VERIFICATION REPORT
VEJO GUSIS,UAB

VERIFICATION OF THE

LIEPYNES WIND POWER PARK JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
1 NOVEMBER 2009 TO 31 DECEMBER 2010

REPORT NO. LITHUANIA-VER/0021/2011
REVISION NO.02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: LITHUANIA-VER/0021/2011

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 25/03/2011	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: VEJO GUSIS, UAB	Client ref.: Egidijus Simutis, Director

Summary:
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 1st periodic verification of the JI Track II Project "Liepynes Wind Power Park Joint Implementation Project", project of Vejo gusis, UAB, located at Kretingos district near the village Liepyne, 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 13 039 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period 01/11/2009-31/12/2010.

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.: LITHUANIA-VER/0021/2011	Subject Group: JI	
Project title: Liepynes wind power park Joint implementation project		
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: 13/05/2011	Rev. No.: 02	Number of pages: 20

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Vejo gusis, UAB has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emission reductions of its "Liepynes wind power park joint implementation project" (hereafter called "the project") in the territory of village Liepyne, Kretingos 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 first periodic verification of the project for the period 01/11/2009-31/12/2010.

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 17/01/2011 submitted by Vejo gusis, UAB and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. the country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Project Determination Report, 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 04 dated 14 September 2009 and the Monitoring Report version 02 dated 28/01/2011.

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. A representative of Vejo gusis, 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
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 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 and 1 Corrective Action 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 25/02/2010.

A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host party was provided, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 15/01/2010.

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 6 wind turbines 4 x E82 (2.0 MW), 1 x E53 (0.8 MW), 1 x E33 (0.33 MW) with the total capacity of 9,13 MW and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid.

The project was commissioned finally in December 2009 and since then has operated without any changes. Clarification request CL1 is issued with request to provide noise monitoring results (required by national law for all new wind power projects) and project commissioning documents. Requested documents were provided with evidences that project was commissioned and fulfilled requirements for noise level, hence CL1 has been closed.

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. The project has not reached the forecasted annual 24 200 MWh/year (30,3 %) 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 20 563 MWh which corresponds to 25,7 % capacity factor. Lower net delivery has resulted on lower emission reduction also: 12873 tCO_2 in 2010 instead of forecasted 14 711 tCO_2.

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 of the monitoring plan included in the PDD version 04 regarding which the determination has been deemed final.

All data sources for calculation emission reduction are clearly identified, reliable and transparent; the data sources are financial invoices based on 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 Vejo gusis, UAB and by LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB.

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)

Not applicable.

3.5 Data management (101)

The monitoring report based on monitoring plan and monthly power dispatch reports is prepared by Vejo gusis, UAB director. Monitoring of net power dispatched to the grid is measured by the commercial and control power meters. The data from all meters are transferred to AB Lietuvos energija side. AB Lietuvos energija send deeds of transfer and acceptance to each wind power park owner. After data verification and acceptance of received power dispatch reports, the invoices from Vejo gusis, UAB are issued.

No mistakes or misstatements have been found, except of minor typing error (CAR1). This CAR was resolved in the monitoring report version 02.

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. Information concerning management of this situation was described in the monitoring report, referenced documents were provided for verification and have been found acceptable (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 1st monitoring period verification of "Liepynes 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 Vejo gusis, 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 04 (dated 14/09/2009).

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 02 (dated 28/01/2011) 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 01/11/2009 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions:	13 039 t CO_2 equivalents;
Project emissions:	0 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2009) :	166 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2010) :	12 873 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Total):	13 039 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 14/09/2009
/2/ Determination report, No. Lithuania-DET/0001/2009, issued by Bureau veritas certification, dated 25/05/2010
/3/ Monitoring Report, dated 17/01/2011 (initial version 01)
/4/ Monitoring Report, dated 28/01/2011 (final version 02)
/5/ Letter of Approval from the Investor party, issued by Ministry of Economic Affairs of Netherlands on 25/02/2010
/6/ Letter of Approval from the Host party, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 15/01/2010

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 Vejo gusis, UAB and Lietuvos energija, AB, November 2009-December 2010
/2/ Technical passports (with calibration records inside) for electric power meters
/3/ Job Task 10-93 for electric power dismantle, dated 29/03/2010
/4/ Project commissioning documents, dated 05/03/2010
/5/ Noise monitoring report, issued by Nacionalinės Visuomenės Sveikatos Priežiūros Laboratorijos Klaipėdos skyrius, dated 17/02/2010

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/ Egidijus Simutis, CEO, VEJO GUSIS, UAB

APPENDIX A: LIEPYNES 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 25/02/2010. A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host party was provided, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 15/01/2010. 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/2UQINSKOBR4GALWX3TEJD98MP15C0H). The project involves 6 wind turbines 4 x E82 (2.0 MW), 1 x E53 (0.8 MW), 1 x E33 (0.33 MW) with the total capacity of 9,13 MW and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid. The turbines were put into operation on December 2009. 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.	CL1	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		CL1: Please provide for verification Project commissioning documents and noise monitoring report. 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.		
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 24200 MWh/year (30,3 %) 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 20563 MWh which corresponds to 25,7 % capacity factor.	O.K.	O.K.
Compliance with monitoring plan				

<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>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 the monitoring were analyzed and compared with the requirements of the monitoring plan. The results of this analysis are described in the table below:

<table><tr><th>Requirement</th><th>Results</th></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Continuous direct measurements</td></tr><tr><td>ELiep(+/-) – net power dispatched to the grid from Liepynes Wind Power Park Joint Implementation Project, MWh</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>ET101 – the data of commercial power meter No.T101, i.e. net power dispatched to the grid from Rudaiciai wind power park (30MW) and Liepynes Wind Power Park Joint Implementation Project (9,13MW), kWh</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>ERud(+/-) – net power dispatched to the grid from Rudaiciai wind power park, kWh</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>P – the sum of net power dispatched to the grid measured by all control meters, kWh</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>P1(+/-)+P2(+/-)+P3(+/-)+P4(+/-) - the data from four separate control meters on net power dispatched to the grid, kWh</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>P4(+/-) - the data of Liepynes Wind Power Park Joint Implementation Project’s control meter, kWh</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>P4% – Liepynes Wind Power Park Joint Implementation Project’s energy generation proportion from total net power amount, %</td><td>O.K.</td></tr></table></td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
<tr><td>95 (a)</td><td>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?</td><td>Not applicable.</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
<tr><td>95 (b)</td><td>Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly</td><td>Data sources are financial invoices based on power dispatch reports issued by the national grid operator LIETUVOS</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
</table>

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	identified, reliable and transparent?	ENERGIJA, AB 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 LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB.		
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				
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	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?			
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 monitoring plan and monthly power dispatch reports is prepared by Vejo gusis, UAB director. Monitoring of net power dispatched to the grid is measured by the commercial and control power meters. The data from all meters are transferred to AB Lietuvos energija side. AB Lietuvos energija send deeds of transfer and acceptance to each wind power park owner. After data verification and acceptance of received power dispatch reports, the invoices from Vejo gusis, UAB are issued. 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 verification report issuance. This fact has not effected verification opinion, because all invoices were audited (100 % sample) and compared with the data presented in the Monitoring report during the verification, no mistakes or misstatements have been found, except of typing error, see CAR1: CAR1: Monitoring report, Annex 1: data on "power supplied to grid", "power consumed from the grid" and "net annual power production" are provided in MWh, but measurement results are	CAR1	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>used in KWh actually. Please correct Annex 1 accordingly.</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 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:

<table><tr><th>Measurement device, No</th><th>Validation status</th></tr><tr><td>Main commercial meter T-101,
No 289135</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>Duplicated commercial meter T-101/D,
No 289203</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>E-1, Back-up feed meter,
No 867455, until 13/10/2010</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>E-1, Back-up feed meter,
No 867455, since 13/10/2010</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>Control meter LN Kiauleikiai,
No 508196</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>Control meter LN Kveciai,
No 508202</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>Control meter LN Liepynes,
No 508174</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>Control meter L 107,
No 649218 (until 27/03/2010)</td><td>O.K.</td></tr><tr><td>Control meter L 107,
No 508174 (since 29/03/2010)</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
		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 installed in 29/03/2010. Information concerning management of this situation was described in the monitoring report: according to the Act on accounting of consumed electricity Nr.10-24 issued on 29/03/2010 accounting of electricity stood from the 27/ 03/2010 22:00 to 29/03/2010 10:30 due to automatic energy meter breakdown and electric energy in this period was calculated based on readings of other 3 control (P1, P2, P3) and commercial meters (T-101), i.e. based on its reading difference. Referenced documents was provided for verification and have been found acceptable, because of these reasons: 1) Emergency monitoring period is quite short (less then 0,4 percent of the all monitoring period); 2) Situation was managed according requirements of the national law: (http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter3/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=263568). Back-up power connection is managed by an other Rudaiciai wind power park (coneccted to the the substation). Hence back-up power monitoring results are included in the monitoring report of the Rudaiciai wind power park and are not applicable for this Project.		
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 accountant. The retention period is 10 years.	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.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
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; − 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	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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
CAR1: Monitoring report, Annex 1: data on "power supplied to grid", "power consumed from the grid" and "net annual power production" are provided in MWh, but measurement results are expressed in KWh actually. Please correct Annex 1 accordingly.	101 (a)	Annex 1 is corrected in the Monitoring report, Version 02 accordingly.	The correction is found acceptable, hence CAR1 is closed.
CL1: Please provide for verification Project commissioning documents and noise monitoring report	92	Requested documents are provided.	Requested documents were provided with evidences that project was commissioned and fulfilled requirements for noise level (max. noise level have not exceeded level limited on hygiene norm HN 33:2007).