



BUREAU
VERITAS

VERIFICATION REPORT LLC “ECO-ALLIANCE”

VERIFICATION OF THE
CMM utilisation on the coal mine
Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State
Holding Joint-Stock Company “GOAO
Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass”

3rd periodic

REPORT NO. UKRAINE-VER/0468/2012

REVISION No. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 16/07/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: LLC "ECO-ALLIANCE"	Client ref.: Mr. Kasyanov
<p>Summary:</p> <p>Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 3rd verification of the "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass", JI Registration Reference Number 0077, project of LLC "ECO-ALLIANCE" located in Donetsk region, Ukraine, and applying the methodology ACM0008 version 03, 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.</p> <p>The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Independent Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the monitoring report against project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.</p> <p>The first output of the verification process is a list of Clarification, Corrective Actions Requests, Forward Actions Requests (CR, CAR and FAR), presented in Appendix A.</p> <p>In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as per determined changes. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions, or misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 129 765 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent for the monitoring period from 16/03/2011 to 30/04/2012 (63 821 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent for the period 16/03/2011 – 31/12/2011 and 65 944 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent for the period 01/01/2012 – 30/04/2012).</p> <p>Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.</p>	

Report No.: UKRAINE-ver/0468/2012	Subject Group: JI
Project title: "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass"	
Work carried out by: Iuliia Pylnova – Team Leader, Lead Verifier Svitlana Gariyenchyk – Team Member, Lead Verifier Vladimir Kulish – Technical Specialist	
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer Vasyl Kobzar – Technical Specialist	
Work approved by: Ivan Sokolov – Operational Manager	
Date of this revision: 27/07/2012	Rev. No.: 02
Number of pages: 50	

- No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- Limited distribution
- Unrestricted distribution



Table of Contents		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	Objective	4
1.2	Scope	4
1.3	Verification Team	5
2	METHODOLOGY	5
2.1	Review of Documents	6
2.2	Follow-up Interviews	6
2.3	Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	7
3	VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS	7
3.1	Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications	8
3.2	Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)	8
3.3	Project implementation (92-93)	8
3.4	Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)	10
3.5	Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)	10
3.6	Data management (101)	11
3.7	Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110) (Not applicable)	12
4	VERIFICATION OPINION	12
5	REFERENCES	14
	APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL	19



Abbreviations

AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
BVC	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CH ₄	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CMM	Coal Mine Methane
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual
ERU	Emission Reduction Unit
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
JI	Joint Implementation
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
DFP	Designated Focal Point
NMHC	Non methane hydrocarbons
PDD	Project Design Document
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change



1 INTRODUCTION

LLC “ECO-ALLIANCE” has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project “CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company «GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass» (hereafter called “the project”) in Donetsk region, Ukraine.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

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

1.2 Scope

Verification scope is defined as an independent and objective review and ex post determination by the Accredited Independent Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions. The verification is based on the submitted monitoring report, the determined project design document including the project’s baseline study, revised monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

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



1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Iuliia Pylnova

Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier

Svitlana Gariyenchyk

Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Lead Verifier

Vladimir Kulish

Bureau Veritas Certification Technical Specialist

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov

Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Vasyl Kobzar

Bureau Veritas Certification Technical Specialist

2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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



2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) submitted by LLC “ECO-ALLIANCE” and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Approved CDM methodology ACM0008 and Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report versions 1, 2, 3, 4, and project as described in the determined PDD.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 15/05/2012 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 Coal Mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya, Eco-Alliance LLC. and Carbon-TF B.V. were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Coal Mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya	Organizational structure Responsibilities and authorities Roles and responsibilities for data collection and processing Installation of equipment Data logging, archiving, and reporting Metering equipment control Metering record keeping system, database IT management Training of personnel Quality management procedures and technology Internal audits and check-ups
Consultant: Carbon-TF B.V., Eco-Alliance LLC.	Baseline methodology Revised monitoring plan Monitoring report



2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

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

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

- (a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;
- (b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the Verification Team to assess compliance with the monitoring plan;
- (c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

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

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

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in



the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 28 Corrective Action Requests, 16 Clarification Requests, and 0 Forward Action Requests.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

There were two remaining issues: FAR 01 concerning keeping evidences of meters calibration status and FAR 02 concerning the issuance of a documented instruction/decreed prescribing the storage of data monitored and required for ERUs calculation for two year after the last transfer of ERUs for the project. Now FAR 01 is closed; FAR 02 was transformed (within this verification) into CAR 17 and then successfully resolved.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

The project was approved by the host Party, Ukraine, which is confirmed by the Letter of Approval of Ministry for Environmental Protection of Ukraine #3872/11/10-08, issued on 26/03/2008. The written project approval by the Netherlands, the other Party involved, has been issued by the DFP of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest (Approval of voluntary participation in a Joint Implementation Project of the Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Netherlands, Ref. 008JI04, dated 22/04/2008).

The abovementioned written approvals are unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

In this project CMM (coal mine methane), which has been sucked out of the active coal mine "Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya", has been utilised in upgraded previous coal boilers, a ventilation air heater, a flare, a cogeneration unit and an emergency generator. The methane has been burned to less harmful CO₂. The units have generated heat and power which have displaced conventionally produced heat and power and gained an additional amount of CO₂ reductions.

 VERIFICATION REPORT

The ventilation air heater was working only for short period of time from November 2011 till March 2012.

The emergency generator was not working during this monitoring period.

The summer boiler house worked until 04/10/2011, after that winter boiler house has worked until 17/04/2012.

The flare has been shut down at 23/10/2010 due to lacking gas amount and has been moved to the Coal Mine Nr.22 Kommunarskaya, J10078 at 29/10/2010. In September 2011 an identical flare has been re-installed and re-started operation at 09/09/2011.

The total CH₄-utilisation remained at the level of the last monitoring period.

Amount of methane utilised for heat and power generation

Unit	period	CH ₄ [t/peri od]	Heat Generation [MWh]	Power Generation [MWh]
Boilers	16/03/2011- 30/04/2012	3,701	13,875	-
Ventilation Air Heater	16/03/2011- 30/04/2012	185	2,526	-
Flare	16/03/2011- 30/04/2012	1,128	-	-
Cogeneration unit	16/03/2011- 30/04/2012	1,440	-	6,403
Emergency generator	16/03/2011- 30/04/2012	0	-	0
Total	2011-2012	6,454	16,401	6,403

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

The monitoring occurred in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and revised monitoring plan version 6a of 30/05/2012 which was positively determined in course of the current verification.

For calculating the emission reductions, key factors, such as availability and amount of extracted gas, concentration of methane in the extracted gas and others, influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account.

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions such as appropriately calibrated measuring devices, equipment passports, the study of standardized emission factors for the Ukrainian electricity grid, sectoral standards, IPCC guidelines, laboratory analysis, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, including default emission factors, are selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

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

3.5. Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

There were several deviations determined during previous monitoring periods.

The calculation of the emission reductions is not calculated on a yearly basis, but for an individual period.

Flow data and flare efficiency as well as the methane amount destroyed by flaring MD_{FI} are calculated in 15 min. intervals in Excel sheets. The main emissions variables for project emissions, baseline emissions and emissions reductions are calculated on a monthly basis. Yearly sums and a total sum for the monitoring are calculated.

The formula for the calculation of project emissions from uncombusted methane has been updated. Formulae from the «Methodological “Tool to determine project emissions from flaring gases containing methane”» [AM_Tool_07] have been applied. The calculation of project emissions from uncombusted methane from flaring is now more accurate.



The heat amount produced by the ventilation air heater and the power amount produced by the emergency power generation have not been measured but calculated using the utilised methane amount.

During this monitoring period there were also revisions to the monitoring plan (now detailed description of the revisions are provided in the Revised monitoring plan version 6a of 30/05/2012 which was positively determined in course of the current verification). The essence of the revision is following: new source for CO₂ emission factor of fuel used for captive power or heat was taken for more applicability as it was published by national authority. The factor is now calculated using the value for “Other Bituminous Coal” of 25.87 t C/TJ from “National Inventory Report of Anthropogenic Emissions from Sources and Absorption by Absorbers of Greenhouse Gases in Ukraine for 1990-2009” Baseline carbon emission factor for other bituminous coal approved in Ukraine.

The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision.

The proposed revision improves the accuracy and applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.

3.6. Data management (101)

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

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

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

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner.

The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan.

Two different but similar systems are used for electronically data collection.



Data from the boilers and the VAH are collected, processed and stored using a Siemens SIMATIC PLC S7 system and Siemens WINCC programming software. All data is stored in the internal memory about 2 GB. One time per hour the data are sent via GPS to an Internet-based Server data base. Eco-Alliance ensures regular back up's and archiving. The data can be read any time from the internet data base by authorised personnel. The utilised methane amount is automatically calculated and stored in the PLC. As all input data are stored, the automatically calculation can be checked in retrospect any time.

Data from the flare and the cogeneration unit are collected, processed and stored using a Siemens SIMATIC PLC S7 system and Siemens WINCC programming software. All data is stored in the internal memory about 2 GB. The data are read daily by Kuhse GmbH via GPS and stored in the Kuhse database in Germany. The data can be viewed any time using special access software provided by Kuhse. Kuhse ensures regular back ups and archiving. The data are regularly reviewed by Carbon-TF and Eco-Alliance. Carbon-TF provides regularly storing and archiving of the data as well as regularly transfer to Excel sheets for analysis, evaluation and reporting procedures.

The data can be read any time from the Kuhse data base by authorised personnel. The utilised methane amount is automatically calculated and stored in the PLC. As all input data are stored, the automatically calculation can be checked in retrospect any time.

For plausibility checks and potential data back up, data recorded by coal mine personnel in hand written journals can be taken. The journals are stored by the coal mine.

3.7. Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

Not applicable.

4. VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial, 3rd periodic verification of the "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass" Project in Ukraine, which applies the methodology ACM0008 version 3. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.



VERIFICATION REPORT

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

The management of LLC “ECO-ALLIANCE” is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the Monitoring Plan as per determined changes. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 04 of 20/07/2012 for the reporting period 16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as per determined changes. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

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

Reporting period: From 16/03/2011 to 31/12/2011

Baseline emissions	: 72 871	tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent.
Project emissions	: 9 050	tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 63 821	tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent.

Reporting period: From 01/01/2012 to 30/04/2012

Baseline emissions	: 75 596	tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent.
Project emissions	: 9 652	tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent.
Emission Reductions	: 65 944	tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent.

For the monitoring period (16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012), total amount of emission reductions is 129 765 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.



5. REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by the project participants that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ Project Design Document "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass", version 07 dated 06/08/2009
- /2/ Monitoring Report "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass", version 1 dated 31/05/2012
- /3/ Monitoring Report "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass", version 2 dated 26/06/2012
- /4/ Monitoring Report "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass", version 3 dated 17/07/2012
- /5/ Monitoring Report "CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company "GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass", version 4 dated 20/07/2012
- /6/ Revised Monitoring Plan version 1 of 07/03/2011
- /7/ Revised Monitoring Plan version 3 of 28/04/2011
- /8/ Revised Monitoring Plan version 5 of 19/05/2011
- /9/ Revised Monitoring Plan version 6a of 30/05/2012
- /10/ Excel-file "ER-SG-2011-03-16_to_2012-04-30_ERU3"
- /11/ Letter of Approval of Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine No 3872/11/10-08, issued on 26/03/2008
- /12/ Approval of voluntary participation in a Joint Implementation Project of the Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Netherlands No 008JI04, issued on 22/04/2008
- /13/ SG-B1+VAH_Measuring_Data_2011-03-16 to 2012-04-30.V0
- /14/ SG-F1_Measuring_Data_2011-09-05 to 2012-04-30.V1
- /15/ SG-M1_Measuring_Data_2011-03-16 to 2012-04-30.V1

**Category 2 Documents:**

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

- /1/ Logbook of Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine shifts, started 18/03/2012, I shift
- /2/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 56090, last calibration date–17/04/2012
- /3/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 41/1, last calibration date–17/04/2012
- /4/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 1, last calibration date–31/01/2012
- /5/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 3, last calibration date–31/01/2012
- /6/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 4, last calibration date–31/01/2012
- /7/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09443, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /8/ Certificate # 1021 dated 01/04/2011 (valid till 01/04/2012) on pressure difference transmitter type STD-3000, fabrication # 09W33C3180872001001.
- /9/ Certificate # 1203 dated 27/05/2011 (valid till 27/05/2012) on pressure transmitter type Sitrans P, fabrication # AZB/X1110844.
- /10/ Certificate # 1204 dated 27/05/2011 (valid till 27/05/2012) on pressure transmitter type Sitrans P, fabrication # AZB/A2199936.
- /11/ Certificate # 666 dated 11/04/2012 (valid till 11/04/2013) on pressure transmitter type Sitrans P, fabrication # AZB/A2199936.
- /12/ Passport on resistance thermometer JUMO, fabrication # TN005159870126666901008400007, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /13/ Certificate # 664 dated 11/04/2012 (valid till 11/04/2013) on pressure transmitter type Sitrans P, fabrication # AZB/X1110844.
- /14/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09456, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /15/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09444, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /16/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09448, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /17/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09451, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /18/ Passport on infrared meter ULTRAMAT23, fabrication # N1-BN-065, last calibration date–10/04/2012
- /19/ Passport on infrared meter ULTRAMAT23, fabrication # N1-WN-925, last calibration date–19/12/2011
- /20/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 501029, last calibration date–17/04/2012
- /21/ Passport on standard orifice, registration # 502741, last calibration

VERIFICATION REPORT

- date–17/04/2012
- /22/ Certificate # 2353 dated 09/12/2011 (valid till 09/12/2012) on pressure difference transmitter type STD 3000, fabrication # 09W12C3149127001001.
 - /23/ Certificate # 663 dated 11/04/2012 (valid till 11/04/2013) on pressure transmitter type Sitrans P, fabrication # AZB/X1110845
 - /24/ Passport on resistance thermometer JUMO, fabrication # TN005159870126666901008400002, last calibration date–14/06/2011
 - /25/ Certificate # 1138 dated 14/06/2011 (valid till 14/06/2012) on pressure difference transmitter type Sitrans P, fabrication # AZB/X1110845.
 - /26/ Utilized methane amount logbook, Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine
 - /27/ Emission reduction units automated monitoring system logbook for the period from 19/02/2010 to 17/04/2012 (Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine)
 - /28/ Logbook of Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine shifts, started 04/03/2011, finished 18/06/2011, I and II shifts
 - /29/ Photo–Emission reduction units automated monitoring system
 - /30/ Photo–Cogeneration unit type NC620K16, fabrication # 146401
 - /31/ Failure, interruption journal (cogeneration unit), daily data for the period from 05/11/2009 to 11/05/2012
 - /32/ Failure, interruption journal (flare unit), daily data for the period from 05/11/2011 to 12/05/2012
 - /33/ Flare unit operation logbook, daily data for the period from 14/09/2011 to 27/04/2012
 - /34/ General regime card on VAH-1 ## 1-4 (ventilation air heater)
 - /35/ Photo–VAH control display
 - /36/ Logbook on shift change and equipment examination
 - /37/ Passport on gas analyzer type BINOS 100, fabrication # 48987001, last calibration date–10/04/2012
 - /38/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09442, last calibration date–10/04/2012
 - /39/ Passport on resistance thermometer TSP U 1-3, fabrication # 09443.
 - /40/ Calibration certificate # 681 dated 11/04/2012, valid till 11/04/2013, on pressure transmitter type P121-E02-311, fabrication # Ex812127132
 - /41/ Calibration certificate # 1022 dated 01/04/2011, valid till 01/04/2012, on pressure transmitter type P121-E02-311, fabrication # Ex812127132
 - /42/ Gas composition analyses, Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine VPS
 - /43/ Order # 1135 dated 02/09/2011 on documentation storage within the project “CMM utilisation on the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya of the State Holding Joint-Stock Company “GOAO



- Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass”
- /44/ Statement dated 29/11/2011 on replacement of gas analyzer type Ultramat 23, fabrication # N1-WN-925 by gas analyzer type Ultramat 23, fabrication # N1-BN-065
 - /45/ Statement dated 09/09/2011 on pre-commissioning of KGUU 5/8, fabrication # 1192
 - /46/ Flare unit operation logbook, started 10/09/2011
 - /47/ Statement dated 10/06/2011 on boiler-house ERUs automated recording system shift into summer mode
 - /48/ Statement dated 23/10/2011 on boiler-house ERUs automated recording system shift into winter mode
 - /49/ Protocol of commission session on Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine boiler-house operators knowledge testing
 - /50/ Technical report on results of pre-commissioning, ecological, thermal and technical testing, and commissioning of boilers type ДKB-10/13 # 1 and # 4, Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine (works started December 2011, finished–January 2012), issued by Remen SPE
 - /51/ Technical report on results of pre-commissioning, ecological, thermal and technical testing, and commissioning of VAH-1, Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine (works started December 2011, finished–January 2012), issued by Remen SPE
 - /52/ Technical report on results of pre-commissioning, ecological, thermal and technical testing, and commissioning of boilers type E1/9Г # 1 and # 2, Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya Coal Mine summer boiler-house (April 2012), issued by Remen SPE
 - /53/ License Series АБ # 294458 issued to Remen Small Private Enterprise by Donetsk Regional State Administration on providing construction services
 - /54/ Information note АБ №318582 dated 24/09/2010 issued by the Single State Register of Enterprises and Organizations of Ukraine (EDRPOU)
 - /55/ Certificate dated 29/09/2010 on state registration of legal entity PJSC “COLLIERY GROUP “DONBAS”
 - /56/ Simatic WinCC flexible 2005 SP1 Standard. Floating license for engineering software.
 - /57/ Simatic S7, Step 7 Prof Ed 2006 SR2 certificate. Floating License for engineering software.
 - /58/ Simatic Sotware for Field PG M2 certificate. Single license for engineering software.
 - /59/ Accreditation certificate # 2H555 dated 01/12/2009 oa State Makiivka Scientific and Research Institute in Mining Safety Test Centre, valid till 30/11/2012, issued by the National Accreditation Office.
 - /60/ Passport on orifice, fabrication #486343, last calibration date – 17/04/2012
 - /61/ Passport on resistance thermometer JUMO, fabrication #200411.



VERIFICATION REPORT

Last calibration date – 10/04/2012

- /62/ Calibration certificate #667 on pressure transmitter, fabrication #Ex612124576 dated 11/04/2012.
- /63/ Calibration certificate #668 on pressure difference transmitter STD3000, fabrication #0609C2801413001002 dated 11/04/2012.
- /64/ Calibration certificate # 5235 dated 07/11/2011, valid till 07/11/2012, on chromatograph type Gazohrom, fabrication # 75

Persons interviewed:

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

- /1/ Viktor Orlov - chief engineer of PJSC “COLLIERY GROUP “DONBAS”
- /2/ Konstantyn Skryl – chief engineer of the coal mine “Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya”
- /3/ Oleksandr Rybalko– chief technologist of PJSC “COLLIERY GROUP “DONBAS”
- /4/ Mykola Dubovyi - chief mechanical engineer of the coal mine “Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya”
- /5/ Ievhenii Shelenkyn - chief electrician of the coal mine “Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya”
- /6/ Viktor Dikhno - heating engineer of the coal mine “Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya”
- /7/ Oleh Rutsyii – head of water facility department
- /8/ Volodymyr Semushyn - head of degassing department
- /9/ Oleksandr Honcharov – head of ventilation department
- /10/ Karl Woste – senior consultant, Carbon-TF B.V.
- /11/ Adam Hadulla – director of business development, Carbon_TF B.V.
- /12/ Viktor Avtonomov – monitoring assistant of “Eco-Alliance” Ltd.



VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	The project was approved as JI-project since 08/12/2009. The information concerning project approval is publicly available.	OK	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	The written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional.	OK	OK
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the	Some project measures have not been implemented in accordance with the PDD. The first flare has been moved to another JI project, JI0078 at «Coal Mine Nr.22 Kommunarskaya». The second flare was not installed due to Global Financial Crisis.		



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	UNFCCC JI website?	<p>Both flares are now pending due to the lacking gas amount. The flares will be re-installed as soon as the eligible gas amount will be available.</p> <p>CL 01. Please, clarify whether re-starting operation of the flare is considered by the project developers as revision to project design (for this monitoring period) or not. In case no, please, provide clarification needed in the monitoring report.</p> <p>CAR 07. Please, revise section A.7 of MR as now revisions (to the registered PDD) from the previous monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in this section.</p> <p>CAR 09. Please, correct the section A.9 of MR as the flare has been re-installed in September 2011, not in summer 2011.</p> <p>CAR 21. Please, revise the MR Annex 5 as now revisions (to the registered PDD) from the previous monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in the Annex.</p>	<p>CL 01</p> <p>CAR 07</p> <p>CAR 09</p> <p>CAR 21</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>CAR 23. The information concerning time of operation of winter and summer boiler houses is missing in the MR. Moreover it was observed during site visit that the same boiler house monitoring point (set of meters) is used in the both boiler houses. Please, add appropriate information to the MR and provide corresponding documented evidence.</p>	CAR 23	OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	<p>CAR 04. Please, update the description of project activity especially in the part related to the given monitoring period (16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012). Please, pay attention that the flare has been re-started not in summer 2011, but in autumn (exactly in September 2011).</p> <p>CAR 22. Please, correct the MR Annex 5 as the flare has been re-installed in September 2011, not in summer 2011.</p> <p>CAR 01. Please, provide the document which confirms the change of the project owner name (from State-run Coal Mine Association “GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass” to Public Joint Stock Company “Colliery Group “Donbas”). Please,</p>	<p>CAR 04</p> <p>CAR 22</p> <p>CAR 01</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>mention these documents in MR.</p> <p>CAR 02. Please, correct the phrase used in footnote #1 (there was not exactly the change of the coal mine name, but the change of the project owner name).</p> <p>CAR 03. Please, interpret the abbreviation <i>CMM</i> where it appears for the first time in the monitoring report.</p> <p>CAR 04. Please, update the description of project activity especially in the part related to the given monitoring period (16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012). Please, pay attention that the flare has been re-started not in summer 2011, but in autumn (exactly in September 2011).</p> <p>CAR 05. Please, provide documentary evidence of re-starting operation of the flare. Also, please, add the information on this documentation to MR.</p> <p>CL 02. Please, specify the period related to the operation time (for this monitoring period) of every unit in the table 2 of the MR section A.3.</p>	<p>CAR 02</p> <p>CAR 03</p> <p>CAR 04</p> <p>CAR 05</p> <p>CL 02</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>CL 03. Please, specify (in MR) the year of construction for two upgraded previously coal fired boilers of type E-1/9.</p> <p>CL 04. Please, revise the sentence below the table on ventilation air heater (pg. 5 of MR) because there are some linguistic mistakes.</p> <p>CL 10. Please, pay attention to the MR Annex 2 as all the words in the MR should be only in English (so the name of the technical drawing needs translation).</p>	<p>CL 03</p> <p>CL 04</p> <p>CL 10</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
Compliance with monitoring plan				
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	<p>No. The monitored occurred in line with the revised monitoring plan.</p> <p>CAR 14. Please, consider the change of the value of CO₂ emission factor of fuel used for captive power or heat as revision to the Monitoring plan.</p>	CAR 14	OK
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors,	CL 14. Please, submit the results of NMHC analysis of the captured gas and the accreditation certification of the laboratory	CL 14	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?	<p>which undertakes the NMHC. Note, that lab's accreditation validity during the whole monitoring period must be confirmed.</p> <p>CAR 13. Please, revise the value of CO₂ emission factor of fuel used of captive power or heat as the value for this factor now should be taken from national sources available not from IPCC. Please, correct the information in the table 6 of MR section B.2.1.</p> <p>CL 06. Please, revise the first comment given in the table 6 of MR section B.2.1 because there is a linguistic mistake.</p> <p>CAR 26. When mentioning the <i>efficiency of the power generation by emergency power generator</i>, please, provide reference to the revised monitoring plan as monitoring plan of the PDD now is not valid because it has been revised.</p>	<p>CAR 13</p> <p>CL 06</p> <p>CAR 26</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and	See CAR 13.	See CAR 13	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	transparent?	<p>CL 07. Please, provide the documentation on the Siemens SIMATIC PLC S7 and Siemens WINCC programming software.</p> <p>CL 05. Please, clarify whether Donbasvugleavtomatyka is involved as Third Party in the project (for making calibration of CH₄- concentration, etc) or not. In case no, please, make necessary corrections in MR.</p> <p>CAR 19a. Please, complete the list of references in the MR Annex 1 by providing reference to the National Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine.</p>	<p>CL 07</p> <p>CL 05</p> <p>CAR 19a</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	<p>See CAR 13 of this table.</p> <p>See CAR 14 of this table.</p>	<p>See CAR 13</p> <p>See CAR 14</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on	CAR 06. Please, update the numerical data used in the table 2 of the MR section A.3.	CAR 06	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	<p>CAR 19b. Please, update data on emission reductions through the whole monitoring report.</p> <p>CL 16. Please, explain why at the time of summer/winter season shift (during several days) there are no records concerning at least one of the boilers (summer or winter) operation.</p> <p>CL 11. Please, provide comparison of the planned in the PDD and actually achieved values of emission reductions and give detailed explanation of this deviation in the MR.</p> <p>CL 12. Please, complete the table 7 of MR section B.2.2 by adding missing data for some parameters.</p> <p>CAR 24. Please, make consistent format of numbers throughout the MR (pay attention to using commas and full stops).</p> <p>CL 09. Please, pay attention to the title of the table E-6 of the MR section D.3.4 as project emissions and emission reductions in this table are related to the</p>	<p>CAR 19b</p> <p>CL 16</p> <p>CL 11</p> <p>CL 12</p> <p>CAR 24</p> <p>CL 09</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<i>3rd monitoring period.</i>		
Applicable to JI SSC projects only				
96	Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring period on an annual average basis? If the threshold is exceeded, is the maximum emission reduction level estimated in the PDD for the JI SSC project or the bundle for the monitoring period determined?	N/A	N/A	N/A
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	N/A	N/A	N/A
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	N/A	N/A	N/A



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
98	If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report? Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?	N/A	N/A	N/A
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	<p>CAR 08. Please, revise section A.8 of MR as now revisions (to the registered monitoring plan) from the previous monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in this section.</p> <p>CAR 25. When describing the revision to Monitoring plan, please, state the essence of the change, the justification of the proposed revision and confirm whether the proposed revision improves the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the Monitoring plan (previously determined) without changing</p>	<p>CAR 08</p> <p>CAR 25</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.		
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	<p>CAR 20. Please, revise the MR Annex 4 as now revisions (to the registered monitoring plan) from the previous monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in the Annex.</p> <p>See CAR 14 of this table.</p> <p>See CAR 25 of this table.</p>	<p>CAR 20</p> <p>See CAR 14</p> <p>See CAR 25</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	<p>CAR 18. Please, provide reports on internal audits conducted at the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya during the monitoring period and work out in detail MR section C.3.</p> <p>CL 08. Please, revise the third paragraph in the section B.4 as there is a linguistic mistake made.</p>	<p>CAR 18</p> <p>CL 08</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	<p>CAR 10. Please, update information on the last calibration of the monitoring equipment (section B.1.2 of MR). Also, please, differentiate (where necessary) dates of the last verification and dates of other previous verifications.</p> <p>CAR 11. Please, update the calibrator name where it is needed (please, see the last column of table 5 of MR section B.1.2).</p> <p>CAR 12. Please, provide the work contracts signed with MakNII Institute, Sumystandardmetrologya, Donetskstandardmetrologya and other calibrators (if there are any others). Also, please, state the presence of these contracts in the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>CL 15. Please, provide the accreditation certificate of Sumystandardmetrologya and Donetskstandardmetrologya. Note, that the accreditation validity during the whole monitoring period must be confirmed.</p> <p>CL 13. Please, clarify whether there were measuring equipment replacement cases</p>	<p>CAR 10</p> <p>CAR 11</p> <p>CAR 12</p> <p>CL 15</p> <p>CL 13</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		during the monitoring period or not. In case yes, please, provide the records confirming the meters replacement.		
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	CAR 17. A documented instruction/decreed prescribing the storage of data monitored and required for ERUs calculation for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project should be issued and communicated to all responsible persons.	CAR 17	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	CAR 16. At the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya the order concerning indication of the names of the personnel involved in the monitoring should be issued.	CAR 16	OK
		CAR 15. Please, revise the section C.1.2 of MR by specifying and updating information on the training conducted during the monitoring period. Also, please provide documentary evidence of the conducting training and mention these documents in MR.	CAR 15	OK
Verification regarding programmes of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	N/A	N/A	N/A



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	N/A	N/A	N/A
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	N/A	N/A	N/A
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	N/A	N/A	N/A
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	N/A	N/A	N/A
Applicable to sample-based approach only				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be	N/A	N/A	N/A



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable, taking into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The types of JPAs; - The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used; - The geographical location of each JPA; - The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified; - The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified; - The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and - The samples selected for prior verifications, if any? 			



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?	N/A	N/A	N/A
108	Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then does the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?	N/A	N/A	N/A
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC ex ante assessment? (Optional)	N/A	N/A	N/A
110	If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions	N/A	N/A	N/A



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?			



VERIFICATION REPORT

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CAR 01. Please, provide the document which confirms the change of the project owner name (from State-run Coal Mine Association “GOAO Shakhtoupravlenye Donbass” to Public Joint Stock Company “Colliery Group “Donbas”). Please, mention these documents in MR.	93	Now the documents « SG-1 - Mine renaming.zip » are provided to the verification team.	The issue is closed based on the documentation provided.
CAR 02. Please, correct the phrase used in footnote #1 (there was not exactly the change of the coal mine name, but the change of the project owner name).	93	MR was corrected. Now the footnote #1 does not contain any mistakes.	The issue is closed based on the amendments made.
CAR 03. Please, interpret the abbreviation <i>CMM</i> where it appears for the first time in the monitoring report.	93	MR was corrected. The abbreviation was interpreted.	CAR 03 is closed due to the interpretation provided.
CAR 04. Please, update the description of project activity especially in the part related to the	93	Now, the information in the monitoring report is corrected. Please, see section A.3 of the monitoring	The issue is closed based on the modification made.



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>given monitoring period (16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012). Please, pay attention that the flare has been re-started not in summer 2011, but in autumn (exactly in September 2011).</p>		<p>report.</p>	
<p>CAR 05. Please, provide documentary evidence of re-starting operation of the flare. Also, please, add the information on this documentation to MR.</p>	<p>93</p>	<p>Response #1. The document was sent to BV.</p> <p>Response #2. MR was corrected.</p>	<p>Conclusion on response #1. Mentioning in the MR re-starting operation of the flare, please, provide reference to the documentation confirming this fact.</p> <p>Conclusion on response #2. The issue is closed based on the amendments made.</p>
<p>CL 01. Please, clarify whether re-starting operation of the flare is considered by the project developers as revision to project design (for this monitoring period) or not. In case no, please, provide</p>	<p>92</p>	<p>Response #1. The flare was <i>loan</i> to K22, so that was a temporarily change within the previous monitoring period. See A.3: <i>“As stated in the previous MR the flare has been shut</i></p>	<p>Conclusion on response #1. The fact of the flare shutting down due to lacking gas amount (in October</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>clarification needed in the monitoring report.</p>		<p><i>down at 23/10/2010 due to lacking gas amount and has been moved to the Coal Mine Nr.22 Kommunarskaya, JI0078 at 29/10/2010. In September 2011 an identical flare has been re-installed and re-started operation at 09/09/2011.”</i></p> <p>Now as the flare is returned back there is deviation with implementation schedule (indicated in the PDD) only in absence of second flare due to lack of gas amount and finance.</p>	<p>2010) and moving it to another JI project (JI0078 at «Coal Mine Nr.22 Kommunarskaya») occurred during the previous monitoring period and were reflected in the verification report of that period. Obviously, re-starting operation of the flare can be considered only as a change since last verification. Please, firstly, revise the section A.7 of the MR as there no revisions to the project design within this monitoring period (there is only the change since last verification); secondly, mentioning the changes related not to the</p>
---	--	--	---



VERIFICATION REPORT

		<p>Response #2. MR was corrected.</p>	<p>monitoring period (16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012), please, indicate that those changes took place in the previous monitoring period.</p> <p>Conclusion on response #2. One of two planned flares was not installed due to lack of funds and gas amount. This fact can not be considered as revision to the registered PDD. It is only deviation from the implementation schedule that should be explained in the section A.6 of the Monitoring Report.</p>
--	--	---	---



VERIFICATION REPORT

		Response #3. MR was corrected.	Conclusion on response #3. The issue is closed.
CL 02. Please, specify the period related to the operation time (for this monitoring period) of every unit in the table 2 of the MR section A.3.	93	The detailed information on operation time of units is given in section A.3. above the table 2.	The issue is closed based on the information added to the MR section 3.
CAR 06. Please, update the numerical data used in the table 2 of the MR section A.3.	95 (d)	Required amendments are now made in the table 2 of the MR.	The issue is closed due to the updates made.
CL 03. Please, specify (in MR) the year of construction for two upgraded previously coal fired boilers of type E-1/9.	93	MR was corrected. Required information is added to the section A.6.	Due to the data added to the MR section A.6, the issue is closed.
CL 04. Please, revise the sentence below the table on ventilation air heater (pg. 5 of MR) because there are some linguistic mistakes.	93	MR was corrected	The issue is closed based on the amendments made.
CAR 07. Please, revise section A.7 of MR as now revisions (to the registered PDD) from the previous monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in this section.	92	See response to CL 01.	Please, see comments on the response to CL 01.



VERIFICATION REPORT

CAR 08. Please, revise section A.8 of MR as now revisions (to the registered monitoring plan) from the previous monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in this section.	99 (a)	MR was corrected.	The issue is closed based on the corrections made.
CAR 09. Please, correct the section A.9 of MR as the flare has been re-installed in September 2011, not in summer 2011.	92	Now necessary correction is made in the MR section A.9.	Based on the correction made, the issue is closed.
CAR 10. Please, update information on the last calibration of the monitoring equipment (section B.1.2 of MR). Also, please, differentiate (where necessary) dates of the last verification and dates of other previous verifications.	101 (b)	MR was corrected.	The issue is closed due to the updating information in the MR.
CAR 11. Please, update the calibrator name where it is needed (please, see the last column of table 5 of MR section B.1.2).	101 (b)	MR was corrected	CAR 11 is closed based on the amendments made.
CAR 12. Please, provide the work contracts signed with MakNII Institute, Sumystandardmetrologya, Donetskstandardmetrologya and	101 (b)	Response #1. The documents were sent to BV.	Conclusion on response #1. Only accreditation certificates required were



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>other calibrators (if there are any others). Also, please, state the presence of these contracts in the Monitoring Report.</p>		<p>Response #2. The documents "Work contracts.rar" are provided to the verification team.</p>	<p>provided to the verification team. Please, provide also work contracts signed with the organizations mentioned previously (particularly, work contract with MakNII Institute).</p> <p>Conclusion on response #2. The issue is closed due to the documentation provided.</p>
<p>CL 05. Please, clarify whether Donbasvugleavtomatyka is involved as Third Party in the project (for making calibration of CH₄- concentration, etc) or not. In case no, please, make necessary corrections in MR.</p>	95 (b)	<p>Donbasvugleavtomatyka is no more involved into calibrations. MR was corrected.</p>	<p>The issue is closed based on the modification made.</p>
<p>CL 06. Please, revise the first comment given in the table 6 of MR section B.2.1 because there is a linguistic mistake.</p>	95 (a)	<p>Response #1. MR was corrected.</p>	<p>Conclusion on response #1. The mistake is still not corrected.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

		Response #2. MR was corrected.	Conclusion on response #2. The issue is closed due to the amendments made.
CAR 13. Please, revise the value of CO ₂ emission factor of fuel used of captive power or heat as the value for this factor now should be taken from national sources available not from IPCC. Please, correct the information in the table 6 of MR section B.2.1.	95 (a)	Required modification has been made. Please, see section B.2.1 of the monitoring report.	The issue is closed based on the correction made.
CAR 14. Please, consider the change of the value of CO ₂ emission factor of fuel used for captive power or heat as revision to the Monitoring plan.	94	Required modification is made in the Monitoring Report.	The issue is closed based on the correction made.
CL 07. Please, provide the documentation on the Siemens SIMATIC PLC S7 and Siemens WINCC programming software.	95 (b)	Documents " SG-2 - Certificates.zip " are provided to the verification team.	The issue is closed due to the documentation provided.
CL 08. Please, revise the third paragraph in the section B.4 as there is a linguistic mistake made.	101 (a)	MR was corrected.	The issue is closed.



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 15. Please, revise the section C.1.2 of MR by specifying and updating information on the training conducted during the monitoring period. Also, please provide documentary evidence of the conducting training and mention these documents in MR.</p>	101 (d)	As no new personnel were employed no trainings were conducted.	CAR 15 is closed based on the clarification received.
<p>CAR 16. At the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya the order concerning indication of the names of the personnel involved in the monitoring should be issued.</p>	101 (d)	Document was sent to BV.	Due to the documentation provided, the issue is closed.
<p>CAR 17. A documented instruction/decreed prescribing the storage of data monitored and required for ERUs calculation for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project should be issued and communicated to all responsible persons.</p>	101 (a)	The document was sent to BV.	CAR 17 is closed as the required document is provided.
<p>CAR 18. Please, provide reports on internal audits conducted at the coal mine Shcheglovskaya-Glubokaya during the monitoring period and work out in detail MR section C.3.</p>	101 (a)	Response #1. Section C.3. was worked in detail under paragraph "QM procedure".	Conclusion on response #1. The section C.3 is still remained unchanged.



VERIFICATION REPORT

		Response #2. MR was corrected.	Conclusion on response #2. The issue is closed.
CAR 19b. Please, update data on emission reductions through the whole monitoring report.	95 (d)	The information in the monitoring report is updated.	Due to the modification made, CAR 19b is closed.
CL 09. Please, pay attention to the title of the table E-6 of the MR section D.3.4 as project emissions and emission reductions in this table are related to the 3 rd monitoring period.	95 (d)	MR was corrected.	The issue is closed based on the amendments made.
CAR 19a. Please, complete the list of references in the MR Annex 1 by providing reference to the National Environmental Investment Agency.	95 (b)	Necessary reference is provided. Please, see Annex 1 of the monitoring report.	The issue is closed based on the information added.
CL 10. Please, pay attention to the MR Annex 2 as all the words in the MR should be only in English (so the name of the technical drawing needs translation).	93	MR was corrected. Annex 2 of the MR is now in English.	Due to the correction made, the issue is closed.
CAR 20. Please, revise the MR Annex 4 as now revisions (to the registered monitoring plan) from the previous monitoring period	99 (b)	Response #1. The Annex 4 is given to show all revisions to Monitoring Plan for information.	Conclusion on response #1. Please, add to the MR Annex 4



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>(already determined) are mentioned in the Annex.</p>		<p>Response #2. MR was corrected.</p> <p>Response #3. MR was corrected.</p>	<p>information on the revision related to the monitoring period (16/03/2011 – 30/04/2012). But for all that distinguish the revision from previous monitoring period and the present one.</p> <p>Conclusion on response #2. Please, distinguish (in Annex 4) revision from previous monitoring period and present one. These amendments are still not made.</p> <p>Conclusion on response #3. The issue is closed.</p>
<p>CAR 21. Please, revise the MR Annex 5 as now revisions (to the registered PDD) from the previous</p>	<p>92</p>	<p>Response #1. The Annex 5 is given to show all changes between PDD and the implemented</p>	<p>Conclusion on response #1. Please, indicate (in</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>monitoring period (already determined) are mentioned in the Annex.</p>		<p>project.</p> <p>Response #2. MR was corrected.</p>	<p>the Annex 5 of the MR) that this Annex shows all the changes between PDD and the implemented project, but there are no changes to the registered PDD just in this monitoring period.</p> <p>Conclusion on response #2. The issue is closed based on the modification made.</p>
<p>CAR 22. Please, correct the MR Annex 5 as the flare has been re-installed in September 2011, not in summer 2011.</p>	<p>93</p>	<p>The information is corrected. Please, see Annex 5 of the monitoring report.</p>	<p>CAR 22 is closed based on the amendments made.</p>
<p>CL 11. Please, provide comparison of the planned in the PDD and actually achieved values of emission reductions and give detailed explanation of this deviation in the MR.</p>	<p>95 (d)</p>	<p>The comparison of planned and achieved emission reductions is given in section D.3.1 of the MR.</p>	<p>The issue is closed based on the amendments made.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 23. The information concerning time of operation of winter and summer boiler houses is missing in the MR. Moreover it was observed during site visit that the same boiler house monitoring point (set of meters) is used in the both boiler houses. Please, add appropriate information to the MR and provide corresponding documented evidence.</p>	92	<p>The information concerning time of operation of winter and summer boilers is given in section A.3. Documents were sent to BV.</p>	<p>The issue is closed due to the information provided and amendments made.</p>
<p>CAR 24. Please, make consistent format of numbers throughout the MR (pay attention to using commas and full stops).</p>	95 (d)	<p>MR was corrected.</p>	<p>The issue is closed as necessary corrections are made.</p>
<p>CAR 25. When describing the revision to Monitoring plan, please, state the essence of the change, the justification of the proposed revision and confirm whether the proposed revision improves the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the Monitoring plan (previously determined) without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.</p>	99 (a)	<p>MR was corrected. Now required information is presented in the Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>CAR 25 is closed based on the modification made in the Monitoring Report.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 26. When mentioning the efficiency of the power generation by emergency power generator, please, provide reference to the revised monitoring plan as monitoring plan of the PDD now is not valid because it has been revised.</p>	95 (a)	<p>The efficiency EffEPG of 36% is not specified in the original monitoring plan (Section D of the PDD) but in the technical description (Section A.4). While this part of the PDD has not been changed, revised or modified, it's still valid.</p>	<p>The issue is closed due explanation provided.</p>
<p>CL 12. Please, complete the table 7 of MR section B.2.2 by adding missing data for some parameters.</p>	95 (d)	<p>MR was corrected.</p>	<p>Based on the information added to the Monitoring Report, the issue is closed.</p>
<p>CL 13. Please, clarify whether there were measuring equipment replacement cases during the monitoring period or not. In case yes, please, provide the records confirming the meters replacement.</p>	101 (b)	<p>There was replacement of gas analyzer at the boilerhouse. Act of replacement was sent to BV.</p>	<p>The issue is closed due to the documents provided to the verification team.</p>
<p>CL 14. Please, submit the results of NMHC analysis of the captured gas and the accreditation certification of the laboratory which undertakes the NMHC. Note, that lab's accreditation validity during the whole monitoring period must be confirmed.</p>	95 (a)	<p>The gas analysis was sent to BV. Accreditation certificate "SG-3 - Licence MAKNI 2009-12-01 to 2012-10-30.pdf" is provided to the verification team.</p>	<p>Based on the information provided, the issue is closed.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CL 15. Please, provide the accreditation certificate of Sumystandardmetrologya and Donetskstandardmetrologya. Note, that the accreditation validity during the whole monitoring period must be confirmed.</p>	101 (b)	<p>Documents “SG-4 - Accreditation certificates.rar” are provided to the verification team.</p>	<p>The issue is closed due to the documentation provided to the verification team.</p>
<p>CL 16. Please, explain why at the time of summer/winter season shift (during several days) there are no records concerning at least one of the boilers (summer or winter) operation.</p>	95 (d)	<p>The periods when there are no data records of boilers concur with time when monitoring system should be switched from winter mode to summer and back. Due to some delays in adjustment of monitoring equipment the monitoring system wasn't switched on exactly at the date of boilers operation start so there is no available data for such periods.</p>	<p>Based on the explanation provided to the verification team, CL 16 is closed.</p>