VERIFICATION REPORT
ENERGOGRUPE,UAB

VERIFICATION OF THE

KREIVENAI WIND POWER PARK JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
1 JULY 2009 TO 31 DECEMBER 2010

REPORT NO. LITHUANIA-VER/0019/2011
REVISION NO.01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: LITHUANIA-ver/0018/2011

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
08/03/2011	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	Client ref.:
ENERGOGRUPE, UAB	Justinas Vilpisauskas, Director

Summary:
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 1st periodic verification of the of the JI Track II Project "Kreivenai wind power park", project of Energogrupe, UAB, located in the village Kreivenai in Taurage 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 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 41 993 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period 01/07/2009-31/12/2010.

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.:	Subject Group:	
LITHUANIA-VER/0019/2011	JI	
Project title: Kreivenai wind power park		
Work carried out by: Tomas Paulaitis: Lead Verifier		
Work reviewed by: Ashok Mammen		
Work approved by: Witold Dżugan		
Date of this revision: 08/03/2011	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 19

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Energogrupe, UAB has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emission reductions of its "Kreivenai wind power park" joint implementation project (hereafter called "the project") in the village Kreivenai 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 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 01/07/2009-31/12/2010.

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 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 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 the 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.

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."

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 05/01/2011 submitted by Energogrupe, 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 06 dated 31/09/2009 and the Monitoring Report version 02 dated 28/01/2011.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 19/01/2011 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 Energogrupe, 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
Energogrupe, 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 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 a 20 MW wind farm consisting of 10 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 10/12/2009 by national authorities. The contract for selling – purchasing electricity was signed with Lietuvos energija, AB and the Project started to deliver electricity to the grid in July 2009.

FAR1 was issued in the Determination report: „The implementation for the monitoring of the noise level will be checked during the first periodic verification.“ A noise monitoring test is required for this type of projects, and this test was carried out by a competent authority Nacionaline sveikatos prieziuros laboratorija on 04/12/2009. The test results confirmed that the noise level is in accordance with the requirements of hygienic norm HN 33:2007, hence FAR1 is closed.

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.

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

The monitoring was reviewed in accordance with the requirements of the monitoring plan included in the PDD version 06 regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website:
http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/BFVOMEK586J0G27WS1CU3IZL9NRT4D

The Monitoring plan change is presented in the Monitoring report version 2 Annex 1 (dated 28/01/2001) and has been applicable since December 2010. See section 3.4 for the verification of this Monitoring plan change.

3.4 Revision of the monitoring plan (99-100)

Another wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park) has been connected to the substation in December 2010 and since then the commercial meter (position T-101) and the duplicated commercial meter (position T-101/D) have been accounting joint electricity delivery and consumption data of these both projects. The monitoring change has not been justified in the monitoring report version 01, hence CL1 is issued with the request to provide information concerning this change.

In response to this clarification request, the Monitoring plan change has been described and justified in the Monitoring report version 02 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 to CL1 was found acceptable, see Annex A, 99 (a) for more details.

3.5 Data management (101)

The Monitoring report based on the Monitoring plan is prepared by the director of Energogrupe, UAB based on monthly energy output/input invoices received from LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB.

The received original invoices are stored by the accountant of UAB "Energogrupe" and were provided for the verification. All invoices 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.

Hence, the data and their sources, provided in the Monitoring report, are clearly identified, reliable and transparent. The implementation of data collection procedures is in accordance with the Monitoring plan, the evidence and records used for monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner.

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.

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 "Kreivenai 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 Energogrupe, 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 06 (dated 31/09/2009).

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 01/07/2009 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions:	41 993 t CO_2 equivalents;
Project emissions:	0 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions:	41 993 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2009) :	13 629 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2010) :	28 364 t CO_2 equivalents.

5 REFERENCES

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

/1/ PDD, version 06, dated 31/09/2009
/2/ Determination report, No. 1244021, issued by TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH, dated 17/08/2010
/3/ Monitoring Report, dated 05/01/2011 (initial version 01)
/4/ Excel calculation tool, dated 25/01/2011 (final version 02)
/5/ Monitoring Report, dated 23/02/2011 (final version 02)
/6/ Letter of Approval from the Investor party, issued by Ministry of Economic Affairs of Netherlands on 25/02/2010
/7/ 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, signed by Energogrupe, UAB and Lietuvos energija, AB, July 2009-December 2010
/2/ Technical passports (with calibration records inside) for commercial electric power meters
/3/ Commissioning documents issued by local authorities to Kreivenai wind power park, dated on 10/12/2009
/4/ Joint venture agreement, signed by Energogrupe, UAB and Vejo gusis, UAB on 01/12/2010
/5/ Noise level monitoring reports (issued by Nacionalines visuomenes sveikatos priežiūros centras on 04/12/2009)

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/ Mr. Justinas Vilpisauskas, director, ENERGOGRUPE UAB

APPENDIX A: KREIVENAI 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 have been 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/BFVOMEK586J0G27WS1CU3IZL9NRT4D). The project involves a 20 MW wind farm consisting of 10 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 10/12/2009 by national authorities. The Project started to deliver electricity to the grid in July 2009. Electric power meters were installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of		O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		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) below. FAR1 was issued in the Determination report: „The implementation for the monitoring of the noise level will be checked during the first periodic verification." A noise monitoring test is required for this type of projects, and this test was carried out by a competent authority Nacionaline sveikatos prieziuros laboratorija on 04/12/2009. The test results confirmed that the noise level is in accordance with the requirements of hygienic norm HN 33:2007, hence FAR1 is closed. 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 has operated without significant shutdowns and failures. The project has not reached the forecasted annual 54948 MWh/year (31,4 %) capacity factor, basically because of the lower average wind speed in the region during the monitoring period. The actual capacity factor was 24,9 % in 2009 and 25,9 % in 2010.	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 monitoring were analyzed and compared with the requirements of the monitoring plan and its change applicable since December 2009 (see section 99 (a) below for justification of this revision). The results of the analysis are described in the table below:	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><table><tr><th>Requirement</th><th>Results</th></tr><tr><td>E_{VP} – net power production at Kreivenai wind power park</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><tr><td>$P1_{L103}$, $P2_{L104}$, $P3_{L105}$ – the data from separate control meters on the net power dispatched to the grid</td><td>O.K.</td></tr></table></td><td></td><td></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 identified, reliable and transparent?</td><td>Financial invoices 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 Energogrupe, UAB and by LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB.</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
</table>

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	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				
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				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	Another wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park) has been connected to the substation in December 2010 and since then the commercial meter (position T-101) and the duplicated commercial meter (position T-101/D) have been accounting joint electricity delivery and consumption data of these projects. This monitoring change has not been justified in the monitoring report version 01, hence CL1 is issued. CL1: Please, provide information on the monitoring change caused by Griezpelkiai wind power park connection and justify it.	CL1	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?	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.	CL1	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 UAB "Energogrupe" based on monthly energy output/input invoices received from the national operator AB Lietuvos energija. The received original invoices are stored by the accountant of UAB "Energogrupe" and were provided for the verification. All invoices were audited (100 % sample) and compared with the data presented in the monitoring report and the data published officially on LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB website: http://www.litgrid.eu/index.php?1973822023 For the quality assurance, the audit company is contracted to revise the company's financial results including monitoring reports, but the financial audit report was at the stage of preparation when this report was issued. Despite this, there is enough evidence to state that the data are reliable, because 100 % of the financial invoices	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>have been verified and additionally compared with the data published officially on LIETUVOS ENERGIJA, AB website.</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 Energogrupe, 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 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>
<tr><td>101 (c)</td><td>Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?</td><td>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).</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
<tr><td>101 (d)</td><td>Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?</td><td>See 101 (a) above.</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
</table>

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

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− 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 information on the monitoring change caused by Griezpelkiai wind power park connection and justify it.	99 (a)	To measure which part of the jointly delivered and consumed electric power should be allocated to Kreivenai wind power park, a joint venture agreement was signed between Energogrupe, UAB and Vejo Gusis, UAB (operator of the Griezpelkiai wind power park) on 01/12/2010. The allocation is based on the data of 3 additional control meters, 2 of them (positions L-103 and L-104) measure Kreivenai wind power park electric power delivery/consumption and 1 (position L-105) measures Griezpelkiai wind power park electric power delivery/consumption. The algorithm and formulas used are described in the joint venture agreement. The Monitoring report version 02 was issued, and this monitoring plan change is described and justified in Annex 1 accordingly. Additional control meters are included in the table „Monitoring equipment technical data“, page 4.	The monitoring plan change was reviewed and verified according to the requirements of the referenced joint venture agreement. This agreement is recognized by the national grid operator Lietuvos energija, AB , hence financial invoices are issued separately and in accordance with this agreement. The validity status and accuracy of additional control meters (positions L-103, L-104, L-105) were verified and found in line with the national legislation. Hence, the monitoring plan change was found acceptable and CL1 was closed.