certificate of weighing scales # 1144 August 2012
/10/ Verification Certificate of measuring electronic scales VLA-200 # 456
/11/ Verification Certificate of measuring electronic scales ADV-200 # 457
/12/ Verification Certificate of measuring technique, set of weights G-2-210 №459
/13/ Verification Certificate of measuring technique, set of weights G-2-210 №458
/14/ Verification Certificate of measuring electronic scales ANG 200 C №2682
/15/ Certificate of laboratory drying box # 160 SNOL -3,5.3,5.3,5/3-M2

/16/ Certificate of laboratory drying box # 161 SNOL
/17/ Certificate of laboratory furnace of resistance # 162 SNOL1,6.2,5.1/9-U4
/18/ Certificate of laboratory furnace of resistance # 163 SNOL1,6.2,5.1/9-U4
/19/ Certificate of laboratory furnace of resistance # 164 SNOL1,6.2,5.1/9-U4
/20/ Certificate #125 of sieve for determination of granulometric composition
/21/ Certificate #126 of sieve for determination of granulometric composition
/22/ Passport of psychrometric hygrometer
/23/ Verification Certificate of measuring technique, mechanical Stopwatch SOS pr-2b-2-000 №02/08-1098
/24/ Agreement # 185 from 15/01/08 between “PI RUN COMPANY” Ltd. and “Artik-bud” Ltd for works of weighing
/25/ Coal quality certificates 2008-2012
/26/ Monthly sale invoices on coal delivery for 2008-2012 years
/27/ Monthly sale invoices on diesel fuel consumption for 2008-2012 years
/28/ Monthly acts on electricity consumption for 2008-2012 years
/29/ Monthly coal weighting act for 2008-2012 years

Persons interviewed:

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

/1/ Gints Klavinsh - JI Project Manager, SIA “Vidzeme Eko”
/2/ Stah Yuri Mykhailovych - JI Consultant, SIA “Vidzeme Eko”
/3/ Olga Mykolayivna Shpak - Head of Laboratory “GOF ‘Almazna” Ltd.
/4/ Vasyl Konstantynovych Pohonyaylo - manager of industrial department, “Artik-bud” Ltd.
/5/ Andriy Romanovych Smischuk – recordkeeper at automobile scales “Artik-bud” Ltd
/6/ Mykola Vasyliovych Vyshnyak – director of “PI RUN Kompany” LLC

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	The project obtained approvals from the DFPs of both Parties Involved. Letter of Approval #3112/23/7 issued by State Environment Investment Agency of Ukraine 19/10/2012. Letter of Approval #12.2-02/14311 dated 30/10/2012 has been issued by Latvian Ministry of Environment Protection and regional development	OK	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	The abovementioned written approvals are unconditional	OK	OK
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	The project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD which determination has been deemed final and is available at JI UNFCCC website	OK	OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	The project is in operation during the monitoring period. The main decisive factors describing project operation status are provided in the section	CAR01 CL01	OK OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		B of the Monitoring Report. *CAR01* The MR indicates in the section A.7 table 1 that values of ERUs obtained in 2012 year is differ than indicated in the PDD by difference in monitoring period duration. This is not fully reasonably, because values in PDD for 2012 year are obtained on the basis of ex-post estimations and data for 9 months of 2012 is factual. Please provide adequate explanation. *CL01* Please clarify if project equipment was changed or replaces during the monitoring period.		
Compliance with monitoring plan				
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	The monitoring was provided in line with determined PDD	OK	OK
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the	The key factors listed in the sections 23 (b) (i)-(vii) of DVM, as well the risks associated with the projects, are taken into account in appropriate way.	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?			
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	The data sources used for calculating the emission reductions are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and are clearly identified *CAR02* Please add reference on source of diesel fuel density, which is indicted as 0,85 kg/l	CAR02	OK
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	The emission factors used for calculating the emission reductions are in line with National GHG Inventory Report for 1990-2010 years, which is approved by SEIA	OK	OK
OK95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	The calculations of emission reductions are based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible future scenarios	OK	OK
Applicable to JI SSC projects only_Not applicable				
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only_Not applicable				
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	The monitoring plan hasn't been revised	OK	OK
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	Not applicable	OK	OK
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	The implementation of data collection procedures with quality control and quality assurance procedure is in accordance with the monitoring plan	OK	OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	*CAR03* The table 2 in the section B.2 indicates only data of initial and the last calibration of project measuring equipment. Please add data on intermediate calibrations of measuring devices	CAR03	OK
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The evidences and records are used in the monitoring are a traceable manner	OK	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management	The data collection and management system is in	OK	OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	accordance with the monitoring plan		
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment) _Not applicable				
Applicable to sample-based approach only_Not applicable				

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarification and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CAR01 The MR indicates in the section A.7 table 1 that values of ERUs obtained in 2012 year is differ than indicated in the PDD by difference in monitoring period duration. This is not fully reasonably, because values in PDD for 2012 year are obtained on the basis of ex-post estimations and data for 9 months of 2012 is factual. Please provide adequate explanation.	93	Project participants during the first 9 months in 2012 used actual data for calculations, and for the last 3 months - predictable. Therefore, in the monitoring report, which covers 9 months in 2012, the difference between values of emission reductions from the data in the PDD consists only of predictable reductions during the last 3 months in 2012.	The issue is closed

CAR02 Please add reference on source of diesel fuel density, which is indicted as 0,85 kg/l	95(b)	Added in section B.3.: If the data in these documents are given in liters instead of tonnes, the data must be transferred through the coefficient 0.85 kg / l. Reference to "GOST 305-82, Diesel fuel. Technical characteristics": http://elarum.ru/info/standards/gost-305-82/. 0.85 kg / l is an average value for fuel of two types: summer and winter fuel.	**The issue is closed**
CAR03 The table 2 in the section B.2 indicates only data of initial and the last calibration of project measuring equipment. Please add data on intermediate calibrations of measuring devices	101(b)	Data on the automobile scales intermediate calibrations is added in Table 2, Section B.1.2.	**The issue is closed**
CL01 Please clarify if project equipment was changed or replaces during the monitoring period.	93	Large amount of mining equipment is involved in waste heaps dismantling. During project implementation its number and models of machinery can be changed and it doesn't significantly affect the project indicator. Other equipment changes didn't take place.	**The issue is closed**