JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

FINAL REPORT

"Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizers Plant"
in
BULGARIA

Monitoring period: 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010

Report N° 11-DG-20-MD

Revision N° 1.2

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

Project Title:	Country:	Estimated ERUs (tCO2e) from the PDD:
Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizer Plant	BULGARIA	403,000
JI Registration Reference: N° BG1000154	Monitoring period: 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	Verified ERUs (tCO2e): 371,242
Client: AGROPOLYCHIM JSC	Client contact: Mrs. Velislava Vasileva	
Report No.: 11-DG-20-MD	Revision: 1.2	Date of this report: 10/05/2011
Approved by (Final Report – DCI Director approval): Roberto Cavanna		Date of approval: 12/05/2011

Methodology – if applicable				
Number:	Version:	Title: Project specific methodology	Scale	SS(s): 5

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA), commissioned by AGROPOLYCHIM JSC, has verified of the greenhouse gas emission reductions reported for the project activity "Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizer Plant" in Bulgaria, JI Registration Reference N° BG1000154, for the period 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010, with regard to the relevant requirements for JI activities. The verification shall ensure that reported emission reductions are complete and accurate in accordance with applicable UNFCCC requirements.
The project was validated by DNV (determination report N° 01 issued on 14/06/2004 /2/) and it was registered on under the JI registration reference N° BG1000154
The GHG emission reductions were calculated on the basis of the project specific methodology and the revised monitoring plan included in the present Monitoring Report for 2010.
In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity "Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizer Plant", in Bulgaria, as described in the Monitoring Report version 02 from 14/04/2011, meets all relevant requirements for JI activities and all relevant host country criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring JI Project specific methodology. Hence RINA 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 ready to generate GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions, or misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize **371,242** tCO2e for the monitoring period.

Work carried out by:	
Konstantin Rachev Viktor Milkov	☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or organizational unit responsible ☐ Strictly confidential ☐ Unrestricted distribution

Work verified by (Final Report – CRT person responsible approval)	Keywords:
Authorized officer Paolo Teramo	Climate Change, Kyoto Protocol, Joint Implementation, Verification

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

Abbreviations

BE	Baseline Emissions
CAR	Corrective Action Request
JI	Joint Implementation Mechanism
VER(s)	Verified Emission Reduction(s)
CH_4	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CO_2	Carbon dioxide
CO_2e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CRT	Coordination and Technical Control Staff
DCI	Certification Division of RINA Services Spa
DFP	Designated Focal Point
AIE	Accredited Independent Entity
JISC	Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee
ER	Emission Reductions
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG(s)	Greenhouse gas(es)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LoA	Letter of Approval
MoV	Means of Verification
MR	Monitoring Report
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDD	Project Design Document
PE	Project Emission
PP(s)	Project Participant(s)
Ref.	Document Reference
RINA	RINA Services Spa
SS(s)	Sectoral Scope(s)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
DVM	Determination and Verification Manual

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

Table of Contents Page

1 INTRODUCTION 5
1.1 Objective 5
1.2 Scope 5
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 6
2.4 Verification conclusions 7
2.5 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91) 7
2.6 Project implementation (92-93) 7
2.7 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98) 7
2.8 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100) 8
2.9 Data management (101) 8
2.10 Verification regarding programmes of activities - Not applicable 8

3 VERIFICATION OPINION 9

4 REFERENCES 10

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

AGROPOLYCHIM JSC has commissioned RINA to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizer Plant" (hereafter called "the project") at Devnya, Bulgaria.
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.
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 and 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 and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.

1.3 Verification Team

The verification team and the technical reviewers consist of the following personnel:

Role	Last Name	First Name	Country
Team Leader JI	Rachev	Konstantin	Bulgaria
Technical Expert JI	Milkov	Viktor	Bulgaria
Technical Reviewer	Severino	Laura	Italy

2 METHODOLOGY

Verification was conducted using RINA procedures in line with the requirements specified in the JI Guideline, the latest version of the JI Determination and Verification Manual, and relevant decisions of the COP/MOP and applying standard auditing techniques.
The verification consisted of the following three phases:

- Desk review;
- On-site assessment:
- The resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and certification.

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.

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) submitted by AGROPOLYCHIM JSC and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Approved CDM methodology (if applicable) and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

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

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 25/03/2011 RINA performed (on-site) interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of AGROPOLYCHIM JSC were interviewed (see References /20/, /21/, /22/). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
AGROPOLYCHIM JSC	❖ Continuing monitoring equipment and measurement; ❖ Calibration and maintenance of the used monitoring equipment; ❖ Roles, responsibilities and legal environmental requirements; ❖ Project specific documentations and monitoring of the main data; ❖ Organization scheme and responsibilities; ❖ Data collecting and archiving; ❖ GHG Emission reduction estimation and calculations. Baseline and Project emission estimations; ❖ Nitric acid Installation ❖ Social and Environmental Responsibilities
(LOCAL Stakeholder)	During the second verification no local stakeholder were consulted
CONSULTANT	For this project no consultant was used

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 RINA 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 AIE 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.

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

2.4 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 0 Corrective Action Requests, 4 Clarification Requests, and 0 Forward Action Requests.

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

2.5 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval by Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and water from July 2004 /5/ and the Kingdom of Denmark from August 2007 /6/ have 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.

The above mentioned written approval is unconditional.

2.6 Project implementation (92-93)

The project implementation date is described in the PDD/1/ and in the Monitoring Report point 4.1/3/. In this point is documented a list of major JI Project stages.
The catalyst is periodically replaced (every three years). The last replacement was done during 08-09 December 2009. The catalyst performance is checking through N2O reduction and used technical regime. This was verified during on site visit of the company.
During the second verification of this project and during the on-site visit in Nitric acid plant we can stated that the installation worked almost without interruption strictly according with all technological procedures.
The project complies with the requirements.

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

The monitoring occurred 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.
For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, key factors, such as quantity of nitric acid (100%) produced; the concentration of N2O in the tail gas and N2O emission factor, 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 were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, such as emission factor and continuous monitoring software are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factor is selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

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

2.8 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

The project participants provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision, which cover the situation in case of emergency operational interruptions or monitoring system calibrations failure, when the read data are not real. In this situation correction in emission reduction calculation must be done. This is done in accordance with approved Procedure for the correcting of false recorded data from the continuous monitoring system for NOx emissions from the Nitric acid plant. This is well documented in point 4 from the MR. The procedure is enclosed in the MR also (Annex III). The corrections made were checked during the on-site visit.

The proposed revision improves 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.

2.9 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. These procedures are mentioned in the section “References” of this report.
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.

2.10 Verification regarding programmes of activities

Not applicable

3 VERIFICATION OPINION

RINA has performed the 2nd periodic verification of the "Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizer Plant" Project in Bulgaria, which applies the project specific methodology. 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 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 AGROPOLYCHIM JSC is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 02. 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.

RINA verified the latest Project Monitoring Report (version 02) for the reporting period as indicated below. RINA 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.

RINA 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 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions	: 476,349 t CO_2e
Project emissions	: 105,205 t CO_2e
Emission Reductions (Year 2010)	: **371,144** t CO_2e
Corrected Emission Reductions (Year 2010)	: 97.79 t CO_2e
TOTAL Emission Reductions (Year 2010)	: **371,242** t CO_2e

4 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by Type the name of the company that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ PDD “Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizers Plant”, Devnya, Bulgaria” from 2004-04-23
/2/ Determination Report No. 2004-0726, Revision 01 from 2004-06-16, issued by DNV
/3/ Monitoring Report of JI Project - “Nitrous Oxide Reduction at Agropolychim Fertilizers Plant” for 2010 – version 1 from 15.03.2011 and version 2 from 14.04.2011
/4/ Emission monitoring data – excel file – Annex I_data_2010 and Annex II_N2O_2010

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

/5/ Letter of approval from Ministry of Environment and water, Bulgaria issued during July 2004
/6/ Letter of Approval from the Kingdom of Denmark during August 2007
/7/ Verification Report № VER/0003/2010 covering period from 2008 to 2009 emission reduction estimation, made from Bureau Veritas
/8/ Company schemes, diagrams, protocols and data flows and Company Monitoring Instructions
/9/ Measurements devices calibrations files
/10/ Technical descriptions on used measurement devices
/11/ Procedure for the correcting of false – recorded data from the continuous monitoring equipment system for NOx emissions from the Nitric acid plant from 2007-10-05.
/12/ Protocols for N2O analyser technical maintenance from 03.11.2010
/13/ Protocol for calibration of Gas analyser №176 from 26.04.2010
/14/ Protocol for calibration of HNO3 flow meter from 07.06.2010
/15/ Protocol for internal checked for tail gas flow from 31.05.2010
/16/ Protocol for internal checked for tail gas temperature from 20.05.2010
/17/ Protocol from JI Internal audit from 12.07.2010
/18/ Mrs. Vasileva Certificate of training covering Coordination and controlling of the JI project between Agropolychim JSC and Danish Ministry of Climate and Energy from 25.05.2010 to 31.05.2010
/19/ Complex Environmental Permission (IPPC) from 2005

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

/20/ Mrs. Vasileva, production department technologist, JI responsible person, Agropolychim JSC
/21/ Eng. Georgi Boshov, nitric acid plant manager, Agropolychim JSC
/22/ Eng. Emil Stefanov, instrumentation engineer, Agropolychim JSC

APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

TABLE 1 REQUIREMENTS CHECK LIST

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approval by the 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?	Yes, Letter of approval of Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and water from July 2004 and the Kingdom of Denmark from August 2007 have been issued and verified		OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, bought Letters of approval are unconditional.		OK
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	Yes, the project is been implemented as described in the registered PDD. During 2010 no changes in the production was found. The producing process was carried on as per the technology plan.		OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	During 2010 the Nitric acid plan has been worked without interruption strictly according with all technological procedures.		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?	Yes, the project monitoring plan in MR for second verification covering 2010 was according with the registered PDD		OK
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the	The monitoring plan is based on an on-line measurement of the tail gas and the production flow. Emission factors are calculated in the baseline and measured on-line continuously. The reporting procedures are described in the monitoring plan in the PDD and in the Monitoring Report. There are slightly revisions in the Monitoring Plan for 2010 which shows the actual emission reduction estimation. All of		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	project taken into account, as appropriate?	the used monitoring methods were verified during the on-site visit of the company and founded reliable.		
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Company used monitoring plan which is based on an on-line measurement. All data are clearly identified and transparent. For more traceability and accurateness were documented the next Clarification requests: **Clarification requests №1; №2; №3 and №4**	~~CL~~ 1 ~~CL 2~~ ~~CL 3~~ ~~CL 4~~	OK
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	Emission factors are calculated in the baseline and measured on-line continuously.		OK
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	The baseline N_2O emission factor (5.54 kg N_2O per t of Nitric acid) was determined ex-ante and used to determine the project's baseline emission. N_2O emission in the project and the baseline scenario during the reporting period was correctly calculated using the validated calculation formulae and baseline emission factor given in the PDD. The conclusion is that all calculations have been performed correctly according to the methodology and the equations determined in the PDD. The calculations in the MR are reliable.		OK
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		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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		
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		
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		
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?	Yes, the company provided appropriate justification for the proposed revision of the monitoring plan which is documented in p. 4.1 from the Monitoring Report. The proposed changes refer to the actual situation. The amendment is reliable and corresponds to the requirements. The proposed revision improves the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan.		OK
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	Yes, the company had being using Procedure for the correcting of false – recorded data from the continuous monitoring equipment which was improved the accuracy of collected information.		OK
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the	The monitoring plan is based on an on-line measurement of the tail gas and the production flow. Emission factors are		OK

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	calculated in the baseline and measured on-line continuously. All the information is collecting in the used software. Mrs. Miroslava Vasileva as well as other staff connected with Nitric acid Installation is responsible for monitoring management. The staff responsibilities are identify and documented in the MR.		
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order?	During the on-site visit were checked all measuring devices calibration. All devices were calibrated from authorized laboratory and regarding Bulgarian laws. All necessary protocols were physically available and checked. There is no deviation found. In the MR is documented a table providing information for used measuring equipment. Please also refer to the raised CLs. The calibration of the N_2O analyzer was done in April 2010 and the Nitric acid flow meter in June 2010. The supplier of the monitoring equipment (ABB) is responsible for the installation, test and periodically check the used devices. During November 2010 was held maintenance of the gas-analyzer, documented in a Protocol.		OK
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	Yes, all the documentation concerning monitoring equipment and data is in good traceable manner.		OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	The used measuring monitoring hardware and software was found adequate. Sampling and analyzing is performed by the online devise every 10 seconds. The used data management system gives evidence and allows for verifications of the emission reduction data calculations. All data collection and emission reduction estimation correspond to the revised monitoring plan for 2010. The documentation is reliable and accurate.		OK
Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	n/a		
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	n/a		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	n/a		
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	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		
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 characteristics of JPAs, such as: − 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?	n/a		

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		
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		
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC.s ex ante assessment? (Optional)	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		

TABLE 2 RESOLUTIONS OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Response by project participants	Verification team conclusion
Clarification request №1 Please insert numbers for every one equation used	95b	Page 19, please see inserted comments: - equation for Emission Factor - (1F); - equation for real ERU –	The verification team has checked the provided additional information and has found it correct and reliable. This CL1 is closed.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Response by project participants	Verification team conclusion
		(2ERU)	
Clarification request №2 Please present in the Table "Emission reduction summarizing for 2010" the used equation for emission reduction	95b	Page 51, please see inserted comment: - new row is inserted with described equations	The verification team has checked the provided additional information and has found it correct and reliable. This CL 2 is closed.
Clarification request №3 Please insert the used HNO3 flow meter in Annex V	95b	Page 52, please see inserted comment: - new row is inserted, point 7	The verification team has checked the provided additional information and has found it correct and reliable. This CL 3 is closed.
Clarification request №4 Please present in Annex V the last calibration date and the next calibration period for all monitoring equipment	95b	Please see new page 53: - a table with required data for calibrations	The verification team has checked the provided additional information and has found it correct and reliable. This CL 4 is closed.

TABLE 3 FORWARD ACTION REQUEST

Forward action request	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion	
None				