VERIFICATION REPORT
VEJU SPEKTRAS,UAB

VERIFICATION OF THE

RUDAICIAI WIND POWER PARK JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
1 JANUARY 2010 TO 31 DECEMBER 2010

REPORT NO. LITHUANIA-VER/0020/2011
REVISION NO.02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: LITHUANIA-VER/0020/2011

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
13/03/2011	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
VEJU SPEKTRAS, UAB	Alvydas Naujėkas, Director

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 3rd periodic verification of the JI Track II Project "Rudaiciai wind power park", project of Veju spektras, UAB, located in the territory of villages Kiauleikiai, Kveciai and Rudaiciai, Kretinga district, Lithuania applying the project specific methodology on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI as well as the 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 made by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

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

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the approved project design documents. The 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 is total 34 121 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period 01/01/2010-31/12/2010.

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

Report No.:	Subject Group:	
LITHUANIA-VER/0020/2011	JI	
Project title:		
Rudaiciai wind power park		
Work carried out by:		
Tomas Paulaitis: Lead Verifier Kęstutis Navickas Technical specialist		
Work reviewed by:		
Ashok Mammen Hristo Schwabski		
Work approved by:		
Witold Dzugan		
Date of this revision:	**Rev. No.:**	**Number of pages:**
13/05/2011	02	22

☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Veju spektras, UAB has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emission reductions of its "Rudaiciai wind power park" joint implementation project (hereafter called "the project") in the territory of villages Kiauleikiai, Kveciai and Rudaiciai, Kretinga district, Lithuania. This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.
The order includes the third periodic verification of the project for the period 01/01/2010-31/12/2010.

1.1 Objective

Verification is a periodic independent review and ex post determination by an Accredited Independent Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during a 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 made by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

1.2 Scope

The verification scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study, monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against the 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:

Tomas Paulaitis, M.Sci. (chemical engineering)
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier
Tomas Paulaitis is a lead auditor for environment and quality management systems and a lead GHG verifier (EU ETS, JI) with over 5 years of experience and was/is involved in the determination/verification of more than 20 JI projects.

Kęstutis Navickas, Associate Professor, Dr.
Bureau Veritas Certification, Technical specialist
Kęstutis Navickas is Head of the Lithuanian Academy of Agriculture department of Agroenergetics. He has more 14 years of experience with the research and development in the renewable energy and bioenergy sectors (more than 10 projects).

This verification report was reviewed by:

Ashok Mammen
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal reviewer
Dr. Mammen is a lead auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems and a lead verifier and tutor for GHG projects. He has been involved in the validation and verification processes of more than 100 CDM/JI and other GHG projects."

Hristo Schwabski, M.Sc. (thermal power engineering)
Bureau Veritas Certification Sofia, Greenhouse Gas Auditor.
Hristo Schwabski specializes in developing of JI projects and assessment of CDM/JI/VCS projects. He has over 8 years of experience in the sector of renewable energies GHG projects.

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, the verification protocol was customized for the project according to version 01.1 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, the criteria (requirements), means of verification and 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) first version dated 14/01/2011 submitted by Veju spektras, UAB and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. the country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Project Determination Report, verification report of the 2nd monitoring period, 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 project as described in the final PDD version 05 dated April 2008 and the Monitoring Report version 03 dated 29/03/2011.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 20/01/2011 Bureau Veritas Certification performed (on-site) interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Veju spektras, UAB was interviewed (see 5 References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Veju spektras, UAB	Organizational structure, responsibilities and authorities Project implementation and technology Training of personnel Quality management procedures Metering equipment control Monitoring record keeping system Environmental requirements Monitoring plan Monitoring report

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

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

If the Verification Team 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.

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 1 Clarification Request.

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

3.1 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Investor party was provided, issued by Ministry of Economic Affairs of Netherlands on 16/05/2007.

A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host party was provided, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 05/04/2007.

The above mentioned written approvals are unconditional (the Project approval does not provide any specific additional conditions for the Project implementation and monitoring).

3.2 Project implementation (92-93)

The project involves 15 wind turbines with the total capacity of 30MW (2MW x 15) and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid.

The project was commissioned finally in 2007 and since then has operated without any changes.

Electric power meters were installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of commercial and control measurement devices is not less than 0,5 s.

Hence, it can be confirmed that the project has been implemented and the equipment has been installed as specified in the PDD and according to the national legislation.

There are no project changes identified during the monitoring period. The project activity was completely operational during the monitoring period, the project has operated without significant shutdowns and failures, except for an unplanned change of one of the turbines vanes which was violated by lightning. The project has not reached the forecasted annual 73850 MWh/year (28,1 %) capacity factor, basically because of the lower average wind speed in the region during the monitoring period. The actual net delivery to the grid was 54507 MWh which corresponds to 20,3 % capacity factor.

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

The approach and data sources used for monitoring were analyzed and compared with the requirements of the monitoring plan and its change applicable since December 2009 (another wind power park, LIEPYNE WIND POWER PARK, operated by Vejo gusis, UAB was connected to the transformer station in December 2009 and since then the main commercial meter T-101 has been used to account the amount of power produced and consumed jointly for RUDAICIAI and LIEPYNE WIND POWER PARKS. This monitoring plan change was positively determined during the previous second verification).

No discrepancies from the monitoring requirements were found.

All data sources for calculation emission reduction are clearly identified, reliable and transparent; the data sources are financial invoices based on:

1) Power dispatch reports issued by the national grid operator LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB are used for calculating as the initial data source. The data are reliable and transparent, the accounting is controlled both by Veju spektras, UAB and by LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB.
2) Power dispatch confirmation documents signed with VST, UAB (for back-up feeding; the power for back-up feeding was not used in 2010).

The default emission factor 0,626 tCO_2/MWh is used as required by the PDD. There is no requirement to review this factor during the crediting period.

3.4 Revision of the monitoring plan (99-100)

FAR2 was raised in the previous verification report with request to revise monitoring: „FAR 2: Please revise monitoring plan (taking into account that monitoring is changed when LIEPYNE wind power park was connected to the transmission grid through Veju spektras, UAB) and submit it for the determination by the accredited independent entity until the next verification. “

In response to this clarification request, the Monitoring plan change has been described and justified in the Monitoring report version 03 Annex 1. The proposed revision has not changed the accuracy of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan and has not changed the conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.

Hence, the response was found acceptable, see Annex A, 99 (a) for more details.

3.5 Data management (101)

The responsibilities and roles for monitoring and reporting are stated in the monitoring plan (generally) and in the following Quality Assurance procedures (in detail). The implementation of these Quality Assurance procedures was audited and was found in order. No mistakes or misstatements have been found.

The calibration equipment is sealed and functioned without any failures during the monitoring period, except for the control meter L 107 which broke down and was replaced with another calibrated meter. CL1 is issued to clarify the reliability of monitoring in the period of the meter change (27/10/2010-29/10/2010). The clarification and documented evidence provided have been found acceptable and hence CL1 is closed (see Annex A for more details).

3.6 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 3rd monitoring period verification of "Rudaiciai wind power park" joint implementation project, which applies the project specific methodology.
The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and the 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) a desk review of the project design, baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

The management of Veju spektras, UAB is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emission data and the reported GHG emission reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD version 05 (dated April 2008).

The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 03 (dated 29/03/2011) for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the approved project design documents. The installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is accurately calculated and is free of material errors, omissions, or misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission 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:	34 121 t CO_2 equivalents;
Project emissions:	0 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions:	34 121 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2010) :	34 121 t CO_2 equivalents.

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by VEJU SPEKTRAS, UAB that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ PDD, version 05, dated April 2008
/2/ Second verification report, No LITHUANIA- VER #/0005/2010, issued by BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION, dated 27/05/2010
/3/ Monitoring Report, dated 14/01/2011 (initial version 01)
/4/ Monitoring Report, dated 29/03/2011 (final version 03)
/5/ Excel calculation tool, dated 11/01/2011 (final version v01)
/6/ Letter of Approval from the Investor party, issued by Ministry of Economic Affairs of Netherlands on 16/05/2007
/7/ Letter of Approval from the Host party, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 05/04/2007

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

/1/ Invoices on electric power delivered/consumed and power dispatch documents, signed by Veju spektras, UAB and Lietuvos energija, AB, January 2010-December 2010
/2/ Technical passports (with calibration records inside) for electric power meters
/3/ Quality Assurance procedures:
• KP-ADM-01: Contract Signature Procedure
• KP-GM-01: Power Production-Consumption Document Signature Procedure with Lietuvos Energija
• KP-GM-02: Power Production Document Signature Procedure with Lietuvos Energija
• KP-GM-03: Power Consumption Document Signature Procedure with Lietuvos Energija
• KP-GM-04: Power Production-Consumption Document Signature Procedure with VST
• KP-GM-05: CO2 Emission Reduction Calculation
/4/ Job Task 10-93 for electric power dismantle, dated 29/03/2010

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

/1/ Alvydas Naujekas, director, VEJU SPEKTRAS, UAB
/2/ Jurate Dociuvienė, business coordinator, VEJU SPEKTRAS, UAB
/3/ Arunas Kubilius, supervisor, VEJU SPEKTRAS, UAB

APPENDIX A: RUDAICIAI WIND POWER PARK JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Check list for verification, according to the joint implementation determination and verification manual (version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Investor party was provided, issued by Ministry of Economic Affairs of Netherlands on 16/05/2007. A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host party was provided, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 05/04/2007. These Letters of Approval were submitted for IAE already during the determination process and were found acceptable.	O.K.	O.K.
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, all the written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	The project implementation has been checked according to the information provided in the PDD: (http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/W1WQBGABVVWXBDF135LVP71PVD7RE6). The project involves a 30 MW wind farm consisting of 15 Enercon E70 2MW wind turbines and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid. The turbines were put into operation gradually starting with 10/10/2006 until 16/02/2007. The electric power meters were installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of commercial and control measurement devices is not less than 0,5 s. See more details on the electric power meters' validation status in 101 (b) below. Hence, it can be confirmed that the project has been implemented	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		and the equipment has been installed as specified in the PDD and according to the national legislation.		
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	There are no project changes identified during the monitoring period. The project activity was completely operational during the monitoring period, the project has operated without significant shutdowns and failures, except for an unplanned change of one of the turbines vanes which was violated by lightning. The project has not reached the forecasted annual 73850 MWh/year (28,1 %) capacity factor, basically because of the lower average wind speed in the region during the monitoring period. The actual net delivery to the grid was 54507 MWh which corresponds to 20,3 % capacity factor. The capacity factor was 21,8 % in 2009 and 27,3 % in 20008.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	The approach and data sources used for the monitoring were analyzed and compared with the requirements of the monitoring plan and its change applicable since December 2009 (another wind power park, LIEPYNE WIND POWER PARK, operated by Vejo gusis, UAB was connected to the transformer station in December 2009 and since then the main commercial meter T-101 is used to account the amount of power produced and consumed jointly for RUDAICIAI and LIEPYNE WIND POWER PARKS. This monitoring plan change was positively determined during the previous second verification). The amount of power produced and consumed by RUDAICIAI WIND POWER PARK and LIEPYNE WIND POWER PARK is monitored and divided according to the algorithm set in the Electric Energy Purchase-Sales Agreement with AB Lietuvos energija No. 104-10, dated February 26, 2010 (appendix No.4), i.e. according to the total data of the 4 control meters the proportion (%) of each producer is calculated (3 control meters are dedicated to measure the power of RUDAICIAI WIND POWER PARK	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		delivered/consumed, and 1 control meter is dedicated to measure the power of LIEPYNE WIND POWER PARK delivered/consumed), then according to this proportion the power production and consumption data of the main commercial meter T-101 is divided between the producers.		
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Data sources are financial invoices based on: 1) Power dispatch reports issued by the national grid operator LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB are used for calculating as the initial data source. The data are reliable and transparent , the accounting is controlled both by Veju spektras, UAB and by LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB. 2) Power dispatch confirmation documents signed with VST, UAB (for back-up feeding, the power for back-up feeding was not used in 2010).	O.K.	O.K.
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 default emission factor EFLE 0,626 tCO2/MWh is used as required by the PDD. There is no requirement to review this factor during the crediting period.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Applicable to JI SSC projects only				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	FAR2 was raised in the previous verification report with request to to revise monitoring: „FAR 2: Please revise monitoring plan (taking into account that monitoring is changed when LIEPYNE wind power park was connected to the transmission grid through Veju spektras, UAB) and submit it for the determination by the accredited independent entity until the next verification. “ In response to this clarification request, the Monitoring plan change has been described and justified in the Monitoring report version 03 Annex 1. Monitoring report section D.1 and D.3 are revised:	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		1) Section D.1 revision provides references to implemented QA/QC procedures. These procedures where implemented to respond to FAR are of the first verification and have been found acceptable. Effectiveness of these procedures was verified during 3rd verification also and has been found sufficient. 2) Section D.3 revision provides information on changed monitoring requirements after new 9,13 MW wind park Liepyne operated by UAB Vejo gusis was connected to the transmission grid through UAB Veju spektras transformer station in December 2009. Since then the main commercial meter T-101 is used to account the amount of power produced and consumed jointly for RUDAICIAI and LIEPYNE wind power parks (the Producers). The amount of power produced and consumed by each Producer is calculated and divided by special algorithm set in the Electric Energy Purchase-Sales Agreement with AB Lietuvos energija No. 104-10, dated February 26, 2010, i.e. ac-cording to the total data of the 4 control meters (P-1.1., P-1.2. and P-1.3 meters are used for Rudaiciai wind park; and P-2.1. for Liepyne wind park) the proportion (%) of each Producer is calculated; then according to these proportions the power production and consumption data of the main commercial meter T-101 is divided between the Producers. This monitoring change have been found acceptable, because it is fully compliant with applicable law requirements and is common practise in wind power generation industry.		
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?	The proposed revision has not changed the accuracy of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan and has not changed the conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans.	O.K.	O.K.
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including	The responsibilities and roles for monitoring and reporting are	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	stated in the monitoring plan (generally) and in the following Quality Assurance procedures (in detail): • KP-ADM-01: Contract Signature Procedure • KP-GM-01: Power Production-Consumption Document Signature Procedure with Lietuvos Energija • KP-GM-02: Power Production Document Signature Procedure with Lietuvos Energija • KP-GM-03: Power Consumption Document Signature Procedure with Lietuvos Energija • KP-GM-04: Power Production-Consumption Document Signature Procedure with VST • KP-GM-05: CO2 Emission Reduction Calculation. The implementation of these Quality Assurance procedures was audited and was found in order. All invoices were audited (100 % sample) and compared with the data presented in the Excel calculation tool, no mistakes or misstatements have been found.		
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	It is defined in the contract signed between Veju spektras, UAB, and Lietuvos energija, AB that Lietuvos energija, AB is the owner of the commercial electric power meters and therefore is responsible for their calibration and maintenance. The calibration status of the measuring equipment was verified and found valid. The calibration status was valid during all the monitoring period. The calibration periodicity is 8 years according to the national legislation. The results of the monitoring equipment validation status and sealing were verified and are described in the table below:	CL1	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion

Measurement device, No	Validation status
Main commercial meter T-101, No 289135	O.K.
Duplicated commercial meter T-101/D, No 289203	O.K.
E-1, Back-up feed meter, No 867455, until 13/10/2010	O.K.
E-1, Back-up feed meter, No 867455, since 13/10/2010	O.K.
Control meter LN Kiauleikiai, No 508196	O.K.
Control meter LN Kveciai, No 508202	O.K.
Control meter LN Rudaiciai, No 508174	O.K.
Control meter L 107, No 649218 (until 27/03/2010)	O.K.
Control meter L 107, No 508174 (since 29/03/2010)	O.K.

It is stated in the monitoring report, that control meter L 107 had failed and was dismantled in 27/03/2010. Another calibrated meter was instaled in 29/03/2010. Clarification action request is issued:
CL1: Please, provide a copy of dismantle act for the failed meter L107 and provide documented evidence concerning the agreement with the grid operator for metering in the period when the meter was dismantled.

E-1 Back-up electric energy meter was changed on 13/10/2010 by

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		the low voltage grid owner VST. The change was carried out on the initiative of VST and was planned in advance (no failure was identified). This was found acceptable without additional clarifications, because back-up power was not used in 2010 and this was confirmed by power delivery notes issued by VST.		
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The initial data (power dispatch reports, invoices, calibration records) are stored by the business coordinator according to Quality Assurance Procedures (see 101 (a) above). The retention period is defined during the crediting period and two years after (until 31/12/2014).	O.K.	O.K.
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	See 101 (a) above.	O.K.	O.K.
Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC.s ex ante assessment? (Optional)	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

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
CL1: Please, provide a copy of dismantle act for the failed meter L107 and provide documented evidence concerning the agreement with the grid operator for metering in the period when the meter was dismantled.	99 (a)	The clarification is provided in the revised monitoring report version 03, section 2: "The electric energy meter L-107 broke down at 22.00 on 27th of March, 2010 and was replaced with a new one by AB Lietuvos energija at 10.30 on 29th of March, 2010. The electricity supplied through this meter during the break period was monitored and calculated by the data of technical accounting points (VJ-1.LN KIAULEIKIAI), (VJ-1.LN KVECIAI), (VJ-1.LN RUDAICIAI) and the commercial accounting point (VJ-1.T-101) of 27th March and 29th March, 2010 by AB Lietuvos energija in accordance with the article No. 96.4 of the Rules of Electric Energy Supply and Use approved by the Minister of Economy on 07/10/2005 (see Note No. 10-12 Regarding the Settlement For Electric Energy Used (in case of accounting meters breakdown) dated 29/03/2010; Job Task 10-93 dated 29/03/2010)."	The referenced documents (Rules of Electric Energy Supply and Use and Job task for meter change) were reviewed. The electricity supplied through control meter L-107 was calculated as difference of the commercial accounting meter (T-101) readings and sum of the other 3 commercial meters (VJ-1.LN KIAULEIKIAI), (VJ-1.LN KVECIAI), (VJ-1.LN RUDAICIAI) readings. The clarification is found acceptable, because: 1) Monitoring has been carried out in conformity with referenced legal requirements; 2) Failure period is relative short (about 0,4 percent of all monitoring period); 3) Failure does not have any impact on joint emission reduction data of Rudaiciai wind power park and Liepyne wind power parks (both projects are JI projects). Hence, CL1 is closed.