DETERMINATION REPORT
UAB NAUJOJI ENERGIJA

DETERMINATION OF THE
CIUTELIAI WIND POWER JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

REPORT NO. LITHUANIA-DET/0056/2012
REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: LITHUANIA-det/0056/2012

DETERMINATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
17/09/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
UAB Naujoji Energija	Tadas Navickas

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the determination of the *Ciuteliai wind power joint implementation project* Track 2 project of UAB Naujoji Energija located in Lithuania 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 determination 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, 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 determination report and opinion. The overall determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the determination process is a list of Clarification and Corrective Actions Requests (CL and CAR), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.

In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
LITHUANIA-det/0056/2012	JI
Project title:	
Ciuteliai wind power joint implementation project	
Work carried out by:	
Tomas Paulaitis Lead verifier Gediminas Vaskela Financial specialist	
Work reviewed by:	
Ashok Mammen	
Work approved by:	
Witold Dzugan	

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
08/10/2012	02	47

Indexing terms

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

UAB Naujoji Energija has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to determine its JI project *Ciuteliai wind power joint implementation project* (hereafter called "the project") at Lithuania.

This report summarizes the findings of the determination of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

The determination serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The determination is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and host country criteria are determined in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. Determination is a requirement for all JI projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of emissions reductions units (ERUs).

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 determination 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 determination 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 design.

1.3 Determination team

The determination 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 GHG energy, oil refinery, cement and agriculture industry sectors, he was/is involved in the determination/verification of more than 50 JI/CDM projects. Tomas Paulaitis holds a Master's degree in chemical engineering.

Financial specialist
Gediminas Vaškėla, Finance specialist
Gediminas Vaskela is a certified auditor with over 8 years of experience in auditing, due-diligence, reorganisation, special review and other assurance projects. He was/is involved in the determination/verification of more than 10 JI and CDM projects financial investment analysis.

This determination report was reviewed by:

Mr. Ashok Mammen
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical 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 determination, from Contract Review to Determination Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

In order to ensure transparency, a determination 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 determination and the results from determining the identified criteria. The determination protocol serves the following purposes:
It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a JI project is expected to meet;
It ensures a transparent determination process where the determiner will document how a particular requirement has been determined and the result of the determination.

The completed determination protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1 Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by UAB Naujoji Energija and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for users of the joint implementation project design document form, Approved CDM methodology and/or Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Determination Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, UAB Naujoji Energija revised the PDD and resubmitted it on August 2012.

The determination findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version 1.3 (ref 1).

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 10/03/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed on-site interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of UAB Naujoji Energija were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
UAB Naujoji Energija	➢ On-site tour, project presentation; ➢ Technical project documentation; ➢ Environmental aspects, stakeholders comments; ➢ Environmental permits, related correspondence with local authorities concerning project, legal raw requirements; ➢ Documents which are intended to be used as source data for monitoring; ➢ Baseline; ➢ Monitoring plan.

2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the determination 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 project design.

Corrective Action Request (CAR) is issued, where:

(a) The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions;

(b) The JI requirements have not been met;

(c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

The determination team may also issue Clarification Request (CL), if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable JI requirements have been met.

The determination team may also issue Forward Action Request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue that needs to be reviewed during 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 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project consists of 17 turbines at 2.3 MW capacities each with a total capacity of 39.1 MW (2.3 MW x 17). The project, in a conservative approach, will generate about 86,611 MWh of electric power per year. The project would displace carbon intensive electricity produced from fossil fuel sources. Such wind park's generation will lead to 54,219 tCO2/year emission reductions.

4 DETERMINATION CONCLUSIONS

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

The findings from the desk review of the original project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are described in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A.

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Determination Protocol in Appendix A. The determination of the Project resulted in 9 Corrective Action Requests and 7 Clarification Requests.

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

4.1 Project approvals by Parties involved (19-20)

Letter of Approval from the involved Host country was not issued on the time of draft determination report issuance (17/09/2012), therefore CL 1 was issued. According Lithuanian National JI guidelines (Ref 2) the final Project approval might be issued only after the Project determination report submission to the Lithuanian DFP.

The Letter of Approval was issued by Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania on 05/10/2012 (Ref 15) and was found acceptable to close CL1.

The Investor Country approval will be issued by a selected Investor Country by latest prior to the first verification of the Project.

4.2 Authorization of project participants by Parties involved (21)

Authorization of project participants by Lithuanian designated focal point will be verified when Letter of Approval will be issued (refer to 4.1 above).

4.3 Baseline setting (22-26)

The PDD explicitly indicates that using a methodology for baseline setting and monitoring developed in accordance with appendix B of the JI guidelines (hereinafter referred to as JI specific approach) was the selected approach for identifying the baseline.

The PDD provides a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner, as well as justification, that the baseline is established by using a multi-project emissions factor (emission factor of the power plant of AB Lietuvos Elektrine, 0.626 tCO2/MWh, listed in the National Alocation Plan, adopted by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania, ref 3).

The baseline emissions are to be calculated as follows:

$BE_y = EG_y \times EF_y$

Where:

BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO_2/yr)

EG_y = Net electricity supplied to the grid (MWh/yr)

EF_y = Emission factor of the power plant of AB Lietuvos Elektrine (0.626 tCO2/MWh)

4.4 Additionality (27-31)

The most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" version 06.0.0 approved by the CDM Executive Board was used. All explanations, descriptions and analyses are made in accordance with the selected tool.

Additionality proofs are provided (ref 7-14).

Additionality is demonstrated appropriately as a result of the analysis using the approach chosen.

4.5 Project boundary (32-33)

The project boundary defined in the PDD, which is Project site (wind power park) and the power plants of AB Lietuvos Elektrine, the power generation of which the wind power farm would replace, encompasses all anthropogenic emissions by sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that are:

(i) Under the control of the project participants;
(ii) Reasonably attributable to the project;
(iii) Significant, as exceed an amount of 2,000 tonnes of CO2 equivalent.

The delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included are appropriately described and justified in the PDD: baseline CO_2 emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants of Lietuvos elektrinė as per National Allocation Plan (ref 3) are included.

The AIE determined the project boundary by:
a) Detail the documentation assessed (Detailed land use plan, Building permit, ref 4,5).
b) Site visit undertaken.

Based on the above assessment, the AIE hereby confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity.

4.6 Crediting period (34)

The PDD states the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began, and the starting date is defined as 08/08/2008 (signing of the contract for delivery of wind turbines), which is after the beginning of 2000.

The PDD states the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months, which is 20 years and 0 months.

The PDD states the length of the crediting period in years and months, which is 6 months, and its starting date as 01/07/2012, which is after the date the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals are generated by the project.

The PDD states that the crediting period for the issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project.

4.7 Monitoring plan (35-39)

The PDD, in its monitoring plan section, explicitly indicates that JI specific approach was selected.

The monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguishes:

(i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination, such as:
- baseline emission factor of 0.626 tCO2/MWh.

(ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination (is stated that no such data and parameters exist).

(iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period, such as:
E_{sup} - Electricity supplied to the grid by the Project;
E_{con} - Electricity consumed from the grid by the project.

The monitoring plan describes the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording, such as measured data of commercial power meter on electricity supplied/consumed to the grid.
The monitoring plan elaborates all algorithms and formulae used for the calculation of baseline emissions such as:

$BE_y = EG_y \times EF_y$

Where:

BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO_2/yr)

EG_y = Net electricity supplied to the grid (MWh/yr)

EF_y = Emission factor of the power plant of AB Lietuvos Elektrine (0.626 tCO2/MWh)

$EGy = E_{sup} – E_{con}$

Where:
E_{sup} = Electricity supplied to the grid by the project (kWh/year)
E_{con} = Electricity consumed from the grid by the project (kWh/year).

Project emissions of emission reductions from the project and leakage are considered to be 0 appropriately.

The monitoring plan presents the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process. Monitoring is based on monthly production reports received from grid operator. In case of failure of commercial measuring meters, electricity production data can be retrieved from:

a) a separate power meters installed at the 20 kV side of the transformer at the grid connection point and
b) the SCADA system of Enercon.

Monitoring plan includes information on calibration and on how records on data and accuracy are kept and made available on request.

The monitoring plan clearly identifies the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities: responsible person at UAB Naujoji energija for monitoring is the member of the management board (Mr. Tadas Navickas) who will officially sign all monitoring reports.

On the whole, the monitoring report reflects good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type.

The monitoring plan provides, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application.

The monitoring plan indicates that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project.

The monitoring plan is established appropriately as a result.

4.8 Leakage (40-41)

No leakage emissions are considered. Is stated that there are no direct or indirect emissions outside the Project boundary attributable to the Project activity, and this was found acceptable in the extent of Project.

4.9 Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals (42-47)

The PDD indicates assessment of emissions in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario as the approach chosen to estimate the emission reductions or enhancement of net removals generated by the project.

The PDD provides the ex ante estimates of:

(a) Emissions for the project scenario (within the project boundary), which are considered to be 0 tons of CO2eq;

(b) Leakage, as not applicable, which are 0 tons of CO2eq;

(c) Emissions for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary), which are 27109 tons of CO2eq;

(d) Emission reductions adjusted by leakage (based on (a)-(c) above), which are 27109 tons of CO2eq.

The estimates referred to above are given:

(a) On a yearly basis;

(b) From 07/01/2012 to 31/12/2012, covering the whole crediting period;

(c) On a source-by-source basis;

(d) For each GHG gas, which are CO2 only in case of project.

(e) In tonnes of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol;

The formula used for calculating the estimates referred above, which are as per section 4.7 above are consistent throughout the PDD.

For calculating the estimates referred to above, key factors as per section 4.7 above influencing the baseline emissions and the activity level of the project and the emissions as well as risks associated with the project were taken into account, as appropriate.

Data sources used for calculating the estimates referred to above, as per section 4.7 above are clearly identified, reliable and transparent.

Emission factors, such as per section 4.7 above were selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice.

The estimation referred to above is based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner.

The estimates referred to above are consistent throughout the PDD.

The annual average of estimated emission reductions over the crediting period (54219 t CO_2e) is calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period, and multiplying by twelve.

4.10 Environmental impacts (48)

The PDD lists and attaches documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project (ref 6), including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party.

According to EIA conclusions bird and noise monitoring should be performed, these requirements are included in the Monitoring plan. Implementation of bird and noise monitoring will be assessed during the first verification.

4.11 Stakeholder consultation (49)

The PDD describes the process of Compulsory public consultation procedure. During the listed administrative procedures the stakeholders consultations have been performed. No comments to the wind farm project have been submitted by any stakeholders.

4.12 Determination regarding small scale projects (50-57)

Not applicable.

4.13 Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) projects (58-64)

Not applicable.

4.14 Determination regarding programmes of activities (65-73)

Not applicable.

5 SUMMARY AND REPORT OF HOW DUE ACCOUNT WAS TAKEN OF COMMENTS RECEIVED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 32 OF THE JI GUIDELINES

No comments, pursuant to paragraph 32 of the JI Guidelines, were received.

6 DETERMINATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a determination of the *Ciuteliai wind power joint implementation project* in Lithuania. The determination 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 determination consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final determination report and opinion.

Project participant/s used the latest tool for demonstration of the additionality. In line with this tool, the PDD provides investment analysis and common practice analysis, to determine that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario.

By synthetic description of the project, the project is likely to result in reductions of GHG emissions. The analysis of investment and technological barriers demonstrates that the proposed project activity is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity. Given that the project is implemented and maintained as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated amount of emission reductions.

The review of the project design documentation (version 1.3) and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria.

In our opinion, the project correctly applied and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the JI and the relevant host country criteria.

The determination is based on the information made available to us and the engagement conditions detailed in this report.

7 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by Type the name of the company that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ PDD “Ciuteliai wind power joint implementation project” version 1.3, dated 21/08/2012
/2/ Lithuanian National JI guidelines, (Order on the approval of the rules for the implementation of the Kyoto protocol’s joint implementation project, dated 18/10/2007)
/3/ Lithuanian National Allocation Plan 2008-2012, approved by the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania on 18/04/2007
/4/ Detailed land use plan, approved by Silute municipality on 17/07/08
/5/ Building permit, No. 08(1)1-156, dated 06/10/2008, 2008
/6/ Conclusion No (9.14.5.)-LV4-5178 of Klaipeda Regional Department of Environment Protection of Lithuanian Ministry of Environment of 30 April 2008
/7/ Investment analysis spreadsheet *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27*
/8/ EMD report, dated 13/10/2010
/9/ Enercon GmbH offer for Ciuteliai wind park, dated 01.10.2010
/10/ Resolution No. O3-27 of the State price and Energy Control Commission of 21 February 2008
/11/ Enercon GmbH EPK offer dated 13.10.2010
/12/ CNA Ltd policy no 310-16033 for Virtsu II wind park 01.03.2008-20.03.2009
/13/ Management agreement already effective between 4energia UAB and Vejo elektra UAB, 24.08.2006
/14/ Management agreement between 4energia UAB and Vejo elektra UAB, 24.08.2007
/15/ The Letter of Approval (LoA), No (10-2)-D8-8617 issued by the Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 05/10/2012

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

/1/ Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality; Version 06.0.0
/2/ Appendix B of the JI Guidelines and the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee "Guidance on Criteria for Baseline Setting and Monitoring" version 02

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

/1/ Mr. Tadas Navickas, Director (Naujoji energija, UAB)
/2/ Mr. Julius Mikalauskas, Project manager (Naujoji energija, UAB)
/3/ Mrs. Vaida Timinskaitė, Project manager assistance (Naujoji energija, UAB)

o0o -

Check list for determination, according JOINT IMPLEMENTATION DETERMINATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL (Version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
General description of the project				
Title of the project				
-	Is the title of the project presented?	The title "Ciuteliai wind power joint implementation project" is presented.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Is the sectoral scope to which the project pertains presented?	Sectoral scope „(1) Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)" is presented.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Is the current version number of the document presented?	The current version is presented (version 1.1 is presented in the initial version, and version 1.3 is presented in the final version).	O.K.	O.K.
-	Is the date when the document was completed presented?	The initial PDD Version 1.1 was completed on May 22, 2012. The final PDD version 1.3 was completed on 21 August, 2012.	O.K.	O.K.
Description of the project				
-	Is the purpose of the project included with a concise, summarizing explanation (max. 1-2 pages) of the: a) Situation existing prior to the starting date of the project; b) Baseline scenario; and c) Project scenario (expected outcome, including a technical description)?	The description of the project activity is described in a clear and transparent manner, by explaining how greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced. It is foreseen to install 17 Enercon E-82 E2 type wind turbines with the total capacity of 39,1 MW (2,3 MW x). The project will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by partially substituting electricity production in other power plants of Lithuania that run on fossil fuel. CAR1: There is stated in the PDD section A.4.2, that wind farm is conservatively estimated to generate 82.666,8 MWh of electric power per year over a period of 20 years, which results in an average load factor of 24,7 %. Referenced EMD International A/S report (conducted on a basis of WindPRO software) report was provided for audit as a proof, however report is covering 20 wind power generators, while only 17 of them will be installed. Please provide estimations on yearly electric power generation for wind power turbines which are included in the Project.	CAR1	O.K.
-	Is the history of the project (incl. its JI component)	History of the project is summarised in the PDD section A.4.2. Key	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	briefly summarized?	permits are obtained by January 2012.		
Project participants				
-	Are project participants and Party(ies) involved in the project listed?	Yes, UAB Naujoji energija is listed as Project participant involved.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Is the data of the project participants presented in tabular format?	All the data of the project participants and Parties are presented.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Is contact information provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	Yes.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Is it indicated, if it is the case, if the Party involved is a host Party?	The host Party involved is Republic of Lithuania, this is indicated in the PDD.	O.K.	O.K.
Technical description of the project				
Location of the project				
-	Host Party(ies)	Republic of Lithuania.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Region/State/Province etc.	Klaipeda county, Silute district.	O.K.	O.K.
-	City/Town/Community etc.	Ciuteliai, Lankupiai, Grumbliai villages.	O.K.	O.K.
-	Detail of the physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of the project. (This section should not exceed one page)	Project location is provided in 2 figures, additionaly, coordinates of the turbines in accordance with LKS94 system are identified. CAR2: Please provide detail of the physical location within one page in a section A.1.4.	CAR2	O.K.
Technologies to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project				
-	Are the technology(ies) to be employed, or measures, operations or actions to be implemented by the project, including all relevant technical data and the implementation schedule described?	Technology, relevant technical data and implementation schedule are described in the PDD section A.4.2. Is stated that emission reductions would thus begin to be generated from June 2012 onwards.	O.K.	O.K.
Brief explanation of how the anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases by sources are to be reduced by the proposed JI project, including why the emission reductions would not occur in the absence of the proposed project, taking into account national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances				
-	Is it stated how anthropogenic GHG emission reductions are to be achieved? (This section should not exceed one page)	It is stated clearly that GHG emission reductions will be achieved by displacing electricity production from fossil fuel sources with the electricity produced by the wind power plant.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
-	Is it provided the estimation of emission reductions over the crediting period?	The estimation of emission reductions is provided over all the crediting period. Will be verified finally when CAR1 will b resolved.	CAR1	O.K.
-	Is it provided the estimated annual reduction for the chosen credit period in tCO2e?	The estimated annual emission reduction is 30187 tonnes of CO2 equivalent. Will be verified finally when CAR1 is resolved.	CAR1	O.K.
-	Are the data from questions above presented in tabular format?	The data are presented in tabular format in the PDD section A.4.4.1.	O.K.	O.K.
Estimated amount of emission reductions over the crediting period				
-	Is the length of the crediting period Indicated?	Length of the crediting period is indicated as 7 months. Starting date of the crediting period: 01/06/2012 (PDD section C.3)	O.K.	O.K.
-	Are estimates of total as well as annual and average annual emission reductions in tonnes of CO2 equivalent provided?	Estimates of total, annual and average emission reductions are provided in the PDD section A.4.3.1. Will be verified finally when CAR1 is resolved.	CAR1	O.K.
Project approvals by Parties				
19	Have the DFPs of all Parties listed as "Parties involved" in the PDD provided written project approvals?	The written project approvals are not provided. According to Lithuanian JI guidelines the final Project approval might be issued only after the Project determination report submission to the Lithuanian DFP. The Investor Country approval will be issued by a selected Investor Country by latest prior to the first verification of the Project. CL1: Please provide project approval (Letter of Approval) issued by Lithuanian FDP. Letter of Approval issued by Investor country will be needed when first monitoring report will be provided for verification at the latest.	CL1	O.K.
19	Does the PDD identify at least the host Party as a "Party involved"?	Republic of Lithuania is identified as involved host party.	O.K.	O.K.
19	Has the DFP of the host Party issued a written project approval?	See CL1 above.	CL1	O.K.
20	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Will be reviewed when Letter of Approval will be issued by Host Party (see CL1 above).	CL1	O.K.
Authorization of project participants by Parties involved				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
21	Is each of the legal entities listed as project participants in the PDD authorized by a Party involved, which is also listed in the PDD, through: − A written project approval by a Party involved, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity? or − Any other form of project participant authorization in writing, explicitly indicating the name of the legal entity?	See CL1 above.	CL1	O.K.
Baseline setting				
22	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used for identifying the baseline? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	The JI specific approach will be applied in the case of the Project, this is clearly indicated in the PDD section B.1.	O.K.	O.K.
JI specific approach only				
23	Does the PDD provide a detailed theoretical description in a complete and transparent manner?	Refer to 25 below.	O.K.	O.K.
23	Does the PDD provide justification that the baseline is established: (a) By listing and describing plausible future scenarios on the basis of conservative assumptions and selecting the most plausible one? (b) Taking into account relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstance? − Are key factors that affect a baseline taken into account? (c) In a transparent manner with regard to the choice of approaches, assumptions, methodologies, parameters, date sources and key factors? (d) Taking into account of uncertainties and using conservative assumptions? (e) In such a way that ERUs cannot be earned for	Refer to 25 below.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	decreases in activity levels outside the project or due to force majeure? (f) By drawing on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B to "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring", as appropriate?			
24	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools for baseline setting are used, are the selected elements or combinations together with the elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 23 above?	Refer to 25 below.	O.K.	O.K.
25	If a multi-project emission factor is used, does the PDD provide appropriate justification?	The chosen baseline and baseline emission factor are based on methodology used by the Lithuanian Ministry of Environment to allocate allowances for JI projects in the National Allocation Plan for greenhouse gas emission allowances for the period 2008 to 2012. The presented emission factor is widely used for other already determined Lithuanian JI wind projects: No.0025, No.0034, No.0163, No.0178, No.0200, No.0205, 0229. Thus multi-project emission factor 0.626 tCO2/MWhe is defined correctly accordingly to National Allocation plan (http://www.am.lt/VI/files/0.127744001228738706.pdf).	O.K.	O.K.
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
26 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
26 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
26 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?			
26 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to the baseline in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
26 (d)	Is the baseline identified appropriately as a result?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Additionality				
JI specific approach only				
28	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches for demonstrating additionality is used? (a) Provision of traceable and transparent information showing the baseline was identified on the basis of conservative assumptions, that the project scenario is not part of the identified baseline scenario and that the project will lead to emission reductions or enhancements of removals; (b) Provision of traceable and transparent information that an AIE has already positively determined that a comparable project (to be) implemented under comparable circumstances has additionality; (c) Application of the most recent version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality. (allowing for a two-month grace period) or any other method for proving additionality approved by the CDM Executive Board".	Is indicated in the PDD section B.2 that version 06.0.0 of the „Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality Application" (additionality tool) is applied. Version 06.0.0 is referenced correctly as the most recent version.	O.K.	O.K.
29 (a)	Does the PDD provide a justification of the applicability of the approach with a clear and transparent description?	See 28 above.	O.K.	O.K.
29 (b)	Are additionality proofs provided?	The project IRR was calculated comparing project activities with	CL2-5	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		and without ERUs income. Relevant costs and revenues have been included to the IRR calculation for the proposed JI project activity and supported with documents. These documents were provided for validation and found sufficient and correct to prove related assumptions on costs and revenues: Feed in tariff: Resolution No. 03-27 of the State price and Energy Control Commission of 21 February 2008 (http://www.regula.lt/lt/elektra/tarifai/viap_kainos.php) Total investment cost: Enercon GmbH offer for Mockiai wind park, dated 18.06.2008 Annual maintenance cost: Enercon GmbH EPK offer dated 10.2008. Fixed maintenance cost will be adjusted by inflation rate every year. Insurance cost: CNA Ltd policy no 310-16033 for Virtsu II wind park 01.03.2008-20.03.2009 Management cost: Management agreement between 4energia UAB and Vejo elektra UAB, 10.12.2008 The investment analysis is presented in a transparent manner in the Excel spreadsheet. However, some issues requires additional clarification or corrections (see CL2-5 below): CL2: Please, clearly justify assumptions: - the reason, why do the running cost increase by 3 percent every		

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		year; - the reason, why Energy Price After 2020 determined 65 Eur and thereafter increase by 3 percent every year. CL3: Clarification action request: Please, clearly justify assumptions with suitable documentation: - applied interest rate – 8 %; - energy Price Until 2020 (EUR/MWh) – 86,9 Eur. CL4: Please, present the link in JI-PDD of selected benchmark data which is publicly available. CL5: Please note clearly in the assumption place that there are / aren't variables which constitute less than 20% and have a material impact on the sensitivity analysis.		
29 (c)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	See 30 below.	CAR3-6	O.K.
30	If the approach 28 (c) is chosen, are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the selected tool or method?	All explanations, description and analysis made in accordance with step approach with the additionality tool and "Guidelines on the assessment of the investment analysis" (version 05) except of CAR's referred below: CAR3: Profit tax should be included as expenses in the Project IRR calculation. CAR4: Requirement to calculate F and N_{all}-N_{diff} is not applicable since no similar activities are identified in the Sub-step 4a. Please correct PDD page 15 accordingly. All formulas used in spreadsheet are readable; all cells are viewable and unprotected, except: CAR5: Please, disclose the project IRR with ERU's and Success Fee calculation in the spreadsheet (used formulas should be readable).	CAR3-6	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		The Investment cost and Energy output were chosen as variables, which possible constitute 10% (from -10% to +10%) of the total project revenue and/or costs. Results of the variations have been presented in the sensitivity analysis. CAR6: Please, use the project IRR with ERU's in the sensitivity analysis.		
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
31 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
31 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why and how the referenced approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
31 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses with regard to additionality made in accordance with the selected methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
31 (d)	Are additionality proofs provided?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
31 (e)	Is the additionality demonstrated appropriately as a result?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Project boundary (applicable except for JI LULUCF projects				
JI specific approach only				
32 (a)	Does the project boundary defined in the PDD encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that are: (i) Under the control of the project participants? (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project? (iii) Significant?	Project boundary is defined in the PDD section B.3 as follows: The Project boundary is drawn around the physical boundary of the wind power farm (i.e. the wind turbines and generators) and the power plants of AB Lietuvos Elektrine, the power generation of which the wind power farm would replace. It is reasonably attributed to the Project and is significant. Other emission sources are not identified.	O.K.	O.K.
32 (b)	Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a	Refer 32 (a) above.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria referred to in 32 (a) above?			
32 (c)	Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources included appropriately described and justified in the PDD by using a figure or flow chart as appropriate?	Foow chart is provided in PDD section B.3 and correctly delianes project boundary and emission sources and gases (only CO2 is included).	O.K.	O.K.
32 (d)	Are all gases and sources included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources related to the baseline or the project are appropriately justified?	Refer 32 (d) above.	O.K.	O.K.
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
33	Is the project boundary defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Crediting period				
34 (a)	Does the PDD state the starting date of the project as the date on which the implementation or construction or real action of the project will begin or began?	Starting date of the Project is stated as 08/08/2011 (signing of the contract for delivery of wind turbines). Referenced contract was provided for audit.	O.K.	O.K.
34 (a)	Is the starting date after the beginning of 2000?	Yes.	O.K.	O.K.
34 (b)	Does the PDD state the expected operational lifetime of the project in years and months?	Expected life time is defined as 20 years 0 months. CL6: Please document choice of the expected lifetime according to to the "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment".	CL6	O.K.
34 (c)	Does the PDD state the length of the crediting period in years and months?	Yes. Length of the crediting period is defined as 7 months.	O.K.	O.K.
34 (c)	Is the starting date of the crediting period on or after the date of the first emission reductions or enhancements of net removals generated by the project?	Yes.	O.K.	O.K.
34 (d)	Does the PDD state that the crediting period for issuance of ERUs starts only after the beginning of 2008 and does not extend beyond the operational lifetime of the project?	Yes.	O.K.	O.K.
34 (d)	If the crediting period extends beyond 2012, does	Crediting period does not extends beyond 2012, however there is	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	the PDD state that the extension is subject to the host Party approval? Are the estimates of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented separately for those until 2012 and those after 2012?	stated "that the crediting period may be extended, the Project developer will seek the right to earn carbon credits for the post 2012 crediting period in addition to emission reductions units (ERUs) generated under the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol."		
Monitoring plan				
35	Does the PDD explicitly indicate which of the following approaches is used? − JI specific approach − Approved CDM methodology approach	CAR7: Please indicate in the PDD section D.1 whether JI specific approach or Approved CDM methodology approach is used to define monitoring plan.	CAR7	O.K.
JI specific approach only				
36 (a)	Does the monitoring plan describe: − All relevant factors and key characteristics that will be monitored? − The period in which they will be monitored? − All decisive factors for the control and reporting of project performance?	The monitoring plan describe all relevant factors and characteristics that will be monitored in a table format, where following information was provided in transparent and reliable way. There is explained how E_{sup} (Electricity supplied to the grid by the Project) and E_{con} (Electricity consumed from the grid by the project) will be measured and EG_y (Net electricity supplied to the grid) will be calculated.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b)	Does the monitoring plan specify the indicators, constants and variables used that are reliable, valid and provide transparent picture of the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals to be monitored?	See 36 (a) above.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b)	If default values are used: − Are accuracy and reasonableness carefully balanced in their selection? − Do the default values originate from recognized sources? − Are the default values supported by statistical analyses providing reasonable confidence levels? − Are the default values presented in a transparent	EFy – Emission factor of the power plant of AB Lietuvos Elektrine is used, refer 25 above.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	manner?			
36 (b) (i)	For those values that are to be provided by the project participants, does the monitoring plan clearly indicate how the values are to be selected and justified?	Refer to 36 (a) above.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b) (ii)	For other values, − Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the precise references from which these values are taken? − Is the conservativeness of the values provided justified?	Refer to 36 (a) and 36 (b) above.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b) (iii)	For all data sources, does the monitoring plan specify the procedures to be followed if expected data are unavailable?	Is rather unlikely that expected data can be unavailable, since data on electricity supplied to the grid by the Project and electricity consumed from the grid by the project are business core data, double checked and controlled by third party with commercial interest (grid operator).	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b) (iv)	Are International System Unit (SI units) used?	Yes, only SI units are used.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b) (v)	Does the monitoring plan note any parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. that are used to calculate baseline emissions or net removals but are obtained through monitoring?	Monitoring plan does not note any additional parameters.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (b) (v)	Is the use of parameters, coefficients, variables, etc. consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan?	Yes, EFy – Emission factor of the power plant of AB Lietuvos Elektrine is consistent between the baseline and monitoring plan.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (c)	Does the monitoring plan draw on the list of standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring"?	Standard variables contained in appendix B of "Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring" are used.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (d)	Does the monitoring plan explicitly and clearly distinguish: (i) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined	E_{sup} (Electricity supplied to the grid by the Project) and E_{con} (Electricity consumed from the grid by the project) are monitored throughout the crediting period. EFy is not monitored throughout the crediting period, but is determined only once and is available	CAR8	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), and that are available already at the stage of determination? (ii) Data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period, but are determined only once (and thus remain fixed throughout the crediting period), but that are not already available at the stage of determination? (iii) Data and parameters that are monitored throughout the crediting period?	already. However this is not explicitly stated in the PDD section D.1 as required by Guidelines for the users of the JI PDD form (version 04): CAR8: Please explicitly and clearly distinguish data and parameters in the PDD section D.1 as required by Guidelines for the users of the JI PDD form (version 04).		
36 (e)	Does the monitoring plan describe the methods employed for data monitoring (including its frequency) and recording?	E_{sup} (Electricity supplied to the grid by the Project) and E_{con} (Electricity consumed from the grid by the project) will be measured monthly and recorded in the electric power dispatch reports.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (f)	Does the monitoring plan elaborate all algorithms and formulae used for the estimation/calculation of baseline emissions/removals and project emissions/removals or direct monitoring of emission reductions from the project, leakage, as appropriate?	CAR9: Please provide description of formulae used to estimate emission reductions for the project in the PDD section D.1.1.4.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (i)	Is the underlying rationale for the algorithms/formulae explained?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (ii)	Are consistent variables, equation formats, subscripts etc. used?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (iii)	Are all equations numbered?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (iv)	Are all variables, with units indicated defined?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (v)	Is the conservativeness of the algorithms/procedures justified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (f) (v)	To the extent possible, are methods to quantitatively account for uncertainty in key parameters included?	Not applicable in the extent of project.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (f) (vi)	Is consistency between the elaboration of the baseline scenario and the procedure for calculating the emissions or net removals of the baseline	Yes, consistency is ensured.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	ensured?			
36 (f) (vii)	Are any parts of the algorithms or formulae that are not self-evident explained?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (vii)	Is it justified that the procedure is consistent with standard technical procedures in the relevant sector?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (vii)	Are references provided as necessary?	Will be reviewed when CAR9 is resolved.	CAR9	O.K.
36 (f) (vii)	Are implicit and explicit key assumptions explained in a transparent manner?	Any assumptions are not applied.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (f) (vii)	Is it clearly stated which assumptions and procedures have significant uncertainty associated with them, and how such uncertainty is to be addressed?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (f) (vii)	Is the uncertainty of key parameters described and, where possible, is an uncertainty range at 95% confidence level for key parameters for the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals provided?	Uncertainty level is estimated as low, and this estimation was found acceptable taking into account that electric power monitoring is standardized by national law and controlled by third party with commercial interest (grid operator).	O.K.	O.K.
36 (g)	Does the monitoring plan identify a national or international monitoring standard if such standard has to be and/or is applied to certain aspects of the project? Does the monitoring plan provide a reference as to where a detailed description of the standard can be found?	Is not applied.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (h)	Does the monitoring plan document statistical techniques, if used for monitoring, and that they are used in a conservative manner?	Is not applied.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (i)	Does the monitoring plan present the quality assurance and control procedures for the monitoring process, including, as appropriate, information on calibration and on how records on data and/or method validity and accuracy are kept and made	The procedures are briefly described in the PDD section D.3. This is standardized electric power monitoring practice established by grid operator in accordance with national law requirements. In addition of that, data will be double-checked with the readings of a separate power meters at the 20 kV side on transformer and the	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	available upon request?	wind farm's SCADA system that will be calibrated with the meter.		
36 (j)	Does the monitoring plan clearly identify the responsibilities and the authority regarding the monitoring activities?	Is stated that UAB 4energia manager Tadas Navickas will be in charge of and accountable for the generation of ERs including monitoring, record keeping, computation of ERs and verification. He will officially sign-off on all monitoring reports that are prepared by UAB 4energia.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (k)	Does the monitoring plan, on the whole, reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the project type? If it is a JI LULUCF project, is the good practice guidance developed by IPCC applied?	Yes, it can be stated that good and standard practices are reflected.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (l)	Does the monitoring plan provide, in tabular form, a complete compilation of the data that need to be collected for its application, including data that are measured or sampled and data that are collected from other sources but not including data that are calculated with equations?	Yes, refer to 36 (a) above.	O.K.	O.K.
36 (m)	Does the monitoring plan indicate that the data monitored and required for verification are to be kept for two years after the last transfer of ERUs for the project?	Yes, it is indicated in the PDD section D.1.2.	O.K.	O.K.
37	If selected elements or combinations of approved CDM methodologies or methodological tools are used for establishing the monitoring plan, are the selected elements or combination, together with elements supplementary developed by the project participants in line with 36 above?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
38 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
38 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?			
38 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
38 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses pertaining to monitoring in the PDD made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
38 (d)	Is the monitoring plan established appropriately as a result?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Applicable to both JI specific approach and approved CDM methodology approach				
39	If the monitoring plan indicates overlapping monitoring periods during the crediting period: (a) Is the underlying project composed of clearly identifiable components for which emission reductions or enhancements of removals can be calculated independently? (b) Can monitoring be performed independently for each of these components (i.e. the data/parameters monitored for one component are not dependent on/effect data/parameters to be monitored for another component)? (c) Does the monitoring plan ensure that monitoring is performed for all components and that in these cases all the requirements of the JI guidelines and further guidance by the JISC regarding monitoring are met? (d) Does the monitoring plan explicitly provide for overlapping monitoring periods of clearly defined	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	project components, justify its need and state how the conditions mentioned in (a)-(c) are met?			
Leakage				
JI specific approach only				
40 (a)	Does the PDD appropriately describe an assessment of the potential leakage of the project and appropriately explain which sources of leakage are to be calculated and which can be neglected?	Is stated that there are no direct or indirect emissions outside the Project boundary attributable to the Project activity, and this was found acceptable in the extent of Project.	O.K.	O.K.
40 (b)	Does the PDD provide a procedure for an ex ante estimate of leakage?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
41	Are the leakage and the procedure for its estimation defined in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals				
42	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches it chooses? (a) Assessment of emissions or net removals in the baseline scenario and in the project scenario (b) Direct assessment of emission reductions	Is indicated in the PDD section D.1.2 that approach (b) is used.	O.K.	O.K.
43	If the approach (a) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emissions or net removals for the project scenario (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emissions or net removals for the baseline scenario (within the project boundary)? (d) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
44	If the approach (b) in 42 is chosen, does the PDD provide ex ante estimates of: (a) Emission reductions or enhancements of net	Ex ante estimation are provided in the PDD section E, however estimation will be reviewed when CAR1 is resolved.	CAR1	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	removals (within the project boundary)? (b) Leakage, as applicable? (c) Emission reductions or enhancements of net removals adjusted by leakage?			
45	For both approaches in 42 (a) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 given: (i) On a periodic basis? (ii) At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? (iii) On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? (iv) For each GHG? (v) In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? (b) Are the formula used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (c) For calculating estimates in 43 or 44, are key factors influencing the baseline emissions or removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or net removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate? (d) Are data sources used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 clearly identified, reliable and transparent? (e) Are emission factors (including default emission factors) if used for calculating the estimates in 43 or 44 selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice? (f) Is the estimation in 43 or 44 based on	Approach is used for all crediting period, in tones of CO2 equivalent, and is consistent thorough the all PDD. Refer to 36 also.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner? (g) Are the estimates in 43 or 44 consistent throughout the PDD? (h) Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
46	If the calculation of the baseline emissions or net removals is to be performed ex post, does the PDD include an illustrative ex ante emissions or net removals calculation?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
47 (a)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals made in accordance with the approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
47 (b)	Is the estimation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals presented in the PDD: − On a periodic basis? − At least from the beginning until the end of the crediting period? − On a source-by-source/sink-by-sink basis? − For each GHG? − In tones of CO2 equivalent, using global warming potentials defined by decision 2/CP.3 or as subsequently revised in accordance with Article 5 of the Kyoto Protocol? − Are the formula used for calculating the estimates consistent throughout the PDD? − Are the estimates consistent throughout the	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	PDD? − Is the annual average of estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals calculated by dividing the total estimated emission reductions or enhancements of net removals over the crediting period by the total months of the crediting period and multiplying by twelve?			
Environmental impacts				
48 (a)	Does the PDD list and attach documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project, including transboundary impacts, in accordance with procedures as determined by the host Party?	CL7: Please provide for audit EIA report referenced in the PDD section F.1.	CL7	O.K.
48 (b)	If the analysis in 48 (a) indicates that the environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the host Party, does the PDD provide conclusion and all references to supporting documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the host Party?	Analysis is briefly described in the PDD section E, however will be reviewed when EIA report is provided for audit.	CL7	O.K.
Environmental impacts				
49	If stakeholder consultation was undertaken in accordance with the procedure as required by the host Party, does the PDD provide: (a) A list of stakeholders from whom comments on the projects have been received, if any? (b) The nature of the comments? (c) A description on whether and how the comments have been addressed?	Compulsory public consultation procedurehas been undertaken during detailed planning procedures. Information about the start of the detailed planning process has been announced at the internet site of local Silute district municipality and in the local newspaper on the 05-10-2007. No remarks or proposals have been received. Relevant documents where provided for audit.	O.K.	O.K.
Determination regarding small-scale projects (additional elements for assessment)				
50	Does the PDD appropriately specify and justify the SSC project type(s) and category(ies) that fall under:	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(a) One of the types and thresholds of JI SSC projects as defined in .Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects.? If the project contains more than one JI SSC project type component, does each component meet the relevant threshold criterion? (b) One of the SSC project categories defined in the most recent version of appendix B of annex II to decision 4/CMP.1, or an additional project category approved by the JISC in accordance with the relevant provision in "Provisions for joint implementation small-scale projects"?			
51	Does the SSC PDD confirms and shows that the proposed JI SSC project is not a debundled component of a large project by explaining that there does not exist a JI (SSC) project with a publicly available determination in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines: (a) Which has the same project participants; and (b) Which applies the same technology/measure and pertains to the same project category; and (c) Whose determination has been made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 34 of the JI guidelines within the previous 2 years; and (d) Whose project boundary is within 1 km of the project boundary of the proposed JI SSC project at the closest point?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
52 (a)	Do all projects in the bundle: (i) Have the same crediting period? (ii) Comply with the provisions for JI SSC projects defined in "Provisions for joint implementation	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	small-scale projects", in particular the thresholds referred to in 50 (a) above? (iii) Retain their distinctive characteristics (i.e. location, technology/measure etc.)?			
52 (b)	Does the composition of the bundle not change over time?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
52 (c)	Has the AIE received (from the project participants): (i) Information on the bundle using the form developed by the JISC (F-JI-SSCBUNDLE)? (ii) A written statement signed by all project participants indicating that they agree that their individual projects are part of the bundle and nominating one project participant to represent all project participants in communicating with the JISC? (iii) Indication by the Parties involved that they are aware of the bundle in their project approvals referred to in 19 above?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
53	If the project participants prepared a single SSC PDD for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Pertain to the same JI SSC project category? (b) Apply the same technology or measure? (c) Located in the territory of the same host Party?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
54	If the project participants prepared separate SSC PDDs for the bundled JI SSC projects, do(are) all the projects: (a) Have SSC PDDs been prepared for all JI SSC projects in the bundle? (b) Does each SSC PDD contain a single JI SCC project in the bundle?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
55	If the projects in the bundle use the same baseline, does the F-JI-SSC-BUNDLE provide an appropriate justification for the use of the same baseline considering the particular situation of each project in the bundle?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
56	Does the PDD indicate which of the following approaches is used for establishing a monitoring plan? (a) By preparing a separate monitoring plan for each of the constituent projects; (b) By preparing an overall monitoring plan including a proposal of monitoring of performance of the constituent projects on a sample basis, as appropriate.	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
56 (b)	If the approach 57 (b) above is used, (i) Are all the JI SSC projects located in the territory of the same host Party? (ii) Do all the JI SSC projects pertain to the same project category? (iii) Do all the JI SSC projects apply the same technology or measure? (iv) Does the overall monitoring plan reflect good monitoring practice appropriate to the bundled JI SSC projects and provide for collection and archiving of the data needed to calculate the emission reductions achieved by the bundled projects?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Applicable to all JI SSC projects				
57	Is the leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties considered?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Determination regarding land use, land-use change and forestry projects (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
58	Does the PDD appropriately specify how the	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	LULUCF project conforms to: (a) The definitions of LULUCF activities included in paragraph 1 of the annex to decision 16/CMP.1, applying good practice guidance for LULUCF as decided by the CMP, as appropriate? (b) In the case of afforestation, reforestation and/or forest management projects, the definition of "forest" selected by the host Party, which specifies: (i) A single minimum tree crown cover value (between 10 and 30 per cent)? and (ii) A single minimum land area value (between 0.05 and 1 hectare)? and (iii) A single minimum tree height value (between 2 and 5 metres)?			
JI specific approach only				
59	Baseline setting - in addition to 22-26 above Does the PDD provide an explanation how the baseline chosen: − Takes into account the good practice guidance for LULUCF, developed by the IPCC? − Ensures conformity with the definitions, accounting rules, modalities and guidelines under Article 3, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Kyoto Protocol?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
60	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (a) Does the project boundary geographically delineate the JI LULUCF project under the control of the project participants? (a) If the JI LULUCF project contains more than one discrete area of land, (i) Does each discrete area of land have a unique geographical identification? (ii) Is the boundary defined for each discrete area?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	(ii) Does the boundary not include the areas in between these discrete areas of land? (b) Does the project boundary encompass all anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs which are: (i) Under the control of the project participants; (ii) Reasonably attributable to the project; and (iii) Significant? (c) Does the project boundary account for all changes in the following carbon pools: − Above-ground biomass; − Below-ground biomass; − Litter; − Dead wood; and − Soil organic carbon? (c) Does the PDD provide: (i) The information of which carbon pools are selected? (ii) If one or more carbon pools are not selected, transparent and verifiable information that indicates, based on conservative assumptions, that the pool is not a source? (d) Is the project boundary defined on the basis of a case-by-case assessment with regard to the criteria in (b) above?			
61 (a)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are the delineation of the project boundary and the gases and sources/sinks included appropriately described and justified in the PDD?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
61 (b)	Project boundary - alternative to 32-33 (cont.) Are all gases and sources/sinks included explicitly stated, and the exclusions of any sources/sinks related to the baseline or the LULUCF project	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	appropriately justified?			
62	Monitoring plan - in addition to 35-39 Does the PDD provide an appropriate description of the sampling design that will be used for the calculation of the net anthropogenic removals by sinks occurring within the project boundary in the project scenario and, in case the baseline is monitored, in the baseline scenario, including, inter alia, stratification, determination of number of plots and plot distribution etc.?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
63	Does the PDD take into account only the increased anthropogenic emissions by sources and/or reduced anthropogenic removals by sinks of GHGs outside the project boundary?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Approved CDM methodology approach only				
64 (a)	Does the PDD provide the title, reference number and version of the approved CDM methodology used?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
64 (a)	Is the approved CDM methodology the most recent valid version when the PDD is submitted for publication? If not, is the methodology still within the grace period (was the methodology revised to a newer version in the past two months)?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
64 (b)	Does the PDD provide a description of why the approved CDM methodology is applicable to the project?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
64 (c)	Are all explanations, descriptions and analyses made in accordance with the referenced approved CDM methodology?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
64 (d)	Are the baseline, additionality, project boundary, monitoring plan, estimation of enhancements of net removals and leakage established appropriately as a	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	result?			
Determination regarding programmes of activities (additional/alternative elements for assessment)				
66	Does the PDD include: (a) A description of the policy or goal that the JI PoA seeks to promote? (b) A geographical boundary for the JI PoA (e.g. municipality, region within a country, country or several countries) within which all JPAs included in the JI PoA will be implemented? (c) A description of the operational and management arrangements established by the coordinating entity for the implementation of the JI PoA, including: − The maintenance of records for each JPA? − A system/procedure to avoid double counting (e.g. to avoid including a new JPA that has already been determined)? − Provisions to ensure that persons operating JPAs are aware and have agreed to their activity being added to the JI PoA? (d) A description of each type of JPAs that will be included in the JI PoA, including the technology or measures to be used? (e) The eligibility criteria for inclusion of JPAs to the JI PoA for each type of JPA in the JI PoA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
67	*Project approvals by Parties involved - additional to 19-20* Are all Parties partly or entirely within the geographical boundary for the JI PoA listed as "Parties involved" and indicated as host Parties in the PDD?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
68	*Authorization of project participants by Parties involved - additional to 21*	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	Is the coordinating entity presented in the PDD authorized by all host Parties to coordinate and manage the JI PoA?			
69	*Baseline setting - additional to 22-26* Is the baseline established for each type of JPA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
70	*Additionality - additional to 27-31* Does the PDD indicate at which of the following levels that additionality is demonstrated? (a) For the JI PoA (b) For each type of JPA	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
71	*Crediting period - additional to 34* Is the starting date of the JI PoA after the beginning of 2006 (instead of 2000)?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
72	*Monitoring plan - additional to 35-39* Is the monitoring plan established for each technology and/or measure under each type of JPA included in the JI PoA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
73	Does the PDD include a table listing at least one real JPA for each type of JPA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
73	For each real JPA listed, does the PDD provide the information of: (a) Name and brief summary of the JPA? (b) The type of JPA? (c) A geographical reference or other means of identification? (d) The name and contact details of the entity/individual responsible for the operation of the JPA? (e) The host Party(ies)? (f) The starting date of the JPA? (g) The length of the crediting period of the JPA? (h) Confirmation that the JPA meets all the	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	eligibility requirements for its type, including a description of how these requirements are met? (i) Confirmation that the JPA has not been determined as a single JI project or determined under a different JI PoA?			

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	Determination team conclusion
CAR1: There is stated in the PDD section A.4.2, that wind farm is conservatively estimated to generate 82.666,8 MWh of electric power per year over a period of 20 years, which results in an average load factor of 24,7 %. Referenced EMD International A/S report (conducted on a basis of WindPRO software) report was provided for audit as a proof, however report is covering 20 wind power generators, while only 17 of them will be installed. Please provide estimations on yearly electric power generation for wind power turbines which are included in the Project.	-	The latest EMD International A/S report was provided, PDD version 1.3 is corrected in accordance with this report.	Provided report on estimated power generation (issued by EMD International A/S, the third party engineering company, Ref-8) is reviewed and found conducted with valid assumption that 17 wind generators will be installed. Estimated power generation 86611 MWh (with load factor of 25,3 %) is referenced in the PDD section A.4.2 correctly and used for emission reductions estimation. Hence CAR1 is closed.
CAR2: Please provide detail of the physical location within one page in a section A.1.4.	-	PDD section A.1.4 is revised in order to meet this requirement.	Correction is found in accordance with requirement to provide detail of the physical location within one page, hence CAR2 is closed.

CAR3: Profit tax should be included as expenses in the Project IRR calculation.	30	Revised investment analysis spreadsheet is provided.	Profit tax has been calculated correctly for calculation of IRR without ERU in the latest version of the Investment analysis spreadsheet *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27*. Hence CAR 3 is closed.
CAR4: Requirement to calculate F and N_{all}-N_{diff} is not applicable since no similar activities are identified in the Sub-step 4a.	30	PDD page 15 is corrected accordingly.	According to data of the Lithuanian wind power association (http://www.lvea.lt/index.php/lt/p/asociacija/vejo-elektriniu-parkai), there are 4 wind parks which deliver the same capacity within in the applicable output range (15.85-63.4), all of them are realised as JI projects. Thus CAR4 is closed.
CAR5: Please, disclose the project IRR with ERU's and Success Fee calculation in the spreadsheet (used formulas should be readable).	30	Request is realized in the Revised investment analysis spreadsheet.	Calculation is found disclosed and correct in the *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27.* Hence CAR 5 is closed.
CAR6: Please, use the project IRR with ERU's in the sensitivity analysis.	30	Request is realized in the Revised investment analysis spreadsheet.	Calculation is found correct in the *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27*. Hence CAR 6 is closed.
CAR7: Please indicate in the PDD section D.1 whether JI specific approach or Approved CDM methodology approach is used to define monitoring plan.	35	PDD section D.1 is amended accordingly.	CAR 7 is closed.
CAR8: Please explicitly and clearly distinguish data and parameters in the PDD section D.1 as required by Guidelines for the users of the JI PDD form (version 04).	36 (d)	PDD section D.1 is amended accordingly.	CAR8 is closed.
CAR9: Please provide description of formulae used to estimate emission reductions for the project in the PDD section D.1.1.4.	36 (f)	PDD section D.1.1.4 is amended accordingly.	Description of formulae is provided as requested, hence CAR9 is closed.

CL1: Please provide project approval (Letter of Approval) issued by Lithuanian FDP. Letter of Approval issued by Investor country will be needed when first monitoring report will be provided for verification at the latest.	19	Initial response: According to Lithuanian JI guidelines the final Project approval might be issued only after the Project determination report submission to the Lithuanian DFP. The Investor Country approval will be issued by a selected Investor Country by latest prior to the first verification of the Project. Second response (08/10/2012): LoA, issued by Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Lithuania for project participant UAB Naujoji energija is provided.	The LoA was reviewed and was found acceptable to close CL1.
CL2: Please, clearly justify assumptions: - the reason, why do the running cost increase by 3 percent every year; - the reason, why Energy Price After 2020 determined 65 Eur and thereafter increase by 3 percent every year.	29 (b)	Request is realized in the Revised investment analysis spreadsheet.	Assumptions are found provided in the *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27*, sheet *Data Sources.* Hence CL2 is closed.
CL3: Clarification action request: Please, clearly justify assumptions with suitable documentation: - applied interest rate – 8 %; - energy Price Until 2020 (EUR/MWh) – 86,9 Eur.	29 (b)	Request is realized in the Revised investment analysis spreadsheet.	Assumptions is found provided in the *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27*, sheet *Data Sources.* Hence CL3 is closed.
CL4: Please, present the link in JI-PDD of selected benchmark data which is publicly available.	29 (b)	Request is realized in the Revised investment analysis spreadsheet	Assumptions is found provided in the *Ciuteliai sensitivity_revised 2012-08-27*, sheet *Data Sources.* Hence CL4 is closed.
CL5: Please note clearly in the assumption place that there are / aren't variables which constitute less than 20% and have a material impact on the sensitivity analysis.	29 (b)	Request is realized in the Revised investment analysis spreadsheet.	Investment and energy variation are chosen correctly, because other variables constitute less than 20 %. Hence CL5 is closed.
CL6: Please document choice of the expected lifetime according to the "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment".	34 (b)	In accordance with the Type Certificate issued to Enercon the E82 E2 turbines are designed according to IEC standards which set down 20 years design lifetime for wind turbines (Standard IEC 61400-1 Design requirements).	PDD section C.2 is found in accordance with provided proofs, hence CL6 is closed.

CL7: Please provide for audit EIA report referenced in the PDD section F.1.	48 (a)	Requested EIA report is provided.	Information provided in the PDD section F.1. is found in accordance with EIA, hence C7 is closed.