

	<h2 style="margin: 0;">JI VERIFICATION REPORT FORM</h2> <p style="margin: 0;">(version 03.1)</p> <p style="margin: 0;">(to be completed by an AIE requesting the publication of a determination pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines)</p>
Accredited independent entity (AIE) submitting form	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
JI activity	
Reference number and title of JI activity	0178: Liepynes Wind Power Park Joint Implementation Project
Coordinating entity (<i>applicable to JI PoA only</i>)	Not applicable
Parties involved in the JI activity	Lithuania and the Netherlands
Type of JI activity:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> large scale <input type="checkbox"/> small scale <input type="checkbox"/> LULUCF <input type="checkbox"/> PoA
Emission reductions / Enhancements of removals	
Monitoring period(s) (DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY)	01/11/2009 - 31/12/2010
Reference number of JPAs verified <i>(applicable to JI PoA only)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.
A sampling approach was used to verify the JI PoA <i>(applicable to JI PoA only)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Verification period (DD/MM/YYYY - DD/MM/YYYY) <i>(applicable to JI PoA only)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.
Verified reductions in anthropogenic emissions by sources / enhancements of anthropogenic removals by sinks (tonnes of CO₂ equivalent)	13 039 tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent
The present verification is the first with regard to the JI activity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Statements regarding requirements and possible changes	
<p>Please confirm that all requirements of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol, the JI guidelines and further relevant requirements defined by the CMP or the JISC with regard to verifications pursuant to paragraph 37 of the JI guidelines are met:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<u>Verification opinion</u>	
<p>Please provide a verification opinion (or a reference to the verification opinion in one of the documents attached), including a statement regarding materiality and level of assurance, in accordance with the Standard for applying the concept of materiality in verifications:</p>	
<p>Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 1st monitoring period verification of "Liepynes wind power park joint implementation project", which applies the project specific methodology.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design, baseline</p>	

and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

The management of Vejo gusis, UAB is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emission data and the reported GHG emission reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD version 04 (dated 14/09/2009).

The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 02 (dated 28/01/2011) for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the approved project design documents. The installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions.

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

Reporting period: From 01/11/2009 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions	:	13 039 t CO2 equivalents;
Project emissions	:	0 t CO2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2009)	:	166 t CO2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Year 2010)	:	12 873 t CO2 equivalents;
Emission Reductions (Total)	:	13 039 t CO2 equivalents.

The project design was revised after the determination has been deemed final	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If yes, please <u>list all revisions</u> to the project design and express a determination opinion (or provide a reference to an attached document containing the required information)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	
If project design was revised, <u>please confirm</u> that conditions defined by paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines are still met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If project design was revised, <u>please confirm</u> that the changes do not alter the original determination opinion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If project design was revised, <u>please confirm</u> that:		
(a) Physical location of the project has not changed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(b) If emission sources have changed, they are reflected in an updated monitoring plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(c) Baseline scenario has not changed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
(d) Changes are consistent with JI specific approach or CDM methodology upon which the determination was prepared for the project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N.A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
The monitoring plan was revised	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If yes, please inform for which technologies and measures under each type of JPA the monitoring plan was revised (applicable to JI PoA only)</i>		

The revisions to the monitoring plan 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

Yes No N.A.

List of documents attached to the verification report form

Please attach relevant documents used in the verification process and check mark below accordingly

Verification report

- Written approvals by the Parties involved, if applicable**
- Other documents:**
 - Document listing all revisions to the project design, if applicable**
 - Determination that the revisions to the project design, if applicable, do not alter the original determination opinion and that the conditions defined by paragraph 33 of the JI guidelines are still met**
 - Revised monitoring plan, if applicable.**
 - Determination that the revisions to the monitoring plan, if applicable, 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**
- Any other documents (please list):**
 - **Monitoring Report, dated 28/01/2011 (final version 02)**

The AIE herewith declares that undertaking the verification for the JI activity referred to above does not constitute a conflict of interest which is incompatible with the role of an AIE

Authorized officer signing for the AIE

Witold Dżugan

Date and signature

25/05/2011

