VERIFICATION REPORT
UAB IVERNETA

VERIFICATION OF THE

MOCKIAI WIND POWER JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

MONITORING PERIOD:
01 JANUARY 2010 TO 31 DECEMBER 2011

REPORT NO. LITHUANIA-VER/0053/2012
REVISION NO.01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Report No: LITHUANIA-VER/0053/2012

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 02/06/2012	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: UAB Iverneta	Client ref.: Tadas Navickas, director

Summary:
Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 1st periodic verification of the JI Track II Project "Mockiai Wind Power Joint Implementation Project", JI Registration Reference Number 0173, project of UAB Iverneta applying the project specific methodology on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the JI as well as the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions made by the JI Supervisory Committee, as well as the host country criteria.

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

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 32765 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period 01/01/2010-31/12/2011.

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

Report No.: LITHUANIA-VER/0053/2012	Subject Group: JI	
Project title: MOCKIAI wind power park Joint implementation project		
Work carried out by: Tomas Paulaitis: Lead Verifier Kęstutis Navickas: Technical specialist		
Work reviewed by: Ashok Mammen		
Work approved by: Witold Dzugan		
Date of this revision: 02/06/2012	Rev. No.: 01	Number of pages: 21

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

UAB Iverneta has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emission reductions of its “Mockiai wind power park joint implementation project” (hereafter called “the project”) at Mockiai village, Silute district, Klaipeda county, Lithuania. This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

1.1 Objective

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

The objective of verification can be divided in Initial Verification and Periodic Verification.

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

1.2 Scope

The verification scope encompasses an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions by the Accredited Independent Entity (AIE). The verification is based on the submitted monitoring report, the determined project design documents including its monitoring plan and determination report, previous verification reports, the applied monitoring methodology, relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the JISC and any other information and references relevant to the project activity’s resulting emission reductions. These documents are reviewed against the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI Modalities and Procedures and related rules and guidance and also against national Estonian JI Guidelines. The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications, corrective and/or forward may provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in GHG emissions.

1.3 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

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

Kęstutis Navickas, Associate Professor, Dr.
Bureau Veritas Certification Team member, technical specialist
Kęstutis Navickas is Head of the Lithuanian Academy of Agriculture department of Agroenergetics. He has more 15 years of experience with the research and development in the renewable energy and bioenergy sectors (more than 10 projects).

This verification report was reviewed by:

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

2 METHODOLOGY

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

In order to ensure transparency, the verification protocol was customized for the project according to version 01.1 of the Joint Implementation Determination and Verification Manual, issued by the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee at its 19 meeting on 04/12/2009. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, the criteria (requirements), means of verification and results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

The Monitoring Report (MR) version 1 dated 15/02/2012 submitted by UAB Iverneta and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. the country Law, Project Design Document (PDD), Project Determination Report, Guidance on criteria for baseline setting and monitoring, Host party criteria, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on verification requirements to be checked by an Accredited Independent Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD Version 1.7, dated 26/05/2011 and the Monitoring Report version 2 dated 09/03/2012.

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. A representative of UAB Iverneta was interviewed (see 5 References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
UAB Iverneta	Organizational structure, responsibilities and authorities Project implementation and technology Training of personnel Quality management procedures Metering equipment control Monitoring record keeping system Environmental requirements Monitoring plan Monitoring report

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that need to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

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

(a) Corrective action request (CAR), requesting the project participants to correct a mistake that is not in accordance with the monitoring plan;

(b) Clarification request (CL), requesting the project participants to provide additional information for the AIE to assess compliance with the monitoring plan;

(c) Forward action request (FAR), informing the project participants of an issue, relating to the monitoring that needs to be reviewed during the next verification period.

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

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 1 Corrective Action Request, 0 Clarification Requests, and 1 Forward Action Request.

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

3.1 Remaining issues and FARs from previous verifications

There are no remaining issues and FARs from previous determination.

3.2 Project approval by Parties involved (90-91)

Written project approval has been issued from the Investor party (The Netherlands) by the DFP (NL Energy and climate change) of that Party when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest (LoA is dated 07/03/2011).

The abovementioned written approval is unconditional.

3.3 Project implementation (92-93)

The project involves a 12 MW wind farm consisting of 6 Enercon E82 type wind turbines and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid.

The wind farm was connected to the grid on June 2010 (instead of planed January 2010) because of construction work delay caused by contractor and wind turbines supplier Enercon GmbH. The contract for electric power dispatch was signed on 03/11/2011 with VST, AB and then on 30/11/2011 with grid operator LESTO, AB. The official commissioning document recognizing that the wind power park (including the all required infrastructure) was built according to the applicable national legislation was issued on 31/01/2011 by national authorities.

Electric power meter is installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of measurement devices is 0,5 s (should be not less than 0,5 s).

Hence, it can be confirmed that the project has been implemented and the equipment has been installed as specified in the PDD and according to the national legislation.

There are no project changes identified during the monitoring period. The project activity was completely operational during the monitoring period with some maintenance shutdowns declared in the monitoring report. Due to the good wind conditions in the region during the monitoring period, the project has exceeded the forecasted annual 33196 MWh/year capacity in a year 2011. This was proved with wind turbine SCADA data on average wind speed during 2009-2011 (data are provided in Monitoring report Annex 5). The actual net delivery to the grid was 39433 MWh. The higher net delivery has also resulted in a higher emission reduction: 25789 tCO_2 in a year 2011 instead of the estimated 21710 tCO_2.

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 1.7, dated 26/05/2011 regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website:
http://ji.unfccc.int/UserManagement/FileStorage/3END942XI586ZMUSOJG0FAYH7BRKLP.

All data sources for calculation emission reduction are clearly identified, reliable and transparent: monthly production reports issued by the grid operator (LESTO, AB), are used for calculating as the initial data source. The accounting is controlled both by the UAB Iverneta side and by LESTO, AB on the other side.

Default emission factors value (0,654 tCO2/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 the monitoring plan (99-100)

Not applicable. Monitoring plan is not revised during the monitoring period.

3.6 Data management (101)

The monthly production data on supplied/consumed electric power segmented by day are sent once a month by grid operator LESTO, AB. The same reports are the basis for electricity sale and consumption invoices.

The production data are entered into the Monitoring protocol/net power calculation tool spreadsheet and compared with the data of the internal Winwind SCADA system of the wind park. Based on the monthly net production, the project assistant generates the annual production report which is the basis for GHG reduction calculations and the monitoring report.

The verification team has reviewed the Monitoring report against monthly production reports and respectively against electricity sale and purchase invoices on 100 % sample basis. No mistakes or misstatements have been found. Then monthly production reports was double checked with the SCADA system, deviation was found up to 2,4 % what is fully acceptable taking into account uncertainties of the different measurement systems and transmission looses.

The calibration equipment is sealed and functioned without any failures during the monitoring period.

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

The data collection and management system for the project was found in accordance with the monitoring plan, except of CAR:
CAR1: There is stated in the monitoring plan, that “two bi-directional measuring meters (one serving as a backup meter) will be installed”. During site visit there was observed that back-up meter is not installed actually.

Response to this CAR1 was provided and it’s status was changed to FAR1, see Table 2 for more details.

3.7 Verification regarding programmes of activities (102-110)

Not applicable.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 1st monitoring period verification of "Mockiai wind power park joint implementation project", which applies the project specific methodology.
The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and the host country criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design, baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The management of UAB Iverneta is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emission data and the reported GHG emission reductions of the project on the basis set out within the within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD version 1.7 (dated 26/05/2011). 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 Monitoring Report version 2 (dated 09/03/2012) for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the approved project design documents. The installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

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

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

Baseline emissions:	32765 t CO_2 equivalents;
Project emissions:	0 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions:	32765 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2010) :	6976 t CO_2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2011) :	25789 t CO_2 equivalents;
Total Emission Reductions:	32765 t CO_2 equivalents.

5 REFERENCES

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

/1/ PDD, version 1.7, dated 26/05/2011
/2/ Determination report No 1066655, issued by TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH, dated 27/05/2011
/3/ Monitoring report, version 1, dated 15/02/2012
/4/ Monitoring report, version 2, dated 03/09/2012

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

/1/ Electric power delivery and consumption reports and invoices, signed by UAB Iverneta and LESTO, AB, year 2011
/2/ Electric power delivery and consumption reports and invoices, signed by UAB Iverneta and VST, AB, year 2010
/3/ Excel spreadsheet “Monitoring data Mockiai”, last modified 11/03/2011
/4/ Project construction commissioning document, issued by Commission of the construction completion (with participation of representatives or responsible authorities) dated 31/01/2011, No. SUA-179
/5/ Contract for selling – purchasing electricity signed with VST, AB on 26/01/2010, No. SUT 10-11
/6/ Contract for selling – purchasing electricity signed with LESTO, AB on 12/30/2010, No. 80000/212274
/7/ Noise monitoring report, issued by National public health laboratory (Klaipeda branch) on 21/10/2010, No S-1KL-469

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

/1/ Tadas Navickas, director (UAB Iverneta)
/2/ Julius Mikalauskas, project manager (UAB Iverneta)
/3/ Ieva Timinskaite, project assistant (UAB Iverneta)

APPENDIX A: MOCKIAI WIND POWER PARK JOINT IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Check list for verification, according to the joint implementation determination and verification manual (version 01)

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Project approvals by Parties involved				
90	Has the DFPs of at least one Party involved, other than the host Party, issued a written project approval when submitting the first verification report to the secretariat for publication in accordance with paragraph 38 of the JI guidelines, at the latest?	A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Investor party (The Netherlands) was provided, issued by NL Energy and climate change on 10/09/2010. A written project approval (Letter of Approval) from the Host party was provided, issued by Lithuanian Ministry of Environment on 30/01/2008 (this LoA was accepted by IAE during the project determination already).	O.K.	O.K.
91	Are all the written project approvals by Parties involved unconditional?	Yes, all the written project approvals by Parties involved are unconditional.	O.K.	O.K.
Project implementation				
92	Has the project been implemented in accordance with the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	The project involves a 12 MW wind farm consisting of 6 Enercon E82 type wind turbines and the necessary infrastructure for connection to the power distribution grid. The wind farm was started to delivery electricity to the grid on September 2010 (instead of planed January 2010) because of construction work delay caused by contractor and wind turbines supplier Enercon GmbH. The contract for electric power dispatch was signed on 03/11/2011 with VST, AB and then on 30/11/2011 with grid operator LESTO, AB. The official commissioning document recognizing that the wind power park (including the all required infrastructure) was built according to the applicable national legislation was issued on 31/01/2011 by national authorities. After installing the wind-power plants the compulsory measurements of the noise level have been undertaken by National	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
		public health laboratory (Klaipeda branch) on 21/10/2010. There is stated in the test report that noise level has been measured in all control points and has not exceeded level limited on hygiene norm HN 33:2007. Electric power meter is installed according to the requirements of the national legislation: the accuracy class for this type of measurement devices is 0,5 s (should be not less than 0,5 s). See more details on the electric power meters' validation status in 101 (b) below.		
93	What is the status of operation of the project during the monitoring period?	The project activity was completely operational during the monitoring period with some maintenance shutdowns declared in the monitoring report. Due to the good wind conditions in the region during the monitoring period, the project has exceeded the forecasted annual 33196 MWh/year capacity in a year 2011. This was proved with wind turbine SCADA data on monthly average wind speed during 2009-2011 (data are provided in Monitoring report Annex 5. SCADA data was checked during site visit and were found higher than regional mean annual wind speed (5,0-5,5 m/s, according Hydrometeorogical Service under the Ministry of environment (http://www.meteo.lt/english/climate_wind.php). The actual net delivery to the grid was 39433 MWh. The higher net delivery has also resulted in a higher emission reduction: 25789 tCO2 in a year 2011 instead of the estimated 21710 tCO2.	O.K.	O.K.
Compliance with monitoring plan				

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
94	Did the monitoring occur in accordance with the monitoring plan included in the PDD regarding which the determination has been deemed final and is so listed on the UNFCCC JI website?	The approach and data sources used for the monitoring were analyzed and compared with the requirements of the monitoring plan. The summary results of this analysis are described in the table below, see 101 (a) below also: Requirement | Results Continuous measurements EGy – Net electricity supplied to the grid | O.K.	O.K.	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?	See 94 b) above.	O.K.	O.K.
95 (b)	Are data sources used for calculating emission reductions or enhancements of net removals clearly identified, reliable and transparent?	Power dispatch reports issued by the grid operator are used for calculating as the initial data source. The data are reliable and transparent, the accounting is controlled both by UAB IVERNETA on one side and by grid operator on the other side.	O.K.	O.K.
95 (c)	Are emission factors, including default emission factors, if used for calculating the emission reductions or enhancements of net removals, selected by carefully balancing accuracy and reasonableness, and appropriately justified of the choice?	The default emission factor EF_{LE} 0,654 tCO2/MWh is used as required by the PDD. There is no requirement to review this factor during the crediting period.	O.K.	O.K.
95 (d)	Is the calculation of emission reductions or enhancements of net removals based on conservative assumptions and the most plausible scenarios in a transparent manner?	See 94, 95 (a), (b), (c) above.	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	The relevant threshold (15 MW installed capacity) was not exceeded. The project involves a 12 MW wind farm	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	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?			
Applicable to bundled JI SSC projects only				
97 (a)	Has the composition of the bundle not changed from that is stated in F-JI-SSCBUNDLE?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
97 (b)	If the determination was conducted on the basis of an overall monitoring plan, have the project participants submitted a common monitoring report?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
98	If the monitoring is based on a monitoring plan that provides for overlapping monitoring periods, are the monitoring periods per component of the project clearly specified in the monitoring report? Do the monitoring periods not overlap with those for which verifications were already deemed final in the past?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Revision of monitoring plan				
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	The monthly production data on supplied/consumed electric power segmented by day are sent once a month by grid operator LESTO, AB. The same reports are the basis for electricity sale and	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	procedures?	consumption invoices. The production data are entered into the Monitoring protocol/net power calculation tool spreadsheet and compared with the data of the internal Winwind SCADA system of the wind park. Based on the monthly net production, the project assistant generates the annual production report which is the basis for GHG reduction calculations and the monitoring report and presents it to Director for approval. During approval process Director has conducted annual monitoring performance review in order to identify possibilities to improve monitoring through the use of the corrective and preventive actions. Since monitoring was conducted smoothly without any nonconformities, any corrective or preventive actions were not raised. Employees was trained already on 2009 under the scope of other JI project "Sudenai and Lendimai wind power park Joint implementation project", since then neither the responsible staff nor the monitoring requirements have changed and no problems related with insufficient staff competence have been identified. Hence, there is no need for additional training programmes so far. The verification team has reviewed the Monitoring report against monthly production reports and respectively against electricity sale and purchase invoices on 100 % sample basis. No mistakes or misstatements have been found. Then monthly production reports was double checked with the SCADA system, deviation was found up to 2,4 % what is fully acceptable taking into account uncertainties of the different measurement systems and transmission looses.		

<table>
<tr><th>DVM Paragraph</th><th>Check Item</th><th>Initial finding</th><th>Draft Conclusion</th><th>Final Conclusion</th></tr>
<tr><td>101 (b)</td><td>Is the function of the monitoring equipment, including its calibration status, in order?</td><td>The calibration periodicity is 8 years according to the national legislation. The calibration equipment is sealed and functioned without any failures during the monitoring period, hence calibration status was found valid during all the monitoring period. The results of the monitoring equipment calibration status and sealing were verified and are described in the table below:

<table><tr><th>Measurement device, No</th><th>Calibration status</th></tr><tr><td>Commercial measuring meter EPQS 124.21.17, No 765118, calibrated on 2009
  </td><td>O.K.</td></tr></table>
However, CAR1 is issued:
There is stated in the monitoring plan, that “two bi-directional measuring meters (one serving as a backup meter) will be installed”. During site visit there was observed that back-up meter is not installed actually.</td><td>CAR1</td><td>FAR1</td></tr>
<tr><td>101 (c)</td><td>Are the evidence and records used for the monitoring maintained in a traceable manner?</td><td>See 101 (a) above.</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
<tr><td>101 (d)</td><td>Is the data collection and management system for the project in accordance with the monitoring plan?</td><td>See 101 (a) above.</td><td>O.K.</td><td>O.K.</td></tr>
</table>

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
Verification regarding programs of activities (additional elements for assessment)				
102	Is any JPA that has not been added to the JI PoA not verified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
103	Is the verification based on the monitoring reports of all JPAs to be verified?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
103	Does the verification ensure the accuracy and conservativeness of the emission reductions or enhancements of removals generated by each JPA?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
104	Does the monitoring period not overlap with previous monitoring periods?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
105	If the AIE learns of an erroneously included JPA, has the AIE informed the JISC of its findings in writing?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
Applicable to sample-based approach only				
106	Does the sampling plan prepared by the AIE: (a) Describe its sample selection, taking into account that: (i) For each verification that uses a sample-based approach, the sample selection shall be sufficiently representative of the JPAs in the JI PoA such extrapolation to all JPAs identified for that verification is reasonable, taking into account differences among the characteristics of JPAs, such as: − The types of JPAs; − The complexity of the applicable technologies and/or measures used; − The geographical location of each JPA; − The amounts of expected emission reductions of the JPAs being verified; − The number of JPAs for which emission reductions are being verified;	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

DVM Paragraph	Check Item	Initial finding	Draft Conclusion	Final Conclusion
	− The length of monitoring periods of the JPAs being verified; and − The samples selected for prior verifications, if any?			
107	Is the sampling plan ready for publication through the secretariat along with the verification report and supporting documentation?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
108	Has the AIE made site inspections of at least the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number? If the AIE makes no site inspections or fewer site inspections than the square root of the number of total JPAs, rounded to the upper whole number, then does the AIE provide a reasonable explanation and justification?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
109	Is the sampling plan available for submission to the secretariat for the JISC.s ex ante assessment? (Optional)	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.
110	If the AIE learns of a fraudulently included JPA, a fraudulently monitored JPA or an inflated number of emission reductions claimed in a JI PoA, has the AIE informed the JISC of the fraud in writing?	Not applicable.	O.K.	O.K.

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CAR1: There is stated in the monitoring plan, that "two bi-directional measuring meters (one serving as a backup meter) will be installed". During site visit there was observed that back-up meter is not installed actually.	101 (b)	According to the technical design (because of simplified project requirements for connection to 35kV distribution network) at the moment there is one measuring meter installed, this is in accordance to Lithuanian legislation and standards. UAB Iverneta will further install a separate power meters at the 20 kV side of the transformer at the grid connection point.	Response was found acceptable since installed meter was operated without any failure during the all monitoring period. Installation of the back-up meter will be reviewed during the next verification.