



DETERMINATION REPORT

CEP CARBON EMISSIONS

PARTNERS S.A.

DETERMINATION OF THE
Implementation of the energy efficiency
measures and reduction of greenhouse gas
emissions into the atmosphere at State
Enterprise “Snizhneantratsyt”

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-DET/0605/2012

REVISION No. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 20/08/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A.	Client ref.: Fabian Knodel

Summary:
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the «Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise «Snizhneanratsyt»» project of CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A. located in Donetsk region, Ukraine 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 determination scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study, monitoring plan and other relevant documents, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of 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 determination report and opinion. The overall determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the determination process is a list of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests (CL and CAR), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.

In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.: UKRAINE-det/0605/2012	Subject Group: JI
Project title: «Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise «Snizhneanratsyt»»	
Work carried out by: Vyacheslav Yeriomin : Team Leader, Lead Verifier Vasiliy Kobzar : Team Member, Technical Specialist	
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer Victoria Legka – Technical Specialist	
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov – Climate Change Operational Manager	
Date of this revision: 31/08/2012	Rev. No.: 02
Number of pages: 47	

Indexing terms

- 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 Determination team	3
2 METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 Review of Documents	4
2.2 Follow-up Interviews	5
2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	5
3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	6
4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS.....	8
4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)	8
4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)	9
4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)	9
4.4 Additionality (27-31)	10
4.5 Project boundary (32-33)	11
4.6 Crediting period (34)	11
4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)	12
4.8 Leakage (40-41)	17
4.9 Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (42-47)	17
4.10 Environmental impacts (48)	20
4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)	21
4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)	21
4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)	21
4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)	21
5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES	21
6 DETERMINATION OPINION.....	21
7 REFERENCES	23
APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL	26



DETERMINATION REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project «Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise “Snizhneanratsyt”» (hereafter called “the project”) in Donetsk region, Ukraine.

This report summarizes the findings of the determination 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

The determination serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The determination is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are determined in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Determination is a requirement for all JI projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of emission reduction units (ERUs).

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

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

1.3 Determination team

The determination team consists of the following personnel:



DETERMINATION REPORT

Vyacheslav Yeriomin
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead
Verifier

Vasiliy Kobzar
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical specialist

This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Viktoriya Legka
Bureau Veritas Certification Technical specialist

2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A. and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form, Approved CDM methodology and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Determination Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.


DETERMINATION REPORT

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A. revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 31/08/2012.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version(s) 01 and 02.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 14/08/2012 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 CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A. and State Enterprise "Snizhneanratsyt " were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
State Enterprise "Snizhneanratsyt"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Implementation schedule ➤ Organizational structure ➤ Responsibilities and authorities ➤ Data collection and processing responsibilities and authorities ➤ Equipment installation ➤ Data recording, archiving and reporting system ➤ Rehabilitation/Implementation of equipment (records) ➤ Metering equipment control ➤ Metering record keeping system, database ➤ IT control ➤ Training of personnel ➤ Quality management procedures and technology ➤ Internal audits and checks
CONSULTANT CEP CarbonEmissions Partners S.A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Baseline methodology ➤ Applicability of methodology ➤ Monitoring plan ➤ Conformity of PDD to JI requirements

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination 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 project design.

If the determination team, in assessing the PDD and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to JI project requirements, it will 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 in the published PDD that is not in accordance with the (technical) process used for the project or relevant JI project requirement or that shows any other logical flaw;

(b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the determination team to assess compliance with the JI project requirement in question;

(c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to project implementation but not project design, that needs to be reviewed during the first verification of the project.

The determination 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 determination.

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

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project's aim is to extinguish and stabilise the waste heaps on the asset registers of Zoria Mine and Udarnik Mine of SE "Snizhneanratsyt", located in the town Snizhne, Donetsk region. The project activities will prevent greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere. The project activities provide for stabilization of waste heaps with the use of vermiculite.

Situation prior to the project.

In the Donbas, coal deposits mainly lie at an average depth of about 400-800 meters, the average coal formation thickness is 0.6-1.2 m. Extraction methods are mainly based on deep mining. Most mines work at a depth of 400-800 m, but there are 35 mines, producing coal from a depth of 1000-1300 m. Coal formations in the Donbas are usually interstratified with rock formations and are usually found every 20-40 m. In such conditions, deposit exploitation cause the extraction of a great amount of rock, which is brought to the surface. Coal is separated from rejects, with the latter being dumped into huge waste heaps, dispersed all over the Donbas. The coal separation process has historically been low-effective. Moreover, over a long time, it was considered



DETERMINATION REPORT

economically unreasonable to extract 100% of coal from the rock raised. As a result, waste heaps in the Donbas contain a great amount of coal.

That eventually make them inclined to self-ignition and smouldering. According to various estimates, rock raised contains up to 65-70% of coal, the remainder is rejects. Up to 60% of these rejects end up in waste heaps. The heaps which are presently smouldering or running the risk of ignition are sources of uncontrolled emissions of green house gases and hazardous substances. The latter include sulphur trioxide, which further on converts to sulphuric acid and causes acid rains, hydrogen sulphide and carbon oxide. Continuous erosion may cause the full disintegration of a heap and its turning into a massive heave, which is dangerous both in the context of direct peril to people and property, and of significant emissions of solids and hazardous substances into the atmosphere. Erosion also accelerates the spontaneous ignition process. Coal smouldering in heaps is a prolonged process, which can last up to 15 years.

Baseline scenario.

Despite the danger caused by waste heap combustion, their extinction is not a customary practice in the Donbas. Owners responsible for waste heaps are obliged to pay rather small penalties for environmental pollution. Thus, they have no major incentive to solve this issue and burning waste heaps may not be extinguished.

The Baseline scenario assumes that this widespread practice will continue; waste heaps will burn on causing constant uncontrolled greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions into the atmosphere.

Project scenario

Main project activities aimed at the reduction of GHG emissions into the atmosphere are:

1. Extinction of SE “Snizhneanratsyt” waste heaps.
2. Implementation of permanent waste heap monitoring system and waste heap extinction technology at SE “Snizhneanratsyt” mines.

History of the project

The project was initiated in September 2003. The project documentation was finished in 2012. Installation and construction works were commenced in 2003. The waste heaps stabilisation had been finished before the beginning of 2004. The joint



DETERMINATION REPORT

implementation scheme was one of the key factors of the project from its very beginning, and financial benefits within this scheme were viewed as one of the motives to start the project and now play a significant part in taking the functioning start decision. On August 30, 2012, the Letter of Endorsement No.2424/23/7 dated 30/08/2012 was issued for the JI project by the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine.

The identified areas of concern as to the project description, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 01 – CAR 04, CL 01 - CL02).

4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A. The determination of the Project resulted in 24 Corrective Action Requests and 05 Clarification Requests.

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

4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)

The project has been officially presented for endorsement to the Ukrainian authorities. State Environmental Investments Agency of Ukraine has issued a Letter of Endorsement for the project #2424/23/7 dated 30/08/2012.

Bureau Veritas Certification received this letter from the project participants and does not doubt its authenticity.

As for the time being no written approval for the project was issued by Ukrainian Party. After receiving Determination Report from the Accredited Independent Entity the project documentation will be submitted to the Ukrainian Designated Focal Point (DFP) which is State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine, for receiving a Letter of Approval.

**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

Bureau Veritas Certification considers the letters to be unconditional in accordance with paragraphs 19-20 of the DVM.

The identified areas of concern as to the project approvals by Parties involved, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 05).

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The official authorization of each legal entity listed as project participant in the PDD by Parties involved will be provided in the written project approvals (refer to 4.1 above).

The identified areas of concern as to the authorization of project participants by Parties involved, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 05).

The project has not been approved by the parties involved thus CAR 05 is pending. The issue will be closed after the Letter of Approval is issued by the Host Party.

4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD explicitly indicates that using a methodology for baseline setting and monitoring developed in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines (hereinafter referred to as JI specific approach) was the selected approach for identifying the baseline.

The PDD provides a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner, as well as justification, that the baseline is established:

- (a) By listing and describing the following plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one (alternative a):
 - a. Continuation of the current situation, without the JI project implementation.
 - b. Proposed project activity without the use of the JI mechanism.
- (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion



DETERMINATION REPORT

plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. In this context, the following key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account:

- Complexity of production process
- Permanent change in price of coal, electricity and natural gas in Ukraine.
- Long payback period.
- Implementation of proposed project requires significant annual capital investments and human resources.
- Ukraine has one of the lowest electricity tariffs in Europe. Therefore, it is really hard to invest the cost for the reconstruction or the rehabilitation of the equipment.

JI specific approach and “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring” were chosen by the project participants for setting the baseline.

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology and the baseline is identified appropriately.

The identified areas of concern as to the baseline setting, project participants’ response and BVC’s conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 06 - CAR 08).

4.4 Additionality (27-31)

The PDD provides a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description.

The developer of the project proved that anthropogenic emissions under the project are lower than the emissions that would take place in the absence of the project activity.

Additionality proofs are provided. Three plausible and realistic alternative scenarios were identified for each type of modernization identified in the project:

- Continuation of the current situation, without the JI project implementation
- Proposed project activity without the use of the JI mechanism
- Partial project activities (some of the project activities are implemented) without the use of the Joint Implementation Mechanism.



DETERMINATION REPORT

Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the analysis using the approach chosen.

The identified areas of concern as to the additionality, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 09).

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

The project boundary defined in the PDD, which in accordance with the specific approach is delineated by the physical site of the entire technological complex, encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that are:

- (i) Under the control of the project participants;
- (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project.

The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD

Based on the above assessment, the AIE hereby confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity.

No outstanding issues concerning the Project boundary were raised.

4.6 Crediting period (34)

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began, and the starting date is 17/09/2003, which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 15 years and 3 months or 183 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 15 years and 3 months, and its starting date as 17/09/2003, which is after the date the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are generated by the project.

The PDD states that the crediting period for the issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.



DETERMINATION REPORT

The PDD states that the extension of its crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval, and the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012 in all relevant sections of the PDD.

The identified areas of concern as to the Project boundary, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 10 – CAR 12, CL 03- CL 04).

4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)

The PDD, in its monitoring plan section, explicitly indicates that JI specific approach was the selected.

The monitoring plan describes all relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored, and the period in which they will be monitored, in particular also all decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance.

The monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable (i.e. provide consistent and accurate values), valid (i.e. are clearly connected with the effect to be measured), and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored.

The monitoring plan draws on the list of standard variables indicated in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" developed by the JISC, as appropriate.

The monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguishes:

(i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination.

(ii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording depending on its kind. It is provided in comprehensive manner in Tables for the key-parameters in Section B.1 of the PDD.

The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions and project



DETERMINATION REPORT

emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate, such as:

Project emissions

Project GHG emissions are calculated by the following formulae:

$$PE_y = \sum PE_{PO}^j$$

Studies have shown that the period of waste heaps burning is 15 years, which means that the entire amount of coal of waste heap completely burned during this period. Project monitoring of waste heap condition allows for the control the condition of the heap and prevention of its burning, and if the latter occurs, to take measures for its rapid quenching, provides for the monthly monitoring of waste heap. Based on the conditions of the monitoring program of waste heap condition, the formula for calculation of GHG emissions from waste heap burning of the baseline was adapted to the activities of the monthly monitoring of heap condition.

$$PE_{PO}^y = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{FC_{p,PO,coal} \cdot NCV_{p,coal}^y \cdot k_i^y \cdot EF_{p,CO_2,coal}^y}{180} + PE_{p,PO,diesel}^y$$

PE_{PO}^y - GHG emissions generated in the process of repeated flickering of waste heap after extinction measures, during period y of the project scenario, tCO₂eq;

$PE_{p,PO,diesel}^y$ - GHG emissions from diesel fuel combustion, which is used in technological process of waste heaps extinction in monitoring period y of the project scenario, t CO₂eq;

$FC_{p,PO,coal} = FC_{b,PO,coal}$ - total amount of coal in waste heap at the beginning of performance of extinction works, ths t;

$NCV_{p,coal}^y$ - net calorific value of coal combustion in monitoring period « y », in the project scenario, TJ/th s t;

$EF_{p,CO_2,coal}^y$ - default CO₂ emission factor for stationary coal combustion in monitoring period « y », in the project scenario, t CO₂/TJ;

k_i^y – waste heap combustion factor at mine i for month m of year y (if waste heap combustion was detected in the reporting month, it is assumed that $k=1$, if the combustion was not detected, as provided by the project, it is assumed that $k=0$. Since the waste heap continues to burn under the baseline scenario, $k=1$ for all months of the monitoring period);

180 - number of months in fifteen years (15 years is the period of complete burning of waste heap).

$diesel$ - index for diesel fuel;



DETERMINATION REPORT

- y - index for monitoring period;
 i - index for sequence number of month, year y ;
 p - index for the project scenario;
 n - index for density;
 $coal$ - index for coal.

Emissions from diesel fuel consumed by technological equipment during waste heap extinction arise only in case of repeated burning of waste heap, and are less than 1% of the emissions generated in the process of waste heap burning because of it these emissions can be neglected. Thus:

$$PE_{PO}^y = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{FC_{p,PO,coal} \cdot NCV_{p,coal}^y \cdot k_i^y \cdot EF_{p,CO_2,coal}^y}{180},$$

$$FC_{b,PO,coal} = \frac{V_{PO} \cdot \rho_n \cdot C_{coal}}{1000000},$$

$FC_{b,PO,coal}$ - total amount of coal in waste heap at the beginning of performance of extinction works, t;

V_{PO} - waste heap volume, m³;

C_{coal} - coal consist in waste heap, %;

ρ_n - waste heap density, kg/m³;

PO - index for waste heap;

n - index for density;

$\left[\frac{1}{1000000} \right]$ - index for kg to thousand tonnes conversion.

$coal$ - index for coal.

$$EF_{p,CO_2,coal}^y = EF_{p,C,coal}^y \cdot OXID_{p,coal}^y \cdot 44 / 12,$$

$EF_{p,C,coal}^y$ - carbon emission factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period y of the project scenario, t C/TJ;

$OXID_{p,coal}^y$ - carbon oxidation factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period y of the project scenario, relative units;

44 / 12 - stoichiometric ratio of CO₂ and C molecular masses, t CO₂/t C;

y - index for monitoring period;

p - index for the project scenario;

$coal$ - index for coal.

Baseline emissions

DETERMINATION REPORT

$$BE_y = \sum BE_{PO}^j$$

Studies have shown that the period of waste heaps burning is 15 years, which means that the entire amount of coal of waste heap completely burned during this period. Project monitoring of waste heap condition allows for the control the condition of the heap and prevention of its burning, and if the latter occurs, to take measures for its rapid quenching, provides for the monthly monitoring of waste heap. Based on the conditions of the monitoring program of waste heap condition, the formula for calculation of GHG emissions from waste heap burning of the baseline was adapted to the activities of the monthly monitoring of heap condition.

$$BE_{PO}^y = \sum_{i=1}^{12} \frac{FC_{b,PO,coal} \cdot NCV_{b,coal}^y \cdot k_i^y \cdot EF_{b,CO_2,coal}^y}{180},$$

$FC_{b,PO,coal}$ - total coal production in the waste heap at the beginning of performance of extinction works, ths t;

$NCV_{b,coal}^y$ - net calorific value of coal combustion in monitoring period y of the baseline scenario, TJ/tht;

$EF_{b,CO_2,coal}^y$ - default CO₂ emission factor for stationary coal combustion in monitoring period y of the baseline scenario, t CO₂/TJ;

k_i^y – waste heap combustion factor at mine i for month m of year y (if waste heap combustion was detected in the reporting month, it is assumed that k=1, if the combustion was not detected, as provided by the project, it is assumed that k=0. Since the waste heap continues to burn under the baseline scenario, k=1 for all months of the monitoring period);

PO - index for waste heap;

\bar{b} - index for the baseline scenario;

coal - index for coal.

i - index for sequence number of the month, year «y».

$$FC_{b,PO,coal} = \frac{V_{PO} \cdot \rho_n \cdot C_{coal}}{1000000},$$

$FC_{b,PO,coal}$ - total amount of coal in waste heap at the beginning of performance of extinction works, ths t;

V_{PO} – waste heap volume, m³;

C_{coal} – content of coal in the waste heap, %;



DETERMINATION REPORT

ρ_n - waste heap density, kg/m³;

PO - index for waste heap;

\bar{b} - index for the baseline scenario;

n - index for density;

$coal$ - index for coal.

$\left[\frac{1}{1000000} \right]$ - index for kg to thousand tonnes conversion.

$$EF_{b,CO_2,coal}^y = EF_{b,C,coal}^y \cdot OXID_{b,coal}^y \cdot 44 / 12,$$

$EF_{b,C,coal}^y$ - CO₂ emission factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period y of the baseline scenario, t C/TJ;

$OXID_{b,coal}^y$ - carbon oxidation factor in the process of coal combustion in monitoring period y of the baseline scenario, relative units;

44/12 - stoichiometric ratio of CO₂ and C molecular masses, t CO₂/t C;

y - index for monitoring period;

\bar{b} - index for the baseline scenario;

$coal$ - index for coal.

Emission reduction

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$$

ER_y - greenhouse gas emission reductions in period y , t CO₂eq;

BE_y - greenhouse gas emissions in period y of the baseline scenario, t CO₂eq;

PE_y - greenhouse gas emissions in period y of the project scenario, t CO₂eq;

y - index for monitoring period.

The monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process. This includes, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available on request.

The monitoring plan clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities. The roles and responsibilities of the persons involved to monitoring process are described in full in section D.3 of PDD and demonstrated on the Scheme of data collection for Monitoring Report.



 DETERMINATION REPORT

On the whole, the monitoring report reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.

The monitoring plan provides, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources (e.g. official statistics, IPCC, commercial and scientific literature etc.) but not including data that are calculated with equations.

The monitoring plan indicates that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.

The identified areas of concern as to the monitoring plan, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 13 – CAR 23).

4.8 Leakage (40-41)

No leakage is expected.

No outstanding issues were raised as per leakage.

4.9 Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (42-47)

The PDD indicates assessment of emissions in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario as the approach chosen to estimate the emission reductions generated by the project.

The PDD provides estimates of:

(a) Emissions in the project scenario (within the project boundary), which are:

Year	Estimated project emissions (t CO ₂ eq)
2004	0
2005	0
2006	0
2007	0
Total 2004-2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0



DETERMINATION REPORT



2011	0
2012	0
Total 2008-2012	0
2013	0
2014	0
2015	0
2016	0
2017	0
2018	0
Total 2013-2018	0
Total (t CO₂eq)	0

(b) Leakage, which is:

0 tonnes of CO₂eq in 2004-2007;

0 tonnes of CO₂eq in 2008-2012;

0 tonnes of CO₂eq in 2013-2018.

(c) Emissions in the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are:

Year	Estimated <u>baseline</u> emissions (t CO ₂ eq)
2004	87 780
2005	86 700
2006	86 016
2007	87 192
Total 2004-2007	347 688
2008	79 644
2009	80 820
2010	80 052
2011	80 052
2012	80 052
Total 2008-2012	400 620
2013	80 052
2014	80 052
2015	80 052
2016	80 052
2017	80 052
2018	80 052
Total 2013-2018	480 312
Total (t CO₂eq)	1 213 728



DETERMINATION REPORT

(d) Emission reductions adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), which are:

Year	Estimated project emissions (t CO ₂ equivalent)	Estimated leakage (t CO ₂ equivalent)	Estimated baseline emissions (t CO ₂ equivalent)	Estimated emission reductions (t CO ₂ equivalent)
2004	0	0	87 780	87 780
2005	0	0	86 700	86 700
2006	0	0	86 016	86 016
2007	0	0	87 192	87 192
Total 2004-2007	0	0	347 688	347 688
2008	0	0	79 644	79 644
2009	0	0	80 820	80 820
2010	0	0	80 052	80 052
2011	0	0	80 052	80 052
2012	0	0	80 052	80 052
Total 2008-2012	0	0	400 620	400 620
2013	0	0	80 052	80 052
2014	0	0	80 052	80 052
2015	0	0	80 052	80 052
2016	0	0	80 052	80 052
2017	0	0	80 052	80 052
2018	0	0	80 052	80 052
Total 2013-2018	0	0	480 312	480 312
Total (t CO₂eq)	0	0	1 213 728	1 213 728

The estimates referred to above are given:

- (a) On a periodic basis;
- (b) From 17/09/2003 to 31/12/2018, covering the whole crediting period;
- (c) Based on primary sources;
- (d) For each GHG gas, such as CO₂;
- (e) In tonnes of CO₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or amended in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol.



DETERMINATION REPORT

Formulae for calculating the above estimations are given in section 4.7. All formulae are in the correct sequence and compliance across the PDD.

For calculating the estimates referred to above, key factors, e.g. energy prices and availability, market development 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.

Emission factors, such as emission factor for electricity consumption, emission factor for diesel fuel and coal, were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

The estimation referred to above is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

The estimates referred to above are consistent throughout the PDD.

The average annual emission reduction estimations over the crediting period are calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total number of months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

Detailed algorithms of calculations and their results are described in section D, E and supporting documents to the PDD.

No outstanding issues concerning the estimated emission reduction were raised.

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

The PDD lists and attaches documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party.

The PDD provides conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party, if the analysis referred to above indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party.



DETERMINATION REPORT

The identified areas of concern as to the estimation of emission reductions, project participants' response and Bureau Veritas Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A to Determination Report (refer to CAR 24).

4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)

Stakeholder consultation was not undertaken as it is not required by the host party.

No outstanding issues were raised as per stakeholder consultation.

4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)

Not applicable.

4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)

Not applicable.

4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)

Not applicable.

5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES

No comments, pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI Guidelines, were received.

6 DETERMINATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a determination of the «Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise "Snizhneanratsyt"» Project in Ukraine. The determination 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 determination consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) the



DETERMINATION REPORT

resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion.

Project participant/s used the latest tool for demonstration of the additionality. In line with this tool, the PDD provides investment analysis and common practice analysis, to determine that the project activity itself is not the 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 and maintained as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The determination revealed pending issues related to the current determination stage of the project: the issue of the written approval of the project and the authorization of the project participant by the host Party. If the written approval and the authorization by the host Party are awarded, it is our opinion that the project as described in the Project Design Document, Version 02 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.

The review of the project design documentation (version 02) and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

The determination is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report.



7 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by CEP CarbonEmissionsPartners S.A. that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ Project Design Document «Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise “Snizhneantratsyt”» version 01 dated 06/06/2012
- /2/ Emissions reduction calculation Excel spreadsheet “Супровідний_документ_1.xls”
- /3/ Project Design Document «Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise “Snizhneantratsyt”» version 02 dated 31/08/2012
- /4/ Investment analysis Excel spreadsheet “Супровідний_документ_2.xls”
- /5/ Letter of Endorsement #2424/23/7 dated 30/08/2012 issued by the State environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine

Category 2 Documents:

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /1/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for June 2012
- /2/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for April 2012.
- /3/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for March 2012
- /4/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for February 2012
- /5/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for January 2012.
- /6/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for December 2011
- /7/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for November 2011
- /8/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for October 2011
- /9/ Statement of control checking of ordinary coal mining for September 2011
- /10/ Passport of wastes disposal site
- /11/ Report on environmental protection for 2011
- /12/ Report on environmental protection for 2010
- /13/ Report on environmental protection for 2009



DETERMINATION REPORT

- /14/ Report on environmental protection for 2008
- /15/ Report on environmental protection for 2005
- /16/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2007
- /17/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2011
- /18/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2010
- /19/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2009
- /20/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2008
- /21/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2006
- /22/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2005
- /23/ Annual statistic report (form 11-MTP) for 2004
- /24/ Report on production of industrial products for 2011
- /25/ Report on production of industrial products for 2007
- /26/ Report on production of industrial products for 2006
- /27/ Report on production of industrial products for 2008
- /28/ Report on production of industrial products for 2009
- /29/ Report on production of industrial products for 2010
- /30/ Passports of waste heap #7 of Udarnik mine and waste heap of Zoria mine
- /31/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap #7 of Udarnik mine for 2008
- /32/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap #7 of Udarnik mine for 2009
- /33/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap #7 of Udarnik mine for 2010
- /34/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap #7 of Udarnik mine for 2011
- /35/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap #7 of Udarnik mine for 2012
- /36/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap of Zoria mine for 2008
- /37/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap of Zoria mine for 2009
- /38/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap of Zoria mine for 2010
- /39/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap of Zoria mine for 2011
- /40/ Electronic register of the monitoring of waste heap conditions of waste heap of Zoria mine for 2012
- /41/ Register of boiler indicators accounting for 2011-2012

Persons interviewed:

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

- /1/ O.Ivasiuk – General director
- /2/ V.Silenko – Acting technical director
- /3/ V.Zhytnikov – Senior surveyor
- /4/ U.Bykadorov – Senior lawyer



DETERMINATION REPORT

- /5/ N.Gusieva – Deputy chief accountant
- /6/ N.Zipunnikova – Accountant on general assets accounting
- /7/ O.Sknar – Lead engineer



DETERMINATION REPORT

APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 Check list for determination, according JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL (Version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
General description of the project				
Title of the project				
-	Is the title of the project presented?	«Implementation of the energy efficiency measures and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere at State Enterprise “Snizhneanratsyt”»	OK	OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	Scope 8: Mining/mineral production <u>Corrective Action Request 01:</u> The proposed project activity not related to the scope #2. Please correct.	CAR 01	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	PDD version number: 02	OK	OK
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	Data of Completion: 31/08/2012	OK	OK
Description of the project				
-	Is the purpose of the project included with a concise, summarizing explanation (max. 1-2 pages) of the: a) Situation existing prior to the starting date of the project; b) Baseline scenario; and c) Project scenario (expected outcome,	<u>Corrective Action Request 02:</u> Please use in the PDD font size provided «JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM» - version 01.	CAR 02	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	including a technical description)?			
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	Yes, brief description of project history provided.	OK	OK
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	Project participants and parties listed in the table in section A.3 of PDD. Parties Project: Ukraine (host country).	OK	OK
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	<u>Corrective Action Request 03:</u> Table A.3 in the PDD must be submitted in a format that provided in the version 04 of the "Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form".	CAR 03	OK
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Contact information is provided in Annex 1.	OK	OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Yes, Ukraine is a host Party	OK	OK
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	Ukraine	OK	OK
-	Region/State/Province etc.	The project is located in Donetsk region	OK	OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Snizhne	OK	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	<u>Clarification Request 01:</u> In PDD indicated only the coordinates of city. Please specify geographic coordinates of mine.	CL 01	OK
Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project				
-	Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	List and brief description of measures to be implemented by the project provided in section A.4.2 of PDD.	OK	OK
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project,				



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	<u>Corrective Action Request 04:</u> Clarification how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved is not provided. Please correct.	CAR 04	OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	<u>Clarification Request 02:</u> Please number the tables with information of the estimates (calculations) of emission reductions.	CL 02	OK
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO ₂ e?	Yes, the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO ₂ e is provided.	OK	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Yes.	OK	OK
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	Yes, length of crediting period is 15 years and 3 months(183 months).	OK	OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent provided?	Yes, estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent provided in section A.4.3.1 of PDD.	OK	OK
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	<u>Corrective Action Request 05:</u> No Letters of Approval of the project issued by the parties involved.	CAR 05	OK
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	Yes, Ukraine is the Host Party.	OK	OK
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	See CAR 05 above	OK	OK
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	See CAR 05 above.	OK	OK
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved				
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD,	See CAR 05 above.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	through: - A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity? or - Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?			
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? - JI specific approach - Approved CDM methodology approach	PDD describes the JI specific approach used to identify the baseline scenario. <u>Corrective Action Request 06:</u> Please provide date of baseline setting according required format DD/MM/YYYY.	CAR 06	OK
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Yes, the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner.	OK	OK
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established: (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one? (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? - Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account? (c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and	In the PDD in a reasonable way showed that the baseline was determined by compiling a listing and description of real scenarios of future scenarios based on conservative assumptions and subsequent selection the most attractive of these scenarios.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	key factors? (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions? (e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure? (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate?			
24	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements or combinations together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 23 above?	To identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality was used "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03. Also taken into consideration the recommendations the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 05.2). <u>Corrective Action Request 07:</u> The PDD (section B.1) is given by the reference to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03, but with different names of this document. Please correct. <u>Corrective Action Request 08:</u> Please provide a current link to the document that was used, "Tools for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 05.2)	CAR 07 CAR 08	OK
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	For baseline emissions calculations were used CO ₂ emission factor for the projects of reducing electricity consumption from Ukraine electricity network, emission factor for natural gas and global warming potential of methane. All factors are justified.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Approved CDM methodology approach only Paragraphs 26(a) – 26(d)_ Not applicable				
Additionality				
JI specific approach only				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used? (a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions or enhancements of removals; (b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; (c) Application of the most recent version of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board”.	In section B.1 PDD provides analysis additionality of project whose purpose is to demonstrate that the design scenario is not part of a particular baseline, and that project will reduce GHG emissions compared to baseline. The analysis was performed based on the latest version of the "Tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality", which was approved by the CDM Executive Board and is completely usable for JI.	OK	OK
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	Investment analysis and common practice analysis which applied are widely used for additionality demonstration of the project activity.	OK	OK
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Yes, justification of additionality provided in section B.1 of PDD.	OK	OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	<u>Corrective Action Request 09:</u> In the PDD does not specify how the registration of this project as JI project will help overcome identified barriers.	CAR 09	OK



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
30	If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	All explanations, descriptive materials and analytical conclusions was presented in accordance with the chosen method.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only Paragraphs 31(a) – 31(e)_ Not applicable				
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects)				
JI specific approach only				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (i) Under the control of the project participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	Yes, project boundary is defined according to the all requirements.	OK	OK
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?	Yes, the project boundary is defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above.	OK	OK
32 (c)	Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate?	Yes, the project boundary is provided in the Figure B.3.1 and Figure B.3.2 and in tabular format in Table B.3.1.	OK	OK
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?	All gases and sources included are explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only Paragraph 33_ Not applicable				
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	The starting date of the project is 17/09/2003. <u>Corrective Action Request 10:</u> Please correct the date format of the project.	CAR 10 CL 03	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<u>Clarification Request 03:</u> Please provide confirmatory information about the beginning of the project.		
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes.	OK	OK
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	15 years and 3 months (183 months). <u>Clarification Request 04:</u> Please specify the expected term of the project life cycle and provide documented evidence of the term.	CL 04	OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	15 years and 3 months (183 months).	OK	OK
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	The starting date of the crediting period is on the date of the first emission reductions generated by the project.	OK	OK
34 (d)	Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?	<u>Corrective Action Request 11:</u> Please state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.	CAR 11	OK
34 (d)	If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval? Are the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012?	<u>Corrective Action Request 12:</u> Please specify that the extension of the crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval.	CAR 12	OK
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach	JI specific approach was used.	OK	OK
JI specific approach only				



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe: - All relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored? - The period in which they will be monitored? - All decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance?	<p>The monitoring plan describes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data to be monitored - The frequency of monitoring annual / monthly - All important factors for monitoring and reporting on project activities - Reports on project activities, structure control, which will be introduced in implementing the monitoring plan. <p><u>Corrective Action Request 13:</u> During the inspection of the project have been identified, as well as in PDD that monitoring will occur periodically (smallest interval - monthly). The units for the parameters are to be presented this month, not per year. Please check it out and make the appropriate adjustments.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request 05:</u> Please explain why the calculations do not take into account emissions by stage of events described in the PDD, for example, emissions of vehicles during stewing waste heap.</p>	CAR 13 CL 05	OK
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?	Yes, the monitoring plan identifies parameters constant and variables, and whether they are reliable, valid and those that allow to obtain a clear picture of emission reductions that are subject to monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (b)	If default values are used: - Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? - Do the default values originate from recognized sources? - Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels?	<p><u>Corrective Action Request 14:</u></p> <p>For some parameters (for example, $OXID_{b,coal}^y$ - Carbon oxidation factor for coal combustion) values used in accordance with the approved CDM methodology ACM0009, but its use in the text of PDD is not justified. Please correct.</p>	CAR 14	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	- Are the default values presented in a transparent manner?			
36 (b) (i)	For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?	Yes. All procedures for the selection and justification required values described.	OK	OK
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, - Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? - Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	<u>Corrective Action Request 15:</u> Please indicate parameters used from NIR is conservative.	CAR 15	OK
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	<u>Corrective Action Request 16:</u> Please indicate in the PDD procedure that must be used if the expected data with any source are not available.	CAR 16	OK
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?	Yes, the emission factors for projects on power loss reduction in power supply networks of Ukraine are used in calculations and are obtained through monitoring.	OK	OK
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Yes, the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. Is consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan.	OK	OK
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring"?	The monitoring plan is developed in accordance with the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring".	OK	OK
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are	Yes, all the relevant parameters are described (refer to the Section D.1 of the PDD).	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination? (iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?			
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	The Table in the Section D.1.1 of the PDD defines the frequency of monitoring and data sources for all parameters and data to be monitored. <u>Corrective Action Request 17:</u> Please provide documented information on how to collect and order of records as well as their storage, archiving and recovery if necessary.	CAR 17	OK
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?	The PDD describes all algorithms and formulae used for the calculation of baseline and project emissions.	OK	OK
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	The underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae is explained.	OK	OK
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Yes, consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. are used.	CAR 18	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<u>Corrective Action Request 18:</u> Please indicate the source of data for the parameters used for the calculations in these formulas		
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	<u>Corrective Action Request 19:</u> Please correct the numbering above formulas.	CAR19	OK
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	Yes, documentation analysis confirming conservative algorithms / procedures for monitoring	OK	OK
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	The level of data uncertainty is provided in the quality control and assurance table (refer to the section D.2 of the PDD). Taking into account that almost all data and parameters are based on the statistical data and calibrated measuring equipment recordings of a certain class of accuracy and tested by the official energy resources supplier and state bodies, their level of uncertainty is considered as low.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline ensured?	Yes.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	Any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident are explained.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	Yes, it is justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	All the references are provided as necessary.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Yes.	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	Used assumptions and procedures do not have any significant uncertainty associated with them.	OK	OK
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals provided?	Level of uncertainty is indicated as low.	OK	OK
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project? Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found?	The monitoring plan identifies national and international monitoring standards used for the proposed project. All relevant references are provided.	OK	OK
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	n/a	OK	OK
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made available upon request?	Control procedures and quality assurance monitoring process described in section D.2 of the PDD. <u>Corrective Action Request 20:</u> Please provide documented information about the internal QA/QC Enterprise. <u>Corrective Action Request 21:</u> Please provide AIE schedule calibration of measuring equipment.	CAR 20 CAR 21	OK
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the	Yes, the monitoring plan in the Section D.3 of the PDD clearly identifies the responsibilities and authorities regarding	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	monitoring activities?	the monitoring activities.		
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type? If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?	<u>Corrective Action Request 22:</u> The Section D.1.5 of the PDD requires from the project participants to indicate the information on data collection and archivation concerning environmental impact and to provide references on the relevant regulations of the host country. Please provide all the necessary information.	CAR 22	OK
36 (l)	Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources but not including data that are calculated with equations?	Yes all the parameters are provided in Sections D.1.1.1 and D.1.1.3 of the PDD.	OK	OK
36 (m)	Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	Methodology the monitoring described in the PDD requires that all information collected during monitoring was for archived electronically and kept at least 2 years after the crediting period. <u>Corrective Action Request 23:</u> Please provide documented information how to store the information collected during monitoring.	CAR 23	OK
37	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?	No elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used in the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only Paragraphs 38(a) – 38(d) Not applicable				
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach Paragraph 39 Not applicable				
Leakage				



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
JI specific approach only				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	No leakage is expected in proposed project activity.	OK	OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	No leakage is expected in proposed project activity.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only Paragraph 41 Not applicable				
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions	Emissions baseline scenario and in the project scenario were assessed.	OK	OK
43	If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary)? (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	The PDD provides ex ante estimates of the project and baseline scenarios, and also emissions reduction. The estimated results are provided in the Section E of the PDD, and also in the Excel spreadsheets.	OK	OK
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	Not applicable	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
45	<p>For both approaches in 42</p> <p>(a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given:</p> <p>(i) On a periodic basis?</p> <p>(ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period?</p> <p>(iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis?</p> <p>(iv) For each GHG?</p> <p>(v) In tones of CO₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol?</p> <p>(b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD?</p> <p>(c) For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?</p> <p>(d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent?</p> <p>(e) Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?</p> <p>(f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?</p>	<p>The estimates are provided on a periodic basis in tones CO₂ equivalent.</p> <p>The formulas used are consistent throughout the PDD.</p>	OK	OK



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (h) Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
46	If the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions or net removals calculation?	Yes, the PDD includes an illustrative ex ante emissions calculation. Preliminary calculations of emission reductions performed in table Excel, which is available to the AIE. Errors in calculations were not found.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only Paragraphs 47(a) – 47(b) Not applicable				
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?	<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 24:</u> There is no information on transboundary impacts in the PDD.	CAR 24	OK
48 (b)	If the analysis in 48 (a) indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?	No significant environmental impacts related to project implementation expected. Therefore separate environmental impact assessment is not required.	OK	OK
Stakeholder consultation				
49	If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide:	Procedures of Ukraine did not require consultations with stakeholders for proposed project. However, information on implementation measures of reducing technological power	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	consumption provided in the media and in electronic media (see section G of PDD). No negative stakeholders' comments were received on company address.		
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment) Paragraphs 50 - 57_Not applicable				
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects Paragraphs 58 – 64(d)_Not applicable				
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
Determination regarding programmes of activities Paragraphs 66 – 73_Not applicable				

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Determination team conclusion
<u>Corrective Action Request 01:</u> The proposed project activity not related to the scope #2. Please correct.	-	Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 02:</u> Please use in the PDD font size provided «JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT DESIGN DOCUMENT FORM» - version 01.	-	Format checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 03:</u> Table A.3 in the PDD must be submitted in a format that provided in the version 04 of the "Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form".	-	Checked and corrected. Table A.3 in the PDD showed in a format that provided in the version 04 of the "Guidelines for users of the JI PDD form". See PDD version 02	The issue is closed



DETERMINATION REPORT

<u>Clarification Request 01:</u> In PDD indicated only the coordinates of city. Please specify geographic coordinates of mine.	-	Geographical coordinates indicated of the mine. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 04:</u> Clarification how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved is not provided. Please correct.	-	Explanation of how is achieved the anthropogenic emissions of GHG added. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Clarification Request 02:</u> Please number the tables with information of the estimates (calculations) of emission reductions.	-	Tables are numbered. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 05:</u> No Letters of Approval of the project issued by the parties involved.	19	Corrected. After determination of the project PDD and Determination Report will be submitted for consideration to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine in order to obtain a Letter of Approval. See PDD version 02	Pending resolution
<u>Corrective Action Request 06:</u> Please provide date of baseline setting according required format DD/MM/YYYY.	22	Format is checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 07:</u> The PDD (section B.1) is given by the reference to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03, but with different names of this document. Please correct.	24	Checked and corrected. The PDD provides a link to the "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring for Joint Implementation" version 03. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 08:</u> Please provide a current link to the document that was used, "Tools for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 05.2)	24	Checked and corrected. Was used "Tools for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 06.0.0) with true links See PDD version 02	The issue is closed



DETERMINATION REPORT

<u>Corrective Action Request 09:</u> In the PDD does not specify how the registration of this project as JI project will help overcome identified barriers.	29 (c)	Checked and corrected. This revised PDD as registration of the project as a JI project will help overcome the identified barriers. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 10:</u> Please correct the date format of the project.	34 (a)	Date format is checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Clarification Request 03:</u> Please provide confirmatory information about the beginning of the project	34 (a)	Project starting date is 17/09/2003. Document confirming of Act #12 into operation rigs with degassing reservoir GBH-1/89/12. Scan-copy document attached	The issue is closed
<u>Clarification Request 04:</u> Please specify the expected term of the project life cycle and provide documented evidence of the term.	34 (b)	Expected operational lifetime of the project is set based on the lifetime of new and reconditioned equipment. Documented evidence of this was provided under the determination under the site-visit as REPAIR forms and acts of commissioning.	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 11:</u> Please state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.	34 (d)	Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed
<u>Corrective Action Request 12:</u> Please specify that the extension of the crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval.	34 (d)	Production ERUs refers to the first commitment period of 5 years (01/01/2008 - 31/12/2012 g.) Continued crediting period after 2012 subject to approval of the host Party and the calculations of emission reductions are presented separately for the period up to 2012 and for the period after 2012. See PDD version 02	The issue is closed



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request 13:</u> During the inspection of the project have been identified, as well as in PDD that monitoring will occur periodically (smallest interval - monthly). The units for the parameters are to be presented this month, not per year. Please check it out and make the appropriate adjustments.</p>	36 (a)	<p>Monitoring waste heap will occur periodically (smallest interval-month). Calculation of GHG emissions resulting from the re-fire waste heap after his stewing measures are calculated for the year. Parameters are for the month indicated in the temperature shooting waste heaps on stage monitoring. Documented evidence of this was provided by determination team during the site-visit in a spreadsheet monitoring the thermal state waste heap.</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Clarification Request 05:</u> Please explain why the calculations do not take into account emissions by stage of events described in the PDD, for example, emissions of vehicles during stewing waste heap.</p>	36 (a)	<p>Emissions from diesel fuel used process equipment in the stewing heap arise only in the event of a re-ignition of satiety, and less than 1% of the emissions generated during combustion waste heap, so they in the process of calculation can be neglected. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 14:</u> For some parameters (for example, $OXID_{b,coal}^y$ - Carbon oxidation factor for coal combustion) values used in accordance with the approved CDM methodology ACM0009, but its use in the text of PDD is not justified. Please correct.</p>	36 (b)	<p>Emissions from diesel fuel used process equipment in the stewing heap arise only in the event of a re-fire satiety, and less than 1% of the emissions generated during combustion waste heap, so they in the process of calculation can be neglected. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request 15:</u> Please indicate parameters used from NIR is conservative.</p>	36 (b) (ii)	<p>National inventories of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases in Ukraine is the official report submitted to the secretariat of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Used parameters selected from NIR designed to reflect the situation of Ukraine and selected indicators for Ukraine. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 16:</u> Please indicate in the PDD procedure that must be used if the expected data with any source are not available.</p>	36 (b) (iii)	<p>If due to force majeure to perform temperature measurements are not possible, the results of the temperature shooting missed last month accepted such as in the month recovery measurements of temperatures. In the enterprise under normal operation the measures envisaged to prevent force-majeure circumstances that may affect the production, as well as measures to address the consequences of possible force majeure. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 17:</u> Please provide documented information on how to collect and order of records as well as their storage, archiving and recovery if necessary.</p>	36 (e)	<p>Documents and reports the data to be monitored will be archived and stored by the project participants. This documentation and other monitoring data required for the determination and verification, as well as any other information relevant to the operation of the project must be kept at least two years after the last transfer of ERUs. Scanned copy of the order is attached.</p>	The issue is closed



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request 18:</u> Please indicate the source of data for the parameters used for the calculations in these formulas</p>	36 (f) (ii)	<p>1) Information on the number of extracted coal mines going on every day, on the basis of these data formed annual report. 2) Based on monthly reports formed an annual report on energy consumption. These counters from each mine. 3) Information on the number of generated heat is going to the mines, on the basis of these data formed annual report. Statement on the volume of production 4) Passport waste heap See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 19:</u> Please correct the numbering above formulas.</p>	36 (f) (iii)	<p>Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 20:</u> Please provide documented information about the internal QA/QC Enterprise.</p>	36 (i)	<p>Documented information was provided by group determination during site visit.</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 21:</u> Please provide AIE schedule calibration of measuring equipment.</p>	36 (i)	<p>Scanned copy of the schedule of calibration of measuring equipment attached.</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 22:</u> The Section D.1.5 of the PDD requires from the project participants to indicate the information on data collection and archivation concerning environmental impact and to provide references on the relevant regulations of the host country. Please provide all the necessary information.</p>	36 (k)	<p>Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request 23:</u> Please provide documented information how to store the information collected during monitoring.</p>	36 (m)	<p>Corrected. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed
<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 24:</u> There is no information on transboundary impacts in the PDD.</p>	48 (a)	<p>Checked and corrected. See PDD version 02</p>	The issue is closed