



BUREAU
VERITAS

VERIFICATION REPORT LLC “PRIMLIGHT”

VERIFICATION OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF ENERGY EFFICIENT LIGHT BULBS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS OF UKRAINE

(01/01/2008 – 31/12/2011

FOR THE PART PERFORMED BY LLC “PRIMLIGHT”)

REPORT No. UKRAINE-VER/0698/2012

REVISION No. 04

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 21/09/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding
Client: LLC "Primlight"	Client ref.: Mykola Tonkovyd

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the periodic verification of the "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", UA1000299, project of LLC "Primlight" located in all regions of Ukraine, and applying JI specific approach, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

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

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as 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 2 486 627 tonnes of CO₂equivalent for the monitoring period 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2011 for the part performed by LLC "Primlight" (144 651 tonnes of CO₂equivalent for the period 01/01/2008-31/12/2008, 495 455 tonnes of CO₂equivalent for the period 01/01/2009-31/12/2009, 830 079 tonnes of CO₂equivalent for the period 01/01/2010-31/12/2010, 1 016 442 tonnes of CO₂equivalent for the period 01/01/2011-31/12/2011 – for the part performed by LLC "Primlight").

Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.

Report No.:	Subject Group:		
UKRAINE-ver/0698/2012	JI		
Project title:	"Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine"		
Work carried out by:	Oleg Skoblyk – Team leader, Lead Verifier		
Work reviewed by:	Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer Pavlo Rosen – Technical Specialist		
Work approved by:	Ivan Sokolov – Operational Manager		
Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
28/09/2012	04	50	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited distribution
			<input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution



Table of Contents		Page
1	Introduction	3
1.1	Objective	3
1.2	Scope	3
1.3	Verification Team	4
2	Methodology	4
2.1	Review of Documents	5
2.2	Follow-up Interviews	5
2.3	Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	6
3	VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS	7
3.1	Remaining issues and FARs from determination / 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) (Not applicable)	12
3.6	Data management (101)	14
3.7	Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110) (Not applicable)	15
4	Verification opinion	15
5	References	17
	Appendix A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL	23



1 INTRODUCTION

LLC “Primlight” has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project “Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine” (hereafter called “the project”) in all regions of Ukraine.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

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

1.2 Scope

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

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



1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Oleg Skoblyk
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Lead Verifier

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ivan Sokolov
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

Pavlo Rosen
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 “Primlight” and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), 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 (prepared by LLC “Primlight”) and project as described in the determined PDD version 01.5.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 06/03/2012 and 20/09/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of LLC “Primlight”, CFLs distribution companies and CFLs consumers were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1 Interview topics**

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
LLC "Primlight"	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 Baseline methodology Revised monitoring plan Monitoring report
Representatives of CFLs distribution companies and CFLs consumers	CFLs sale monitoring Responsibilities for the monitoring Legal relationship between LLC "Primlight" and CFLs distributorships / consumers

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 10 Corrective Action Requests, 11 Clarification Requests, and 2 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 determination / previous verifications

There are two pending issues remained from determination: FAR 01 concerning keeping monitoring data for two years after the last transfer of emission reductions units for the project; FAR 02 concerns issuance of the order concerning indication of the names of the personnel involved in the monitoring. These issues are still under consideration due to the issue of confidentiality that is not solved yet. FAR 01 and FAR 02 will be checked during the next periodic verification.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval by the Party involved in the JI project, other than the host Party has been received (Written Approval of Voluntary Participation from Estonia's Designed Focal Point under Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol for the project "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", #12-1/7267 of 27/09/2011). The abovementioned written approval will be unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

The project involves distribution of energy efficient light bulbs to various customers from public and private sectors. The project is conducted within the geographical boundaries of Ukraine and it is implemented and managed by LLC "Primlight".

The goal of the project is to enhance the energy efficiency of Ukraine's lighting stock by distributing over a period of about fifteen years approximately two hundred ten million compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) to Ukrainian customers from private, as well as from public sectors. By doing so, the project abate greenhouse gas emissions through avoided electricity usage, significantly reduce national electricity demand and stress on energy infrastructure, and save customer's money on their electricity bills.

Although CFLs were introduced to the Ukrainian market as early as 2004, they have failed to replace incandescent lamps as the largest component of the Ukrainian lighting stock. Moreover, the sales of incandescent lamps accelerated during 2009 and 2010. The ubiquity of incandescent lamps is attributed to their low cost combined with the relatively low wealth level of



an average Ukrainian citizen (in 2010, the average consolidated financial wealth per Ukrainian person was equal to 947 USD).

Under the present JI project scheme, quality self-ballasted CFLs are distributed to residential households, as well as to industrial, commercial and government organizations. Once the CFLs have reached their end of life, or any CFLs which have failed prematurely during the project period, the project team would arrange for the collection and disposal of CFLs as per applicable environmental norms.

In order to create a rapid uptake of CFL use, the proposed JI project utilizes one of two types of incentives or their combination:

1) Discount;

The customers receive CFLs free of charge or at a heavily discounted price.

2) Rebate;

The customers pay full price of CFLs upfront and then are reimbursed gradually after certain time periods in several installments.

The incentives can vary for different types of consumers according to the marketing policies of the project, and can be up to 50% or free of charge. In any case, the average (of all CFLs distributed within the project for any given year) incentive will be no less than 20% of the average market price of a CFL for that particular year. If in the future this condition is not met, the project owner will re-evaluate the additionality of the project.

Apart from the direct financial benefit to the project participants in terms of savings on their electricity bills, this JI project activity also generates a range of less tangible social outcomes in education, awareness and collateral energy saving measures. This energy efficiency project creates an opportunity for collective action on climate change, enhancing a sense of responsibility for the future of our planet. At the same time, the lumen outputs of the CFLs that are used within the project are equal or exceed the corresponding lumen outputs of incandescent lamps. This means that the CFL that changes an incandescent lamp has the same or better "brightness". This is confirmed by CFL certificates and is a part of the project database (in the format of Excel file) provided to the verification team.

The implementation status is monitored through examining collection of CFL nameplate data, monitoring use of project devices, establishment of project sample group and project database.

The project activity started on 26/11/2007. The project currently at the phase of distribution of CFLs, combined with monitoring activity.



Distribution to the households has been delayed due to time consuming infrastructure development. On the other hand the distribution to legal entities goes ahead of the schedule. This compensates the delay with households.

The actual operation of the proposed project is in the Monitoring report version 4.

The monitoring for the above mentioned period (01/01/2008 – 31/12/2011) has been conducted by two entities, namely LLC “Primlight” (for the period 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2011) and Gazotron–Lux Ltd. (for the period 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2010). The CFLs from their databases clearly traceable and totally different that excludes double counting.

The first periodic monitoring report for the period from 01/01/2008 to 31/12/2010 was based on the data from Gazotron –Lux Ltd. And it was submitted on the 19th of September 2011. The present monitoring report is based on the data from LLC “Primlight” (for the period 01/01/2008 – 31/12/2011) with a separate database which is an essential part of the report. Electronic database of LLC “Primlight” is supported by corresponding paper documentation such as invoices, contracts, etc. The CFLs reflected in the monitoring report of the final version (presented to the verification team) are only those installed until the end of 2010.

The identified areas of concern as to Project implementation, project participants response and BV Certification’s conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CL 01, CL 02, CL 03, CL 08, and CAR 06).

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

The monitoring occurred not only in accordance with the previously determined monitoring plan but also in accordance with the revisions to the monitoring plan provided in the section A.7 of the monitoring report of the final version (determined within the present verification).

For calculating the emission reductions, key factors, such as (total number of CFLs distributed, average operating hours, the number of operational CFLs, wattage difference between CFL corresponding incandescent lamps, and carbon emission factor), influencing the baseline



emissions and project emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Collection of CFL Nameplate Data

The project coordinator keeps a record of the power rating of the CFLs distributed during the project activity and uses this to determine the weighted average power rating for the project devices. CFLs distributed under the JI project are marked with a logo to ensure that they can be unambiguously differentiated from other light bulbs.

Monitoring Use of Project Devices

Monitoring a sample of distributed CFLs to determine average hours of utilization or total energy consumption has been undertaken by installing metering equipment to consumers belonging to the Project Sample Group (PSG). PSG size is 100 participants.

The annual operating hours of monitored devices are used to determine the energy baseline. The average hours of use of light bulbs found in the PSG are directly extrapolated to all consumers involved in the project. The purpose of establishing the PSG is to create a representative sample of all other project consumers. It is not possible to monitor all consumers involved in the project, and it is a fundamentally agreed scientific and statistical procedure to apply mean values obtained through sampling to the broader population. Therefore, for each monitoring period a mean value is obtained for the time of use then statistically corrected to a confidence level of 95% (similar to AM0046 version 2), and extrapolated across the total number of bulbs operating during that monitoring period. This is used in the calculations of emission reductions.

Establishment of Project Sample Group

The procedure to determine the sample of CFLs ensures that they adequately represent the broader population, minimizing sampling error. Given that participation in the project is voluntary, determination of the exact population of participating consumers prior to establishment of the PSG is not possible. In addition, because the project coordinator cannot force consumers to participate in sample groups, the devices monitored in the resulting sample are to a degree, self-selected rather than purely random. Despite these limitations, the project owner ensures that devices sampled are representative of the broader population of measures in participating consumers.



The results obtained from the sampling process are directly extrapolated across the entire population of consumers participating in the project. Therefore, the proportion of CFLs installed at PSG and continuing to function as determined through the check is taken to be representative of the pattern occurring to all consumers.

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.

The monitoring periods per component of the project are clearly specified in the monitoring report and do not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past.

Nevertheless, there is a relatively large discrepancy between the ex ante emission reductions and the monitored reductions (by both the first and the second (present) reports). This discrepancy is attributed to the difference between the theoretical hours of utilization and real ones. The default value for ex-ante calculations was 3,7 operating hours (highly conservative), while monitored average value was 8,43 operating hours. It can also be explained by the fact that during this period of distribution mostly legal entities (offices, commercial buildings, manufacturing facilities, etc.) were targeted, rather than individual households.

The identified areas of concern as to Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology, project participants response and BV Certification's conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CAR 01, CL 04, CAR 02, CAR 03, CAR 04, CAR 05, CL 06, CL 07, CL 09, CL 10, CAR 08, CL 11, CAR 09, and CAR 10).

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

The monitoring occurred not only in accordance with the previously determined monitoring plan but also in accordance with the revisions to the monitoring plan provided in the section A.7 of the monitoring report of the final version.

Based on the principles of conservatism in the calculation of GHG emission reductions under the project was submitted coefficient which equals 0,889 taking into account the demand for CFL in the absence of the project activity. The study, conducted by the project participant showed distribution by types of lamps in Ukraine, the results of which are

following (also they were partly provided in the Appendix 2 of the PDD version 1.5):

Distribution by types of lamps

Type	Percentage
Incandescent	80%
Compact fluorescent lamps	10%
High pressure gas discharge lamps	2%
Other (not compact fluorescent, LED, etc)	8%

As the high pressure gas discharge lamps and other lamps (industrial spotlights, LED bulbs, etc.) have a different cartridge and require additional hardware to install compared to an incandescent lamp they cannot be considered in the process of baseline forming.

Eliminating the lamp provided above, we the following ratio for the types of lamps in Ukraine without the JI project are obtained: incandescent – 88,9%, CFL - 11,1%. This ratio can draw the following conclusions:

- in the distribution of CFLs based on the needs of light, both in private and in the commercial and public sectors, 11,1% of lamps that were installed before the project and were replaced under the project activity was CFL or similar lamps;
- in case of absence of the JI project, which provided favorable conditions for purchasing a CFLs for consumers
- 11,1% of lighting power are still amounted the CFL or similar lamps.

From the above it follows that the reduction of GHG emissions occur only at 88,9% set by the project activity CFL. Since the activities under this project will definitely affect statistics of market lighting equipment Ukraine, this factor is taken as unchanged during the term of the project, and is equal to 0,889.

Thus, application of the correction factor for baseline share of CFLs (0,889) is considered as revision to the previously determined monitoring plan. This revision in fact improves accuracy and applicability of monitoring data.



3.6 Data management (101)

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

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

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

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

The project owner develops and manages a project database that records all information relevant to project activities and monitoring, including:

- A list of participating consumers, including information to identify consumers by name and address.
- A record of the CFLs (date, number, type and power) provided to each consumer.
- A list of participants included in the PSG, including information to identify participants (name, address and date added to the sample group).
- The following data relating to monitored CFLs and equipment:
 - o Identification number for each piece of equipment
 - o Type of monitoring equipment and date of installation
 - o Confirmation at each check that monitoring equipment is functioning
 - o Confirmation at each check that the monitored CFL is functioning
 - o Utilization data (hours of use and/or electricity consumption)

Personnel responsible for the monitoring

Responsibility	Staff
General guidance	Vice-CEO (LLC "Primlight")
Selection & recruitment of sample groups	Sales managers (LLC "Primlight")
Periodic collection of monitoring data	Sales managers (LLC "Primlight")



Database maintenance	Financial Directors (LLC “Primlight”)
Preparation of monitoring reports for emission reduction verification	Head Analyst (LLC “Primlight”)

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

The identified areas of concern as to Data management, project participants response and BV Certification’s conclusion are described in Appendix A (refer to CL 05, FAR 01, and FAR 02).

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110) (“Not applicable”)

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the periodic verification of the “Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine” Project in Ukraine, which applies JI specific approach. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

The management of LLC “Primlight” is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the Project Revised Monitoring Plan (included in the Monitoring Report of final version). The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission



VERIFICATION REPORT

reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 4 for the reporting period as indicated below. 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 01/01/2008 to 31/12/2011 (for the part performed by LLC "Primlight")

Emission Reductions (Year 2008) : 144 651 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.
Emission Reductions (Year 2009) : 495 455 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.
Emission Reductions (Year 2010) : 830 079 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.
Emission Reductions (Year 2011) : 1 016 442 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.

Total emission reductions (2008-2011): 2 486 627 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent (detailed calculation of emission reductions are presented in the Excel-file provided to the verification team).



5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by LLC "Primlight" that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

- /1/ PDD "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine" version 01.5 of 21/05/2011.
- /2/ Excel file "ERUs calculation and contract partners list_ "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs" (from LLC "Primlight").
- /3/ Monitoring Report "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", prepared by LLC "Primlight", version 1 of 19/02/2012.
- /4/ Monitoring Report "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", prepared by LLC "Primlight", version 2 of 05/03/2012.
- /5/ Monitoring Report "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", prepared by LLC "Primlight", version 3 of 19/09/2012.
- /6/ Monitoring Report "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", prepared by LLC "Primlight", version 4 of 25/09/2012.
- /7/ Written Approval of Voluntary Participation from Estonia's Designed Focal Point under Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol for the project "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine", #12-1/7267 of 27/09/2011.
- /8/ Letter of Approval #2640/23/7 of 20/09/2011 for the JI project "Distribution of energy efficient light bulbs in public and private sectors of Ukraine" issued by State Environmental Investment Agency of Ukraine.

Category 2 Documents:

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

- /1/ Glossary of JI terms, version 03, JISC
- /2/ Guidance on Criteria for Baseline Setting and Monitoring, version 03, JISC



VERIFICATION REPORT

- /3/ JISC "Clarification regarding the public availability of documents under the verification procedure under the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee", version 03
- /4/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-090713/13 of 13/07/2009 between ME "Kievpastrans" and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /5/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-090/31/1 of 31/07/2009 between Committee on Drug Control and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /6/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-090731/09 of 2009 between Sanatorium "Mountain Sun" of the Ministry of Health Care of Ukraine and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /7/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-100112/11 of 11/01/2010 between Kherson Boarding School and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /8/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-100512/1 of 12/05/2010 between School № 66, Kyiv and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /9/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-100427/1 of 27/04/2010 between ME DNG № 746, Kyiv and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /10/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-0908041/12 of 13/07/2009 between UKRAINIAN STATE ASSOCIATION "Polytechmed" and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /11/ Contract # №12-090708/6 between Vinnitsa National Medical University named by M.I.Pyrohov and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /12/ Contract # №12-ПЛ-090710/13 of 13/07/2009 between Kharkiv National Medical University and LLC "Primlight" on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs
- /13/ Certificate dated 29/01/2007 of Conformity, Low Voltage Directive 2006/95/EC (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), report #28203037001, issued by TÜV Rheinland InterCert kft.
- /14/ Certificate #S60017063 dated 30/01/2007, valid till 29/01/2012 (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), issued by TÜV Rheinland Product Safety GmbH



- /15/ Certificate #V60017068 dated 30/01/2007 (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), issued by TÜV Rheinland Product Safety GmbH
- /16/ Certificate dated 26/04/2007 of Conformity to Low Voltage Directive 2006/95/EC (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), report #28203037002, issued by TÜV Rheinland InterCert kft.
- /17/ Certificate #S60017063 dated 26/04/2007, valid till 29/01/2012 (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), issued by TÜV Rheinland Product Safety GmbH
- /18/ Certificate #V60017068 dated 26/04/2007 (energy saving lamp), issued by TÜV Rheinland Product Safety GmbH
- /19/ Certificate dated 28/06/2007 of Conformity to Low Voltage Directive 2006/95/EC (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), report #28203037003, issued by TÜV Rheinland InterCert kft.
- /20/ Certificate #S60017063 dated 28/06/2007, valid till 29/01/2012 (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), issued by TÜV Rheinland Product Safety GmbH
- /21/ Certificate #V60017068 dated 29/06/2007 (evaluation of self-ballasted lamps for general lighting services), issued by TÜV Rheinland Product Safety GmbH
- /22/ Certificate of conformity #UA1.035.0080031-11, Series BB, valid 21/06/2011-20/06/2012, issued by the State Committee of Ukraine for technical regulation and consumer policy
- /23/ Certificate of conformity #UA1.035.0112774-10, Series BB, valid 14/09/2010-29/09/2015, issued by the State Committee of Ukraine for technical regulation and consumer policy
- /24/ Certificate #UA.2.039.05078-10, dated 30/08/2010 on quality control system, valid till 29/08/2015
- /25/ Certificate of conformity # POCC UA.ME64.BO9357, valid from 29/10/2010 till 29/10/2013
- /26/ Statement dated 10/04/2008 on compact fluorescent lamps



marking

- /27/ Statement dated 03/02/2011 on compact fluorescent lamps utilization
- /28/ Statement dated 31/08/2009 on compact fluorescent lamps recording and exploitation rules
- /29/ Certificate of conformity # BY/112 03.03.002 15428, series A, valid from 02/12/2010 till 29/08/2015
- /30/ License #564600 dated 22/03/2011, series AB, valid 14/03/2011 – 14/03/2016, issued by the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine
- /31/ Conclusion of state sanitary and epidemiological expert examination #03.02-22/388/7555 dated 11/10/2006, issued by the Rivne Region Sanitary and Epidemiological Station
- /32/ Conclusion of state sanitary and epidemiological expert examination #03.01-25/48/1519 dated 18/02/2011, issued by the State Sanitary and Epidemiological Service
- /33/ Contract #247 dated 05/07/2011, valid from 05/07/2011 till 31/12/2013
- /34/ Fax #80577544277 dated 17/02/2011 on services cost on handling different types of wastes as of 20/01/2011, Ekosfera Scientific and Production Enterprise LLC
- /35/ License #361301, series AB, dated 21/08/2007, valid 16/08/2007 – 16/08/2012, issued by the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine
- /36/ License #487720, series AB, dated 22/12/2009, valid 23/12/2009 – 23/12/2014, issued by the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Ukraine
- /37/ Contract #02/0203-11 dated 02/03/2011, valid from 05/07/2011 till 31/12/2014
- /38/ Certificate on state metrology attestation #11-00/206 dated 08.07.2011 (lighting logger, #LL10070209), issued by the Scientific and Production Institute of Metrological Assurance of Electromagnetic Units



- /39/ Contract #12-ПЛ-090703/5 between SU "Clinic Medical Academy" State Institution "Dnipropetrovsk Medical Academy, Ministry of Health" and LLC "Primlight" of 02/07/2009 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /40/ Contract #12-ПЛ-100111/3 between UE "Kherson City Hospital" and LLC "Primlight" of 11/06/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /41/ Contract #12-ПЛ-100128/2 between Culture office of KCC and LLC "Primlight" of 28/01/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /42/ Contract #12-ПЛ-10122415 between MUC "Corund" and LLC "Primlight" of 24/12/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /43/ Contract #12-ПЛ-100111/25 between Kherson city dental clinic and LLC "Primlight" of 11/01/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /44/ Contract #12-ПЛ-101224/2 between Kherson specialized school #52 and LLC "Primlight" of 24/12/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /45/ Contract #12-ПЛ-101224/4 between Kherson Marine College of fishing industry and LLC "Primlight" of 24/12/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /46/ Contract #12-ПЛ-101224/6 between Justice Department in Kherson region and LLC "Primlight" of 24/12/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /47/ Contract #12-ПЛ-090730/2 between Regulation Committee and LLC "Primlight" of 30/07/2009 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /48/ Contract #06-ПЛ-090920/4 between LLC "PA Artem" and LLC "Primlight" of 20/09/2009 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /49/ Contract #06-ПЛ-090803/3 between SEI #771 and LLC "Primlight" of 03/08/2009 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /50/ Contract #06-ПЛ-090803/3 between SC "Slavic culture and education" and LLC "Primlight" of 14/12/2009 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /51/ Contract #06-ПЛ-100117/2 between LLC "Miratex" and LLC "Primlight" of 17/01/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /52/ Contract #06-ПЛ-100117/2 between PE "Sams" and LLC "Primlight" of 01/02/2010 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.
- /53/ Contract #06-ПЛ-090803/2 between SEI #171 and LLC "Primlight" of 03/08/2009 on transferring for use of energy-saving CFLs.



Persons interviewed:

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

- /1/ V. Vezhnin – project manager
- /2/ O. Tymenko – Lummax Trading Company sales director
- /3/ S. Patyichuk – deputy general director of LLC “Primlight”
- /4/ A. Alexandrov – head analyst of LLC “Primlight”
- /5/ I. Machehina – director of Kiev school #66 (CFLs consumer from the year 2010)
- /6/ L. Melnichenko – director of the restaurant “IL Patio” (CFLs consumer from the year 2008) and others.



VERIFICATION REPORT

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION HOLDING SAS

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 DFP of Estonia has issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication. The letter of approval (LoA) from Estonia for this project is provided to the verification team.	OK	OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved	All the written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional.	OK	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	unconditional?			
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	<p>The project monitoring occurred not only in accordance with the previously determined monitoring plan but also in accordance with the revisions to the monitoring plan provided in the section A.7 of the monitoring report of the final version.</p> <p>CL 01. Please, make necessary amendments in the title of the Monitoring Report (MR) by deleting the word “second”.</p>	CL 01	OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	See CL 01 of this table.	See CL 01	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>CAR 06. Please, describe the status of the project implementation in the section A of the Monitoring Report.</p> <p>CL 02. Please, clarify the amount of CFLs that is expected to be distributed within the project and the period of distributing because in the previous monitoring report (in comparison to the present one) the similar description provided not the same information.</p> <p>CL 03. Please, revise the last sentence in the paragraph 4 of the MR section A.4. Perhaps, it looks reasonably to replace the word “adult” by the word “person”.</p>	<p>CAR 06</p> <p>CL 02</p> <p>CL 03</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		CL 08. Please, represent in the Figure 1 of the MR section A.8, planned CFLs distribution for the year 2011.	CL 08	OK
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>The monitoring occurred not only in accordance with the previously determined monitoring plan but also in accordance with the revisions to the monitoring plan provided in the section A.7 of the monitoring report of the final version</p> <p>CAR 01. Please, state in the section A.7 of the MR the fact that the revision to MR improves accuracy / applicability of the monitoring data used.</p>	CAR 01	OK
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors,	For calculating the emission reductions, key factors (such as total number of CFLs distributed, average operating hours, the	OK	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

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?	number of operational CFLs, wattage difference between CFL corresponding incandescent lamps, and carbon emission factor), influencing the baseline emissions and project emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate. Data sources used for calculating emission reductions are reliable.		
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Data sources used for calculating emission reductions are reliable. CAR 04. Please, complement the MR with the actual (real) data on ERs. CAR 05. Please, provide the detailed calculation of the emission reductions in the format of Excel spreadsheet. Also,	CAR 04 CAR 05	OK OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>please, provide the project database related to this monitoring report preparation.</p> <p>CAR 02. Please, state that the project database is presented in the Excel file which will accompany the MR (section C of the MR, pg. 13).</p> <p>CL 04. Please, clarify the size of PSG (60 participants) indicated in this MR as in previous one and in the PDD another amount of participants was indicated (100 participants).</p> <p>CL 09. Please, clarify in the section A.8 (after Figure 1) that the first and second monitoring reports are related to the different periods (correspondingly, 2008-2010 and 2008-2011). Please, make</p>	<p>CAR 02</p> <p>CL 04</p> <p>CL 09</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>necessary corrections in this paragraph of the MR.</p> <p>CL 11. Please, pay attention to the fact that the pg.17 of the English version of MR (the pg.16 of the Ukrainian version of MR) is almost empty.</p> <p>CAR 09. Please, make necessary corrections in the MR and Excel file as the stated sum of emission reductions is 2 486 627 tonnes of CO₂equivalent, and in fact the calculation results in 2 486 628 tonnes of CO₂equivalent.</p> <p>CAR 10. Please, pay attention to the fact that Step 1 of the calculation of GHG emission reduction (in the section C) differently described in the Ukrainian and English versions of the MR. Please, make</p>	<p>CL 11</p> <p>CAR 09</p> <p>CAR 10</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



BUREAU
VERITAS

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>them consistent.</p> <p>CAR 08. Please, correct the last paragraph of the MR (Ukrainian version) because the period for previous and present monitoring reports is not exactly the same.</p>	CAR 08	OK
95 (c)	<p>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>	<p>Emission factors, used for calculating emission reductions, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.</p> <p>CAR 03. Please, add to the Table 6 of the MR (in the column "Recording frequency" for emission factor for electricity) information on exact values of this factor for the present monitoring period.</p>	CAR 03	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>CL 10. Please, clarify whether correction factor for baseline share of CFLs is default value or not. In case of yes, please, clearly indicate this in the MR. In case of no, please, refer this factor to Table 7 with monitoring data.</p>	CL 10	OK
95 (d)	<p>Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?</p>	<p>The calculation of emission reductions is based on conservative assumptions.</p> <p>CL 07. Please, clarify (in the MR section C) whether the amount of emission reductions for the years 2008-2011 indicated in the PDD of the final version differs from the total amount of emission reductions stated in the MRs for this period or not. In case of yes, please, explain the difference in the MR section C.</p>	CL 07	OK



BUREAU
VERITAS

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Applicable to JI SSC projects only				
96	<p>Is the relevant threshold to be classified as JI SSC project not exceeded during the monitoring period on an annual average basis?</p> <p>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?</p>	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	N/A	N/A	N/A



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?			
98	<p>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?</p> <p>Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?</p>	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	Please, see section A.7 of the monitoring report of the final version.	OK	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	justification for the proposed revision?			
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?	Yes. The revision adds conservativeness to the monitoring results and improves their overall accuracy.	OK	OK
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	Generally, the implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the PDD of the final version and the revised monitoring plan determined within the present verification.		



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		CL 05. Please, indicate in the Table 4 of the MR who is responsible for the activities stated in this table.	CL 05	OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	CL 06. Please, include in the MR section C information on calibration status of the monitoring equipment.	CL 06	OK
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	FAR 01. The data to be monitored and required for determination are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of emission reductions units for the project. The order concerning the procedure for keeping monitoring data should be issued.	FAR 01	Pending
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the	FAR 02. The order concerning indication of the names of the personnel involved in the monitoring should be issued.	FAR 02	Pending



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	monitoring plan?			
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
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



BUREAU
VERITAS

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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 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	N/A	N/A	N/A



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>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



VERIFICATION REPORT

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



VERIFICATION REPORT

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarification and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CL 01. Please, make necessary amendments in the title of the Monitoring Report (MR) by deleting the word “second”.	92	Now the title of the Monitoring Report is improved.	The issue is closed due to the amendments made.



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CL 02. Please, clarify the amount of CFLs that is expected to be distributed within the project and the period of distributing because in the previous monitoring report (in comparison to the present one) the similar description provided not the same information.</p>	93	<p>The goal of the project is to enhance the energy efficiency of Ukraine's lighting stock by distributing over a period of about 15 years approximately 210 million compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) to Ukrainian customers from private, as well as from public sectors. More exact information can be as a period of over 14 years and 210 926 791 CFLs for distributing (see PDD of the final version).</p>	<p>The explanation is received and found satisfactory</p> <p>The issue is closed.</p>
<p>CL 03. Please, revise the last sentence in the paragraph 4 of the MR section A.4. Perhaps, it looks reasonably to replace the word "adult" by the word "person".</p>	93	<p>Required modification is now made in the Monitoring Report.</p>	<p>CL 03 is closed as the required modification is successfully made.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

CAR 01. Please, state in the section A.7 of the MR the fact that the revision to MR improves accuracy / applicability of the monitoring data used.	94	The corresponding statement has been added at the end of the section A.7	The issue is closed based on the information added to the MR.
CL 04. Please, clarify the size of PSG (60 participants) indicated in this MR as in previous one and in the PDD another amount of participants was indicated (100 participants).	95 (b)	Now the size of PSG is indicated as 100 participants. The same information is also stated in the PDD of the final version.	Based on the correction made, the issue is closed.
CL 05. Please, indicate in the Table 4 of the MR who is responsible for the activities stated in this table.	101 (a)	Necessary information is now added to the monitoring report. The responsibilities in table 3 and 4 have been personalised.	Due to the information added to the MR, CL 05 is closed.



BUREAU
VERITAS

VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 02. Please, state that the project database is presented in the Excel file which will accompany the MR (section C of the MR, pg. 13).</p>	95 (b)	Now, the required reference is provided.	Now, necessary amendments are made in the Monitoring Report. The issue is closed.
<p>CAR 03. Please, add to the Table 6 of the MR (in the column “Recording frequency” for emission factor for electricity) information on exact values of this factor for the present monitoring period.</p>	95 (c)	The data required (on emission factor for electricity) are added to the corresponding table of the MR.	CAR 03 is closed based on the information added to the monitoring report.
<p>CAR 04. Please, complement the MR with the actual (real) data on ERs.</p>	95 (b)	The complete version of the MR is now provided to the verification team.	The issue is closed due to completion of the MR.



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 05. Please, provide the detailed calculation of the emission reductions in the format of Excel spreadsheet. Also, please, provide the project database related to this monitoring report preparation.</p>	95 (b)	Required documentation is now presented to the verification team.	Taking into account that necessary documents are now provided to the verification team, CAR 05 is closed.
<p>CAR 06. Please, describe the status of the project implementation in the section A of the Monitoring Report.</p>	93	The status of the project implementation is now added to the section A of the MR.	Based on the corrections made, the issue is closed.
<p>CL 06. Please, include in the MR section C information on calibration status of the monitoring equipment.</p>	101 (b)	Information on calibration status is now included in the monitoring report.	The issue is closed.



VERIFICATION REPORT

FAR 01. The data to be monitored and required for determination are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of emission reductions units for the project. The order concerning the procedure for keeping monitoring data should be issued.	101 (c)	The issue will be resolved till the next verification.	Pending.
FAR 02. The order concerning indication of the names of the personnel involved in the monitoring should be issued.	101 (d)	The issue will be resolved till the next verification.	Pending.



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CL 07. Please, clarify (in the MR section C) whether the amount of emission reductions for the years 2008-2011 indicated in the PDD of the final version differs from the total amount of emission reductions stated in the MRs for this period or not. In case of yes, please, explain the difference in the MR section C.</p>	95 (d)	<p>The amount of ERUs for the years 2008-2011 indicated in the PDD of final version differs from the total amount of ERUs stated in the MRs for this period. This discrepancy is attributed to the difference between the theoretical hours of utilization and real ones.</p>	<p>The explanation is received and found satisfactory.</p> <p>The issue is closed.</p>
<p>CL 08. Please, represent in the Figure 1 of the MR section A.8, planned CFLs distribution for the year 2011.</p>	93	<p>Figure 1 has been removed as not informative and one that duplicates data from Table 2.</p>	<p>The issue is closed.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CL 09. Please, clarify in the section A.8 (after Figure 1) that the first and second monitoring reports are related to the different periods (correspondingly, 2008-2010 and 2008-2011). Please, make necessary corrections in this paragraph of the MR.</p>	<p>95 (b)</p>	<p>The clarification has been added.</p>	<p>CL 09 is closed due to the amendments made in the MR.</p>
<p>CL 10. Please, clarify whether correction factor for baseline share of CFLs is default value or not. In case of yes, please, clearly indicate this in the MR. In case of no, please, refer this factor to Table 7 with monitoring data.</p>	<p>95 (c)</p>	<p>This factor by is taken as unchanged during the term of the project.</p>	<p>The issue is closed based on the clarification provided.</p>



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 08. Please, correct the last paragraph of the MR (Ukrainian version) because the period for previous and present monitoring reports is not exactly the same.</p>	95 (b)	Required amendments are made.	CAR 08 is closed due to the amendments made in the Ukrainian version of the MR.
<p>CL 11. Please, pay attention to the fact that the pg.17 of the English version of MR (the pg.16 of the Ukrainian version of MR) is almost empty.</p>	95 (b)	Necessary amendments are made.	The issue (CL 11) is closed.
<p>CAR 09. Please, make necessary corrections in the MR and Excel file as the stated sum of emission reductions is 2 486 627 tonnes of CO₂equivalent, and in fact the calculation results in 2 486 628 tonnes of CO₂equivalent.</p>	95 (b)	Required modification is made.	CAR 09 is closed as the necessary corrections are made.



VERIFICATION REPORT

<p>CAR 10. Please, pay attention to the fact that Step 1 of the calculation of GHG emission reduction (in the section C) differently described in the Ukrainian and English versions of the MR. Please, make them consistent.</p>	<p>95 (b)</p>	<p>English version of the MR is successfully corrected.</p>	<p>The issue is closed based on the corrections made.</p>
--	---------------	---	---