



## AIE REPORT FORM

(version 04)

(to be completed by an AIE requesting the publication of a determination pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines)

Accredited independent entity (AIE) submitting form Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS

### JI activity

Reference number and title of JI activity 0173: Mockiai Wind Power Joint Implementation Project

Parties involved in the JI activity Lithuania  
Netherlands

Project participants UAB Iverneta  
Stichting Carbon Finance (SCF)

Coordinating entity (applicable to JI PoA only) N.A.

Type of JI activity:  large-scale  small-scale  LULUCF  PoA

### Emission reductions/Enhancements of removals

Monitoring period(s) (DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY) 01/01/2010-31/12/2011

Verified reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources/enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks (tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> eq.) 32765

The present verification is the first with regard to the JI activity  Yes  No

Applicable to JI PoA only	Verification period (DD/MM/YYYY-DD/MM/YYYY)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
	Reference number of JPAs verified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
	Sampling approach used to verify the PoA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

### Statements regarding requirements and possible changes

Please confirm that all requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements defined by the CMP or the JISC with regard to verifications pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines are met:

- Yes  
 No

### Verification opinion

Please provide a verification opinion (or a reference to the verification opinion in one of the documents attached), including a statement regarding materiality and level of assurance, in accordance with the Standard for applying the concept of materiality in verifications

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 1st monitoring period verification of "Mockiai 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 UAB Iverneta 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 within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD version 1.7 (dated 26/05/2011). 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 Monitoring Report version 2 (dated 09/03/2012) 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 31/12/2011

Baseline emissions: 32765 t CO2 equivalents;

Project emissions: 0 t CO2 equivalents;

Emission Reductions: 32765 t CO2 equivalents;

Emission Reductions (Year 2010) : 6976 t CO2 equivalents;

Emission Reductions (Year 2011) : 25789 t CO2 equivalents;

Total Emission Reductions: 32765 t CO2 equivalents

<b>The <u>project design</u> was revised in the current monitoring period, after the determination has been deemed final</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If yes, please <u>list all revisions</u> to the project design and express a determination opinion (or provide a reference to an attached document containing the required information)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<b>If project design was revised in the current monitoring period, <u>please confirm</u> that conditions defined in JI guidelines (paragraph 33) are still met</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If project design was revised in the current monitoring period, <u>please confirm</u> that the changes do not alter the original determination opinion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>If project design was revised in the current monitoring period, <u>please confirm</u> that:</b>		
(a) Physical location of the project has not changed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(b) If emission sources have changed, they are reflected in an updated monitoring plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(c) Baseline scenario has not changed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(d) Changes are consistent with JI specific approach or CDM methodology upon which the determination was prepared for the project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>The <u>monitoring plan</u> was revised in the current monitoring period</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If yes, please specify for which technologies and measures under each type of JPA the monitoring plan was revised (applicable to JI PoA only)</i>		
<b>The current <u>revisions</u> to the monitoring plan 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 establishing</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

**monitoring plans**

**List of documents attached to the verification report form**

Please attach relevant documents used in the verification process and mark below accordingly

**Verification report**

**Written approvals by the Parties involved, if applicable. Note: LoA's were provided during determination process.**

**Other relevant documents:**

- Document listing all revisions to the project design, if applicable
- Determination that the revisions to the project design, if applicable, do not alter the original determination opinion and that the conditions defined by paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines are still met
- Revised monitoring plan, if applicable
- Determination that the revisions to the monitoring plan, if applicable, improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected, compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with relevant rules and regulations for establishing monitoring plans
- Sampling plan, if applicable (*JI PoA only*)
- Any other documents (please list):  
Monitoring report version (version 2, dated 09/05/2012)

**The AIE herewith declares that undertaking the verification for the JI activity referred to above does not constitute a conflict of interest which is incompatible with the role of an AIE**

**Operational manager signing for the AIE**

Witold Dzugan

**Date and signature**

2012-06-12

