

Bureau Veritas Certification  
Holding SAS



# VERIFICATION REPORT

**JSC "GAZPROMNEFT-NOYABRSKNEFTEGAZ"**

**2<sup>ND</sup> PERIODIC VERIFICATION  
OF THE**

**"YETY-PUROVSKOE OIL FIELD  
ASSOCIATED GAS RECOVERY  
AND UTILIZATION PROJECT"**

(MONITORING PERIOD: 01 JANUARY 2010 – 31 DECEMBER 2010)

**BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION**

**REPORT No. RUSSIA-VER/0119/2011**

REVISION No. 01

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"

Date of first issue: 14/05/2011	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: JSC "Gazprom Neft"	Client ref.: Mr. V. Basevich
<p>Summary:</p> <p>Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 2nd periodic verification of the "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project" of the project participants JSC "Gazprom Neft" and JSC "Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz" located at Yamal-Nenets autonomous district in northwest Siberia, Russian Federation and applying the JI specific approach regarding baseline setting, additionality demonstration, and monitoring on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.</p> <p>The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report &amp; Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.</p> <p>The first output of the verification process is a list of Corrective Actions Requests (CARs) presented in Appendix A.</p> <p>In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as per determined changes. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements, and the ERUs issued totalize 757,376 tCO<sub>2</sub>e for the 2nd monitoring period from 01 January 2010 to 31 December 2010.</p> <p>Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.</p>	

Report No.: RUSSIA-ver/0119/2011	Subject Group: JI
Project title: "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"	
Work carried out by: Leonid Yaskin – Team Leader, Lead Verifier Alexey Kulakov – Team Member, Specialist	
Work reviewed by: Ivan Sokolov – Internal Technical Reviewer Elena Mazlova - Specialist	
Work approved by: Flavio Gomes – Operational Manager	
Date of this revision: 14/05/2011	Rev. No.: 01
Number of pages: 21	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
<input type="checkbox"/>	Limited distribution
<input type="checkbox"/>	Unrestricted distribution

<b>Table of Contents</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	INTRODUCTION .....	3
1.1	Objective	3
1.2	Scope	3
1.3	Verification Team	3
2	METHODOLOGY .....	4
2.1	Review of Documents	4
2.2	Follow-up Interviews	4
2.3	Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	5
3	VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS .....	6
3.1	Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)	6
3.2	Project implementation (92-93)	6
3.3	Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)	6
3.4	Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)	7
3.5	Data management (101)	7
3.6	Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110) - Not applicable	8
4	VERIFICATION OPINION .....	8
5	REFERENCES .....	9
	APPENDIX A: COMPANY PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL.....	11

## 1 INTRODUCTION

JSC "Gazprom Neft" (hereafter referred 'GPN') has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project" (hereafter referred 'the project').

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 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 consists of the following personnel:

Leonid Yaskin

Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier

Alexey Kulakov

Bureau Veritas Certification Team Member, Specialist

This verification report was reviewed by:



Ivan Sokolov  
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

Elena Mazlova  
Bureau Veritas Certification, 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 determination protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

### 2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) submitted by GPN and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, and Host party criteria to be checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report No 2 Version 2.0 dated 11 April 2011 /1/ and the project as described in the determined PDD /2/.

### 2.2 Follow-up Interviews

The AIE Lead Verifier L. Yaskin performed interviews on 20/04/2011 with the project participants JSC Gazprom Neft and JSC Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz (hereafter referred 'GPN-NNG') and on 05/05/2011 with the Consultant Mitsubishi Corporation to confirm the selected information and to clarify some issues identified in the document review. The list of the persons interviewed is provided in References. The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

**Table 1. Interview topics related to verification**

Interviewed organization	Date	Interview and/or inspected topics
GNG GNG-NNG	20/04/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Status of the project</li> <li>➤ Deviations from the estimated ER in PDD</li> <li>➤ QC and QA procedures</li> <li>➤ Sustainability of monitoring procedures</li> </ul>
CONSULTANT Mitsubishi Corporation	05/05/2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Data logs on electricity and APG</li> <li>➤ Data on molecular weight of non-project oil fields</li> <li>➤ Calibration status of measuring equipment</li> </ul>
(Local Stakeholder)	N/A	N/A

### 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 AIE to assess compliance with the monitoring plan (were not raised in this assignment);
  - (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 (were not raised in this assignment).
- To guarantee the transparency of the verification process, the concerns raised are normally documented in more detail in the verification protocol in Appendix A. No issues of concern were reported in this verification.

### **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 Corrective 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 7 Corrective Action Requests.

#### **3.1 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)**

The project has written approval by the Host Party Russian Federation /4/ and another involved Party Japan /5/. All these written approvals have been provided to AIE at the stage of the 1<sup>st</sup> verification.

This report was not submitted to the secretariat since the determination of the project was not made publicly available by the former AIE (TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH) in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines.

#### **3.2 Project implementation (92-93)**

The implementation status of the project is as described in Appendix A paragraph 92.

The project was implemented in accordance with the PDD. However, due to the lack of processing capacity, APG was not supplied to the Vingayahinskaya compressor station from DNS-1 throughout the 1st Monitoring period as planned at the determination stage. DNS-1 was also not operational in January and February 2011 of the 2nd Monitoring period. Its operations started in March 2011 and were stable throughout the next 10 months. Operation of DNS-2 was stable at the level of 2010.

In the second monitoring period 01 January 2010 – 31 December 2010 the project generated 757,376 tCO<sub>2</sub>e as compared with 1,066,505 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the determined PDD. This deviation is explained by the low volume of APG supplied by DNS-1: about 1% of the amount delivered by DNS-2.

#### **3.3 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)**

The monitoring occurred basically in accordance with JI specific approach regarding monitoring that was applied in the determined PDD.

The set of data collected to monitor emission reduction as well as the equations for calculation of emission reduction did not change.

For calculating the emission reductions, the key parameters influencing the baseline and project emissions were measured such as APG volume, APG composition, and electricity consumption.

All the data and parameters monitored are presented in the tabular format in MR Section D. Relevant monitoring points are explicitly indicated in the figure in the MR Section C.1.

Calculation of emission reduction was carried out on the excel spreadsheet /2/ and is illustrated in MR Section E which provides all the measured data used for the calculation.

### **3.4 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)**

In response to CAR 01, the project participant amended the MR Section by including Section B.2 "Revision of the monitoring plan".

The revisions were minor and concerned three issues:

- (i) QA and QC procedures were extended by requirements of GOST R 8.615-2005;
- (ii) requirements to accuracy of the ultrasonic flow meter Panometrics GM 868 404 were weakened (2-5% as compared with 1% in PDD);
- (iii) operational and management structure of monitoring was extended by including departments of Gazpromneft, Mitsubishi corporation and JX Nippon Oil & Energy Corporation.

The AIE positively determined the above revisions since the first improved the accuracy, the second just adjusted the accuracy of the flow meter with its passport data and the relevant GOST R, and the third furthered implementation of monitoring procedures.

### **3.5 Data management (101)**

The implementation of data management procedures is basically in accordance with the determined monitoring plan and is an integral part of the operational routine at the JSC Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz including quality control and quality assurance procedures.

In response to CAR 02 – CAR 08 issued on data management the project participants provided the AIE with primary data logs and information needed for verification of emission reduction (CAR 02, CAR 07, CAR 08) and improved reporting on QA/QC procedures (CAR 03 – CAR 06).

The project is equipped with appropriate gas and electricity metering systems as specified in the MR Section D. The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order. Records of



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
"Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"

---

calibration of electric meters and gas metering system were checked /13, 15, 17/ and the status of calibration was positively verified.

Implementation of the quality control and quality assurance procedures is as specified in tabular forms in Section D. The functions, levels and units responsible for data collection, processing and reporting are indicated in the MR Section C.2.

After collecting the data based on the operational and management structure, Gazprom Neft submits it to JX Nippon Oil & Energy Corporation. Then JX Nippon Oil & Energy Corporation drafts the monitoring report based on the data submitted by Gazprom Neft and Gazprom Neft confirms the content.

### **3.6 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)**

Not applicable.

## **4 VERIFICATION OPINION**

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 2<sup>nd</sup> periodic verification of the "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project" of JSC "Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz" located at Yamal-Nenets autonomous district in northwest Siberia, Russian Federation, which applies the 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 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.

JSC "Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz" 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 Plan indicated in the final PDD Version 3 dated 4 Feb 2010. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification has verified the project Monitoring Report No 2 Version 2.0 dated 11 Apr 2011 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as per determined changes. Installed equipment being



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"

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 project received approvals from the host Party (Russian Federation) and the Party involved other than the host Party (Japan).

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 determined 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:

<u>Reporting period:</u> From 01/01/2010 to 31/12/2010	
Baseline emissions	: 861,455 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Project emissions	: 104,080 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Leakage	: 0 tCO <sub>2</sub> e
Emission Reduction	: 757,376 tCO <sub>2</sub> e

## 5 REFERENCES

### Category 1 Documents:

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

- /1/ JI Monitoring Report Version 2.0 dated 11 Apr 2011. Yety-Purovskoe Oil Field Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project. Monitoring period: 01 January – 31 December 2010. UNFCCC Reference No.: JI-0184. Project Investor: JSC "Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz".
- /2/ Excel spreadsheet "calculation 2010(revised)" dated 04/04/2011.
- /3/ PDD Version 3 dated 4 Feb 2010, Yety-Purovskoe Oil Field Associated Gas Recovery and Utilization Project
- /4/ RF Government resolution #326 dd. 23/07/2010 on approval of list of projects being implemented in accordance with article 6 of Kyoto protocol to the UN Framework Convence on Climate Changes
- /5/ Letter of Approval of a JI project and authorization of participation under the Kyoto Protocol by the Government of Japan, May 18, 2010

### Category 2 Documents

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents obtained in the course of 2<sup>nd</sup> verification

- /6/ Passports of measuring composition of APG at DNS-1 Yety-

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

- Purovskoe oil field in period January – December 2010.
- /7/ Passports of measuring composition of APG at DNS-2 Yety-Purovskoe oil field in period January – December 2010.
  - /8/ Monthly brief table of APG at DNS-2 Yety-Purovskoe oil field in period January – December 2010.
  - /9/ Certificates of delivery-acceptance of electric energy between JSC Mezhregionenergosbyt and Noyabrsky GPK Ltd in period January – December 2010.
  - /10/ List of electric meters installed at Vingayahinskaya compressor station.
  - /11/ Description of electric meter SET-4TM.03.
  - /12/ Calibration certificates of electric meters SET-4TM.03.
  - /13/ Operational manual of electric meter SET-4TM.03.
  - /14/ Certificates of maintenance of equipment installed on commercial APG metering unit of Vingayahinskaya compressor station.
  - /15/ Certificate of chromatograph «Crystallux 4000M».
  - /16/ Calibration certificate of chromatograph «Crystallux 4000M».
  - /17/ APG supply by JSC Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz to the objects of Noyabrsky GPK Ltd in period January – December 2010.
  - /18/ Operation sheets for DNS-1 and DNA-2 Yety-Purovskoe oil field for January, July and December 2010.
  - /19/ Reports with data on molecular weight of APG at Yety-Purovskoe oil field DNS-1, DNS-2 and at Vingayahinskoye and Novogodnee oil fields.

**Persons interviewed:**

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

/1/	V. Basevich – Head of management in the department of gas and liquid hydrocarbons department, management of gas refining marketing and liquid hydrocarbons sell, GPN.
/2/	K. Katsapenko – Project coordinator, GPN.
/3/	V. Akimov – Head of Department for gas collection and handing over, Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz.
/4/	Alexey N. Chashikhin – Mitsubishi Corporation, Project Manager.

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

## VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1

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
<b>Project approvals by 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?	<p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> Monitoring Report (hereafter referred 2<sup>nd</sup> MR) Version 01 dated 9 March 2011 does not provide information about the status of the project in JI Terms. The AIE fulfils this gap below.</p> <p>The project was registered on UNFCCC JI website as JI 0184. The AIE had been TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH. PDD was published on 30 May 2009 and was positively determined (version 03 dated 4 February 2010 /3/). Afterwards the project was withdrawn from Track 2.</p> <p>The project received Letters of Approval (LoA) from Designated Focal Points of the Russian Federation (the host Party) and Japan (the Party involved other than the host Party):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LoA #D07-1025 dated 30 July 2010 issued by the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation /4/;</li> <li>- LoA dated 10 May 2010 issued by the Japan Government /5/.</li> </ul> <p>The LoA were provided to AIE which does not question its authenticity.</p> <p>The LoA were available at the time when the present AIE (BVC) issued the first verification report /4/. This report was not submitted to the secretariat since the determination of the project was not made publicly available by the former AIE (TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH) in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines.</p>		OK
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, all the written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional and they were granted.		OK
<b>Project implementation</b>				
92	Has the project been implemented in	The project has been implemented in accordance with the PDD. The		OK

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	<p>determination of the project cannot be deemed final in JI terms since it was not made publicly available by TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH nor the transfer of the project to BVC was agreed.</p> <p>By the time of the AIE site visit in July 2010, the project has been implemented completely including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- construction of associated gas pipeline 273x10mm from booster stations DNS-1 of Yety-Purovskoe oil-field up to connection to connection point to pipeline from DNS-2 of Yety-Purovskoe oil-field (L-10,865km),</li> <li>- construction of associated gas pipeline 530x8mm from booster stations DNS-2 of Yety-Purovskoe oil-field up to connection to connection point to pipeline from DNS-1 of Yety-Purovskoe oil-field (L-19,225km),</li> <li>- construction of associated gas pipeline 530x8mm from connection point from DNS-1 and 2 of Yety-Purovskoe oil-field up to connection to the existing pipeline from booster station DNS-1 of Vingayahinskoe oil-field going to Vingayahinskaya Compressor Station (L-41,155km).</li> </ul> <p>Construction works was undertaking by OJSC “Gazpromneft – Noyabrskneftegaz” in the period from March to June 2009, and officially commissioned on 17/07/2009 that was confirmed by commissioning certificate /5/.</p> <p>The starting date of the crediting period has not been changed and remained 1st August 2009.</p> <p>APG was not supplied to the Vingayahinskaya compressor station from DNS 1 through the 1st Monitoring period as planned at the determination stage due to the lack of APG processing capacity.</p> <p>In the second monitoring period 01 January 2010 – 31 December 2010 the project generated 757,376 tCO<sub>2</sub>e as compared with 1,066,505 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the determined PDD.</p>		OK
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	DNS-1: Was not operational in January and February 2011. Operations started in March and were stable throughout the next 10		OK

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		months. DNS-2: Operation was stable at the level of 2010. For evidence please refer to table in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> MR on page 16.		
<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?	The Monitoring System is in place and operational. Monitoring of GHG emission reductions occurred basically in accordance with the determined Monitoring Plan in the PDD. Determination was not deemed final in JI terms since it was not listed on the UNFCCC JI website.		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 project taken into account, as appropriate?	For calculating the emission reductions, the key parameters influencing the baseline and project emissions were taken into account and measured such as APG volumes, APG composition, and electricity consumption.		OK
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	All the data sources used for calculating emission reductions are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.  Data and parameters that were determined at registration and not monitored during the monitoring period, including default values and factors, as well as data and parameters monitored are presented in Section D.  The measured data are presented in Section E on a monthly and annual basis. These include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- measurements of APG volume at DNS-1 and DNS-2 of Yety-Purovskoe oil field;</li> <li>- measurements of APG volume supplied to Vingayahinskaya Compressor Station from of Yety-Purovskoe oil field and other fields;</li> <li>- measurements of APG composition at DNS-1 and DNS-1;</li> <li>- measurements of electricity consumption by Vingayahinskaya Compressor Station.</li> </ul>		OK

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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?	CO2 emission factor for methane 49,55 tCO <sub>2</sub> /TJ was taken as a conservative assumption for estimation of CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from APG flaring under the baseline as per AM0009 Version 04.  CO <sub>2</sub> emission factor for consumed grid electricity 1,3 tCO <sub>2</sub> /GWh was taken as a conservative assumption for estimating CO <sub>2</sub> emissions for the project activity as per “Tool to calculate baseline, project and/or leakage emissions from electricity consumption” Version 02.		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 calculation of emission reductions is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenario in a transparent manner as per the applied CDM approved baseline and monitoring methodology AM0009 “Recovery and utilization of gas from oil wells that would otherwise be flared or vented” Version 04.  Conclusion is pending the provision to the AIE of (1) excel spreadsheets with calculation of (i) APG NCV at points F1 and F2, (ii) baseline emissions, project emissions and emission reduction;	Pending	OK
<b>Applicable to JI SSC projects only_Paragraph 96_Not applicable</b>				
<b>Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only_Paragraphs 97(a) – 98_Not applicable</b>				
		(2) data on molecular weights of APG at Vingayahinskoye and Novogodnee oil fields and Yety-Purovskoe oil field (refer to MR page 20).		
<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?	No revision to the determined monitoring plan was indicated in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> the 2 <sup>nd</sup> MR.  <b>CAR 01.</b> The determined monitoring plan was revised: (iv) QA and QC procedures were extended by requirements of GOST R 8.615-2005; (v) requirements to accuracy of the ultrasonic flow meter Panametrics GM 868 404 were weakened (2-5% as compared with 1% in PDD);	CAR 01	OK

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>(vi) operational and management structure of monitoring was extended by including departments of Gazpromneft, Mitsubishi corporation and JX Nippon Oil &amp; Energy Corporation.</p> <p>An appropriate justification for the proposed revision was not provided.</p> <p>“Revisions to the monitoring plan to improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected shall be justified by project participants and shall be submitted as part of the determination referred to in paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines by the AIE” quoted by Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (Version 2.0) paragraph 30 (b) .</p>		
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?	Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 01.	Pending	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?	<p>The implementation of data collection procedures is basically in accordance with the determined monitoring plan and is an integral part of the operational routine at the JSC Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz including quality control and quality assurance procedures.</p> <p><b>CAR 02.</b> Please provide AIE:</p> <p>(i) samples of primary readings of gas flow meters, electrical meter and chromatograph;</p> <p>(ii) monthly data on APG Volume at points F1, F2, A;</p> <p>(iii) monthly data on APG composition and NCV at points F1, F2;</p> <p>(iv) monthly data on electricity consumption by the Vingayahinskaya Compressor Station.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> the data should have signs of control, such as title, signature, position of signatory, date.</p> <p><b>CAR 03.</b> Please include in the 2<sup>nd</sup> MR a table providing data on the</p>	<p>CAR 02</p> <p>CAR 03</p> <p>CAR 04</p> <p>CAR 05</p> <p>CAR 06</p>	<p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		<p>status of QA and QC procedures as to the date of the last and the next calibration of each measuring device.</p> <p><b>CAR 04.</b> GOST R 8.615-2005 and GOST R 8.585 (1-5) -2005 are irrelevant to measurements by chromatograph. Refer to D.2.3 and D.2.4. Please indicate appropriate QA and QC procedures.</p> <p><b>CAR 05.</b> Please specify GOST R in QA and QC procedures applied for the electricity meter.</p> <p><b>CAR 06.</b> Please provide evidence that the applied gas flow meters and the electricity meter provide accuracy 1%.</p>		
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order?	<p><b>CAR 07.</b> Please provide the following information and data needed for verification of emission reduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Calibration certificates for each measuring device;</li> <li>(ii) Orifice meter (DKS-0, 6-300) as per D.2-1;</li> <li>(iii) Ultrasonic flow meter (Panametrics GM 868) as per D.2-2;</li> <li>(iv) Orifice meter (Flo Boos 407) as per D.2-5;</li> <li>(v) Gas chromatograph as per D.2-3 and D.2-4;</li> <li>(vi) Electricity meter as per D.2-6.</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u> for orifice meters please provide calibration certificates for orifice, manometer, thermometer, and integrating processor, if appropriate.</p> <p><b>CAR 08.</b> Please provide evidence that gas flow orifice meters were used in range of applicability of orifice calibration results.</p>	CAR 07 CAR 08	OK OK
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	<p>Evidence and records of monitoring APG volumes, APF composition, and electric energy are maintained in a traceable manner. This was demonstrated to the AIE by providing records of readings.</p> <p>Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 02.</p>	Pending	OK
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	<p>Conclusion is pending a response to CAR 01 (iii).</p>	Pending	OK



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)_Paragraphs 102 – 105_ Not applicable				
Applicable to sample-based approach only_Paragraphs 106 – 110_ Not applicable				

**Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
<p><b>CAR 01.</b> The determined monitoring plan was revised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) QA and QC procedures were extended by requirements of GOST R 8.615-2005;</li> <li>(ii) requirements to accuracy of the ultrasonic flow meter Panametrics GM 868 404 were weakened (2-5% as compared with 1% in PDD);</li> <li>(iii) operational and management structure of monitoring was extended by including departments of Gazprom Neft, Mitsubishi corporation and JX Nippon Oil &amp; Energy Corporation.</li> </ul> <p>An appropriate justification for the proposed revision was not provided.</p> <p>“Revisions to the monitoring plan to improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected shall be justified by project participants and shall be submitted as part of the determination referred to in paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines by the AIE” quoted by Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring (Version 2.0) paragraph 30 (b).</p>	99 (a)	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>The revision of the determined monitoring plan has been effected in accordance with the results of the Initial Verification and 1<sup>st</sup> Periodic Verification of the “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project” performed by Bureau Veritas Certification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) QA and QC procedures were extended by requirements of GOST R 8.615-2005 in accordance with CAR 02 during the Initial Verification.</li> <li>(ii) Requirements to accuracy of the ultrasonic flow meter Panametrics GM 868 were weakened in line with the data presented in the technical documentation.</li> <li>(iii) Operational and management structure of monitoring was extended by including departments of Gazprom Neft, Mitsubishi Corporation and JX Nippon Oil &amp; Energy Corporation in accordance with the request of the AIE during the Initial Verification.</li> </ul> <p><u>Response 2 dated 19/04/2011</u></p>	<p><u>Response 1 is not accepted.</u></p> <p>Please indicate all revisions in MR Section B.2 “Revision of the monitoring plan” with precise explanation why the revisions were made.</p> <p>CAR is not closed.</p> <p><u>Response 2 is accepted</u></p> <p>CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the MR.</p>

2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"

		<p>The Section B.2 of the Monitoring Report has been updated with the information that indicates all revisions to the monitoring plan.</p>	
<p><b>CAR 02.</b> Please provide AIE:</p> <p>(i) samples of primary readings of gas flow meters, electrical meter and chromatograph;</p> <p>(ii) monthly data on APG Volume at points F1, F2, A;</p> <p>(iii) monthly data on APG composition and NCV at points F1, F2;</p> <p>(iv) monthly data on electricity consumption by the Vingayahinskaya Compressor Station.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> the data should have signs of control, such as title, signature, position of signatory, date.</p>	<p>101 (a)</p>	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>The requested information is presented to the AIE.</p> <p><u>Response 2 dated 19/04/2011</u></p> <p>(i) Please specify the period for which the data on primary readings of gas flow meters should be presented.</p> <p>(ii) The measurement of the composition data in JSC "Gazpromneft-Noyabrskneftegaz" is effected in line with presented passports of the APG composition indicating the date of sampling and name of the operator.</p> <p>(iii) The composition data of APG for DNS-1 and DNS-2 of Yety-Purovskoe oil field has been checked and updated in the Monitoring Report and the Excel calculation.</p> <p>(iv) The data for 2009 contains the list of electrical measurement equipment installed at Vingayahinskaya compressor station. The information for energy consumption has been checked and updated in the Monitoring Report and the Excel calculation.</p> <p>(v) Please specify the period for which the data on molecular weights of APG should be presented.</p> <p><u>Response 3 dated 29/04/2011</u></p>	<p><u>Conclusion on Response 1:</u></p> <p>(i) Samples of primary readings of gas flow meters and protocols on APG composition are not provided. This data should be signed.</p> <p>(ii) Accepted. Request is closed.</p> <p>(iii) 2010 monthly data on gas composition are provided. However, excel calculations of emission reduction are based on different data. Please provide correct calculations. Refer to BE(2), BE(3), BE(4)(5) inserts.</p> <p>(iv)-1 The presented file "Информация о потреблении электроэнергии ВКС" relates to 2009.</p> <p>(iv)-2 The presented file "Акты приема-передачи ээ 2010" is not transparent to confirm the data in the insert "Data Input" of the excel file "calculation 2010(revised)"</p> <p>(v) Not provided are "Data on molecular weights" of Associated Petroleum Gas at Vingayahinskoye and Novogodnee oil fields and Yety-Purovskoe oil field (refer to MR page 20)" which was requested in the e-mail dated 10/03/2011</p> <p>CAR is not closed.</p>



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

		<p>(i) The requested data with the primary readings of gas flow meters for January, July and December 2010 at DNS-1 and DNS-2 of Yety-Purovskoe oil field is provided.</p> <p>(iv) The data for energy consumption for 2010 to confirm the data in the insert “Data Input” of the excel file “calculation 2010(revised)” has been provided by JSC “Noyabrskii GPK”. The energy consumption at Vingayahinskaya compressor station is shown in the table under the title №3 PS 110/10 kV “Mayak” of the Acceptance Certificate for electricity consumption for each month and verified by the CEOs of JSC “Mezhregionenergobit” and JSC “Noyabrskii GPK”. The access to primary data for the energy consumption is limited due to the fact that JSC “Noyabrskii GPK” is not a part of “Gazprom neft” Group and is not committed to provide such data.</p> <p>(v) Reports with the data on molecular weight of Vingayahinskoye, Novogodnee and Yety-Purovskoe oil fields are provided.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion on Response 2</u></p> <p>(i) Please provide data for January, July and December 2010.</p> <p>(ii) Response is accepted. Please have in mind that the names of files with APG passports are mixed. File DNS-1 should be read DNS-2 and vice versa.</p> <p>(iii) Response is accepted.</p> <p>(iv) Response is not accepted. Please provide primary data to verify data in Monitoring Report and excel file.</p> <p>(v) Please provide the requested data for any month that would allow to determine the conclusion in Monitoring Report.</p> <p><u>Conclusion on Response 3</u>                  Response is accepted.                  CAR is closed based on verification of the information provided to the AIE.</p>
<p><b>CAR 03.</b> Please include in the 2<sup>nd</sup> MR a table providing data on the status of QA and QC procedures as to the date of the last and the next calibration of each measuring device.</p>	<p>101 (a)</p>	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> monitoring report is updated with table providing data on the status of QA and AC procedures as to the date of the last and the next calibration of each measuring device.</p> <p><u>Response 2 dated 19/04/2011</u></p> <p>The Section D of the monitoring report has been updated and includes the information on dates of calibration.</p>	<p><u>Response 1 is not accepted.</u></p> <p>Please provide the updated MR.</p> <p>CAR is not closed.</p> <p><u>Response 2 is accepted.</u></p> <p>CAR will be closed when type and brand name of chromatograph and electric meters are indicated in MR.</p>



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 "Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project"

			CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the MR.
<b>CAR 04.</b> GOST R 8.615-2005 and GOST R 8.585 (1-5)-2005 are irrelevant to measurements by chromatograph. Refer to D.2.3 and D.2.4. Please indicate appropriate QA and QC procedures.	101 (a)	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>Monitoring is effected in compliance with the standard GOST 26703-93 "Analytical gas chromatographs. Specifications and testing methods".</p> <p><u>Response 2 dated 19/04/2011</u></p> <p>The monitoring report is updated with the correct name of the standard.</p>	<p>Response 1 is not accepted.</p> <p>Please provide the updated MR with reference to the right GOST and deleting the irrelevant references.</p> <p>CAR is not closed.</p> <p><u>Response 2 is accepted</u></p> <p>CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the MR.</p>
<b>CAR 05.</b> Please specify GOST R in QA and QC procedures applied for the electricity meter.	101 (a)	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>Monitoring is effected in compliance with the standard GOST 52320-2005 "Electricity metering equipment (a.c). General requirements. Tests and test conditions. Part 11: Meters for electric energy".</p> <p><u>Response 2 dated 19/04/2011</u></p> <p>The monitoring report is updated with the correct name of the standard.</p>	<p>Response 1 is not accepted.</p> <p>Please provide the updated MR with reference to the specified GOST.</p> <p>CAR is not closed.</p> <p><u>Response 2 is accepted</u></p> <p>CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the MR.</p>
<b>CAR 06.</b> Please provide evidence that the applied gas flow meters and the electricity meter provide accuracy 1%.	101 (a)	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>The information that shows the accuracy of the applied gas flow meters and the electricity meter is presented to the AIE.</p> <p><u>Response 2 dated 19/04/2011</u></p> <p>The monitoring report is updated with the correct name of the standard.</p>	<p>Response 1 is accepted with regard to all meters except gas meter GM868 Panametrics which has measuring inaccuracy in the range <math>\pm 2</math> to <math>\pm 5\%</math>.</p> <p>Please correct MR accordingly.</p> <p>CAR is not closed.</p>



2<sup>nd</sup> Verification Report on JI project  
 “Yety-Purovskoe oil field associated gas recovery and utilization project”

			<p><u>Response 2 is accepted</u></p> <p>CAR is closed based on due amendments made to the MR.</p>
<p><b>CAR 07.</b> Please provide the following information and data needed for verification of emission reduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Calibration certificates for each measuring device:</li> <li>(ii) Orifice meter (DKS-0, 6-300) as per D.2-1;</li> <li>(iii) Ultrasonic flow meter (Panametrics GM 868) as per D.2-2;</li> <li>(iv) Orifice meter (Flo Boos 407) as per D.2-5;</li> <li>(v) Gas chromatograph as per D.2-3 and D.2-4;</li> <li>(vi) Electricity meter as per D.2-6.</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u> for orifice meters please provide calibration certificates for orifice, manometer, thermometer, and integrating processor, if appropriate.</p>	101 (b)	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>The requested information is presented to the AIE.</p>	<p>Response 1 is accepted.</p> <p>CAR is closed based on the documented evidence provided to the AIE.</p>
<p><b>CAR 08.</b> Please provide evidence that gas flow orifice meters were used in range of applicability of orifice calibration results.</p>	101(b)	<p><u>Response 1 dated 11/04/2011</u></p> <p>The requested information is presented to the AIE.</p>	<p>Response 1 is accepted.</p> <p>CAR is closed based on the documented evidence provided to the AIE.</p>