VERIFICATION REPORT

ALIZE ENERJI URETIM SAN. VE TIC. A.S.

VERIFICATION OF THE

ALIZE CAMSEKI 20.8 MW WIND FARM PROJECT, TURKEY

REPORT NO. TURKEY/CER.986.10.C45/2010

REVISION NO. 01

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
11/10/2010	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S.	Mr. Salih Uysal Managing Director

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 1st periodic verification of the "Alize Camseki 20.8 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey", Gold Standard Registration Reference Number GS399, project of Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. located in Ezine / Canakkale, TURKEY, and applying the methodology ACM0002 version 07, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, Gold Standard Version 1 Criteria as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board.

The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Designated Operational 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 Actions Requests, Forward Actions Requests (CL, CAR and FAR), presented in Appendix A.

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in validated and registered 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 ready to generate GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements, and the CER issued totalize 46,599 tons of CO_2eq for the monitoring period. The monitoring period covered by this report is between 01/07/2009 and 31/08/2010 (first and last days are included).

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

Report No.:	Subject Group:
TURKEY/CER.986.10.C45/2010	VER

Project title:

Alize Camseki 20.8 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey

Work carried out by:

Ms. Bade Cebeci, Team Leader
Mrs. Isil Timuroglu, Team Member
Mrs. Burcu Mutman, Team Member
Mr. Mustafa Isik, Sector Specialist

Work verified by:

Mr. Ashok Mammen

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
01/11/2010	03	59

Indexing terms

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CO_{2eq}	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
GS	Gold Standard
I	Interview
MoV	Means of Verification
NGO	Non Government Organization
GS-VER-PDD	Project Design Document
PMUM	Market Financial Conciliation Center (Piyasa Mali Uzlastirma Merkezi)
TEIAS	Turkish Electricity Transmission Company (Turkiye Elektrik Iletim A.S.)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
VER	Voluntary Emission Reductions
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its GS-VER project Alize Camseki 20.8 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey (hereafter called "the project") at Ezine / Canakkale, TURKEY.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, Gold Standard Version 1 Criteria as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

Verification is the periodic independent review and ex post determination by the DOE 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 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board.

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, Gold Standard version 1 rules and associated interpretations.

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

1.3 GHG Project Description

Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. (hereafter referred to as: Alize) has installed a 20.8 MW wind power plant in Ezine / Canakkale in Turkey. The purpose of the project is to generate electricity and to feed it into the public grid. Turkish grid consists mainly of fossil fuel fired power plants; the project activity reduces the GHG emissions by replacing fossil fuel power generation. The project includes 10 units of E82 turbines with an output of 2000 kW and 1 unit of E48 turbine with an output of 800 kW.

1.4 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

Ms. Bade Cebeci
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier

Mrs. Isıl Timuroglu
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

Mrs. Burcu Mutman
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

Mr. Mustafa Isık
Bureau Veritas Certification Sector Specialist

Dr. Ashok Mammen
Bureau Veritas Certification, Internal Technical Reviewer

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 01.2 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual, issued by the Executive Board at its 55th meeting on 30/06/2010. 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 VER 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) submitted by Mavi Consultants who is the carbon consultants for Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Project Design Document (GS-VER-PDD), Approved

methodology, Kyoto Protocol, Clarifications on Verification Requirements to be Checked by a Designated Operational Entity were reviewed.

The verification findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the GS-VER-PDD version 3.1. dated 31/05/2010.

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 16/07/2010 Bureau Veritas Certification made a site visit and performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. were also interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S.	➢ Implementation of the project ➢ Review of the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters ➢ Confirmation of the correct implementation of procedures of operations and data collection ➢ Information on the monitoring equipment ➢ The data for cross-checking the values on the Monitoring Report ➢ PMUM data, Invoices, SCADA records ➢ Training of the employees ➢ Working conditions
LOCAL Stakeholders	➢ Observation of bird deaths ➢ Project's impact on local economy
Mavi Consultants	➢ Monitoring Report ➢ Emission reduction calculations ➢ The data for cross-checking the values on the Monitoring Report ➢ PMUM data, Invoices, SCADA records ➢ Training of the employees ➢ Meter reading protocols ➢ Calibration records

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.

Findings established during the initial verification can either be seen as a non-fulfilment of criteria ensuring the proper implementation of a project or where a risk to deliver high quality emission reductions is identified.

Corrective Action Requests (CAR) is issued, where:

(a) Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;

(b) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions, which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;

(c) Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

Forward Action Requests (FAR) are issued, for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

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

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 7 Corrective Action Requests and 8 Clarification Requests.

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

3.1 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document (197)

The project was implemented in accordance with the registered project design document, which was verified during the first periodic verification.

All of 11 turbines were commissioned on the same time. The starting date of the first crediting period is 01/07/2009.

The operation has started generating and feeding electricity before 01/07/2009, without invoicing. The electricity in this period has not invoiced and not included in the emission reduction calculations since the power generation data is of low quality.

The actual operation of the proposed project activity is generation of electricity from Wind Power and feeding it to the public grid.

GHG emission reduction is 46,599 tCO_2 between 01/07/2009-31/08/2010. For comparison purposes, the year-round actual GHG emission reductions of the Project between 01/07/2009-31/06/2010 should be calculated. The net electricity generation between this these dates (as a comparable time period) is 63,014 MWh, corresponding to GHG emission reductions of 40,014 tCO_2. This is lower than the annual estimations of 51,955 tCO_2 in the registered GS-VER-PDD.

3.2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (202)

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology ACM0002 version 7 applied by the proposed GS VER project activity.

3.3 Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan (205)

Monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.

The parameters required by the monitoring plan and the way the Verification Team has verified the values in the monitoring reports are described below:

(a) EG_y – Annual net electricity amount fed to the grid by the project activity: According to the monitoring plan, the net electricity generation data will be taken from official TEIAS data from the PMUM web site.

The generation data is stored by PMUM on the web site. The Project owner has an ID and password to access this data on the web site. After the Project owner log in to web site, they can access electricity generation and consumption reports of the project. They can export these reports in electronic format and print hardcopies. The Project owner stores also the hardcopies of the monthly meter reading protocols until at least 2 years after the end of the crediting period.

TEIAS personnel monthly perform on-site measurements for both the primary and secondary (back-up) measurement devices on the first days of the month. In the beginning of each month, an authorized TEIAS employee comes to the project activity site and reads the generation data from the meters. Based on this reading, monthly meter reading protocol is prepared by TEIAS on site and then signed by both parties each month.

PMUM cuts a certain percentage of the generation to account for transmission losses. Therefore, PMUM records include the transmission losses. The invoices are

prepared according to PMUM records and the emission reduction calculation is based on the PMUM records.

Copies of the monthly meter reading protocols were submitted to the verification team. These values were cross-checked with PMUM data, which is also a basis for the invoices. The values were also cross-checked with the monthly invoices. To see how the monitoring procedures were implemented, the whole process was explained to the verifier during the site visit by sampling the monitoring activities realized during a day.

As the EG_y represents net electricity supplied to the grid, electricity imported from the grid is subtracted from the electricity exported by the Project to obtain the next value of EG_y.

During on site assessment, verification team was able to verify that the metering system consists of two electric energy meters which are in place and functions well. It was validated on the site visit that the serial numbers of the meters are in accordance with the monitoring report. The types and serial numbers of the electricity meters are noted as follows:

Main Meter:

Manufacturer	: LANDIS+GYR
Device Model	: ZMD402CT44.2407S2
Model Year	: 2009
Serial No	: 95824743

Backup Meter:

Manufacturer	: LANDIS+GYR
Device Model	: ZMD402CT44.2407S2
Model Year	: 2009
Serial No	: 95824742

The serial numbers of the meters are in line with the monitoring report.
The primary measurement device is used for invoicing, and the secondary measurement device is used for quality control and back-up purposes. The generation data is also recorded automatically by the Enercon SCADA system for each single wind turbine. The instantaneous generation values and the wind speed of the turbines were observed.

According to the registered GS-VER-PDD, regarding the sustainability monitoring, the following parameters are monitored:

1) Quality and quantity of local employment: This parameter is monitored every monitoring period.

a. Quality of local employment: “Relevant health and safety precautions” and “health and safety trainings given to personnel” is identified as quality parameter. Current situation and future target of parameter is identified and it will be checked whether the actual practice is in line with the targets.

All necessary health and safety precautions are taken during the monitoring period was verified through the records and interviews with the employees. During the site visit, it was seen that safety equipments are available and used by personnel depending on their roles and responsibilities.

Trainings that were given to the personnel were verified through the training certificates and list of attendance. The training certificates, list of attendance and High Voltage Licenses were submitted to verification team. Also during the site visit, the employees were interviewed about the trainings.

The trainings given to personnel are given below:

- High voltage training
- Turbine Operation and Maintenance training
- Health and Safety training

b. Quantity of local employment: "Number of local people permanently employed by the Project" is identified as quality parameter. Local job creation was verified through the Social Insurance Institution records, certificate of residence and interviews with the employees. At the project activity site, 13 workers are employed and all of them are local. Personnel have been employed by two company, Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. and Enercon Servis Ltd. Şti.. Alize Enerji is the owner company of the project; Enercon is the service and maintenance company of the producer company of the wind turbines. Alize Enerji have two wind firms that are located closely and some of the personnel have been working alternately at two wind farms. These personnel are considered as part-time personnel for the Project activity.

The employee distribution is given below:

- 1 Plant Responsible Engineer, Enercon, part-time
- 4 Electricity Technicians, Alize Enerji
- 1 Maintenance Technician, Enercon, part-time
- 3 Security Guards, Alize Enerji
- 4 Service Technicians, Enercon, part-time

2) Air quality: The reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions are monitored every monitoring period by calculation. The ratio between net electricity generation of the Project and grid has been calculated first, and host county emissions have been multiplied by this ratio in order to find emission reductions.

This ratio has been calculated in the Monitoring Plan of the registered PDD with 2007 year values and it has been explained that this ratio will be used. However, in the Monitoring Report the reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions have been calculated with 2008 year values and PP has a deviation request for air quality parameter. PP is explaining that this deviation has the aim to correctly updating the actual emission reductions with more accurate numbers. Also, the PP is indicating that an error was found in the monitoring plan of the PDD, where the grid net electricity generation is given as 189,762 MWh, instead of GWh. It was validated on the site visit that the serial numbers of the meters are in accordance with the monitoring report. Deviation request

of the PP has asked to the Gold Standard and they have confirmed that this is very minor deviation it does not need to get Gold Standards' approval before requesting issuance. The deviation request is accepted by the verification team since the updating and more accurate values is used.

During the validation of the project activity following FAR was raised by Gold Standard:

a. *FAR#1: The PP shall please monitor the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds during the first monitoring period and the DOE shall please check results during the first verification and recommend continued monitoring if required.*

   During the site visit, project personnel were interviewed about the bird death and the personnel confirm no bird death was observed on the project site during the monitoring period. The village head was interviewed about the bird migration and local birds and he confirmed that he has not observed any bird deaths. It was verified through the records and interviews with the village head that project is not located on bird migration route.

   On the conservative side, the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds should continue monitoring. Please continue monitoring the effect of the project on local birds.

During the validation of the project activity following FAR was raised by the validation team:

b. *FAR#2: The project sites need to be clearly demarked. The unique identification of each turbine needs to be provided to the verifier, based on micro-siting. Please provide also the installed turbine details for verification.*

   Micrositing for both projects was not finalized yet at time of PDD design. Meanwhile the revised PDD contains also coordinates of the single turbines. The final locations of the turbines will be confirmed in the course of the first verification of the project activity.

   The project activity consists of 11 turbines and the locations of all of the turbines were verified during the site visit by the GPS device according to the generation license. It has been verified on the site visit that the project includes 10 units of E82 turbines with an output of 2000 kW and 1 unit of E48 turbine with an output of 800 kW.

During the first verification of the project activity following FARs were raised by the verification team. Please consider following FARs on the second verification period.

FAR1: During the site visit, project personnel were interviewed about the bird death and the personnel confirm no bird death was observed on the project site during the monitoring period. The village head was interviewed about the bird migration and local birds and he confirmed that he has not observed any bird deaths. It was verified through the records and interviews with the village head that project is not located on bird migration route.

On the conservative side, the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds should continue monitoring. Please continue monitoring the effect of the project on local birds.

FAR2: According to news published on internet on 27.07.2010, wind energy plants including Alize Enerji Camseki Wind Farm are under consideration by the Turkish General Staff and the effects of wind turbines to the radar signal has being researched.

During the first verification period, the research has not finished. Please, check the results at the second verification period.

3.4 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions (208)

A complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available.

The critical parameters used for the determination of the Emission Reductions are the official TEIAS data from the PMUM web site dedicated for measuring the electricity exchanged with the grid and the emission factor, which was determined ex-ante in the registered GS-VER-PDD of the Project.

The data pertaining to the monitoring parameters are maintained in the archived records. All the data are consistent with the values input in the Monitoring Report. According to the registered GS-VER-PDD, the emission reductions of the project are calculated as follows:

$BEy = (EG_y - EG_{baseline}) \times EF_{grid,CM,y}$

Where:

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

EG_y : Electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid (MWh)

$EG_{baseline}$: Baseline electricity supplied to the grid in the case of modified or retrofit facilities (MWh)

$EF_{grid,CM,y}$: Combined Margin CO_2 emission factor (tCO_2/MWh) for grid connected power generation in year y, calculated ex-ante in the registered GS-VER-PDD as 0.635 tCO_2/MWh

Y : Refers to a given year

As a wind project both leakage and project emissions are assumed to be negligible, hence the emission reductions are equal to the baseline emissions.

The project has a generator in the project activity site for emergency cases. During the site visit, it was seen that the generator has worked for 53.8 hours since the start of the project activity. The generator is also used once a week for testing during 5 minutes. The fossil fuel used in the diesel generator is not included in the monitoring plan, which is in line with the applied methodology.

The projects' internal consumption is usually taken from the grid when there is no generation in the project activity; this value is deducted from the electricity generation figures to get the net electricity figure.

Starting date of the first crediting period is given as 24/06/2009 in the registered PDD. However, the project is registered to the PMUM on July 2010 and the emission reduction calculations are based on the PMUM records according to the monitoring plan. Therefore, the June 2009 emission reductions are removed from the Monitoring Report conservatively. Gold Standard indicated that it does not need to get Gold Standards' approval before requesting issuance for minor deviations since this deviation was accepted by the validation team.

The calculation of net electricity delivered to the grid in this reporting period are as shown in the Table below.

Months	**Electricity supplied to the grid (kWh) (1)**	**Electricity consumption from the grid (kWh) (2)**	**Net electricity supplied to the grid (MWh) (3) =(1)-(2)**	**Baseline emission (acc. formula 3): ER = GEN*EF [t CO2e]**
July'09	4.802.103	3.330	4.798.773	3.047,22
August'09	8.918.347	210	8.918.137	5.663,02
September'09	5.710.880	2.170	5.708.710	3.625,03
October'09	4.535.060	3.190	4.531.870	2.877,74
November'09	3.187.990	3.520	3.184.470	2.022,14
December'09	6.845.444	1.310	6.844.134	4.346,03
SUM'09	**33.999.824**	**13.730**	**33.986.094**	**21.581**
January'10	8.852.630	623	8.852.007	5.621,02
February'10	6.142.038	1.624	6.140.414	3.899,16
March'10	4.741.031	3.062	4.737.969	3.008,61
April'10	4.592.190	3.212	4.588.978	2.914,00
May'10	2.098.950	4.590	2.094.360	1.329,92
June'10	2.617.997	3.829	2.614.168	1.660,00
July'10	4.909.745	1.236	4.908.509	3.116,90
August'10	5.464.682	2.244	5.462.438	3.468,65
SUM'10	**39.419.263**	**20.420**	**39.398.843**	**25.018**
Total Sum '09-'10	**73.419.087**	**34.150**	**73.384.937**	**46.599**

The reported data was cross-checked by PMUM records, invoices and monthly meter protocols. SCADA records were also reviewed during the site visit.

Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed.

The assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.

The below table shows a summary of the emission reductions generated during the monitoring period and specifically during the years 2009 and 2010:

Emission reductions generated during the monitoring period (from 01/07/2009 to 31/08/2010-both days are included)	46,599 tCO_2e
Emission reductions generated in the year 2009 (from 01/07/2009 to 31/12/2009-both days are included)	21,581 tCO_2e
Emission reductions generated in the year 2010 (from 01/01/2010 to 31/08/2010-both days are included)	25,018 tCO_2e

All CLs/CARs have been closed on 01/10/2010. The main change in the monitoring report has been done for the generation parameters. Some of the data was not in line with the objective evidence that have submitted. All changes has been done in the monitoring report are listed in the verification protocol.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 1nd periodic verification of the "Alize Camseki 20.8 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey", which applies the methodology ACM0002 version 7. The verification was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, Gold Standard criteria as well as 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 Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. 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 GS-VER-PDD version 03. 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 1.4 dated 01.10.2010 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented and described in validated and registered 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 ready to generate GHG emission reductions

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the valid and registered project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Data Vintage	***Baseline Emissions (tCO_2 eq)***	***Project Emissions (tCO_2 eq)***	***Emission Reductions (tCO_2 eq)***
01/07/2009 – 31/12/2009	*21,581*	*0*	*21,581*
01/01/2010 – 31/08/2010	*25,018*	*0*	*25,018*
TOTAL	***46,599***	***0***	***46,599***

Reporting period: From 01/07/2009 to 31/08/2010
Total Baseline emissions : 46,599 t CO_2 equivalents.
Project emissions : 0 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions : 46,599 t CO_2 equivalents.

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by Alize Enerji Uretim San. ve Tic. A.S. that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Registered GS-VER-PDD version 3.1 dated 31/05/2010
/2/ Validation Report No: 2008-9217 – dated 29/06/2010
/3/ Monitoring Report Version 1.0 dated 29/06/2010
/4/ Monitoring Report Version 1.1 dated 31/08/2010
/5/ Monitoring Report Version 1.2 dated 17/09/2010
/6/ Monitoring Report Version 1.3 dated 29/09/2010
/7/ Monitoring Report Version 1.4 dated 01/10/2010
/8/ Monthly Meter Reading Protocols

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

/1/ ACM0002 version 07
/2/ Electricity Sales Invoices
/3/ Training Records
/4/ Social Insurance Institution Records
/5/ Certificate of Residence
/6/ SCADA Records
/7/ Monthly PMUM Data
/8/ Monthly Meter Reading Protocols

/9/ Meter Testing and Calibration Records
/10/ Validation and Verification Manual v01.1

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. Engin Topcu – Enercon – Plant Manager
/2/ Mr. Fatih Yenigun – Enercon – Plant Manager
/3/ Mr. Ahmet Topac – Alize Enerji – Electricity Technicians
/4/ Mr. Yagmur Karabulut – Mavi Consultant
/5/ Mr. Nail Dinckal – Uvecik Village Head

6. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VERIFICATION TEAM MEMBERS

Ms. Bade Cebeci
Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier

Bade Cebeci has over 10 years experience in environmental sciences and auditing. She is an auditor in EMS&QMS&OHS. She is lead verifier for GHG Emission Reduction Projects.

Mrs. Isil Timuroglu
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

Isil Timuroglu has over 5 years experience in environmental sectors. She worked about calculation of greenhouse gases. She is a verifier for GHG Emission Reduction Projects.

Mrs. Burcu Mutman
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier

Burcu Mutman is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. Has participated various online trainings, seminars and personal trainings on Gold Standard also participated in the Gold Standard Academy in 2009 and 2010.

Mr. Mustafa Isık
Bureau Veritas Certification Sector Specialist
Mustafa Isık is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. He has over 5 years experience in Health Safety and Environmental management system coordination in the wind farm construction projects.

Dr. Ashok Mammen – PhD Oils and Lubricants
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. He is also a lead verifier and tutor for GHG projects and has been involved in the validation and verification processes of more than 100 CDM/JI/VCS and other GHG projects.

APPENDIX A: ALIZE ENERJI URETIM SAN. VE TIC. A.S. VER PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 Verification requirements based on the Validation and Verification Manual version 01.1 (EB51 Annex 3)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
1 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document					
It is assessed if the CDM project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD*	**VVM**	**194**			
a Are all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity, proposed in the registered PDD, in place?	VVM	195	All physical features of the GS VER project activity, proposed in the registered PDD are in place. During the validation of the project activity following FAR was raised by the validation team: *"FCAR2: The project sites need to be clearly demarked. The unique identification of each turbine needs to be provided to the verifier, based on micro-sitting. Please provide also the installed turbine details for verification."* The project activity consists of 11 turbines and the locations of all of the turbines were verified during the site visit by the GPS device according to the generation license. The coordinates are as given following: **Turbine Nr** | **E** | **N**	**OK**	**OK**

* This Q is 'Requirement to be verified' in VVM.

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>§</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Draft Concl</th><th>Final Concl</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>T1</td><td>4°31’ 234”</td><td>44°15’ 670”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T2</td><td>4°31’ 089”</td><td>44°15’ 740”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T3</td><td>4°30’ 960”</td><td>44°15’ 836”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T4</td><td>4°30’ 552”</td><td>44°15’ 750”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T5</td><td>4°30’ 392”</td><td>44°15’ 765”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T6</td><td>4°30’ 003”</td><td>44°15’ 684”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T7</td><td>4°29’ 870”</td><td>44°15’ 783”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T8</td><td>4°29’ 746”</td><td>44°15’ 893”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T9</td><td>4°29’ 636”</td><td>44°16’ 015”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T10</td><td>4°29’ 512”</td><td>44°16’ 122”</td></tr>
<tr><td>T11</td><td>4°30’ 807”</td><td>44°15’ 918”</td></tr>
</table>
It has been verified on the site visit that the project includes 10 units of E82 turbines with an output of 2000 kW and 1 unit of E48 turbine with an output of 800 kW.
Hence, the FAR is closed.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>It was verified on the site visit that project activity consists of 11 turbines. The coordinates of the turbines has been amended 2 times in the generation license. The amended was done before the turbines were installed.
However, the coordinates given in the Table 1 of the monitoring report are not in accordance with the generation license. Please correct accordingly.</td><td>CAR1</td><td>OK</td></tr>
<tr><td>b Have the project participants operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the</td><td>VVM</td><td>195</td><td>The project participants have operated the project activity as per the registered PDD.</td><td>OK</td><td>OK</td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
registered PDD?			It has been verified on the site visit that the project includes 10 units of E82 turbines with an output of 2000 kW and 1 unit of E48 turbine with an output of 800 kW as per the registered PDD. The coordinates of the turbines are in accordance with the registered PDD. Generated electricity is supplied to the grid at the Ezine transformer station as stated in the registered PDD.		
c Is the proposed CDM project implemented against the description in the PDD?	VVM	195	The GS VER project activity is implemented as per the descriptions in the registered PDD. This was also verified during the site visit.	**OK**	**OK**
d Was an on-site visit conducted?	VVM	195	An on-site visit was conducted on 16.07.2010.	**OK**	**OK**
e If not, justify the rationale of the decision.	VVM	195	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology					
It Is assessed if the monitoring plan of the proposed CDM project activity is in accordance with the applied methodology	**VVM**	**198**			
a Is the validated monitoring plan in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	199	The validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology ACM002 Version 07. According to the methodology the only parameter that needs to be monitored is EG_y which is the net electricity generation of the plant. In the monitoring plan, this parameter is included as per the methodology. Also as this is a GS VER project, two sustainable development indicator parameters are included in	**OK**	**OK**

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
				the monitoring plan: • Quality and quantity of local employment • Air Quality		
b	If no, was a request for revision of the monitoring plan was done? (The DOE may request for revision of the monitoring plan covering the monitoring period under verification, for approval by the Board)	VVM	200	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
c	Are there any monitoring aspects of the project activity that are not specified in the methodology, particularly in the case of small-scale methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency)?	VVM	201	During the validation of the project activity Gold Standard has raised the following FAR: *"The PP shall please monitor the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds during the first monitoring period and the DOE shall please check results during the first verification and recommend continued monitoring if required."* In the monitoring report PP has stated that the employees have not observed any bird deaths. During the site visit the village head was interviewed about this subject and he also confirmed that he has not observed any bird deaths. Please give detailed explanation on how this parameter is monitored and clarify if any records are kept regarding this parameter. Please also send objective evidence showing that the project is not located on bird migration route.	**CL1**	**OK**
3	***Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring***					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
plan					
It is assessed if monitoring of reductions in GHG emissions to result from the proposed CDM project activity is implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or the accepted revised monitoring plan*.	**VVM**	**203**			
a Have the monitoring plan and the applied methodology been properly implemented and followed by the project participants?	VVM	204	Project participant has generally implemented and followed the monitoring plan and the applied methodology. See discussions below for details and some discrepancies addressed through CARs and CLs.	**OK**	**OK**
			<u>Electricity generation</u> Electricity generation of the plant, EG_y, is monitored continuously. • There are two LANDIS+GYR / ZMD402CT44.2407 S2 meters with serial number 9584742 and 9584743, which continuously measuring and recording electricity generation and consumption of the Project activity. It was validated on the site visit that the serial numbers of the meters are in accordance with the monitoring report. The primary measurement device is used for invoicing, and the secondary measurement device is used for quality control and back-up purposes. The measurement devices give the total gross electricity generated and the total electricity consumed by the wind farm. The	**OK**	**OK**

<table>
<tr><th>CHECKLIST QUESTION</th><th>Ref.</th><th>§</th><th>COMMENTS</th><th>Draft Concl</th><th>Final Concl</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>
difference of these two data is the net electricity generated.

On the site visit, the generation values were read from the main and auxiliary meters. The difference between main and auxiliary meter is very small and acceptable. The values are as following:

<table>
<tr><th>Meters</th><th>First Index (01.07.10)</th><th>Last Index (15.07.10)</th><th>Difference</th></tr>
<tr><td>Main Meter</td><td>65,100</td><td>67,203</td><td>2,103</td></tr>
<tr><td>Auxiliary Meter</td><td>65,117</td><td>67,221</td><td>2,104</td></tr>
</table>

• TEIAS (The National Grid Operator) personnel monthly perform on-site measurements for both the primary and secondary (back-up) measurement devices on the first days of the month.

In the beginning of each month, an authorized TEIAS employee comes to the project activity site and reads the generation data from the meters. Based on this reading, a protocol is prepared by TEIAS on site and then signed by both parties each month.

• The measurement devices give the total gross electricity generated and the total electricity consumed by the wind farm. The difference of these two data is the net electricity generated.
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Furthermore, TEIAS cuts a certain percentage of the generation to account for transmission losses. The net electricity generation, which is to be monitored and to be used for baseline emissions, is the net electricity generation, which does not include the transmission losses. • The generation data is also recorded automatically by the Enercon SCADA system for each single wind turbine. • SCADA system automatically records all electricity generation data for each single wind turbine 7/24. The project participant is able to monitor the electricity generation data by the use of a SCADA system, however it has no control over, or access to the measurement devices and cannot perform any type of maintenance or calibration.		
			<u>Quality and quantity of local employment</u> 1. In the registered PDD the recording frequency of the local employment is given as "each monitoring period" however in the monitoring report it is stated that this parameter is monitored continuously. Please clarify. 2. It has been stated at the Monitoring Plan in the PDD that the local employment is monitored by calculation. However, it has been stated in the Monitoring Report that the local employment is monitored by estimation and measurement.	**CL2**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Please clarify.		
			Health and safety precautions are given in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report. During the site visit it was seen that safety equipments are available and used by personnel depending on their roles and responsibilities. 1. It has been stated in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report that the site does not pose any danger or health risk to the personnel. Please justify this statement and give detailed information. 2. It has been stated in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report that there has not been any work accident on site during the monitoring period. Please clarify what kind of work accident has not occurred (i.e. work accident resulting with necessary first aid or work accident resulting with time loss or both). 3. It has been stated in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report that the project is compliance with relevant regulations in the host country. Please send the health and safety audit record and/or approved list of the health and safety equipments by authorized person.	**CAR2**	**OK**
			Trainings that had been given to the personnel are given in the Table 10 of the Monitoring Report. “Health and Safety” trainings had been given to the Responsible Engineer, maintenance technician and	**CAR3**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			one of the electricity technicians. “High Voltage” training had been given to all technicians. “Turbine Operation and Maintenance” training had been given to Responsible Engineer and maintenance technician. Certificates of the trainings have been submitted to verification team. 1. All trainings that had been given to personnel have not been stated in the Table 10 of the Monitoring Report. Please revise the Table 10 including all trainings. 2. It has been stated in the Table 10 of the Monitoring Report that all technicians have HV licenses. Please send the HV licenses of all technicians.		
			Number of local people permanently employed by the project is counted every monitoring period. 9 people are employed in total and all of them are local. Employment information is given in the Table 11 of the Monitoring Report. The Social Insurance Institution record and personnel’s certificate of residence have been submitted to verification team. 1. On the site visit it has been observed that a new Plant Manager have been employed as a local person. Please send the Social Insurance Institution record and certificate of residence of the Plant Manager. 2. Personnel have been employed by two company, Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. and	**CAR4**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Enercon Servis Ltd. Şti.. Alize Enerji is the owner company of the project; Enercon is the service and maintenance company of the producer company of the wind turbines. In the monitoring report, in Table 11, it is stated that only 1 personnel is employed by Enercon, however during the site visit it was seen that 3 personnel was employed by Enercon. Please clarify and correct the list accordingly. Also during the site visit it was seen that Alize Enerji have more than one wind firm and some of the personnel have been working alternately at two wind farms. Please indicate the personnel have been working at two wind farms in Table 11.		
			<u>Air quality</u> The reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions are monitored every monitoring period by calculation. The ratio between net electricity generation of the Project and grid has been calculated first, and host county emissions have been multiplied by this ratio in order to find emission reductions. 1. This ratio has been calculated in the Monitoring Plan of the PDD with 2007 year values and it has been explained that this ratio will be used. However, in the Monitoring Report the reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions have been calculated with 2008 year values. Please correct accordingly so that the monitoring report is in line with the monitoring plan that is given in	**CAR5**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			the registered PDD. 2. Total host county SO_2 emissions are given as 1007.788 tons and NO_X emissions are given as 313.24 tons in the Monitoring Report. However, total host county SO_2 emissions are given as 1,007,788 tons and NO_X emissions are given as 313,240 tons in the reference document. Net electricity generation is given as 189,762 kWh in the monitoring plan but net electricity generation is 189,762,000 kWh in the monitoring report. Please revise the reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions using the values at given references. Please make sure the values are in line with the values given in the monitoring plan and please also revise the reference source. 3. The reference 8 does not refer to net electricity generation. Please edit the link.		
			In the monitoring report the start date of operation of the project activity is given as 24/06/2009 and the beginning of the first crediting period is given as 24/06/2009. However, The meters installation date is given as 25/06/2009. Please clarify.	**CL3**	**OK**
b Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable, including:	VVM	204			
i Project emission parameters?	VVM	204	The project emission parameters have been	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			defined as zero according to the methodology. It has been stated in the section D.1. of the Monitoring Report that the diesel generator is used for only emergency cases therefore the related emissions are negligible. On the site visit, it has been verified that the generator is used for very limited amount of time. The fuel invoice and frequency of using generator have been submitted to the verification team. The generator had been used 53.8 hours during the monitoring period when the grid was offline. In addition to this, the generator is used once a week for testing during 5 minutes. The testing records were submitted to the verification team and testing period is found acceptable. The measurement devices give the total gross electricity generated and the total electricity consumed by the wind farm. Also, PMUM records show the internal consumption. The difference of the total gross electricity generated and the internal consumption give the net electricity generated which is based on the emission reduction calculation.		
ii Baseline emission parameters?	VVM	204	There are two measurement devices continuously measuring and recording electricity generation and consumption of the Project activity. The primary measurement device is used for invoicing, and the secondary measurement device is used for quality	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			control and back-up purposes. TEIAS (the national grid operator) personnel monthly perform on-site measurements for both the primary and secondary (back-up) measurement devices on the first days of the month. In the beginning of each month an authorized TEIAS employee comes to the project activity site and reads the generation data from the meters. Based on this reading, a protocol is prepared by TEIAS on site and then signed by both parties each month. The invoices are prepared according to PMUM records. The monthly meter reading protocols was submitted to verification team. The measurement devices give the total gross electricity generated and the total electricity consumed by the wind farm. The difference of these two data is the net electricity generated. Furthermore, TEIAS cuts a certain percentage of the generation to account for transmission losses. The net electricity generation, which is to be monitored and to be used for baseline emissions, is the net electricity generation, which does not include the transmission losses. It has been observed on the site visit that the generation data is also recorded automatically by the Enercon SCADA system for each single wind turbine. The instantaneous generation values and the wind speed of the turbines were observed. The total instantaneous generation was read as 21.60		

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			MWh from the SCADA system. At the same time, total generation was read as 21.28 MWh from the main meter.		
iii Leakage parameters?	VVM	204	There is no leakage for the project activity. Leakage is negligible regarding to the methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
iv Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	VVM	204	The management and operational system are in accordance with the monitoring plan. The calibration of the electricity meters are the responsibility of TEIAS and the project owner has no control over this calibration process. It has been verified on the site visit that the meters were sealed by TEIAS personnel. If a problem occurs, The Plant Manager informs TEIAS about the case. The necessary maintenance and calibration are the responsibility of TEIAS.	**OK**	**OK**
c Is the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board and are equipment controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan?	VVM	204	The calibration of the electricity meters are the responsibility of TEIAS and the project owner has no control over this calibration process. The meters are calibrated at 25.06.2009. Please send the first calibration records of the meters.	**CAR6**	**OK**
			According to the “regulation on the testing of measurement devices” which was published on the official gazette dated 24/07/1994 the testing of the electricity meters are done every 10 years unless there is a major discrepancy between the main and	**CL4**	

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			auxiliary meters. In February 2010, according to the main meter the last index value for T2 is 10,909.34 however the same value is 19,917.14 according to the auxiliary meter. There is approximate one hundred percent discrepancy between the main and auxiliary meters according to the data on the monthly meter reading protocols. Please clarify.		
i Are monitoring results consistently reccorded as per approved frequency?	VVM	204	The primary and back-up measurement devices measure, read and record various data such as electricity generated and consumed, in real-time. It has been verified on the site visit that two meters record the monitoring results consistently as per monitoring plan. Enercon SCADA system also records the generation data. The generation data is stored by PMUM on the web site. The Project owner has an ID and password to access this data on the web site. After the Project owner log in to web site, they can access electricity generation and consumption reports of the project. They can export these reports in electronic format and print hardcopies. The Project owner stores also the hardcopies of the monthly meter reading protocols until at least 2 years after the end of the crediting period. The hardcopies of the monthly meter reading protocols was submitted to verification team.	**OK**	**OK**
ii Have quality assurance and quality control	VVM	204	The quality assurance and quality control	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?			procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan. There are two LANDIS+GYR / ZMD402CT44.2407 S2 meters with serial number 9584742 and 9584743, which continuously measuring and recording electricity generation and consumption of the Project activity. The primary measurement device is used for invoicing, and the secondary measurement device is used for quality control and back-up purposes. It has been verified on the site visit that the meters were sealed by TEIAS personnel. In the beginning of each month an authorized TEIAS employee comes to the project activity site and reads the generation data from the meters. Based on this reading, a protocol is prepared by TEIAS on site and then signed by both parties each month. The invoices are prepared according to PMUM records. The generation data is also recorded automatically by the Enercon SCADA system for each single wind turbine.		
			It has been stated in the Monitoring Report that quality of local employment is monitored by Plant Manager on site continuously and quantity of local employment is monitored by Plant Manager on site every monitoring period. It has been stated in the Monitoring Report that air quality is monitored by	**CL5**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Plant Manager on site every monitoring period. From the above statements it is understood that the monitoring activities depend solely on the Plant Manager. However, in the absence of the Plant Manager the monitoring activities shall continue as planned. Therefore, a system for the quality assurance of the monitoring activities shall be employed. If the plant has such a system this should be explained in detail in the monitoring report.		
4 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions					
It is assessed if GHG emission reductions achieved by / resulting from the proposed CDM project activity are calculated applying the selected methodology	VVM	206			
a Is a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available? (If no, i.e., only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the DOE shall opt to either make the most conservative assumption theoretically possible in finalizing the verification report, or raise a request for deviation if appropriate).	VVM	207	The invoices of some months have not been submitted. Please send the TEIAS invoices for the following months: June 2009, January 2010, February 2010, March 2010, April 2010 and May 2010. The PMUM records show total values including all wind farms of Alize Enerji before December 2009. Please send the values of Alize Enerji Camseki Wind Farm approved by TEIAS for the following months: June 2009, July 2009, August 2009, September 2009, October 2009 and November 2009.	**CAR7**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
b Has information provided in the monitoring report been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis?	VVM	207	Information in the monitoring report has been cross-checked with invoices, PMUM records and monthly meter reading protocols.	**OK**	**OK**
			Information in the monitoring report is cross-checked with monthly meter reading protocols, invoices and PMUM records. According to these records there are some small discrepancies with the reported data. Please clarify the following: 1. In general the sum of T1, T2 and T3 are not equal to total values in the monthly meter reading protocol. Please clarify why sum of T1, T2 and T3 are not equal to total values. 2. The gross generation value is 158,530 kWh and the internal consumption value is 1,610 kWh according to the June 2009 monthly meter reading protocol. However, the gross generation value is taken as 1,583,184 kWh and the internal consumption value is taken as 16,100 kWh for the calculation of emission reduction. Please revise the calculation of the emission reductions.	**CL6**	**OK**
c Have calculations of baseline emissions, proposed CDM project activity emissions and leakage, as appropriate, been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document?	VVM	207	The combined margin emission factor is given as 0.635 tCO_2/MWh in the registered PDD. However, it is taken as 0.635146705739254 for the calculation of emission reduction. Please use the value given in the registered PDD to be on the conservative side.	**CL7**	**OK**

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
d	Have any assumptions used in emission calculations been justified?	VVM	207	The emission and emission reduction calculations are based on the data measured using calibrated meters of adequate accuracy. Apart from the ex-ante emissions factor, no other assumption is used in these calculations, which is in line with the monitoring methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
e	Have appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values been correctly applied?	VVM	207	The emission factor used was fixed on ex-ante basis during the verification. No other factor or default value is used for the calculation of emission reductions. The combined margin emission factor is given as 0.635 tCO_2/MWh in the registered PDD. However, it is taken as 0.635146705739254 for the calculation of emission reduction. Please use the value given in the registered PDD to be on the conservative side.	**CL7**	**OK**

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action / Forward Action / Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
CAR1 It was verified on the site visit that project activity consists of 11 turbines. The coordinates of the turbines has been amended 2 times in the generation license. However, the coordinates given in the Table 1 of the monitoring report are not in accordance with the generation license. Please correct accordingly.	Table 1 – 1.a.	The turbine locations that have been submitted in the monitoring report have been corrected, as requested. The correct turbine locations can be found on page 2 of the generation license.	The coordinates of the turbines given in the Table 1 of the Monitoring Report version 1.1 are in accordance with the Generation License. **This corrective action request is closed.**
CAR2 Health and safety precautions are given in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report. During the site visit it was seen that safety equipments are available and used by personnel depending on their roles and responsibilities. 1. It has been stated in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report that the site does not pose any danger or health risk to the personnel. Please justify this statement and	Table 1 – 3.a.	1. The sentence claiming that "The work does not involve any activity which is dangerous or hazardous to health." has been deleted. All necessary safety precautions, equipment and training are available to mitigate these risks. Another sentence	**Review 1:** 1. The project may involve dangerous activity however does not involve any hazardous activity. The changes made are accepted. 2. The plant manager and personnel of the project activity were interviewed during the site visit. They confirmed that any work accident has not occurred.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
give detailed information. 2. It has been stated in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report that there has not been any work accident on site during the monitoring period. Please clarify what kind of work accident has not occurred (i.e. work accident resulting with necessary first aid or work accident resulting with time loss or both). 3. It has been stated in the Table 9 of the Monitoring Report that the project is compliance with relevant regulations in the host country. Please send the health and safety audit record and/or approved list of the health and safety equipments by authorized person.		claiming that the project does not pose health risk has been reformulated to "The Project does not involve any activity that is hazardous." 2. Table 10 is revised by adding the explanation "personal injury, first aid etc.". 3. This document is provided to the DOE as a separate attachment. **Response 1:** This document is requested from Enercon Servis Ltd. It will be submitted to the DOE as soon as it arrives. **Response 2:** The information regarding work	It was added that any work accident has not occurred resulting with personal injury, first aid etc. The changes made are accepted. 3. The health and safety audit record and/or approved list of the health and safety equipments by authorized person are not submitted to the verification team. Please send the health and safety audit record and/or approved list of the health and safety equipments by authorized person. **This corrective action request is still open.** **Review 2:** The corrective action request will be reviewed when the document is

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
		health and safety is separately provided to the DOE.	submitted. **<u>This corrective action request is still open.</u>** **<u>Review 3:</u>** Occupational health and safety directions are submitted to the validation team. **<u>This corrective action request is closed.</u>**
CAR3 Trainings that had been given to the personnel are given in the Table 10 of the Monitoring Report. “Health and Safety” trainings had been given to the Responsible Engineer, maintenance technician and one of the electricity technicians. “High Voltage” training had been given to all technicians. “Turbine Operation and Maintenance” training had been given to Responsible Engineer and	Table 1 – 3.a.	1. Table 11 has been revised to include the HS trainings. 2. The HV licenses are provided to the DOE as a separate attachment. **<u>Response 1:</u>** The missing license is submitted to the DOE.	**<u>Review 1:</u>** 1. All trainings that had been given to personnel have stated in the Table 11 of the Monitoring Report version 1.1. 2. HV licenses of three technicians are submitted to the verification team. However, one of the technician’s HV license is not submitted to the verification

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
maintenance technician. Certificates of the trainings have been submitted to verification team. 1. All trainings that had been given to personnel have not been stated in the Table 10 of the Monitoring Report. Please revise the Table 10 including all trainings. 2. It has been stated in the Table 10 of the Monitoring Report that all technicians have HV licenses. Please send the HV licenses of all technicians.			team. Please send. **<u>This corrective action request is still open.</u>** **<u>Review 2:</u>** All HV licenses are submitted to the validation team. **<u>This corrective action request is closed.</u>**
CAR4 Number of local people permanently employed by the project is counted every monitoring period. 9 people are employed in total and all of them are local. Employment information is given in the Table 11 of the Monitoring Report. The Social Insurance Institution record and personnel's certificate of residence have been submitted to verification team. 1. On the site visit it has been observed that a new Plant Manager have been employed	Table 1 – 3.a.	1. The plant manager has been Mr. Fatih Yenigün until 05.07.2010. His social security and certificate of residence documents have already been submitted to the DOE (on the first pages of both pdf files). Mr Engin Topçu has been hired as the replacing plant manager, effective as of 05.07.2010.	**<u>Review 1:</u>** 1. The Social Insurance Institution record and certificate of residence of Mr. Engin Topçu has been submitted to the verification team. However, the Social Insurance Institution record of Mr. Engin Topçu does not indicate that Enercon employs him. Please check the record.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
as a local person. Please send the Social Insurance Institution record and certificate of residence of the Plant Manager. 2. Personnel have been employed by two company, Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. and Enercon Servis Ltd. Şti.. Alize Enerji is the owner company of the project; Enercon is the service and maintenance company of the producer company of the wind turbines. In the monitoring report, in Table 11, it is stated that only 1 personnel is employed by Enercon, however during the site visit it was seen that 3 personnel was employed by Enercon. Please clarify and correct the list accordingly. Also during the site visit it was seen that Alize Enerji have more than one wind firm and some of the personnel have been working alternately at two wind farms. Please indicate the personnel have been working at two wind farms in Table 11.		2. The correct list of employment, including their work sharing with İntepe Anemon wind farm, is submitted to the DOE as a separate attachment. **Response 1:** Mr. Engin Topcu has been employed by Enercon Servis Ltd as of July 2010. Therefore the social security can only be checked in August. The earliest date for SGK documentation for this personnel is August 23rd, and this document will be submitted to the DOE as soon as possible. **Response 2:** The information about Mr Engin Topcu's social security is provided to the DOE separately.	2. Table 12 (Employment Information) in the Monitoring Report version 1.1. has been changed including both firms personnel correctly. The Social Insurance Institution record and certificate of residence all of the local personnel has been submitted to the verification team. **This corrective action request is still open.** **Review 2:** The corrective action request will be reviewed when the document is submitted. **This corrective action request is still open.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
			Review 3: Social Insurance Institution record is submitted to the validation team. **This corrective action request is closed.**
CAR5 Air quality The reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions are monitored every monitoring period by calculation. The ratio between net electricity generation of the Project and grid has been calculated first, and host county emissions have been multiplied by this ratio in order to find emission reductions. 1. This ratio has been calculated in the Monitoring Plan of the PDD with 2007 year values and it has been explained that this ratio will be used. However, in the Monitoring Report the reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions have been calculated with 2008 year values. Please correct	Table 1 – 3.a.	1. This is a deviation request by the PP, as indicated below the table of indicator ID.3 of the MR. This deviation has the aim to correctly revising/updating the actual emission reductions with more accurate numbers. If the DOE/GS does not accept this deviation request application, the previous registered NOx and SOx intensities will be used. Please note that an error is found in the monitoring plan of the PDD, p.53, where the grid net	1. Deviation request of the PP has asked to the Gold Standard and they have confirmed that this is very minor deviation it does not need to get Gold Standards' approval before requesting issuance. Deviation request has been accepted by the verification team since the updating and more accurate values is used and calculation has been checked. 2. It is verified that unit conversion error has been corrected. 3. It is verified that the link is

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
accordingly so that the monitoring report is in line with the monitoring plan that is given in the registered PDD. 2. Total host county SO_2 emissions are given as 1007.788 tons and NO_X emissions are given as 313.24 tons in the Monitoring Report. However, total host county SO_2 emissions are given as 1,007,788 tons and NO_X emissions are given as 313,240 tons in the reference document. Net electricity generation is given as 189,762 kWh in the monitoring plan but net electricity generation is 189,762,000 kWh in the monitoring report. Please revise the reductions of SO_2 and NO_X emissions using the values at given references. Please make sure the values are in line with the values given in the monitoring plan and please also revise the reference source. 3. The reference 8 does not refer to net electricity generation. Please edit the link.		electricity generation is given as 189,762 MWh, instead of GWh. This deviation request is also added to the MR. 2. This unit conversion error is corrected to 1,007,784 tons, as requested. The correct grid net electricity is 189,762 GWh (deviation requested in the MR). This is also corrected in the MR. Also; this calculation is added to the spreadsheet (submitted as a separate attachment) to avoid calculation errors. 3. The link is corrected.	corrected. **<u>This corrective action request is closed.</u>**
CAR6	Table 1 – 3.c.	The test certificates of the meters performed at the factory and by	**<u>Review 1:</u>**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
The calibration of the electricity meters are the responsibility of TEIAS and the project owner has no control over this calibration process. The meters are calibrated at 25.06.2009. Please send the first calibration records of the meters.		TEIAS are submitted to the DOE as a separate attachment. The product brochure is also submitted. The first calibration date is corrected from 25.06.2009 to 22.03.2009 in the MR. The date of installation is deleted from the MR, as the accurate date is unknown. **Response 1:** The date of 02/07/2010 is the date when the manufacturer prepared that document. It is not the date of calibration. The calibration of measurement devices can legally be only carried out by TEIAS. TEIAS calibrated the devices on 22/03/2009. This document is submitted to the DOE.	The test certificates of the meters performed at the factory, "Test Certificate for High-Precision Combimeter", dated 02.07.2010 is submitted to the verification team. The test date is (02.07.2010) later than the first calibration date (22.03.2009) that is performed at the power plant. Please clarify. **This corrective action request is still open.** **Response 2:** The calibration reports dated 22/03/2009 are submitted to the verification team. The explanation is accepted by the verification team. **This corrective action request is closed.**
CAR7	Table 1 – 4.a.	The missing invoices are	**Review 1:**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
The invoices of some months have not been submitted. Please send the TEIAS invoices for the following months: June 2009, January 2010, February 2010, March 2010, April 2010 and May 2010. The PMUM records show total values including all wind farms of Alize Enerji before December 2009. Please send the values of Alize Enerji Camseki Wind Farm approved by TEIAS for the following months: June 2009, July 2009, August 2009, September 2009, October 2009 and November 2009.		submitted to the DOE, as a separate attachment. The statement is not correct. Before December 2009, the previous PMUM web-based user interface allowed to filter out the Camseki project and the already provided PMUM printouts indicate the name Camseki (please look for the name Camseki in parenthesis at the PMUM reports) between June-November 2009. A cross checking with the invoices will also confirm this. **Response 1:** Generation values cannot be accessed from PMUM until December 2009. For this reason, a letter is submitted by the PP to TEIAS on 10/08/2010 asking for these values. As soon as TEIAS's electricity breakdown document	1. The TEIAS invoice of June 2009 has not been submitted to the verification team. Please send the invoice of June 2009. 2. The records of Camseki do not indicate that the values are approved by TEIAS. The records of the each month are not in a tabular format. For example, the format of June 2009 is different from other months. The PMUM records, approved by TEIAS, indicate all wind farms of Alize Enerji. In addition, the gross generation and internal consumption values are different between monthly meter reading protocol and Camseki record for June 2009. Please send the values of Alize Enerji Camseki Wind Farm approved by TEIAS for the following months: June 2009, July 2009, August 2009,

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
		arrives, it will be submitted to the DOE. **Response 2:** The TEIAS protocol is provided to the DOE. **Response 3:** The invoice of July 2009 also includes June 2009 power generation. However, some evidence is missing to prove the exact power generation. Therefore, the June 2009 generation is omitted from the Monitoring report conservatively.	September 2009, October 2009 and November 2009. **<u>This corrective action request is still open.</u>** **<u>Review 2:</u>** The corrective action request will be reviewed when the document is submitted. **<u>This corrective action request is still open.</u>** **<u>Review 3:</u>** TEIAS letter is submitted to the verification team. However, June 2009 values are not stated at the TEIAS letter. The project is registered to the PMUM on July 2010 and the emission reduction calculations are based on the PMUM records according to the

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
			monitoring plan. Please remove the June 2009 emission reductions. **<u>This corrective action request is still open.</u>** **<u>Review 4:</u>** Starting date of the first crediting period is given as 24/06/2009 in the registered PDD. However, the project is registered to the PMUM on 01/07/2010 and the emission reduction calculations are based on the PMUM records according to the monitoring plan. Therefore, the June 2009 emission reductions are removed from the Monitoring Report conservatively. Generation and consumption values of the other months were cross-checked with monthly meter reading protocols and PMUM records. **<u>This corrective action request is</u>**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
			closed.
CL1 During the validation of the project activity Gold Standard has raised the following FAR: *"The PP shall please monitor the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds during the first monitoring period and the DOE shall please check results during the first verification and recommend continued monitoring if required."* In the monitoring report PP has stated that the employees have not observed any bird deaths. During the site visit the village head was interviewed about this subject and he also confirmed that he has not observed any bird deaths. Please give detailed explanation on how this parameter is monitored and clarify if any records are kept regarding this parameter. Please also send objective evidence showing that the project is not located on bird migration route.	Table 1 – 2.c.	As the validation report also suggests, no significant impact on birds is expected. This was also checked by the validating DOE during various interviews with local stakeholders. The aim of the monitoring of this FAR is to check the actual impact of the project on birds during the monitoring period (and not validating the potential impact by comparing bird migration routes etc.). As impact on birds was not in the monitoring plan, and as GS does not provide a certain procedure to monitor bird mortality, the PP believes that interviewing project personnel and local communities about bird deaths is a proper, feasible and acceptable way to verify this issue. Local people, the village headman of Üvecik village, or the	**FAR1** The explanation of the PP is accepted by the verification team. During the site visit, the village head was interviewed about this subject and he confirmed that he has not observed any bird deaths. On the conservative side, the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds should continue monitoring. **This clarification request is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
		personnel did not reported anything related to bird mortality during the monitoring period. These interviews have been conducted in a transparent way, and the result is a plausible measure for the project performance regarding this FAR.	
CL2 <u>Quality and quantity of local employment</u> 1. In the registered PDD the recording frequency of the local employment is given as "each monitoring period" however in the monitoring report it is stated that this parameter is monitored continuously. Please clarify. 2. It has been stated at the Monitoring Plan in the PDD that the local employment is monitored by calculation. However, it has been stated in the Monitoring Report that the local employment is monitored by estimation and measurement. Please	Table 1 – 3.a.	The expression "continuously" has been deleted from the MR. The number of local employment is actually found by interviewing / document review – i.e. counting. The word "calculation" in the monitoring plan (PDD) was meant for counting. This expression in the PDD might have not been expressed very carefully as it is logically not very plausible to calculate personnel number.	1. The recording frequency of the local employment has been changed as "every monitoring period" in accordance with the registered PDD. 2. This explanation is accepted by the verification team. **<u>This clarification request is closed.</u>**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
clarify.			
CL3 In the monitorin report the start date of operation of the project activity is given as 24/06/2009 and the beginning of the first crediting period is given as 24/06/2009. However, The meters installation date is given as 25/06/2009. Please clarify.	Table 1 – 3.a.	Please see CAR6. This date is incorrect and has been deleted from the MR completely. The exact installation date is unknown. The Project started generating and feeding electricity before 24.06.2009 (test operation), without invoicing. As uninvoiced power generation data is of low quality, the PP does not include it in the ER calculations. The meter installation date is logically before than the official starting date (24.06.2009).	The meters installation date (22.03.2009) is before the project activity starting date (24.06.2009). **This clarification request is closed.**
CL4 According to the "regulation on the testing of measurement devices" which was published on the official gazette dated 24/07/1994 the testing of the electricity meters are done every 10 years unless there is a major discrepancy between the main and auxiliary meters.	Table 1 – 3.c.	The meters do not report the montly generation figures, but the overall total generation from their first installation dates until the reading date. Each month, the meter reading of the previous month is subtracted from the	The PMUM records and the starting meter index in the March 2010 protocol reading verify that difference between two meters is a result of misreading. The starting gross generation value of the auxiliary meter is in accordance with the main meter that given in the March

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
In February 2010, according to the main meter the last index value for T2 is 10,909.34 however the same value is 19,917.14 according to the auxiliary meter. There is approximate one hundred percent discrepancy between the main and auxiliary meters according to the data on the monthly meter reading protocols. Please clarify.		actual month's reading to calculate the monthly generation. This reading and subtraction is done by TEIAS and confirmed with a monthly protocol. The value the PP reports to be 19,917.14 is an incorrect value in the protocol. We believe it is a result of a misreading of 0 to be 9. The PMUM report also shows that the February 2010 total (T1+T2+T3) gross generation is 6,142,038 kWh (the same as the primary meter reading, including 10,909.34 that results in T2 generation of 1,373,040 kWh). The invoice of February 2010 also supports this. Please note that in the March 2010 reading, the starting meter index in the protocol is 10,917.14 (and not 19,917.14) so that the error is fixed in the following month.	2010 monthly protocol readings. Therefore, it is shown that the misreading is fixed in the following month. The explanation of the PP is accepted by the verification team. **This clarification request is closed.**
CL5	Table 1 – 3.c.ii.	The statement saying that the	In the Monitoring Plan version 1.1.,

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
It has been stated in the Monitoring Report that quality of local employment is monitored by Plant Manager on site continuously and quantity of local employment is monitored by Plant Manager on site every monitoring period. It has been stated in the Monitoring Report that air quality is monitored by Plant Manager on site every monitoring period. From the above statements it is understood that the monitoring activities depend solely on the Plant Manager. However, in the absence of the Plant Manager the monitoring activities shall continue as planned. Therefore, a system for the quality assurance of the monitoring activities shall be employed. If the plant has such a system this should be explained in detail in the monitoring report.		employment quality/quantity indicator would be monitored continuously is deleted from the MR in agreement with the monitoring plan. Monitoring parameter ID1 (net electricity generation) is monitored and recorded via the PMUM system and this procedure is managed with high quality as invoicing is based on this internal procedure. ID2 will be monitored every monitoring period. Therefore it is a simple and straightforward procedure which can be overtaken by any other personnel of the project owner in case of such a need. The project owner already works with Enercon and experts to ensure that all EHS precautions are taken, as a core activity (regardless of GS VER monitoring). Similarly,	monitoring frequency of quality of local employment is changed as every monitoring period. The explanation of the PP shows that in the absence of the Plant Manager the monitoring activities will continue as planned. **This clarification request is closed.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
		employment (social security, paychecks, other social benefits etc.) requirements are managed at the project owner's headquarters (not the plant manager). The compilation and information flow is the responsibility of the plant manager, which is made once a while at monitoring periods (not continuously) and it does not require special training or manual. ID3, air quality, is monitored by calculation where the source data is again the net electricity generation. Electricity generation, as stated in ID1, is monitored and recorded at the headquarters. Therefore the management plan is adequate and ensures proper quality of monitoring activities.	
CL6	Table 1 – 4.b.	1. The Protocols are	**Review 1:**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
Information in the monitoring report is cross-checked with monthly meter reading protocols, invoices and PMUM records. According to these records there are some small discrepancies with the reported data. Please clarify the following: 1. In general the sum of T1, T2 and T3 are not equal to total values in the monthly meter reading protocol. Please clarify why sum of T1, T2 and T3 are not equal to total values. 2. The gross generation value is 158,530 kWh and the internal consumption value is 1,610 kWh according to the June 2009 monthly meter reading protocol. However, the gross generation value is taken as 1,583,184 kWh and the internal consumption value is taken as 16,100 kWh for the calculation of emission reduction. Please revise the calculation of the emission reductions.		measured on site, using the primary and secondary meter readings. There might be several reasons for this small discrepancy between the protocol and the PMUM reports, such as settlement (between the PP and TEIAS) and rounding. Please note that the PMUM reports (not protocols) are the most final data where the invoices and the monitoring plan are based upon. 2. The first page of the PMUM reports document lists the June 2009 values. According to this report, the ISVM (gross generation) is “1.583.184” kWh and the UECM (consumption from the grid) is “16.100” kWh.	1. The explanation is accepted by the verification team. 2. The gross generation and the internal consumption values are different between monthly meter reading protocol and Camseki record for June 2009. In addition, the invoice of June 2009 has not been submitted to the verification team. Please send the invoice of June 2009 and Please send the values of Alize Enerji Camseki Wind Farm approved by TEIAS for the following months: June 2009, July 2009, August 2009, September 2009, October 2009 and November 2009. **<u>This clarification request is still open.</u>**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
		Please note that PMUM is the final, settled information source and that according to the monitoring plan, the data source is PMUM reports (and invoices as supporting information). The June invoice is in agreement with the PMUM report. **Response 1:** Please see CAR7. After this request, the PP has investigated this issue and found out that the Project did not enter the PMUM system in June 2009, but only in July 2009. For this reason, the generation and invoices of June and July are together. The invoice of June 2009 is included in the July 2009 invoice as an additional item.	**Review 2:** The clarification request will be reviewed when the document is submitted. **This clarification request is still open.** **Review 3:** TEIAS letter is submitted to the verification team. However, June 2009 values are not stated at the TEIAS letter. The project is registered to the PMUM on July 2010 and the emission reduction calculations are based on the PMUM records according to the monitoring plan. Please remove the June 2009 emission reductions. **This corrective action request is still open.**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
		The letter from TEIAS will clearly provide these data. **Response 2:** The TEIAS protocol is provided to the DOE. **Response 3:** The June 2009 power generation is omitted from the Monitoring Report, as sufficiently accurate evidence is unavailable.	**Review 4:** Starting date of the first crediting period is given as 24/06/2009 in the registered PDD. However, the project is registered to the PMUM on July 2010 and the emission reduction calculations are based on the PMUM records according to the monitoring plan. Therefore, the June 2009 emission reductions are removed from the Monitoring Report conservatively. Gold Standard indicated that it does not need to get Gold Standards' approval before requesting issuance for minor deviations since this deviation was accepted by the validation team. **This corrective action request is closed.**
CL7 The combined margin emission factor is given as 0.635 tCO_2/MWh in the registered PDD. However, it is taken as 0.635146705739254	Table 1 – 4.c. Table 1 – 4.e.	This exact number was used for the sake of calculation accuracy. The number is revised to 0.6350, as requested.	The combined margin factor (0.635 Tco_2/MWh) that is given in the registered PDD is used for the calculation of emission reduction.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
for the calculation of emission reduction. Please use the value given in the registered PDD to be on the conservative side.			**This clarification request is closed.**
FAR1 During the site visit, project personnel were interviewed about the bird death and the personnel confirm no bird death was observed on the project site during the monitoring period. The village head was interviewed about the bird migration and local birds and he confirmed that he has not observed any bird deaths. It was verified through the records and interviews with the village head that project is not located on bird migration route. On the conservative side, the effect of the project on bird migration and local birds should continue monitoring. Please continue monitoring the effect of the project on local birds.		**Response 1:** The Turkish army has initiated a check on the impacts of wind farms on military airports in Turkey. This is a procedure that is applied to all wind farms in Turkey, it is not specific to the Project activity. The results of this check are not clear yet.	This FAR will be followed up in the next monitoring report.
FAR2 According to news published on internet on 27.07.2010, wind energy plants including Alize Enerji Camseki Wind Farm are under			This FAR will be followed up in the next monitoring report.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
consideration by the Turkish General Staff and the effects of wind turbines to the radar signal has being researched. During the first verification period, the research has not finished. Please, check the results at the second verification period.			