VERIFICATION REPORT
VEJO GUSIS,UAB

VERIFICATION OF THE
GRIEZPELKIU WIND POWER PARK PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
01 OCTOBER 2010 TO 31 DECEMBER 2011

REPORT NO. LITHUANIA-VER/0036/2012

REVISION NO. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: LITHUANIA-ver/0036/2012

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
17/02/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
Vejo gusis, UAB	Mr. Egidijus Simutis, Director

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 1st periodic verification of the JI Track II Project "Griezpelkiu wind power park project", JI Registration Reference Number 0200, project of Vejo gusis, UAB, located in the village Griezpelkiai in Taurage district, Lithuania applying the project specific methodology 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.

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 & 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 17978 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period 01/10/2010-31/12/2011.

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/0036/2012	JI
Project title:	
Griezpelkiu wind power park project	
Work carried out by:	
Tomas Paulaitis: Lead Verifier Kęstutis Navickas Technical specialist	
Work reviewed by:	
Ashok Mammen	
Work approved by:	
Witold Dzugan	

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
17/02/2012	01	19

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Vejo gusis, UAB has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project "Griezpelkiu wind power park project" (hereafter called "the project") in the village Griezpelkiai in Taurage district, Lithuania.

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.
The order includes the first periodic verification of the project for the period 01/10/2010-31/12/2011.

1.1 Objective

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Independent Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period.

UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

1.2 Scope

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

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward 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
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier
Tomas Paulaitis is a lead auditor for the environment and quality management systems with over 10 years of experience and a lead GHG verifier (EU ETS, JI, CDM) with over 6 years of experience in energy, oil refinery and cement industry sectors, he was/is involved in the determination/verification of more than 50 JI projects. Tomas Paulaitis holds a Master's degree in chemical engineering.

Kęstutis Navickas, Associate Professor, Dr.
Bureau Veritas Certification Team member, technical specialist
Kęstutis Navickas is Head of the Lithuanian Academy of Agriculture department of Agroenergetics. He has more 15 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:

Mr. Ashok Mammen
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal reviewer
Over 20 years of experience in chemical and petrochemical field. Dr. Mammen is a lead auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems and a lead verifier for GHG projects. He has been involved in the validation and verification processes of more than 100 CDM/JI and other 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, 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 verification protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) version 1 dated 02/01/2012 submitted by Vejo gusis, UAB 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, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report version 1 dated 02/01/2012 and project as described in the determined PDD version 04 dated 23/07/2010.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 11/01/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed on-site interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representative of Vejo gusis, UAB was interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Vejo gusis, 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 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 Verification Team 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.

The Verification Team will make an objective assessment as to whether the actions taken by the project participants, if any, satisfactorily resolve the issues raised, if any, and should conclude its findings of the verification.

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

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

This is the first periodic verifications. There were no FAR's issued during the project determination.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval has been issued by the DFP (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation of Netherlands) of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest (LoA is issued on 22/12/2010).

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

The project involves a 10 MW wind farm consisting of 5 Enercon E82 2MW wind turbines and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid.

The official commissioning document recognizing that the wind power park was built according to the applicable national legislation was issued on 17/12/2010 by national authorities. The contract for electric power dispatch was signed on 01/04/2011 (incl. amendments dated 09/12/2010 and 31/12/2010) with grid operator LITGRID, AB and the Project started to deliver electricity to the grid in December 2010.

Electric power meters were installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of measurement devices is 0,2 s (should be 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.

Project was fully operational during the 1st monitoring period. The project's net power generation was 28335 MWh in 2011 (32,3 % capacity factor) and was close to forecasted annual 31718 MWh net power generation (36,2 % capacity factor). Power generation was 383 MWh in 2010 and was not reached forecasted amount for year 2010 (7928,5 MWh) mainly because project has started to deliver power in December 2010 only, instead as planed in October 2010.

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

The monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD version 04 regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website: http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/VEAXOI2N4LHS8U60M3C1Z5FYKQWGB7

Data sources used for calculating emission reductions such as purchased and delivered electricity amount to the grid, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Default emission factors value (0,626 t CO2/MWh) is selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice in the final PDD.
There is no requirement to review this emission factor during the crediting period.

The calculation of emission reductions is based in a transparent manner.

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

Not applicable.

3.6 Data management (101)

The data and their sources (monthly power dispatch reports on delivered/purchased electricity) are clearly identified, reliable and transparent. The received original monthly power dispatch reports are stored by the accountant and were provided for the verification. All monthly power dispatch reports were audited (100 % sample) and compared with the data presented in the Monitoring report and the data published officially on LITGRID, AB website: http://www.litgrid.eu/index.php?1973822023 and no mistakes or misstatements have been found.

The implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the monitoring plan.

The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order.
The calibration equipment is sealed and was functioned without any failures during the monitoring period. 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 evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner.

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

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 1st periodic verification of the JI Track II Project "Griezpelkiu wind power park project" in Lithuania, which applies project specific methodology. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

The management of Vejo gusis, UAB is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 04. 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 1 dated 02/01/2012 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. 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 emissions reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm, with a reasonable level of assurance, the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/10/2010 to 31/12/2011

Baseline emissions:	17978 t CO_2 equivalents.
Project emissions:	0 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions (Year 2010) :	240 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions (Year 2011) :	17738 t CO_2 equivalents.

Total Emission Reductions: 17978 t CO_2 equivalents.

5 REFERENCES

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

/1/ PDD, version 04, dated 23/07/2010
/2/ Determination report, No. LITHUANIA-DET/0002/2010, issued by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS, dated 27/07/2010
/3/ Monitoring Report, dated 02/01/2012 (version 1)
/4/ Letter of Approval from the Investor party, issued by Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation of Netherlands on 22/12/2010
/5/ Letter of Approval from the Host party, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 19/06/2010, No. (10-2)-D8-6065

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

/1/ Power dispatch reports on electric power delivered/consumed, signed by Vejo gusis, UAB and Litgrid, AB, October 2010-December 2011
/2/ Technical passports (with calibration records inside) for commercial electric power meters
/3/ Project construction commissioning document, issued by Commission of the construction completion (with participation of representatives or responsible authorities) on 17/12/2010
/4/ The contract for selling – purchasing electricity signed with LITGRID, AB on 01/04/2010 (incl. amendments dated 09/12/2010 and 31/12/2010)
/5/ Noise monitoring report, issued by National public health laboratory (Klaipeda branch) on 26/05/2011, No S-IKL-I24

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/ Mr. Egidijus Simutis, director, Vejo gusis, UAB

APPENDIX A: GRIEZPELKIU WIND POWER PARK PROJECT 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, Agriculture and Innovations of Netherlands on 22/12/2010. A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 19/06/2010 have been submitted for IAE already during the determination process already.	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/VEAXOI2N4LHS8U60M3C1Z5FYKQWGB7). The project involves a 10 MW wind farm consisting of 5 Enercon E82 2MW wind turbines and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid. The official commissioning document recognizing that the wind power park was built according to the applicable national legislation was issued on 17/12/2010 by national authorities. The contract for electric power dispatch was signed on 01/04/2011 (incl. amendments dated 09/12/2010 and 31/12/2010) with grid operator LITGRID, AB. Electric power meters were installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of measurement devices is 0,2 s (should be not less than 0,5 s). See more details on electric power meters' validation status in 101 (b)	O.K.	O.K.

<table>
<tr><th>DVM Paragraph</th><th>Check Item</th><th>Initial finding</th><th>Draft Conclusion</th><th>Final Conclusion</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>below.
After installing the wind-power plants the compulsory measurements of the noise level have been undertaken by National public health laboratory (Klaipeda branch) on 26/05/2011. There is stated in the test report that noise level has been measured in all control points and has not exceeded level limited on hygiene norm HN 33:2007.
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.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>93</td><td>What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?</td><td>There are no project changes identified during the monitoring period. The project has operated without significant shutdowns and failures. Project was fully operational during the 1st monitoring period. The project’s net power generation was 28335 MWh in 2011 (32,3 % capacity factor) and was close to forecasted annual 31718 MWh net power generation (36,2 % capacity factor). Power generation was 383 MWh in 2010 and was not reached forecasted amount for year 2010 (7928,5 MWh) mainly because project has started to deliver power in December 2010 only, instead of planed October 2010.</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Compliance with monitoring plan</td></tr>
<tr><td>94</td><td>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?</td><td>The approach and data sources used for monitoring were analyzed and compared with the requirements of the monitoring plan.
The results of the analysis are described in the table below:
<table><tr><th>Requirement</th><th>Results</th></tr><tr><td>E_{VP} – net power production at Griezpelkiu wind power park project</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>E_{T101} – net power dispatched to the grid from Keivenai wind power park and another wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park)</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>E_{w2} – net power dispatched from the other wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park)</td><td>O.K.</td></tr></table></td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
</table>

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		$P1_{L103}$, $P2_{L104}$, $P3_{L105}$ – the data from separate control meters on the net power dispatched to the grid — O.K.		
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?	Power dispatch reports issued by the national grid operator are used for calculating as the initial data source. The data are reliable and transparent , the accounting is controlled both by Vejo gusis, UAB and by LITGRID, AB.	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 EF_{LE} 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				
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				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	The monitoring report based on the monitoring plan is prepared by the director of Vejo gusis, UAB based on monthly power dispatch reports received from the national grid operator. The received original power dispatch reports are stored by the accountant of Vejo gusis, UAB and were provided for the verification. For the quality assurance, an audit company is contracted to revise company's financial results including the monitoring reports. However, financial audit report was not issued at the time of	O.K.	O.K.

<table>
<tr><th>DVM Paragraph</th><th>Check Item</th><th>Initial finding</th><th>Draft Conclusion</th><th>Final Conclusion</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>verification report issuance. This fact has not affected verification opinion, because all power dispatch reports were audited (100 % sample) and compared with the data presented in the Monitoring report, and no mistakes or misstatements have been found. Additionally, data on delivered electricity amount to the grid have been found in accordance with the data published officially on LITGRID, AB website (http://www.litgrid.eu/index.php?1973822023).</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>101 (b)</td><td>Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?</td><td>It is defined in the contract signed between Vejo gusis, UAB, and LITGRID, AB that grid operator is the owner of the commercial electric power meters and therefore is responsible for their calibration and maintenance.
The calibration equipment is sealed and was functioned without any failures during the monitoring period. 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 verification are described in the table below:

<table>
<tr><th>Measurement device, No</th><th>Validation/ calibration date</th><th>Validation/ calibration validity date</th></tr>
<tr><td>Commercial meter T-101, No 649233</td><td>11/12/2008</td><td>11/12/2016</td></tr>
<tr><td>Commercial meter T-102, No 649235</td><td>11/12/2008</td><td>11/12/2016</td></tr>
<tr><td>Control meter L-103, No 524226</td><td>12/12/2008</td><td>12/12/2016</td></tr>
<tr><td>Control meter L-104, No 649153</td><td>10/12/2008</td><td>10/12/2016</td></tr>
<tr><td>Control meter L-105, No 524226</td><td>11/12/2008</td><td>11/12/2016</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
</table>

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The reporting documents are stored by the director and the initial data are stored by the accountant. 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 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;	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− 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
-	-	-	-