



DETERMINATION REPORT

CARBON MANAGEMENT COMPANY GMBH

DETERMINATION OF THE POWER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM MODERNIZATION OF PJSC “AES RIVNEOBLENERGO”

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-DET/0512/2012

REVISION No. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 01/08/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: Carbon Management Company GmbH	Client ref.: Alain Girardet

Summary:
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the "Power distribution system modernization of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo" project of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo" located in Rivne city and Rivne 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/0512/2012	Subject Group: JI
Project title: "Power distribution system modernization of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo"	
Work carried out by: Vyacheslav Yeriomin : Team Leader, Lead Verifier Volodymyr Kulish : Team Member, Verifier	
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov : Internal Technical Reviewer Victoria Legka : Technical Specialist	
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov - Operational Manager	
Date of this revision: 06/08/2012	Rev. No.: 02
Number of pages: 62	

- 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)	11
4.5 Project boundary (32-33)	11
4.6 Crediting period (34)	12
4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)	12
4.8 Leakage (40-41)	15
4.9 Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (42-47)	15
4.10 Environmental impacts (48)	18
4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)	19
4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)	19
4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)	19
4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)	19
5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES	19
6 DETERMINATION OPINION.....	19
7 REFERENCES	21
APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL	28



1 INTRODUCTION

Carbon Management Company GmbH has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project “Power distribution system modernization of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” (hereafter called “the project”) at Rivne city and Rivne 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:

Vyacheslav Yeriomin
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Volodymyr Kulish
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier



This determination report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal reviewer

Victoria 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 Carbon Management Company GmbH 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.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, Carbon Management Company GmbH revised the PDD and resubmitted it as version 2.0 of 20/06/2012.

DETERMINATION REPORT

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD versions 1.0 dated 22/03/2012 and 2.0 dated 20/06/2012.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 12/06/2012 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 PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” and Carbon Management Company GmbH were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Implementation schedule ➤ Project management organization ➤ Responsibilities and authorities ➤ The powers and responsibilities regarding the collection and processing of data ➤ Installation of equipment ➤ Saving, archiving and reporting system data ➤ Evidence and records on reconstruction and new equipment and its operation ➤ Measurement equipment control ➤ Records indicators measuring equipment system ➤ Information Technology Management ➤ Training of personnel ➤ Quality control and quality assurance procedures ➤ Internal audits and inspections
Carbon Management Company GmbH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Applicability of methodology ➤ Baseline and Project scenarios ➤ Barriers analysis ➤ Additionality justification ➤ Common practice analysis ➤ 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



DETERMINATION REPORT

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 determination process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the determination protocol in Appendix A.

3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The main objective of the Joint Implementation project “Power distribution system modernization of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” is the technical reconstruction of electrical network and equipment programme realization, introduction of the progressive technologies, organization structure improvement, transition to the higher level organization of electricity grid transmission and distribution.

Situation at the beginning of the project activity

At the beginning of the project, (in 2002) “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC has been carrying out only the measures aimed at the maintaining of power grid in good working condition. Generally, these measures included repair works on eliminations of breakdowns occurring during the operation of power grid. That resulted in 18.10% power losses at “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC grids out of the total amount of the power transmitted to the network.

Project scenario

Joint Implementation project is based on the implementation of investment plans, introduced and financed since the period end of 2003 - beginning



of 2004, which includes a set of measures aimed at the preventing of excess power losses.

Measures taken within this Programme, as well as implementation and performance of regular monitoring of possible sources of power losses and their prevention, let "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC reduce losses in the grid up to 12.54% out of the total amount of power, that had come into the company's distributive network.

Technological power losses (TPL) reduction in the grids allowed the Company to reduce CO₂ emissions, caused by the power generation that was lost.

Duration of the project is unlimited, since the measures taken to identify and eliminate inadmissible TPL in the components and feeders of power grids, power sites and power networks districts, as well as to reduce the total amount of reported technological power losses in the "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC power networks, are considered to be ongoing and continual process.

Baseline scenario

Baseline scenario assumes further use of existing equipment along with performing of routine maintenance and repair works without significant investment. Justification of baseline scenario is provided in Section B PDD.

History of a project

Chronologically, the history of the project may be represented by the following dates:

- 20/12/2002 – Minutes of general meeting of shareholders of OJSC "A.E.S Rivneenergo" regarding development and implementation of investment plans aimed at reducing of TPL (Protocol # 12). This date can be considered to be the date of qualifying this project as a JI Project.
- 31/12/2003 - recording the first results from a reduction of TPL by the results of this investment plan.
- 01/01/2004 – 31/12/2011 - gradual reduction of TPL, according to investment plans, along with the preparation and study of the situation regarding the implementation of JI projects in Ukraine (the order of execution of projects, research precedents of JI projects in Ukraine, tax legislation, the choice of project developer, etc.)

Benefits of the project

Besides the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, implementation of measures described in the investments plans has the following benefits:



DETERMINATION REPORT

- Increase of employment opportunities in relation to the introduction of new equipment into service, construction and renovation of enterprise's facilities;
- Reduction of hazardous pollutants emissions due to the power generation cut down as a result of power losses reduction in the grid;
- Production cost reduction.

Realization of Joint Implementation project will ensure the greenhouse gas emissions reduction by cutting back on power generation supplied to the "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC networks. In such a way, project realization will result in the greenhouse gas emissions reduction and prevention of their further atmospheric concentration, which, in its turn, will speed down climate changes.

The Project envisages the development of TPL control system (energy rating, energy audit and energy management) in the Company in order to implement a number of organizational and technical measures, as well as measures aimed at development and improvement of methodological support for TPL reduction during realization of licensable types of activity in terms of power distribution and supply.

The identified areas of concern as to the project description, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 01-CAR 04, CL 01-CL 03).

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 15 Corrective Action Requests and 09 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)

After receiving Determination Report from the Accredited Independent Entity the project documentation will be submitted to the State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine and Federal Department of



DETERMINATION REPORT

Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications of Switzerland for receiving a Letter of Approval.

The identified areas of concern as to the approval by Parties involved, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 05).

The project has no approvals by the Parties involved, therefore CAR 05 remains pending. This CAR will be closed after the Host Party Letter of Approval presentation.

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

The participation of each project participant listed in the PDD will be authorized by Letter of Approval from appropriate party explicitly stating the name of the legal entity.

The identified areas of concern as to the approval by Parties involved, project participants response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 05).

The project has no approvals by the Parties involved, therefore CAR 05 remains pending. This CAR will be closed after the Host Party Letter of Approval presentation.

4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD explicitly indicates that JI specific approach was the selected approach for identifying the baseline.

The baseline scenario has been established in accordance with Appendix B of the JI Guidelines and in accordance with the "Guidance on Criteria for Baseline Setting and Monitoring" and used Methodological Tool "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality".

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:
 - a. Continuation of the existing situation



- b. Implementation of the proposed project activity without the project registration as JI project.

Partial implementation of the Power losses reduction programme within the “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC networks will considerably decrease the outcome effect of the project. Therefore, this scenario cannot be considered as an alternative to the proposed project activity.

- (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances, such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector. In this context, the following key factors that affect a baseline are taken into account:
 - a. Electricity and main fuel prices are fixed by the government and change independently from the enterprise needs;
 - b. The Power Grid is a very complicated system, which consists of the groups of power transformation, transmission and distributing equipment, management and monitoring systems and only if these groups work coherently the result will be positive. It means that all of the groups of measures implemented in the “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC power grid should be coordinated with the other parts of the system. Besides, some new equipment will be implemented on the Units and there is no experience or historical data that could show the possibility of the effective work of such a system;
 - c. Ukraine has one of the lowest electricity tariffs in Europe. Therefore, it is really hard to invest some cost for the reconstruction or the rehabilitation of the equipment.

In order to establish the baseline scenario project participants have chosen the use of JI specific approach and “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”.

Default multi-project emission factor for Ukrainian National Power Grid defined by National Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine has been applied for calculation of greenhouse gas emissions.

All explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD are made in accordance with the identified JI specific approach 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 CL 04 - CL 05).



4.4 Additionality (27-31)

Traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project implemented under comparable circumstances (same GHG mitigation measure, same country, similar technology, similar scale) would result in a reduction of anthropogenic emissions by sources or an enhancement of net anthropogenic removals by sinks that is additional to any that would otherwise occur and a justification why this determination is relevant for the project at hand was provided.

Barrier analysis and common practice analysis were used to demonstrate additionality of the project activity. All explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected tool or method.

The following additionality proofs are provided:

1. two alternative scenarios to the project activity are identified;
2. the identified financial barrier would credibly prevent the implementation of the proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a JI activity;
3. the common practice analyses carried out by the PP's, complementing the investment and barrier analysis.

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 BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CL 06).

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

The project boundary defined in the PDD encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that are:

Reasonably attributable to the project:

- CO₂ emissions related to electric energy production for electrical grid

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

The AIE determined the project boundary by:

- a) Detailed review of relevant documentation (list of all determined documents provided in "Category 2 Document" below).
- b) Interviews and observations during site visit to "AEC Rivneoblenergo" PJSC dated 12/06/2012 (list of interviewed persons provided in "Persons interviewed" below).



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.

The identified areas of concern as to the project boundary, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CL 07).

4.6 Crediting period (34)

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the real action of the project began, and the starting date is 20/12/2002, which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 25 years (300 months).

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 25 years or 300 months, and its starting date as 01/01/2004, which is the date the first emission reductions 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.

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 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 crediting period, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CL 06 – CL 07).

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, such as fuel saving.

The monitoring plan specifies the indicators, constants and variables that are reliable (i.e. provide consistent and accurate values), valid (i.e. be



DETERMINATION REPORT

clearly connected with the effect to be measured), and that provide a transparent picture of the emission reductions to be monitored such as:

1. Actual receiving of electricity to the grid
2. Total reduction of technical power losses
3. CO₂ emission factor for Ukrainian Grid

The monitoring plan draws on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" developed by the JISC, such as PE_y; BE_y; GEF_y.

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, such as: N/A.

(ii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period, such as: PE_y; BE_y; GEF_y, V_y.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording depending on its kind.

The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions and project emissions or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project:

Project emissions

The mission reduction will be achieved by reducing power losses in the company's power grids which in its turn will be achieved as a result of the project implementation.

Since the baseline emissions are calculated based on difference between power loss before and after the project implementation, consequently the project emission will equal zero.

$$PE_y=0$$

Baseline emissions

Baseline emissions are defined by the following equation:

$$BE_y=V_y \cdot GEF_y$$

where

BE_y - baseline emissions (tCO₂e);

 DETERMINATION REPORT

- V_y - total technical loss reduction in the power distribution system during the period y of the project scenario compared with the baseline, MWh;
 GEF_y - CO₂ emission factor in UPS of Ukraine for the power replacement projects in the period y , tCO₂e/MWh;
 y - the period for which estimates are made.

Emission reduction

Emission reductions are defined by the following equation:

$$ER_y = BE_y - (PE_y + LE_y)$$

Where:

- ER_y - emission reduction during the period y , tCO₂e;
 BE_y - baseline emission of the greenhouse gases in the period y , tCO₂e;
 PE_y - greenhouse gases emission caused by the project activity in the period y , tCO₂e;
 LE_y - Leakages emission in the period y , tCO₂e.

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.

Data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.

The monitoring plan clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities.

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 identified areas of concern as to monitoring plan, project participants' response and BVC's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 08 – CAR 14, CL 08 – CL 09).



4.8 Leakage (40-41)

The PDD appropriately describes an assessment of the potential Indirect external leakage of CO₂, CH₄, N₂O generated by fuel production and its transportation and appropriately explains that they are neglected.

Electronegative gas (SF₆) used in circuit breakers and other equipment of "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC is toxic and is listed as a gas, circulation and utilization of which is under the control of state environment organizations.

Equipment containing electronegative gas is hermetically sealed and prevents leakage of gas into the atmosphere. In the case of its failure or decommissioning SF₆ will be collected and reused by filling in new similar equipment. Potential emissions do not exceed 1 tCO₂e per year. In connection with all the mentioned above, SF₆ emissions were excluded from the calculations.

No outstanding issues were raised.

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 the ex ante estimates of:

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

Since the baseline emissions are calculated based on difference between power loss before and after the project implementation, consequently the project emission will equal zero.

$$PE_y=0$$

- (b) Leakages, if applicable, which are 0 tonnes CO₂ equivalent;

During the project activity leakages are not expected.

- (c) Emissions for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are 6 223 915 tonnes of CO₂eq:

Baseline emissions over the period from 01/01/2004 till 31/12/2007



DETERMINATION REPORT

Year	Estimated baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)
2004	58 546
2005	66 397
2006	133 660
2007	109 675
Total for the period:	368 278

Baseline emissions over the period from 01/01/2008 till 31/12/2012

Year	Estimated baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)
2008	177 077
2009	158 345
2010	156 240
2011	216 290
2012	302 805
Total for the period:	1 010 757

Baseline emissions over the period from 01/01/2013 till 31/12/2028

Year	Estimated baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)
2013	302 805
2014	302 805
2015	302 805
2016	302 805
2017	302 805
2018	302 805
2019	302 805
2020	302 805
2021	302 805
2022	302 805
2023	302 805
2024	302 805
2025	302 805
2026	302 805
2027	302 805
2028	302 805
Total for the period:	4 844 880

(d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), which are 6 223 915 tonnes of CO₂eq.

DETERMINATION REPORT

Emission reductions over the period from 01/01/2004 till 31/12/2007

Year	Sum of the project leakage and emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated emission reductions (tCO ₂ e)
2004	0	58 546	58 546
2005	0	66 397	66 397
2006	0	133 660	133 660
2007	0	109 675	109 675
Total for the period:	0	368 278	368 278

Emission reductions over the period from 01/01/2008 till 31/12/2012

Year	Sum of the project leakage and emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated emission reductions (tCO ₂ e)
2008	0	177 077	177 077
2009	0	158 345	158 345
2010	0	156 240	156 240
2011	0	216 290	216 290
2012	0	302 805	302 805
Total for the period:	0	1 010 757	1 010 757

Emission reductions over the period from 01/01/2013 till 31/12/2028

Year	Sum of the project leakage and emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated baseline emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Estimated emission reductions (tCO ₂ e)
2013	0	302 805	302 805
2014	0	302 805	302 805
2015	0	302 805	302 805
2016	0	302 805	302 805
2017	0	302 805	302 805
2018	0	302 805	302 805
2019	0	302 805	302 805
2020	0	302 805	302 805
2021	0	302 805	302 805
2022	0	302 805	302 805
2023	0	302 805	302 805
2024	0	302 805	302 805



 DETERMINATION REPORT

2025	0	302 805	302 805
2026	0	302 805	302 805
2027	0	302 805	302 805
2028	0	302 805	302 805
Total for the period:	0	4 844 880	4 844 880

The estimates referred to above are given:

- (a) On a periodic basis;
- (b) From 01/01/2004 to 31/12/2028, covering the whole crediting period;
- (c) On a source-by-source basis;
- (d) For each GHG, i.e. CO₂;
- (e) In tonnes 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;

The formula used for calculating the estimates referred above, which are referred above, are consistent throughout the PDD.

Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred to above, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

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 annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

No issues concerning estimation of emission reductions or were found.

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

All activities under the project do not envisage any negative impacts on the environment, therefore no EIA was specifically developed for this project.



Accordingly, the project also does not have any transboundary impact, as it is implemented in the Rivne region (Ukraine) and does not include any impact that may occur in another region or another country.

No outstanding issues concerning the environmental impact were raised.

4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)

The stakeholders are the citizens of Rivne region who were informed about the project implementation through the mass-media.

The programme of power losses reduction was discussed on the meetings of the representatives of the regional State Administration, Ministry of Energy and Coal Industry of Ukraine, NJSC “Energy Company of Ukraine”, Derzhenerhonahlyad; the main principles of the project were announced by the regional radio of Rivne State-owned TV and Radio Company.

No comments on the project have been received from stakeholders.

No outstanding issues concerning the stakeholder consultation were raised.

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 “Power distribution system modernization of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” project of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” located in Rivne city and Rivne region, Western 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.



DETERMINATION REPORT

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

Project participants used the latest tool for demonstration of the additionality. In line with this tool, the PDD provides investment analysis, technological and organizational barriers analysis, as well as 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 one 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 2.0 meets all the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the determination stage and the relevant host Party criteria.

The review of the project design documentation (version 2.0) 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 PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ Project Design Document “Power distribution system modernization of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” version 1.0 dated 22/03/2012
- /2/ Emissions reduction calculation Excel spreadsheet “20120330_ROE_ER.xls”
- /3/ Project Design Document “Power distribution system modernization of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” version 2.0 dated 20/06/2012
- /4/ Emissions reduction calculation Excel spreadsheet “20120726_ROE_ER.xls”
- /5/ Letter of Endorsement # 2042/23/7 dated 31/07/2012 of JI project “Power distribution system modernization of PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo”

Category 2 Documents:

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

- /1/ License Series АГ # 500341 on power transfer to PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” local power grids, issued by Ukrainian Electricity Supervision Authority (decision on issuance # 730 dated 28/04/2011)
- /2/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2002
- /3/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2003
- /4/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2004
- /5/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2005
- /6/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2006
- /7/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2007
- /8/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2008
- /9/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2009
- /10/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2010
- /11/ Structure of power balance and TPL for transfer within “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC 154-0,38 kV power grid for 2011
- /12/ Power commercial accounting balance sheet dated 01/12/2012

DETERMINATION REPORT

- (devices calibration schedule)
- /13/ Order # 434 dated 11/06/2012 on storage of documents concerning JI project within Kyoto Protocol
 - /14/ Agreement # 350-1 dated 29/03/2012 with Rivne Scientific and Production Centre for Standardization, Metrology and Certification on providing services of technical testing and analysis
 - /15/ Agreement # 41-00329/12 dated 28/02/2012 with All-Ukrainian State Scientific and Production Centre for Standardization, Metrology and Certification (Ukrmetrteststandart SE) on providing services of measuring equipment calibration
 - /16/ Agreement # 324/33 П dated 21/04/2011 with Lviv State Scientific and Production Centre for Standardization, Metrology and Certification State Enterprise (Lvivstandartmetrolohiia SE) on providing services of measuring equipment calibration
 - /17/ Schedule of intersystem accounting between "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC and Ternopiloblenergo PJSC for 2012
 - /18/ Schedule of intersystem accounting between "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC and Lvivoblenergo PJSC for 2012
 - /19/ Schedule of intersystem accounting between "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC and Khmelnytskoblenergo PJSC for 2012
 - /20/ Schedule of intersystem accounting between "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC and Volynoblenergo PJSC for 2012
 - /21/ Certificate C8.119-2010 dated 17/06/2010 on state metrological attestation of automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption
 - /22/ List of technical characteristics of commercial power accounting units
 - /23/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047058 (metrological attestation dated 28/05/2010)
 - /24/ Calibration certificate # 9A/437 dated 25/05/2010 on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047058
 - /25/ Passport on current transducer type T-0,66, # 31556
 - /26/ Calibration certificate # 9A/440 dated 25/05/2010 on current transducer type T-0,66-1-Y3, # 13735
 - /27/ Passport-protocol on Mochulky 10/0,4 kV КТП-797 ПЛ-0,4 kV measuring unit
 - /28/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01065395 (metrological attestation dated 28/05/2010)
 - /29/ Calibration certificate # 9A/437 dated 25/05/2010 on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01065395
 - /30/ Passport-protocol on Mochulky 10/0,4 kV КТП-262 ПЛ-0,4 kV measuring unit
 - /31/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01065893 (metrological attestation dated 26/05/2010)
 - /32/ Calibration certificate # 9A/429 dated 28/05/2010 on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01065893
 - /33/ Passport-protocol on Derazhne 35/10 kV Hremiache ПЛ-10 kV



DETERMINATION REPORT

- measuring unit
- /34/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047020 (metrological attestation dated 26/05/2010)
 - /35/ Calibration certificate # 9A/433 dated 28/05/2010 on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047020
 - /36/ Passport-protocol on Derazhne 35/10 kV Tsuman ПЛ-10 kV measuring unit
 - /37/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01042834 (metrological attestation dated 26/05/2010)
 - /38/ Calibration certificate # 9A/434 dated 28/05/2010 on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01042834
 - /39/ Passport-protocol on Ostrozhets 35/10 kV Lutsk ПЛ-10 kV measuring unit
 - /40/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01065391 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2012)
 - /41/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01065387 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2012)
 - /42/ Passport-protocol on Kutyn 110/10 kV Liubeshiv ПЛ-110 kV measuring unit
 - /43/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047059 (metrological attestation dated 26/05/2010)
 - /44/ Calibration certificate # 9A/434 dated 28/05/2010 on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047059
 - /45/ Passport-protocol on Netishyn 110/10 kV Kraiiv ПЛ-110 kV measuring unit
 - /46/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047014 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2010)
 - /47/ Passport-protocol on Ostroh 110/10 kV Miakoty ПЛ-110 kV measuring unit
 - /48/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047023 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2010)
 - /49/ Passport-protocol on Kutynka 35/10 kV Pererosle ПЛ-35 kV measuring unit
 - /50/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047053 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2010)
 - /51/ Passport-protocol on Myliatyn 35/10 kV Holovli ПЛ-35 kV measuring unit
 - /52/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01042838 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2010)
 - /53/ Passport-protocol on Korets 35/10 kV Murakhiv ПЛ-35 kV measuring unit
 - /54/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01037505 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2007)
 - /55/ Passport-protocol on Krupets 35/10 kV Biliavtsi ПЛ-35 kV measuring unit
 - /56/ Passport on power meter type EA02RAL-C-4, # 01047061 (metrological attestation dated 2nd quarter 2010)



DETERMINATION REPORT

- /57/ Passport-protocol on Zelenyi Dub 10/0,4 kV ТП-191 ПЛ-0,4 kV measuring unit
- /58/ The list of measuring equipment which is in operation and to be calibrated in 2012
- /59/ The list of measuring equipment which is in operation and to be calibrated in 2011
- /60/ Statement on flow amount between Lvivska Zaliznytsia STFO and "AES Rivneoblenergo" PJSC for 01-31 December 2011
- /61/ Investment programme of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2003-2007
- /62/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for the period from 01/12/2001 to 31/12/2002
- /63/ Investment programme of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2003
- /64/ Investment programme of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2004
- /65/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2004
- /66/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2005
- /67/ Investment plan of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2005 (covering the period till 2009)
- /68/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2005 (covering the period for 2009)
- /69/ Investment plan of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2006 (covering the period till 2010)
- /70/ Investment plan of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2007 (covering the period till 2011)
- /71/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2008 (covering the period for 2012)
- /72/ Investment plan of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2008 (covering the period till 2012)
- /73/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2008
- /74/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2009
- /75/ Investment plan of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2010 (covering the period till 2014)
- /76/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2010
- /77/ Report on implementation of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC investment development programme for 2011
- /78/ Investment plan of "AES Rivneoblenergo" OJSC for the period 2011 (covering the period till 2015)



DETERMINATION REPORT

- /79/ Investment plan of “AES Rivneoblenergo” OJSC for the period 2012 (covering the period till 2016)
- /80/ Development programme of 35-110 kV power grids and decision on 0,4-(6)10 kV power grids rehabilitation for 2007-2011, “AES Rivneoblenergo” OJSC
- /81/ Photo-reconstructed packaged transformer substation КТП-583, fabrication # 1717
- /82/ Photo-new power meter # 2732968 installed on the building face as per activity “Replacement of power meter by high level of accuracy and installation on the building face”
- /83/ Form # 1-wastes (annual). Wastes handling for 2011
- /84/ Form # 1-wastes (annual). Wastes handling for 2010
- /85/ Form # 1-wastes (annual). Wastes handling for 2009
- /86/ Form # 1-wastes (annual). Wastes handling for 2008
- /87/ Form # 1-wastes (annual). Wastes handling for 2007
- /88/ Form # 1-wastes (annual). Wastes handling for 2006
- /89/ Inventory report on pollutants emission, “AES Rivneoblenergo” OJSC, production sites 1-28 (issued in 2008)
- /90/ Declaration on the beginning of construction works dated 04/08/2011. Reconstruction КЛ-10kV from ТП-279 to 3ТП-311 in Rivne city, code ДК 2224.1, level of difficulty - II
- /91/ Expert opinion on safety and conformity of the project design to regulations “647.11.56-40.10.5 dated 16/08/2011 on working project “Reconstruction КЛ-10kV from Volodymyrets ПС 35/10kV to ТП-449 (Volodymyrets district)”
- /92/ Declaration on the beginning of construction works dated 04/08/2011. Reconstruction КЛ-10kV in Volodymyrets from ПСТ 35/10kV unit # 27 to ТП-449 (Shevchenko, Chornovola, Hrushevskoho streets, Naharina lane)” Rivne region, code ДК 2224.1, level of difficulty - I
- /93/ Construction cost balance of “Reconstruction КЛ-10kV КЛ-10kV to Volodymyrets substation ТП-449 in Volodymyrets town
- /94/ Training schedule for engineer and technical personnel for 2012
- /95/ Training schedule for personnel for 2012
- /96/ Vocational education schedule for personnel of other qualifications and work in state educational bodies for 2012
- /97/ Training schedule for engineer and technical personnel for 2011
- /98/ Training schedule for personnel for 2011
- /99/ Prospective plan of specialists and top management training, “AES Rivneoblenergo” CJSC for 2011-2015
- /100/ Prospective plan of personnel training, “AES Rivneoblenergo” CJSC for 2011-2015
- /101/ Protocol # 45 dated 25/05/2012 on qualification exam passing for personnel conducting works from lift platform
- /102/ Protocol # 39 dated 11/05/2012 on qualification exam passing for personnel responsible for safe lift platform operation
- /103/ Protocol # 13 dated 06/05/2012 on commission session on



DETERMINATION REPORT

- conducting credits for students of PM-041, PM-042 groups, issued by the National Technical University of Ukraine "Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Centre of Managers and Specialists Training, Ministry of Energy and Coal Industry of Ukraine
- /104, Order # 453 dated 16/11/2011 on distribution network operation fitter training
 - /105, Training plan on distribution network operation fitter vocational education for the period 21/11/2011-29/12/2011
 - /106, License Series AB # 586188 on providing educational services on vocational training complying with retraining and vocational training requirements
 - /107, Technical instruction AAHC.466452.322 on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption AAHC.466452.322 T3 modernization
 - /108, Letter # 03/42-1144 dated 25/05/2010 on agreement of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Enerhorynok State Enterprise
 - /109, Agreement dated 19/06/2009 of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Ukrenerho State Enterprise
 - /110, Agreement dated 30/09/2009 of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Lvivolenerho OJSC
 - /111, Agreement dated 01/06/2009 of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Volynoblenerho OJSC
 - /112, Agreement dated 16/06/2009 of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Zhytomyroblenergo OJSC
 - /113, Agreement of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Khmelnytskoblennerho OJSC
 - /114, Agreement dated 10/11/2009 of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Enerhoatom State Enterprise
 - /115, Agreement of technical instruction and proposal on automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption construction issued by Ternopilolenerho OJSC
 - /116, Statement #1 dated 25.08.2010 made as a result of the commission for the introduction of ASCAPC by CJSC " AES Rivneoblenergo" within the Wholesale Energy Market of Ukraine (WPM) in commercial operation
 - /117, Certificate # C8.119-2010 dated 17/06/2010 on state metrological attestation automatic system for commercial accounting of power consumption of "AES Rivneoblenergo" CJSC
 - /118, Certificate on introduction of the amendments to the Register of



DETERMINATION REPORT

Automatic System for Commercial Accounting of Power Consumption "AES Rivneoblenergo" CJSC ASCAPC, valid from 11/01/2011 to 30/06/2011

- /119/ Statement test the readiness ASCAPC to the formation of data for calculation dated 05/06/2011
- /120/ Agreement on transfer of non-exclusive rights to use the software ASCAPC (license agreement) dated 02/12/2005
- /121/ Photo– generator of report - ASCAPC
- /122/ Certificate #588611 AA from the USREOU (Unified State Register of Enterprises and Organizations of Ukraine)
- /123/ Certificate on introduction of the amendments to the Register of Automatic System for Commercial Accounting of Power Consumption "AES Rivneoblenergo" CJSC ASCAPC, valid from 01/07/2011 to 30/06/2014

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/ Ivan Vasyliiev | Thermal technical engineer PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo" |
| /2/ Oleksandr Kovtianiuk | PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo Production and Technical Service engineer" |
| /3/ Oleksii Myroniuk | Head of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo Capital Construction Department" |
| /4/ Yurii Chechel | Head of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo Power Balance Analysis Department" |
| /5/ Pavlo Chupryna | Head of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo Power Meters Operation and Metrology Department" |
| /6/ Volodymyr Mariuk | Head of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo Training Department" |
| /7/ Denys Rzhanov | Carbon Management Company GmbH
Technical Director |

DETERMINATION REPORT

APPENDIX A: DETERMINATION PROTOCOL

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?	"Power distribution system modernization of PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo"	OK	OK
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	Sectoral scope (2) Power distribution.	OK	OK
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	PDD version 2.0	OK	OK
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	Date of completion: 20/06/2012	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, including a technical description)?	<u>Clarification Request (CL) 01:</u> Please provide the documented evidence of the losses in PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo" networks for 2002. <u>Clarification Request (CL) 02:</u> Please provide the documented evidence of implementation of the programme aimed at the reduction of TPL.	CL 01 CL 02	OK
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component) briefly summarized?	<u>Clarification Request (CL) 03:</u> Please provide the documented evidence of the date since the project is considered to be a JI activity.	CL 03	OK
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved	The list of the parties involved and project participants is	CAR 01	OK


**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	in the project listed?	provided in the tabular format in Section A.3 of the PDD. Parties involved: Ukraine (Host country), Switzerland. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01:</u> Please update the indicated production activities as per KVED (Classification of economic activities).		
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	The data of the project participants is presented in tabular format.	OK	OK
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	The contact information is provided in Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	Ukraine, the Party involved, is the 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 implemented in the Rivne city and Rivne region	OK	OK
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Rivne region (headquarters of the company is located in Rivne city)	OK	OK
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	The project is implemented at the PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo" facilities located in the Rivne region. For more detailed information please refer to the Section A.4.1.4. of the PDD. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02:</u> Please indicate geographic coordinates of the company's headquarters.	CAR 02	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	The project envisages the implementation of the programme aimed at reduction of technological power losses in the PJSC "AES Rivneoblenergo" power grid, which includes a	CAR 03	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	number of technological and organizational activities – section A.4.2 of the PDD. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03:</u> Please provide the project implementation schedule.		
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission 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)	The reduction of technological power losses in the company's power grid led to the reduction of CO ₂ emissions connected with generation of additional (needed for coverage of TPL) power.	OK	OK
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	The estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period is provided.	OK	OK
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO ₂ e?	The estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period is provided in tCO ₂ e.	OK	OK
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	Yes, the data is presented in tabular format.	OK	OK
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	Yes, the duration of the crediting period is 25 years (300 months). <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04:</u> Please justify the chosen duration of the crediting period.	CAR 04	OK
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent provided?	The estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent are provided in section A.4.3.1 of the 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 (CAR) 05:</u> The Letters of Approval from parties involved are absent.	CAR 05	Pending
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party	Yes, Ukraine is the host Party.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	as a "Party involved"?			
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	Refer to CAR 05 above.	OK	OK
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Refer to 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, 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?	Refer to CAR 05 above.	OK	OK
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	The PDD describes the JI specific approach which is used for setting the baseline. <u>Clarification Request (CL) 04:</u> Please indicate which of the mentioned approaches is used for setting the baseline: - JI specific approach; - approved CDM methodology. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 15:</u> Please provide in the Section B.1 theoretical description of the chosen baseline.	CL 04 CAR 15	OK
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Yes, the PDD provides a detailed theoretical description of the project in a complete and transparent manner.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
23	<p>Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established:</p> <p>(a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one?</p> <p>(b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? – Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account?</p> <p>(c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, data sources and key factors?</p> <p>(d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions?</p> <p>(e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure?</p> <p>(f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to “Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring”, as appropriate?</p>	<p>The PDD provides justification that the baseline is established by listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one.</p>	OK	OK
24	<p>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?</p>	<p>“Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” was used for baseline setting and demonstration of additionality.</p> <p><u>Clarification Request (CL) 05:</u> Please indicate the valid version of the document used.</p>	CL 05	OK
25	<p>If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?</p>	<p>Carbon dioxide emission factor for projects of power loss reduction in power supply networks of Ukraine, emission factor for natural gas and methane global warming potential</p>	OK	OK



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		were used for calculation of baseline emissions.		
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
26 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
26 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
26 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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;	The Section B.1 of the PDD provides the analysis of the project additionality showing that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions. The analysis was performed based on the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" (Refer to CL 05 above) approved by the CDM Executive Board and fully applicable for JI projects.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(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".			
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	The barrier analysis and common practice analysis are used for the demonstration of project activity additionality.	OK	OK
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	The additionality proofs are provided in the Section B.1 of the PDD.	OK	OK
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06:</u> The PDD does not provide any information on how the registration of the project as JI activity will aid to overcome the identified barriers.	CAR 06	OK
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, descriptions and analyses were made in accordance with "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" (Refer to CL 05 above).	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?			
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
31 (e)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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 2 and in tabular format. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07:</u> Please indicate the number of the mentioned table.	CAR 07	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				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the	20/12/2002 – The Decision of the PJSC “AES Rivneoblenergo” board of directors on development and	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	implementation of the Programme on TPL Reduction (Protocol # 12). This date is the date since the project is considered to be a JI activity. Refer to CL 03 above.		
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?	25 years (300 months).	OK	OK
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	25 years (300 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>Clarification request (CL) 06:</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.	CL 06	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>Clarification request (CL) 07:</u> Please specify that the extension of the crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval.	CL 07	OK
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? – JI specific approach – Approved CDM methodology approach	<u>Clarification request (CL) 08:</u> During the analysis of the PDD it was revealed that the project developer used JI specific approach for setting the monitoring plan, but it is not explicitly indicated. Please clearly describe in the PDD the approach chosen.	CL 08	OK
JI specific approach only				
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe:	Monitoring approach developed for this project conforms to	CL 09	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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>assumptions and methods used in the baseline. Such approach to the monitoring requires control and measurement of the variables and parameters needed for calculation of the baseline and project emissions in a transparent manner.</p> <p><u>Clarification request (CL) 09:</u> Please provide the calculation algorithm for the parameter $V_{2,3}$.</p>		
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?	Refer to CL 09 above.	OK	OK
36 (b)	<p>If default values are used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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? – Are the default values presented in a transparent manner? 	The used TPL level includes technical and commercial consumption and losses. Commercial losses do not influence GHG emissions and are excluded from the calculation.	OK	OK
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?	<p>Yes. The monitoring plan clearly indicates how the values are to be selected and justified.</p> <p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08:</u> Please provide operational and management structure which will be developed by the project operator for monitoring plan implementation.</p>	CAR 08	OK
36 (b) (ii)	<p>For other values,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are 	<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 09:</u> Please indicate who is responsible for providing the actual CO₂ emission factors for projects on power loss reduction in</p>	CAR 09	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	taken? – Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	power supply networks of Ukraine.		
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 10: Please provide the documented evidence that the data to be monitored and needed for the determination will be stored for two years after last transfer of ERUs by the project.	CAR 10	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 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?	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
	(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.	OK	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. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 11:</u> Please provide the expanded formula of the emissions reduction calculation due to the project activity (Equation 2).	CAR 11	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.	OK	OK
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	Yes.	OK	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?	Please refer to CAR 11 above.	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	Any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	are not self-evident explained?	evident are explained.		
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
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. <u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 12:</u> Please indicate for the parameter <i>EF_{grid, produced, y}</i> the source of data and the page where the used for 2003-2007 values are indicated.	CAR 12	OK
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	Refer to CAR 12 above.	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	<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 13:</u> Please indicate quality control and assurance procedures described in the Section D.2 of the PDD.	CAR 13	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	are kept and made available upon request?			
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	Yes, the monitoring plan in the Section D.3 of the PDD clearly identifies the responsibilities and authorities regarding the monitoring activities.	OK	OK
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?	Corrective Action Request (CAR) 14: 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 14	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?	Refer CAR 12.	OK	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				
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
38 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
38 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach				
39	<p>If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period:</p> <p>(a) Is the underlying project composed of clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently?</p> <p>(b) Can monitoring be performed independently for each of these components (i.e. the data/parameters monitored for one component are not dependent on/effect data/parameters to be monitored for another component)?</p> <p>(c) Does the monitoring plan ensure that monitoring is performed for all components and that in these cases all the requirements of the JI guidelines and further guidance by the JISC regarding monitoring are met?</p>	No overlapping of monitoring periods is envisaged during the crediting period.	OK	OK



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(d) Does the monitoring plan explicitly provide for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?			
Leakage				
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 leakages are envisaged by the proposed project activity.	OK	OK
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	No leakages are envisaged by the proposed project activity.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
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)?	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



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?			
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	N/A	N/A
45	For both approaches in 42 (a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given: (i) On a periodic basis? (ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? (iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? (iv) For each GHG? (v) In tones of CO ₂ equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? (b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (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? (d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable	The estimates are provided on a periodic basis in tones CO ₂ equivalent. The formulas used are consistent throughout the PDD.	OK	OK



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>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>(g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD?</p> <p>(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?</p>			
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.	OK	OK
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
47 (a)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
47 (b)	<p>Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented in the PDD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On a periodic basis? - At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? 	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? – For each GHG? – 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? – Are the formula used for calculating the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? – Are the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? – 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? 			
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?	The project also does not have any transboundary impact, as it is implemented in the Rivne region (Ukraine) and does not include any impact that may occur in another region or another country.	OK	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?	All activities under the project do not envisage any negative impacts on the environment, therefore no EIA was specifically developed for this project.	OK	OK
Environmental impacts				



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
49	<p>If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide:</p> <p>(a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any?</p> <p>(b) The nature of the comments?</p> <p>(c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?</p>	<p>The procedures of Ukraine don't require any stakeholder consultation concerning the proposed project. However, the information on TPL reduction was announced by the printed mass media and on the Internet (refer to the Section G of the PDD). No comments on the project have been received from stakeholders.</p>	OK	OK
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)				
50	<p>Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under:</p> <p>(a) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in .Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects.? If the project contains more than one JI SSC project type component, does each component meet the relevant threshold criterion?</p> <p>(b) One of the SSC project categories defined in the most recent version of appendix B of annex II to decision 4/CMP.1, or an additional project category approved by the JISC in accordance with the relevant provision in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects"?</p>	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
51	<p>Does the SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled component of a large project by explaining that there does not exist a JI (SSC) project with a publicly available determination in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines:</p> <p>(a) Which has the same project participants;</p>	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	and (b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and (c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and (d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point?			
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
52 (a)	Do all projects in the bundle: (i) Have the same crediting period? (ii) Comply with the provisions for JI SSC projects defined in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects", in particular the thresholds referred to in 50 (a) above? (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
52 (c)	Has the AIE received (from the project participants): (i) Information on the bundle using the form developed by the JISC (F-JI-SSCBUNDLE)? (ii) A written statement signed by all project participants indicating that they agree that their individual projects are part of the bundle and nominating one project participant to represent all project participants in communicating with the JISC?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(iii) Indication by the Parties involved that they are aware of the bundle in their project approvals referred to in 19 above?			
53	If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category? (b) Apply the same technology or measure? (c) Located in the territory of the same host Party?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
54	If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Have SSC PDDs been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle? (b) Does each SSC PDD contain a single JI SCC project in the bundle?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
55	If the projects in the bundle use the same baseline, does the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provide an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
56	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan? (a) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects; (b) By preparing an overall monitoring plan including a proposal of monitoring of performance of the constituent projects on a sample basis, as appropriate.	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
56 (b)	If the approach 57 (b) above is used, (i) Are all the JI SSC projects located in the territory of the same host Party? (ii) Do all the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category? (iii) Do all the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure? (iv) Does the overall monitoring plan reflect good monitoring practice appropriate to the bundled JI SSC projects and provide for collection and archiving of the data needed to calculate the emission reductions achieved by the bundled projects?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Applicable to all JI SSC projects				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
58	Does the PDD appropriately specify how the LULUCF project conforms to: (a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying good practice guidance for LULUCF as decided by the CMP, as appropriate? (b) In the case of afforestation, reforestation and/or forest management projects, the definition of "forest" selected by the host Party, which specifies: (i) A single minimum tree crown cover value (between 10 and 30 per cent)? and (ii) A single minimum land area value (between 0.05 and 1 hectare)? and (iii) A single minimum tree height value	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(between 2 and 5 metres)?			
JI specific approach only				
59	<p>Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above Does the PDD provide an explanation how the baseline chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC? - Ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol? 	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
60	<p>Project boundary - alternative to 32-33</p> <p>(a) Does the project boundary geographically delineate the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants?</p> <p>(a) If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land,</p> <p>(i) Does each discrete area of land have a unique geographical identification?</p> <p>(ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area?</p> <p>(ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land?</p> <p>(b) Does the project boundary encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are:</p> <p>(i) Under the control of the project participants;</p> <p>(ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and</p> <p>(iii) Significant?</p> <p>(c) Does the project boundary account for all changes in the following carbon pools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Above-ground biomass; - Below-ground biomass; 	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Litter; - Dead wood; and - Soil organic carbon? (c) Does the PDD provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The information of which carbon pools are selected? (ii) If one or more carbon pools are not selected, transparent and verifiable information that indicates, based on conservative assumptions, that the pool is not a source? (d) Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria in (b) above? 			
61 (a)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included appropriately described and justified in the PDD?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
61 (b)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are all gases and sources/sinks included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline or the LULUCF project appropriately justified?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
62	Monitoring plan - in addition to 35-39 Does the PDD provide an appropriate description of the sampling design that will be used for the calculation of the net anthropogenic removals by sinks occurring within the project boundary in the project scenario and, in case the baseline is monitored, in the baseline scenario, including, inter alia, stratification, determination of number of plots and plot distribution etc.?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
63	Does the PDD take into account only the	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?			
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
64 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
64 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
64 (d)	Are the baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage established appropriately as a result?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
66	Does the PDD include: (a) A description of the policy or goal that the JI PoA seeks to promote? (b) A geographical boundary for the JI PoA (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all JPAs included in the JI PoA will be implemented?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The maintenance of records for each JPA? – A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)? – Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA? (d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used? (e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA?			
67	<i>Project approvals by Parties involved - additional to 19-20</i> Are all Parties partly or entirely within the geographical boundary for the JI PoA listed as "Parties involved" and indicated as host Parties in the PDD?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
68	<i>Authorization of project participants by Parties involved - additional to 21</i> Is the coordinating entity presented in the PDD authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
69	<i>Baseline setting - additional to 22-26</i> Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
70	<i>Additionality - additional to 27-31</i> Does the PDD indicate at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(a) For the JI PoA (b) For each type of JPA			
71	<i>Crediting period - additional to 34</i> Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
72	<i>Monitoring plan - additional to 35-39</i> Is the monitoring plan established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A
73	For each real JPA listed, does the PDD provide the information of: (a) Name and brief summary of the JPA? (b) The type of JPA? (c) A geographical reference or other means of identification? (d) The name and contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the JPA? (e) The host Party(ies)? (f) The starting date of the JPA? (g) The length of the crediting period of the JPA? (h) Confirmation that the JPA meets all the eligibility requirements for its type, including a description of how these requirements are met? (i) Confirmation that the JPA has not been determined as a single JI project or determined under a different JI PoA?	Not applicable	N/A	N/A



DETERMINATION REPORT

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by determination team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Determination conclusion team
<u>Clarification Request (CL) 01:</u> Please provide the documented evidence of the losses in “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC networks for 2002.	-	The documented evidence in form of statistic report “Structure of power balance and technological power losses for transfer within power grid” for 2002 was provided to the determination team. Please refer to supporting documents 01.	The issue is closed.
<u>Clarification Request (CL) 02:</u> Please provide the documented evidence of implementation of the programme aimed at the reduction of TPL.	-	The documented evidence of implementation of the programme aimed at the reduction of TPL is the reports on investment plans implementation. These reports (for the period 2003-2011) were provided to the determination team.	The issue is closed.
<u>Clarification Request (CL) 03:</u> Please provide the documented evidence of the date since the project is considered to be a JI activity.	-	The starting date of the JI project is 20/12/2002 The Protocol of the “AES Rivneoblenergo” PJSC board of directors meeting on development and implementation of the Programme on TPL Reduction (Protocol # 12). The documented evidence was provided to the determination team. Please refer to the supporting documents Protokol.pdf	The issue is closed.



BUREAU
VERITAS

DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Clarification Request (CL) 04:</u> Please indicate which of the mentioned approaches is used for setting the baseline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - JI specific approach; - approved CDM methodology. 	22	<p>“The methodology used to determine the baseline and the corresponding calculations based on the JI specific approach, according to the Guidelines on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (version 03), paragraph 9a. Also, methodological tool “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” (Version 03.0.1) was used for setting of the baseline scenario and demonstration of additionality”.</p> <p>This information was added to the PDD version 2.0 (refer to the Section B.1).</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Clarification Request (CL) 05:</u> Please indicate the valid version of the document used.</p>	24	<p>At the start of the determination of the project, the latest version of "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" is version 04.0.0, dated from March 2, 2012. In this project, the project participants using a previous version of this tool, according to "Guidelines on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" (version 03), paragraph B (10), page 3 Thus “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” (Version 03.0.1) was used.</p> <p>This clarification was added to the PDD version 2.0 (refer to the Section B.1).</p>	The issue is closed.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Clarification request (CL) 06:</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.</p>	34 (d)	<p>“ERUs generation period will start at 01/01/2008 and will not exceed the project operation period.”</p> <p>This clarification was added to the PDD version 2.0 (refer to the Section C.3).</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Clarification request (CL) 07:</u> Please specify that the extension of the crediting period beyond 2012 is subject to the host Party approval.</p>	34 (d)	<p>The status of emissions reduction or enhancement of net removals generated by the JI projects after ending of the first commitment period within Kyoto Protocol (continuation of the crediting period after 2012) may be defined as per relevant agreements and procedures within the framework of UNFCCC and host country.</p> <p>This clarification was added to the PDD version 2.0 (refer to the Section C.3).</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Clarification request (CL) 08:</u> During the analysis of the PDD it was revealed that the project developer used JI specific approach for setting the monitoring plan, but it is not explicitly indicated. Please clearly describe in the PDD the approach chosen.</p>	35	<p>Methodology used to monitor emission reductions for the project based on a JI specific approach, according to the Guidelines on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (version 03), Article 9a. This approach is also foresees to use the approach similar to one used in the registered (ITL UA1000316) PDD “Khmelnyskoblenergo PJSC Power Distribution System Modernization”.</p> <p>This clarification was added to the PDD version 2.0 (refer to the Section D.1).</p>	The issue is closed.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<u>Clarification request (CL) 09:</u> Please provide the calculation algorithm for the parameter V_{α} .	36 (a)	Calculation of this parameter is carried out according to the algorithm as shown in the registered (ITL UA1000316) PDD "Khmelnyskoblenergo PJSC Power Distribution System Modernization". This clarification was added to the PDD version 2.0 (refer to the Section D.1.1.4)	The issue is closed.
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 01:</u> Please update the indicated production activities as per KVED (Classification of economic activities).	-	Production activities as per KVED were updated. The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section A.3).	The issue is closed.
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 02:</u> Please indicate geographic coordinates of the company's headquarters.	-	Geographic coordinates of the company's headquarters were indicated. The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section A.4.1.4).	The issue is closed.
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 03:</u> Please provide the project implementation schedule.	-	The implementation schedule and quantity and quality parameters of the project were developed within company's investment plans aimed at TPL reduction. These investment plans were provided to the determination team during the site visit. The main stages of the project implementation were described in the Section A.4.2.	The issue is closed.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 04:</u> Please justify the chosen duration of the crediting period.	-	The duration of the crediting period is 22 years were listed incorrectly. Correct duration of the crediting period is 25 years (300 months), which corresponds with the project operational lifetime. The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section C.3)	The issue is closed.
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 05:</u> The Letters of Approval from parties involved are absent.	19	Letters of Approval from Parties involved will be obtained after the successful determination process as per the acting regulations of the Parties.	Pending
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 06:</u> The PDD does not provide any information on how the registration of the project as JI activity will aid to overcome the identified barriers	29 (c)	The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section B.1)	The issue is closed.
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 07:</u> Please indicate the number of the mentioned table.	32 (c)	The number of the Table was indicated. The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section B.3)	The issue is closed.
<u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 08:</u> Please provide operational and management structure which will be developed by the project operator for monitoring plan implementation.	36 (b) (i)	Flow-chart of the monitoring structure was added. The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section D.3)	The issue is closed.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 09:</u> Please indicate who is responsible for providing the actual CO₂ emission factors for projects on power loss reduction in power supply networks of Ukraine.</p>	36 (b) (ii)	<p>Different emission factors data sources were used for emissions reduction calculation. The detailed description of the parameters was added to the Section B.1. For more transparency the same information was added to the Section D.2 of the PDD.</p> <p>The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section D.2)</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 10:</u> Please provide the documented evidence that the data to be monitored and needed for the determination will be stored for two years after last transfer of ERUs by the project.</p>	36 (b) (iii)	The documented evidence for the fact is the Order №434 dated 11/06/2012 which was provided to the determination team.	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 11:</u> Please provide the expanded formula of the emissions reduction calculation due to the project activity (Equation 2).</p>	36 (f)	<p>Equation 2 was corrected as per the requirement of the CAR.</p> <p>The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section D.1.4)</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 12:</u> Please indicate for the parameter EF_{grid, produced} the source of data and the page where the used for 2003-2007 values are indicated.</p>	36 (g)	<p>Data sources were provided.</p> <p>The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section B.1)</p>	The issue is closed.
<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 13:</u> Please indicate quality control and assurance procedures described in the Section D.2 of the PDD.</p>	36 (i)	<p>Quality control and assurance procedures are described in the PDD.</p> <p>The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section D.2)</p>	The issue is closed.



DETERMINATION REPORT

<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 14:</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>	<p>36 (k)</p>	<p>“Any negative impact on the environment as a result of project implementation is absent. Accordingly, the requirements of the country where the project is implemented cannot be applied”. Please refer to the PDD, version 2.0 (see Section D.1.5)</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p>
<p><u>Corrective Action Request (CAR) 15:</u> Please provide in the Section B.1 theoretical description of the chosen baseline.</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>The updated information is added to the PDD version 2.0 (please refer to the Section B.1)</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p>