



VERIFICATION REPORT ENERGOGRUPE, UAB

VERIFICATION OF THE KREIVENAI WIND POWER PARK JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
01 JANUARY 2012 TO 31 OCTOBER 2012

REPORT No. LITHUANIA-VER/0074/2012

REVISION No. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION



 VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 30/11/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: ENERGOGRUPE, UAB	Client ref.: Mr. Justinas Vilpišauskas, Director

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 3rd periodic verification 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 criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Accredited Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the verification process is a list of Clarification, Corrective Action Requests, Forward Action Requests (CR, CAR and FAR), presented in Appendix A.

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the approved project design documents. The installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is ready to generate GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated accurately and without material errors, omissions or misstatements, and is total 24,903 tons of CO₂eq for the monitoring period 01/01/2012-31/10/2012.

Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.

Report No.: LITHUANIA-VER/0074/2012	Subject Group: JI	
Project title: Kreivenai wind power park		
Work carried out by: Tomas Paulaitis: Lead Verifier		
Work reviewed by: Witold Dzugan Kęstutis Navickas – Technical specialist		
Work approved by: Witold Dzugan		
Date of this revision: 30/11/2012	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 20

- No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- Limited distribution
- Unrestricted distribution



Table of Contents		Page
1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Objective	3
1.2	Scope	3
1.3	Verification Team	4
2	METHODOLOGY	5
2.1	Review of Documents	5
2.2	Follow-up Interviews	5
2.3	Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	6
3	VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS	7
3.1	Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications	7
3.2	Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)	7
3.3	Project implementation (92-93)	7
3.4	Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (94-98)	8
3.5	Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)	8
3.6	Data management (101)	8
3.7	Verification regarding programmes of activities	9
4	VERIFICATION OPINION	10
5	REFERENCES	11
	APPENDIX A: KREIVENAI WIND POWER PARK PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL	12



1 INTRODUCTION

Energogrupe, UAB has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its JI project “Kreivenai wind power park” (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 criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. The order includes the third periodic verification of the project for the period 01/01/2012-31/10/2012.

1.1 Objective

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

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 and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward actions may provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.



1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Tomas Paulaitis

Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Verifier

Tomas Paulaitis is a lead auditor for the environment and quality management systems with over 10 years of experience and a lead GHG verifier (EU ETS, JI, CDM) with over 6 years of experience in energy, oil refinery and cement industry sectors, he was/is involved in the determination/verification of more than 50 JI projects. Tomas Paulaitis holds a Master's degree in chemical engineering.

This verification report was reviewed by:

Witold Dzugan

Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

Witold Dzugan is a lead auditor for environment and quality management systems and a GHG verifier with over 10 years of experience. He was/is involved in the determination/verification of more than 15 JI projects. He holds a Master's degree in environmental engineering.

Kęstutis Navickas, Associate Professor, Dr.

Bureau Veritas Certification Team member, technical specialist

Kęstutis Navickas is Head of the Lithuanian Academy of Agriculture department of Agroenergetics. He has more 15 years of experience with the research and development in the renewable energy and bioenergy sectors (more than 10 projects).



2 METHODOLOGY

The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

In order to ensure transparency, a verification protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 01 of the Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual, issued by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee at its 19 meeting on 04/12/2009. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a JI project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent verification process where the verifier will document how a particular requirement has been verified and the result of the verification.

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) version 1 dated 02/11/2012 submitted by Energogrupe, UAB and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the Monitoring Report version 1 dated 02/11/2012 and project as described in the determined PDD version 06 dated 31/09/2009.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 22/11/2012 Bureau Veritas Certification performed on-site interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representative of Energogrupe, UAB was interviewed (see 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 needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

If the Verification Team, in assessing the monitoring report and supporting documents, identifies issues that need to be corrected, clarified or improved with regard to the monitoring requirements, it should raise these issues and inform the project participants of these issues in the form of:

- (a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;
- (b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the Verification Team to assess compliance with the monitoring plan;
- (c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

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

To guarantee the transparency of the verification process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the verification protocol in Appendix A.



3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 0 Corrective Action Requests, 0 Clarification Requests, and 0 Forward Action Requests.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

There were no FAR's issued during the previous verification.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval by Netherlands has been issued by the DFP (Ministry of Economic Affairs of Netherlands) of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest.

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

3.3 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 grid operator and 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 measurement devices is 0,2 s (should be not less than 0,5 s).

Information above was assessed during the first verification and it was confirmed that the project has been implemented and the equipment has been installed as specified in the PDD and according to the national legislation. There are no any project changes implemented during the monitoring period.



The project activity was completely operational during the monitoring period and delivered to the grid (net) 39,781 MWh. The estimated annual net delivery to the grid 55,000 MWh/year have not been achieved yet mainly due to the shortened monitoring period consisting of 10 months in a year 2012, taking in to account also that November-December usually is a windy period with higher monthly production levels.

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

The monitoring occurred in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD version 06 regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website:

http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/BFVOMEK586J0G27WS1CU3IZL9NR_T4D and the Monitoring plan change presented in the Monitoring plan Annex 1 which was determined during the previous 1st verification: http://ji.unfccc.int/JI_Projects/DB/GQ2HPCGNIBMONKBG9NGZ9VDHB8NBD5/Monitoring/TBXH6NSVQQ8JHLZW3OFBLNY3ILT14D/viewVerificationReport?visible.

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

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

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

3.5 Revision of monitoring plan (99-100)

Not applicable.

3.6 Data management (101)

The data and their sources (monthly invoices on delivered/purchased electricity) are clearly identified, reliable and transparent. 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 any mistakes or misstatements have not been found.

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



The function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, is in order.

The calibration equipment is sealed and was functioned without any failures during the monitoring period. The calibration status of the measuring equipment was verified and found valid. The calibration status was valid during all the monitoring period. The calibration periodicity is 8 years according to the national legislation.

The evidence and records used for the monitoring are maintained in a traceable manner.

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

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities

Not applicable.



4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 3rd periodic verification of the “Kreivenai wind power park” Project in Lithuania, the project specific methodology. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

The management of Energogrupe, UAB is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 06 and its revision verified during the 1st verification. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 1 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in approved project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is accurately calculated and is free of material errors, omissions, or misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project’s GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the approved project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm, with a reasonable level of assurance, the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/01/2012 to 31/10/2012

Baseline emissions:	24,903 t CO ₂ equivalents;
Project emissions:	0 t CO ₂ equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2012):	24,903 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/ 1st periodic verification report No. LITHUANIA-VER/0019/2011, issued by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS on 08/03/2011
- /4/ 2nd periodic verification report No. LITHUANIA-VER/0033/2012, issued by Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS on 23/01/2012
- /5/ Monitoring Report, dated 02/11/2012 (version 1)
- /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 Litgrid, AB, January 2012-October 2012
- /2/ Technical passports (with calibration records inside) for commercial electric power meters

Persons interviewed:

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

- /1/ Mr. Justinas Vilpišauskas, director, ENERGOGRUPE UAB



VERIFICATION REPORT

APPENDIX A: KREIVENAI WIND POWER PARK 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?	<p>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.</p> <p>A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host party was provided, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 15/01/2010.</p> <p>These Letters of Approval have been submitted for IAE already during the determination process and were found acceptable.</p>	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?	<p>The project implementation has been checked according to the information provided in the PDD: http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/BFVOMEK586J0G27WS1CU3IZL9NRT4D.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Electric power meters were installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of measurement devices is 0,2 s (should be not less than 0,5 s). See more details on electric power meters' validation status in 101 (b) below.</p>	O.K.	O.K.


**BUREAU
VERITAS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion										
		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.	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?	<p>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. The results of the analysis are described in the table below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Requirement</th> <th>Results</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </table>	Requirement	Results	E _{VP} – net power production at Kreivenai wind power park	O.K.	E _{T101} – net power dispatched to the grid from Keivenai wind power park and another wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park)	O.K.	E _{w2} – net power dispatched from the other wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park)	O.K.	P1 _{L103} , P2 _{L104} , P3 _{L105} – the data from separate control meters on the net power dispatched to the grid	O.K.	O.K.	O.K.
Requirement	Results													
E _{VP} – net power production at Kreivenai wind power park	O.K.													
E _{T101} – net power dispatched to the grid from Keivenai wind power park and another wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park)	O.K.													
E _{w2} – net power dispatched from the other wind power park (Griezpelkiai wind power park)	O.K.													
P1 _{L103} , P2 _{L104} , P3 _{L105} – the data from separate control meters on the net power dispatched to the grid	O.K.													
95 (a)	For calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, were key factors, e.g. those listed in 23 (b) (i)-(vii) above, influencing the baseline emissions or net removals and the activity level of the project and the emissions or removals as well as risks associated with the project taken into account, as appropriate?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.										
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Financial invoices issued by the national grid operator are used for calculating as the initial data source. The data are reliable and transparent, the accounting is controlled both by Energogrupe,	O.K.	O.K.										



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		UAB and by LITGRID, AB.		
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	The default emission factor EF_{LE} 0,626 tCO ₂ /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.




**BUREAU
VERITAS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Revision of monitoring plan				
Applicable only if monitoring plan is revised by project participant				
99 (a)	Did the project participants provide an appropriate justification for the proposed revision?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
99 (b)	Does the proposed revision improve the accuracy and/or applicability of information collected compared to the original monitoring plan without changing conformity with the relevant rules and regulations for the establishment of monitoring plans?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Data management				
101 (a)	Is the implementation of data collection procedures in accordance with the monitoring plan, including the quality control and quality assurance procedures?	The monitoring report based on the monitoring plan is prepared by the director of Energogrupe, UAB based on monthly invoices received from the national grid operator. The received original invoices are stored by the accountant of Energogrupe, UAB 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 on net delivered electricity published officially on LITGRID, AB website: http://www.litgrid.eu/index.php?1973822023	O.K.	O.K.



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		 <p>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 evidences to state that the data are reliable, because 100 % of the financial invoices have been verified and additionally compared with the data on delivered electricity to the grid published officially on LITGRID AB website, any mistakes have not been found.</p>		
101 (b)	Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?	<p>It is defined in the contract signed between Energogrupe, UAB, and LITGRID, AB that grid operator is the owner of the commercial electric power meters and therefore is responsible for their calibration and maintenance.</p> <p>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:</p>	O.K.	O.K.



VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion																		
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Measurement device, No</th> <th>Validation/ calibration date</th> <th>Validation/ calibration validity date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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-101/D, 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 649240</td> <td>11/12/2008</td> <td>11/12/2016</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Measurement device, No	Validation/ calibration date	Validation/ calibration validity date	Commercial meter T-101, No 649233	11/12/2008	11/12/2016	Commercial meter T-101/D, No 649235	11/12/2008	11/12/2016	Control meter L-103, No 524226	12/12/2008	12/12/2016	Control meter L-104, No 649153	10/12/2008	10/12/2016	Control meter L-105, No 649240	11/12/2008	11/12/2016		
Measurement device, No	Validation/ calibration date	Validation/ calibration validity date																				
Commercial meter T-101, No 649233	11/12/2008	11/12/2016																				
Commercial meter T-101/D, No 649235	11/12/2008	11/12/2016																				
Control meter L-103, No 524226	12/12/2008	12/12/2016																				
Control meter L-104, No 649153	10/12/2008	10/12/2016																				
Control meter L-105, No 649240	11/12/2008	11/12/2016																				
101 (c)	Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?	The reporting documents are stored by the director and the initial data are stored by the accountant. The retention period is defined during the crediting period and two years after (until 31/12/2014).	O.K.	O.K.																		
101 (d)	Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?	See 101 (a) above.	O.K.	O.K.																		
Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)																						
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.																		
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.																		
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.																		
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.																		
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.																		


**BUREAU
VERITAS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	writing?			
Applicable to sample-based approach only				
106	<p>Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE:</p> <p>(a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that:</p> <p>(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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The types of JPAs; – The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used; – The geographical location of each JPA; – The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified; – The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified; – The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and – The samples selected for prior verifications, if any? 	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
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	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.



**BUREAU
VERITAS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	reasonable explanation and justification?			
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.



VERIFICATION REPORT

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
-	-	-	-