



**RINA Bulgaria**

# JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

**Final**

**“COGENERATION GAS POWER STATIONS  
AKB FORES PLC Financial Industrial Group”  
in  
Bulgaria**

**Monitoring period: 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012**

**Report N°2012-BG-MD-14**

**Revision N° 1.0**

**RINA BULGARIA IS ACTING ON THE BASIS OF ITS EU ETS REGISTRATION IN BULGARIA  
AS PER ARTICLE 20 (1) OF INSTRUCTION FOR VERIFICATION OF JI PROJECTS  
OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND WATERS OF  
REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA**

**VERIFICATION REGISTRATION NUMBER: 6-207**





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

<b>Project Title:</b> Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group	<b>Country:</b> Bulgaria	<b>Estimated ERUs (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) from the PDD:</b> 48,000 annual average (4,000 monthly average)
<b>JI Registration Reference:</b> BG 1000208	<b>Monitoring period:</b> 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012	<b>Verified ERUs (tCO<sub>2</sub>e):</b> 18,769 current period (721 monthly average)
<b>Client:</b> Kostenets HHI Jsc	<b>Client contact:</b> Eng. Mariya Vaklina	
<b>Report No.:</b> 2012-BG-MD-14	<b>Revision:</b> 1.0	<b>Date of this report:</b> 14/12/2012
<b>Approved by (Final Report – EU ETS Authorized Signature):</b> Kalin Panev		<b>Date of approval:</b> 17/12/2012



### Methodology – if applicable



<b>Number:</b>	<b>Version:</b>	<b>Title:</b> JI Project Specific Methodology	<b>Scale</b> Large	<b>SS(s):</b> 1
----------------	-----------------	--	-----------------------	--------------------

RINA Services S.p.A. (RINA), commissioned by Kostenets HHI Jsc, has verified of the greenhouse gas emission reductions reported for the project activity “Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group” in Bulgaria, JI Registration Reference N° BG 1000208, for the period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012, 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 TUV SUD (Determination report N° 619868 issued on 14/04/2005 ) under the JI registration reference N° BG1000208.

The GHG emission reductions were calculated on the basis of the Project Specific Methodology.

In conclusion, it is RINA's opinion that the project activity “Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group” in Bulgaria, as described in the latest Monitoring Report version 2 of 13/12/2012, 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. Hence RINA is able to certify that the emission reductions from the project during the monitoring period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012 amount to 18,769 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.

<b>Work carried out by:</b>  Konstantin RACHEV Viktor MILKOV	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission from the Client or organizational unit responsible <input type="checkbox"/> Strictly confidential <input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted distribution
<b>Work verified by (Final Report – EU ETS Technical Manager):</b> Ani STOILOVA 	<b>Keywords:</b> 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 <sub>4</sub>	Methane
CL	Clarification Request
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2</sub> e	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	7
2.4 Verification conclusions	8
2.5 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)	8
2.6 Project implementation (92-93)	8
2.7 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)	8
2.8 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)	8
2.9 Data management (101)	9
2.10 Verification regarding programmes of activities - Not applicable	9
3 VERIFICATION OPINION.....	10
4 REFERENCES.....	11

### APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

### 1 INTRODUCTION

Kostenets HHI Jsc has commissioned RINA to carry out the verification and certification of emission reductions reported for the registered "Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group" project in Bulgaria, JI Registration Reference N°BG 1000208, for the period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012.

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 EU ETS 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.

The objective of this verification/certification was to verify and certify emission reductions reported for the "Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group" project in Bulgaria for the period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012.

#### 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	STOILOVA	Ani	Bulgaria

### 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





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

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 Reports (MR) /3/ and Monitoring PDD Kostenets HHI excel files /4/ submitted by Kostenets HHI 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 06/12/2012 RINA performed (on-site) interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representative of Kostenets HHI Jsc was interviewed. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

The key personnel interviewed and the main topics of the interviews are summarized in the table below.

	Date	Name and Role	Organization	Topic
/a/	06/12/2012	Eng. Maria Vaklina – Ecologist	Kostenets HHI Jsc	Continuing monitoring equipment and measurement Calibration and maintenance of the used monitoring equipment Roles, responsibilities and legal environmental requirements – amendments Technical details of cogenerations Project specific documentations and monitoring of the main data Data collecting and archiving
/b/	06/12/2012	Eng. Stefan Manev – project consultant	Cogen Engineering LTD	GHG Emission reduction estimation and calculations. Baseline and Project emission estimations; Monitoring Report consultation

**Table 1 Interview topics**





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Kostenets HHI Jsc and Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>❖ Monitoring plan for the crediting period</li><li>❖ Monitoring Report for the crediting period;</li><li>❖ Monitoring equipment and measurement;</li><li>❖ Monitoring parameters;</li><li>❖ Calibration and maintenance of the used monitoring equipment;</li><li>❖ Roles, responsibilities, training and legal environmental requirements;</li><li>❖ Project specific documentations and monitoring of the main data;</li><li>❖ Organization scheme and responsibilities;</li><li>❖ Data collecting and archiving;</li><li>❖ GHG Emission reduction estimation and calculations. Baseline and Project emission estimations;</li><li>❖ Social and Environmental Responsibilities;</li></ul>
(LOCAL Stakeholder)	During the second verification no local stakeholder were consulted

### 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:

(c) 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;

© 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.

During the initial and first verification period two FARs were documented and checked during this verification phase, as follows /10/:

FAR 1: Cross-check procedures of every measuring devices have to be provided in the following Monitoring Report.

Answer: Cross-check procedures are introduced in the current verification phase, documented in Section 6 of the MR /3/. The FAR is closed.

FAR 2: Measuring Journal has to be update, after launching of new tissue machine and new electrometers.

Answer: The figures are continuously documented in company Diaries and final figures are presented in Annex 1 /4/ and Annex 3 /6/ of current MR /3/. The FAR is closed.





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

### 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 2 Corrective Action Requests, 6 Clarification Requests, and 0 Forward Action Requests. All of the opened issues are now closed.

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 the Bulgarian Ministry of Environment and Water /8/ and Letter of Approval from the State of the Netherlands /9/ 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 approvals are unconditional.

### 2.6 Project implementation (92-93)

The project implementation date is described in the PDD/1/ and in the Monitoring Report /3/. In this documents are pointed a list of major JI Project stages. The project was validated during 2005 /1/; /2/ and commissioning during August 2009. The start of operation was on 01/09/2009 /3/. The first verification period was held and documented in Report /10/.

### 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 Monitoring Report /3/ covering the current monitoring period. For calculating the emission reductions key factors, monitoring parameters, fixed data influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions such as baseline emission factor of the grid and monthly produced electricity and heat as well as consummation of natural gas are clearly identified, reliable and transparent. Emission factor is selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice. It is used The Netherlands emission factors values from the "Guidelines for Project Design Documents of Joint Implementation Projects" of the Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Netherlands 2004 are used.

By the reason of the calibration delay (not available calibration records) of measurement position ET 04 (produced steam to the plant) for the current monitoring period, the calculations of the produced steam in the calculation file at Annex 1 to the Monitoring Report /4/ for the whole period of this report was adjusted as per the maximum error of the measuring devices.

### 2.8 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

The project participants have been provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision, which mainly covered improving the accuracy and applicability of information collected, compared to the original monitoring plan, without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

### 2.9 Data management (101)

The data and their sources, provided in monitoring report, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent /3-7/.

The implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures /3/ and /4/. These procedures are mentioned in the section "References" of this report.

The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order /5-7/.

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner /3-7/.

The data collection and management system for the project is in accordance with the monitoring plan /3-7/.

### 2.10 Verification regarding programmes of activities

Not applicable





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

### 3 VERIFICATION OPINION

RINA Service Spa (RINA) has performed verification of the emission reductions reported for the project activity "Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group" in Bulgaria, JI Registration Reference N° BG 1000208, for the period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012, with regard to the relevant requirements for JI activities.

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 project participants of the "Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group" project are responsible for:

- the preparation of greenhouses gas emissions data and the reported greenhouse gas emission reductions from the project on the basis set out in the monitoring plan contained in the registered project design document from April 2005 /1/
- the development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of greenhouse gas emission reductions of the project

It is RINA's opinion that the GHG emission reduction stated in the monitoring report version 01 of 05/12/2012 and amended version 02 of 13/12/2012 for the "Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group" project in Bulgaria for the period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012 are fairly stated. The GHG emission reductions were calculated correctly on the basis of the Project Specific Monitoring Methodology and the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD.

Hence RINA is able to certify that the emission reductions from the project during the monitoring period 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012 amount to 18,769 tCO<sub>2e</sub>.

Reporting period: From 01/09/2010 to 31/10/2012

Baseline emissions	: 49,943 t CO <sub>2e</sub>
Project emissions	: 31,174 t CO <sub>2e</sub>
Emission Reductions	: 18,769 t CO <sub>2e</sub>

**TOTAL Emission Reductions** : 18,769 t CO<sub>2e</sub>





## JOINT IMPLEMENTATION VERIFICATION REPORT

### 4 REFERENCES

The monitoring reports /3/, the emission reduction calculations provided in the form of a spreadsheet /4/, Bulgargas Gas Quality Certificates /5/, Measurement journals of the plant /6/ Measurement data crosscheck log /7/ were assessed as part of the verification. In addition the Project Design Document (PDD) /1/ in particular the baseline estimations and the monitoring plan, the previous verification report revision 4 of 05/11/2010 /10/ and the determination report, revision 01 of 14/04/2005 /2/ for the project were reviewed.

The following table lists the documentation that was reviewed during the verification.

List the documentation provided by the project participants; methodologies, tools and other guidance by the CDM Executive Board; documentation used by RINA to verify/cross-check the information provided by the project participants.

/1/	Global Carbon PDD: Cogeneration gas power portfolio AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group, from April 2005
/2/	TUV SUD Determination Report № 619868, revision 01, issued on 14/04/2005
/3/	Cogen Engineering LTD Monitoring Report of JI Project – “ Cogeneration gas power stations AKB Fores PLC Financial Industrial Group ”, ver. 01 of 05/12/2012 and ver. 2 of 13/12/2012
/4/	Cogen Engineering LTD Ann.1 Monitoring PDD Kostenets HHI Sep.2010-Oct.2012 Rev 1 of 05/12/2012 and Monitoring PDD Kostenets HHI Sep.2010-Oct.2012 Rev 2 of 13/12/2012
/5/	Cogen Engineering LTD Ann.2 – Bulgargas Gas Quality Certificates for the crediting period
/6/	Cogen Engineering LTD Ann.3 – Measurement journals of the plant for the crediting period
/7/	Cogen Engineering LTD Ann.4 – Measurement data crosscheck log for the crediting period
/8/	Ministry of Environment and Water of Bulgaria Letter of Approval dated on 01/04/2005
/9/	The State of the Netherlands Letter of Approval, dated on 04/08/2005
/10/	Bureau Veritas: First Periodic Verification Report, rev. 4 of 05/11/2010 covering the period of 01/01/2009 to 31/08/2010



## **APPENDIX A: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL**



TABLE 1 REQUIREMENTS CHECK LIST

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
<b>Project approval by the parties involved</b>				
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 from the Ministry of Environment and Water, Bulgaria, dated on 01/04/2005 /8/ and Letter of Approval from the State of the Netherlands dated on 04/08/2005 /9/ have been issued and verified.		OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, both Letters of approval are unconditional.		OK
<b>Project implementation</b>				
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 /1/. During the crediting period no changes in the production are found. The producing process is carried on as per the technology plan.		OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	No changes have been found during the crediting period /3/.		OK
<b>Compliance with monitoring plan</b>				
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 the MR /3/ for this crediting period is according to the registered PDD. The project participants have been provided an appropriate justification for the proposed revision, which mainly covered improving the accuracy and applicability of information collected, compared to the original monitoring plan, without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans		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	The installations at Kostenets are with gas turbine modules. The main Cogeneration Gas Power Station equipment in Kostenets comprise gas turbine modules and Heat Recovery Steam Generators: The main technical parameters of the gas turbine gensets are shown in the MR. The used head and electricity were only for internal use. No exported		OK



DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
95 (b)	as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate? Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	electricity to the grid was conducted during the monitoring period.  All monitoring data are not clearly identified, transparent and conservative. For more traceability and accuracy of the emission reduction estimations the following Corrective actions and Clarification requests were documented:  <b><u>Corrective action request №1 and 2</u></b> <b><u>Clarification requests from № 1 to № 6</u></b>	CAR-1 CAR-2 CL-1—6	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?	The Netherlands emission factors values from the "Guidelines for Project Design Documents of Joint Implementation Projects" of the Ministry of Economic Affairs of the Netherlands 2004 are used correctly.		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?	All monitoring parameters and used emission reduction calculations are not described and documented in the MR /3/ correctly. Please refer to CAR 2	CAR2	OK
<b>Applicable to JI SSC projects only</b>				
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		
<b>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only</b>				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	n/a		



DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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		
<b>Revision of monitoring plan</b>				
<b>Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant</b>				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	The MP /3/ for this verification period is not revised. The conducted amendments improve the accuracy and the way of collecting and archiving the monitoring data /4-7/		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 proposed amendments improve the accuracy and its results of the used Monitoring Plan /3/. The proposed amendments are not changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.		OK
<b>Data management</b>				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	The main data that is collected is the volume of the natural gas; produces electricity and heat. This data is collected daily, monthly and early. This data is also cross-checked all the time. Final monitoring files are checked again before presented to the verifiers. During the on-site visit of the company all data, protocols and invoices for the monitoring period have been verified /4-7/. The staff's responsibilities are identified and documented in the MR /3/.		OK
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status,	The main monitoring equipment that is used is the electricity, natural gas and other measuring devices, described in the	GAR-2	OK



DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
101 I	is in order?	MR /3/. The measuring devices calibration data in not well described in the PDD, documented as CAR. Please refer to CAR 2		
101 (d)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner? Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	Please refer to CAR 2  CO2 emission reductions calculations have been performed on a monthly basis by the Project manager and consultant /4/. All energy sources flows such as electricity and heat are followed on-line. All protocols and Invoices (Bulgargas) for the crediting period are available and checked /5/. All the monitoring parameters are collected, documented and checked by the Project manager and consultant as per the MR /3/.	CAR-2	OK
<b>Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)</b>				
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		
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		
<b>Applicable to sample-based approach only</b>				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (2) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (2) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample	n/a		



DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	<p>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 the differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The types of JPAs;</li> <li>- The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used;</li> <li>- The geographical location of each JPA;</li> <li>- The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified;</li> <li>- The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified;</li> <li>- The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and</li> <li>- The samples selected for prior verifications, if any?</li> </ul>			
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	n/a		



DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			

**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
<b>Corrective action request № 1</b> The crediting period is not correctly stated for this current verification	95 (b)	Yes, we corrected on page 4 from MR.	The crediting period is now correctly stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CAR is closed
<b>Corrective action request № 2</b> The measurement devices descriptions table is not updated. The natural gas measurement devices are not presented. The calibration period and the accuracy of all measuring devices are not presented. The ET 05 measuring devices operational date is not correctly stated.	95 (b)	Yes, the Table is replaced with new one with all necessary data of measurement devices.	The measurement devices descriptions table is updated. The natural gas measurement devices are presented as well as the calibration period, accuracy and calibration protocols in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CAR is closed
<b>Clarification request № 1</b> The project owner during this verification is not correctly stated	95 (b)	Updated.	The project owners are now correctly stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CL is closed
<b>Clarification request № 2</b> There is inconsistency between the names and position of the project consultant staff, on page 4 and of the MR. The company Global Carbon Bulgaria is not any more existing.	95 (b)	Yes. The Monitoring structure chart is updated.	The project names, positions and companies are now correctly stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CL is closed
<b>Clarification request № 3</b>	95 (b)	Yes, The verification period is	The current verification period is now correctly



Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. To checklist question in table 1	Response by project participants	Verification team conclusion
Current Verification period is not correctly stated.		updated.	stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CL is closed
<b>Clarification request № 4</b> Version number and date of the present MR is not correctly stated	95 (b)	Yes. The version number and date are updated.	The version number and date of the MR are now correctly stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CL is closed
<b>Clarification request № 5</b> The legal requirements concerning the periodically checks of the used measuring devices are not updated for this monitoring period.	95 (b)	Yes. We updated and corrected the calculations in Annex 1 and MR accordingly.	The legal requirements are now correctly stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CL is closed
<b>Clarification request № 6</b> The project name is not correctly stated in the MR	95 (b)	No it is correctly stated	The project name is now correctly stated in MR ver. 02 of 13/12/2012. This CL 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			