VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş.

AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP

IN

TURKEY

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 01/09/2013 to 31/08/2016 (both days included)

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd. Carbon Department		
Project Title:	AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current MR Version:**
455	Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş.		04
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
05/09/2017	24/01/2018	02	73
Verification Number:	**Registration Number:**	**Monitoring Period:**	
04	GS 634	From: 01/09/2013	To: 31/08/2016

Summary:

Host Country: Turkey

Project is Reviewed Against:

☒ Kyoto Protocol ☒ UNFCCC CDM rules and regulations and associated documents

☒ Gold Standard rules and regulations ☐ Other (Please Specify)

Methodology: ACM0002 **Version:** 09

Verified Emissions Reductions: 54,457 tCO_2e

Project Size: ☒ Large Scale ☐ Small Scale ☐ Micro Scale

Project Participants:	Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş.; and GTE Carbon

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings:

During the verification 19 Corrective Action Requests, 03 Clarification Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. No Forward Action Requests were issued during the verification.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 5.1 dated 31/05/2010. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version 04 dated 23/01/2018 are fairly stated.

Verification Team Leader:	Sandeep Kanda		**Indexing Terms:**
Verification Team Members:	Göknil Tüfeközdemir Anıl Söyler		☐ No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit
Approved By (Technical Reviewer):	**Name:**	**Signature:**	☐ Limited Distribution
	Sukanta Das		☐ Unrestricted Distribution

Abbreviations

CAR : Corrective Action Request
CDM : Clean Development Mechanism
CEF : Carbon Emission Factor
CER : Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL : Clarification request
CO_2 : Carbon dioxide
CO_2e : Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA : Designated National Authority
DOE : Designated Operational Entity
DR : Document Review
EF : Emission Factor
ER : Emission Reductions
ERPA : Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
FAR : Forward Action Request
GHG : Greenhouse gas(es)
GS : Gold Standard
GWP : Global Warming Potential
I : Interview
IPCC : Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
kWh : Kilo Watt Hour
MP : Monitoring Plan
MoV : Means of Verification
MW : Mega Watt
MWh : Mega Watt Hour
NGO : Non-governmental Organisation
ODA : Official Development Assistance
PDD : Project Design Document
PP : Project Participant(s)
tCO2e : Tonnes of CO2 equivalents
UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the 4th periodic verification of the “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS 634” for the period between 01/09/2013 and 31/08/2016. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report Version 4.0 dated 23/01/2018 of “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP”.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 5.1 dated 31/05/2010. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is ACM0002 Version 9.

Re Carbon Ltd. confirms the following based on the results of document review and on-site assessment:

Corresponding to the GS requirement of verification site visiting frequency, i.e. by default once every three years, it can be noticed that last onsite during the 3rd periodic verification was on 03/09/2013 and for this 4th periodic verification it was conducted on 15/08/2017. Therefore, PP has revised the MR for clarity stating that this 4th monitoring period starts from 01/09/2013 however the credits will only be claimed for latest 3 years corresponding to verification site visit, i.e., could have been from 16/08/2014 however taken conservatively from 01/09/2014.

The implementation of the project has resulted in 54,457 tCO2e during the period 01/09/2014 up to 31/08/2016.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by “Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş.” to perform the 4th periodic verification of the “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP” with the contract dated 25/07/2017. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated “23/01/2018” conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan of the registered PDD and the approved methodology
- if the project activity conforms with the monitoring report and the registered PDD, and
- if the data reported in the monitoring report are complete and transparent.

2.2. Scope

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review of the monitored GHG reductions. The verification activity is based on the validated and registered PDD version 5.1 dated 31/05/2010.

The project activity and the monitoring report are assessed against the requirements of the Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, CDM Modalities and Procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes to this decision, “ACM0002 version 9.0”, subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other related rules, according to the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities, version 1.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 1.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 1.0, Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit version 2.2 and other relevant GS requirements.

The only purpose of the verification and certification is its usage during the issuance process as part of the GS project cycle. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. can’t be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the verification and certification opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

2.3. Description of the Project Activity

Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş., has installed and commissioned a 15 MW wind power plant with 5 Vestas make V90 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 3.0 MW. Subsequently beyond the first crediting period 4 Vestas make V112 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 3.3 MW, have also been commissioned. The project is located at Ayyıldız Hill near the town of Bandırma, Balıkesir Province, in Turkey (hereafter referred as “Ayyıldız WPP”). The purpose of the project is to generate electricity and to feed it into the Turkish national grid. This has been checked during the on-site visit.

The crediting period start date of the project is 01/09/2009, corresponding to the commissioning of the first set of turbines with choice of renewable crediting period.

2.4. Parties Involved

Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş. as the project owner and GTE Carbon as the project developer and host country is Turkey.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the 4th verification period from 01/09/2013 to 31/08/2016 (both days included). However, the credits are only being claimed from 01/09/2014 to 31/08/2016 due to delay beyond 3 years in conducting the verification site visit.

3. METHODOLOGY

The verification of this GS project activity includes the following steps:

- Assessment of the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD dated 31/05/2010 version 5.1.
- A site visit was conducted on 15/08/2017 to assess that all physical features of the project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and that the project participants has operated the project activity as per the registered PDD.
- Assessment of the compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology ACM0002
- Assessment of the compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions
- Issuance of the verification report
- Independent technical review
- Approval of the verification report and request of issuance

The Verification Protocol is used for the assessment of each requirement during the execution of verification activities and is given in Annex-1 of this verification report.

The Verification Protocol consists of three tables:

- Table 1 (Monitoring Report and CDM verification requirements)
- Table 2 (Additional Gold Standard (GS) requirements) and
- Table 3 (Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests)

The usage description of Table-1 in Verification Protocol is explained in Table 3-1 below:

Table 3-1: Explanation about Table-1 in Verification Protocol

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with the monitoring report and verification	Gives reference to the legislation or documents where the relevant requirement is found	Explains how conformance with question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are Document Review (DR), Interview (I) and Not Applicable (NA)	Is used to elebarote and discuss the question and/or conformance to the question by giving related references and document sources based on which the finding is issued or evidence is checked	Either acceptable based on the evidence provided (OK), non-compliance with the requirement (CAR), further clarification (CL) due to insufficient, unclear or not transparent information, forward action request (FAR) that needs to be solved during the next periodic verification

The usage description of Table-2 in Verification Protocol is explained in Table 3-2 below:

Table 3-2: Explanation about Table-2 in Verification Protocol

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The additional requirements related with Gold Standard	Gives reference to the legislation or documents where the relevant requirement is found	Explains how conformance with question is investigated. Examples of means of verification are Document Review (DR), Interview (I) and Not Applicable (NA)	Is used to elebarote and discuss the question and/or conformance to the question by giving related references and document sources based on which the finding is issued or evidence is checked	Either acceptable based on the evidence provided (OK), non-compliance with the requirement (CAR), further clarification (CL) due to insufficient, unclear or not transparent information, forward action request (FAR) that needs to be solved during the next periodic verification

The usage description of Table-3 in Verification Protocol is explained in Table 3-3 below:

Table 3-3: Explanation about Table-3 in Verification Protocol

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Verification Team	Ref. to Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
The all CL, FAR and CARs determined during the draft verification report should be listed here	Gives reference to the checklist questions in Table-1 of Verification Protocol	Is used to summarize the responses by project participants regarding the non-conformities	Is used to summarize the responses by verification and their conclusions

The Verification Protocol is fulfilled by the verification team in line with the descriptions above and all the CARs, CLs and FARs are listed in a transparent and clear manner.

3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the verification team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience required amongst team members for the verification of the emission reductions achieved by the project activity in the relevant monitoring period for this verification. The relevant GS verification and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The verification team and ITR are assigned to this verification activity on 05/07/2017 taking all the above factors into consideration and as a result of the contract review process.

The verification team and ITR details are given in Table 3-4 below:

Table 3-4: Verification team and ITR details

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Involvement*
Sandeep Kanda	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	DR, R
Göknil Tüfeközdemir	Trainee Verifier	☒	☒	☒	SV, R
Anıl Söyler	Certification Manager	☒	☒	☒	A, DR, R
Sukanta Das	ITR	☒	☒	☒	ITR

* Explanations for the abbreviations used for involvement types are as follows:

A : Administrative

DR : Desk Review

SV : Site Visit

R : Reporting

ITR : Independent Technical Review

The first crediting period of the project ended on 31/08/2016. There has been a capacity expansion of the project thereafter, so conducting a site visit even after a year of the monitoring period end date provides further impression of the project on the local stakeholders.

3.2. Desk Review of Documents

The basis for the verification activity is the monitoring report version 01, dated 07/08/2017, which was submitted to the verification team on 13/08/2017. This monitoring report was revised due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 04 dated 23/01/2018 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 5.1 dated 31/05/2010, GS Passport dated 31/05/2010, the ACM0002, version 9.0, the relevant CDM rules and regulations, CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 1.0, Gold Standard Toolkit version 2.2 and previous verification report of Bureau Veritas Certification, version 3, dated 14/01/2014.

The following actions were involved in the desk review:

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures

- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions

A list of all the documents that were reviewed can be found in Section 6 of this verification report.

3.3. On-Site Visits

As a part of the verification activities a site visit was performed to the project activity site, details of which can be seen in the below Table 3-5:

Table 3-5: Site visit details

Date	15/08/2017	
Location	Bandirma, Balikesir	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
Cansu PERDELİ	GTE Carbon	Consultant
Osman ELÇİ	Akenerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	Operation Chief
Ünal ÜSTÜN	Akenerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	Operator
Ömür ZEHİR	Edincik District	Grocer
Hayrettin ÖZKAN	Edincik District	Neighborhood Resident
Ahmet SİVASLI	Edincik District	Neighborhood Resident
Mustafa ÖZBOSTANCI	Edincik District	Neighborhood Resident
Hüseyin ÖZBAKAN	Edincik District	Neighborhood Resident
Orhan ARABACIOĞLU	Edincik District	Neighborhood Resident
Volkan TOKAT	Meadow (Bandırma)	Meadow Owner

Points Verified	**Source of Information**
Implementation and operation of the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD	Interviews
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Interviews
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD	Interviews
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or	Interviews

similar data sources	
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Interviews
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Interviews
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Interviews

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol

During the verification period, a Verification Protocol, which is attached in Annex 1 to this verification report was used to submit the findings to the project participants.

In line with the CDM Validation and Verification Standard the team reports the non-conformities in the forms of Corrective Action Requests (CARs), Clarification Requests (CLs) and Forward Action Requests (FARs). When and for which type of non-conformities CARs, CLs and FARs are issued are explained below:

- The Verification team raises a **CAR** if one of the following occurs:
  - Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in the monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
  - Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impair the estimate of emission reductions;
  - Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.
- The Verification team raises a **CL** if information is insufficient or not transparent not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.
- The Verification team raises a **FAR** during verification for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

According to these principles total of 19 CARs and 03 CLs were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol. There hasn't been any FAR issued during the verification.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

During the verification period follow-up interviews were realized by the verification team to further analyze the correctness and accurateness of the information provided. A list of persons interviewed is given in Section 5 of this Verification Report.

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

During the verification activities CARs and CLs were issued to clarify the issues that are not transparent enough to reach a positive verification opinion and to approve the achieved GHG emission reductions.

If there are any findings issued as Forward Action Requests (FARs) indicated in previous validation and/or verification reports were discussed during this phase.

Issues issued in the FARs from previous reports, and CLs and CARs from this verification activity, were resolved, during the written and oral communications between the Project Participant and Re Carbon Ltd. Verification Team members. These communications are backed up with objective evidences that were sent to the verification team as a proof of compliance. Concerns issued in the desk review, the on-site audit assessments and the follow up interviews and the responses provided for the issued concerns are documented in Annex 1 (Verification Protocol) to guarantee the transparency of the verification process.

Table 3-6: Timeline of verification activities

Activity	Date
Desk review started	07/08/2017
On site assessment	15/08/2017
1st Protocol submission to client	05/09/2017
Various rounds of review with client	05/09/2017 - 16/11/2017
Closure of all CARs and CLs	23/11/2017
Submission for Technical Review	04/12/2017
Submission for final approval	05/12/2017
Final documents submitted to client	05/12/2017
Revision based on GS comments	24/01/2018

Information or clarifications provided as a response to a CAR, CL or FAR could also lead to a new request. This can also be seen transparently in the Verification Protocol provided in Annex 1 of this Verification Report.

3.7. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report and its annexes have to undergo an internal quality control by the Re Carbon Ltd.. This quality control is also referred to as Independent Technical Review process.

The Independent Technical Review is performed by another Team Leader who hasn't been involved in the verification activities of this project activity. When the Team Leader finalizes the Verification Report, the report is sent to Independent Technical Reviewer, at this stage not only the report but all the supporting documents like emission factor calculations, additionality justifications, relevant excel sheets etc. are reviewed.

Further, CLs and CARs can be issued by the Independent Technical Reviewer during this review, to cover all the points that may need further clarification.

After all the CLs and CARs are closed, the verification report is reviewed and approved by the Team Leader, ITR and the Certification Manager/General Manager, and the request of issuance is submitted to the EB in line with the positive verification opinion and along with the all relevant documents.

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1. Remaining Issues From Previous Validation or Verifications

The previous third periodic verification report does not present any FAR.

However, one FAR was raised by GS during the 3-week issuance review period, as follows:

FAR#1: During verification site visits, DOE shall ensure interviewing muhtar and/or people living in the vicinity of the project and not directly involved in the project management (either as employee or supplier). The PP shall ensure that at next verification, DOE will interview muhtar and provide feedback about the project with official records.

The audit team on site visited Muhtar and local people from Edincik district, nearest to the project site, including a meadow owner. No complaints were found during these discussions and the surrounding communities were found comfortable with the coming up of the project activity. Thus, this FAR is closed.

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

The project is fully implemented according to the description presented in the registered PDD. Based on the site visit it is confirmed that 5 Vestas make V90 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 3.0 MW are installed. Also, it has been observed that there has been capacity addition at the site with commissioning of 4 Vestas make V112 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 3.3 MW. However, the capacity addition has happened in 2017 and beyond the covered monitoring period and also the first crediting period.

Based on the site visit, PMUM and TIEAS records, the verifier confirms, that all physical features of the project activity including data collecting systems and storage have been implemented in accordance with the registered PDD. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed based on official records.

According to the registered PDD, the estimated emission reduction for the 3 year monitoring period is 92,991 and the period for which emission reductions is being claimed is 61,994 tCO_2e. The actual amount of emission reduction achieved during this monitoring period is 54,457 tCO_2e. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period is less than the estimated emission reduction amount. The difference is small enough to be considered as a deviation from estimated data.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, ACM0002, Version 9.0, applied by the project activity.

In line with the methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity and the diesel consumed by the generators.

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

The net electricity is measured continuously by a main meter at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There is also a cross-check control meter. The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. The serial numbers are 53064316 and 530634340 for the main meters and back-up meters respectively. These meters have been replaced in 2015 by new meters with serial numbers 51222783 and 51255642 for the main meter and back-up meter respectively. The accuracy class of the meters is 0.2s. The electricity meters have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner. The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPİAŞ (the financial settlement centre of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by TEIAS. All readings and billings are done via EPİAŞ system, which is the legal database of the ministry.

The diesel consumption corresponds to the operating hours and the maximum hourly consumption value.

There are always internal reviews of the metered data, which is checked by different parties. SCADA system is available from which daily reports are taken. The data collected daily is saved in plant manager computer and backed up. All the generation records were checked during site visit. There were no differences in data.

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring

All parameters required by the methodology and Gold Standard are monitored. In line with the methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity exported to the grid by the project activity and the diesel consumed in the generators. The sustainable development indicators indicated in the Passport are:

- Air quality
- Quality of employment
- Livelihood of the poor
- Access to affordable and clean energy services
- Quantitative employment and income generation
- Balance of payments and investment
- Technology transfer and technological self-reliance

As there are no missing parameters, monitoring is complete.

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring

Sustainability measures are in line with Section G of the GS-Passport. For verification of sustainability parameters in the current monitoring period, on site visit observations and interviews with local stakeholders were used.

Compliance check of the parameters indicated in the sustainability monitoring plan of the GS-Passport has been carried out, as follows in Table 4-1 below:

Table 4-1: Sustainability monitoring parameters

SD Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of monitoring	Assessment
Air quality	SO_2 and NO_x emissions by thermal power plants	Based on electricity generated by the project. Every monitoring period.	The monitoring data for SO_2 and NO_x emissions are in line with electricity generation during the current monitoring period. The electricity generation values were verified based on the meter readings and submitted records. During the monitoring period the project has resulted in reduction of 460 tSO_2 and 99.8 tNO_x
Water Quality and Quantity	Records for transport of wastewater	Waste water collected and disposed off as per national regulations.	The receipt of waste water transfer to the municipality is verified.
Soil condition	Accessibility to grassland around turbines for grazing activities	Accessibility of the region as grassland Restoration of top layer of soil around the project	Site visit and photographic evidences are used to assess the parameter in line with the information presented in the MR.
Biodiversity	Impact on Bird population	Impact on bird population monitored through expert reports.	Observation report of 2016 prepared by experts was verified to confirm minimum impact of project on birds.
Quality of Employment	Certificates and safety equipment distributed	Training certificates of the employees. Once for crediting period or annually.	The training certificates were submitted and assessed to confirm the information presented in the MR.
Livelihood of the poor	Numbers of locally recruited staff	Recruitment of local staff	8 out of 13 hired staff are from local region as verified during the on-site visit and the social security records. Of the 13 staff, 5 are operators, 7 are security staff and 1 cleaning staff.
Access to clean affordable energy	Amount of natural gas imported for power	Monitored based on electricity	The avoidance of import of natural gas has been calculated based on ex-ante fixed factor as in Passport and the electricity generation during the

SD Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of monitoring	Assessment
services	production	generation	monitoring period. The electricity generation values were verified based on the meter readings and submitted records.
Quantitative employment and income generation	Numbers of locally recruited staff	No. of local recruitments in the project	The project involves 2 operators, 5 security and 1 cleaning staff from the local region.
Balance of payments and investment	Decrease dependency on fossil fuel through increasing use of local resources	Monitoring the electricity generated by the project leads to saving of fuel imports. Monitored yearly.	The monitoring data presented for avoided fuel import are in line with electricity generation during the current monitoring period. The electricity generation values were verified based on the meter readings and submitted records. The project has resulted in NG saving of about 19.414 million m3 NG corresponding to 4.9 million €, during the monitoring period.
Technology transfer and Self reliance	Equipment expenditures	Regular maintenance of equipment	Maintenance of the equipment was evident during the on-site visit. Besides that, the test report of the meter (ZG405CR-1001b serial number 51222783) was provided to DOE.

Based on site visit observations and provided documents DOE confirms that sustainability parameters are monitored in line with the Gold Standard Passport and Monitoring Plan.

4.7. Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments

During validation calibrated meters were installed as per the regulations. Although, re-calibration is required after ten years, nevertheless, in case of irregular difference between main and cross-check spare meter, TEIAŞ responsible are informed for intervention. TEIAS is responsible for calibration and maintenance of the devices.

All documents regarding meter quality and approvals/acceptance have been presented for the second verification. During the monitoring period, the set of main meter and back-up meter have been replaced with new set of meters. This was also confirmed based on the meter change protocol.

All data collected as part of monitoring will be archived electronically by the project owner and be kept at least for 2 years after the end of the last crediting period.

4.8. Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions

EPİAŞ records are presented to DOE for all months of the monitoring period. All data in emission reductions table are checked with EPİAŞ records. The net electricity generated during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-2 below:

Table 4-2: Net electricity generation

Period	Amount	Compliance check
01/09/2013 – 31/08/2014	Export to Grid: - MWh Import from Grid: - MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: - MWh	Not being claimed due to delay in verification site visit beyond 3 years
01/09/2014 – 31/12/2014	Export to Grid: 13,571.48 MWh Import from Grid: 40.66 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 13,530.82 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2015 – 31/12/2015	Export to Grid: 45,031.49 MWh Import from Grid: 136.64 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 44,894.85 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2016 – 31/08/2016	Export to Grid: 31,849.38MWh Import from Grid: 99.61 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 31,749.77 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.604 tCO_2/MWh. The value is same as fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD.

DOE confirms that the methods and formulae used for calculating baseline emissions are in line with the methodology and the registered PDD. The net electricity generation is multiplied with the grid emission factor to arrive at the emission reductions.

Emission factor and data and parameters avaiable before validation are also applied in line with the PDD and baseline excel sheet for validation.

4.9. Quality of Evidence

According to the PDD the estimated emission reduction for this monitoring period would be 92,991 tCO_2e and the period for which emission reductions is being claimed is 61,994 tCO_2e. However, the project in operation reached 54,457 tCO_2e in this period. The vintage break-up of the emission reductions during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-3 below:

Table 4-3: Emission reduction

Period	Emission reductions (tCO_2e)
01/09/2013 – 31/08/2014	-
01/09/2014 – 31/12/2014	8,171
01/01/2015 – 31/12/2015	27,112

01/01/2016 – 31/08/2016	19,174

Calculations have been reproduced by DOE. Source data (EPİAŞ records) are presented by PP.

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There are two meters attached to the power plant for measurement of the generated electricity which were installed to the plant. The meters used in the power house are in line with the EMRA requirements for electricity meters. Both the meters are bi-directional (meter the energy in two directions - consumption and production). If there is a measuring difference between these two meters and one of the parties (TEIAS or the PP) requests for calibration of the meters, in this case, the meters will be calibrated without waiting for the periodical check. This calibration process is made by an accredited party under the control of TEIAS. The PP is not responsible for calibration of the meters in Turkey according to the local standards.

4.11. Materiality

Verification DOE checked all data set for which the emission reductions are being claimed (i.e., EPİAŞ records from 01/09/2014 - 31/08/2016) and each day of production is included in these readings. These readings are exact and are the basis for billing. They are recorded and saved automatically by government authority. There is no base for any option of material information.

Level of materiality is ensured by application of “Guideline on the Application of Materiality in Verifications, v1). To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

N/A.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

N/A.

4.13.4. Permanent changes

N/A.

4.13.5. Changes to the project design

N/A.

5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

The list of people who were interviewed during the verification period is given in the Table 5-1 below:

Table 5-1: List of persons interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview[1]	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Cansu PERDELİ	Consultant	GTE Carbon
I02	SV	Osman ELÇİ	Operation Chief	Akenerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.
I03	SV	Ünal ÜSTÜN	Operator	Akenerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.
I04	SV	Ömür ZEHİR	Grocer	Edincik District
I05	SV	Hayrettin ÖZKAN	Neighborhood Resident	Edincik District
I06	SV	Ahmet SİVASLI	Neighborhood Resident	Edincik District
I07	SV	Mustafa ÖZBOSTANCI	Neighborhood Resident	Edincik District
I08	SV	Hüseyin ÖZBAKAN	Neighborhood Resident	Edincik District
I09	SV	Orhan ARABACIOĞLU	Neighborhood Resident	Edincik District
I10	SV	Volkan TOKAT	Meadow Owner	Meadow (Bandırma)

[1] SV: Site visit; T: Telephone; EM: E-mail

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The list of the documents, which were reviewed during the verification period is given in the Table 6-1 below:

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	GS-VER PDD 'AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP'	5.1	31/05/2010
D02	GS Passport 'AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP'	-	31/05/2010
D03	ACM0002	09.0	
D04	Verification Service Agreement	-	25/07/2017
D05	Monitoring Report	01	07/08/2017
D06	Monitoring Report	02	16/11/2017
D07	Monitoring Report	03	27/11/2017
D08	Emission Reduction Calculation Excel Sheet	01	07/08/2017
D09	CDM Validation and Verification Standard	1.0	
D10	CDM Project Standard	1.0	
D11	CDM Project Cycle Procedure	1.0	
D12	Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit	2.2	-
D13	3rd Verification GS Issuance Review Document	-	30/01/2014
D14	Emission Reduction Calculation Excel Sheet	02	20/11/2017
D15	Monthly Reading Protocols	-	09/2014 – 08/2016
D16	EPIAS Screenshoots	-	09/2014 – 08/2016
D17	Meter Calibration Test Report	-	27/10/2014
D18	Verification report of 3rd monitoring period by Bureau Veritas Certification	03	10/08/2015
D19	Ornithology report	-	2016
D20	Training records	-	15/09/2014 05/11/2014 06/11/2014 20/05/2015 27/07/2015 25-26/01/2016 01/02/2016 30/03/2016
D21	Hazardous waste declaration forms	-	2014-2015-2016
D22	Waste oil declaration forms	-	2014-2015-2016

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D23	Electricity Generation Licence		09/11/2006
D24	Waste water transfer records (to municipality)	-	02/01/2014 03/09/2014 04/05/2015 14/07/2016
D25	Social security records	-	-
D26	Site visit photos	-	15/08/2017
D27	Monitoring Report (final)	04	23/01/2018
D28	Emission Reduction Calculation Excel Sheet	04	23/01/2018

7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Sandeep KANDA holds a degree in Mechanical Engineering, Masters in Energy systems engineering from Indian Institute of Technology – Bombay and Post Graduate Diploma in Industrial Safety & Environmental Management from National Institute of Industrial Engineering in India. He has more than ten years of work experience with auditing and consultancy firms, seven years thereof with Designated Operational Entities under the CDM. He is experienced working on diversified areas of energy and environmental management, including policies, Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Corporate Sustainability Reporting (CSR) Audits, energy audits, utility audits and product development. As CDM auditor and technical reviewer for TÜV Süd, he has audited more than 30 CDM projects as technical reviewer; 40 projects as lead auditor and 7 PoAs in various capacities; covering a broad range of sectoral scopes, such as Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources), Energy distribution, Energy demand, Manufacturing industries, Chemical industries, Transport, Metal production, Waste handling & disposal and Agriculture. He has been working as a contracted team leader, technical reviewer, TA 1.1 and renewable energy expert in the context of Re Carbon.

Anıl SÖYLER, Bsc. in Environmental Engineering, has completed his Bachelor degree in Middle East Technical University, Turkey. His Master study in the same field is at thesis stage and has 9 years of professional experience in environmental management, monitoring and auditing, waste and waste water management, environmental and social impact assessment, control of greenhouse gas emissions, environmental reports, and quality management systems. He has been involved in both national and international projects supported by IFC and World Bank. He has been working as Certification Manager in the context of Re Carbon.

Göknil TÜFEKÖZDEMİR, B.Sc. in Environmental Engineering has completed her Bachelor degree in Uludağ University, Turkey. She has about 10 years of professional working experience in automotive and packaging sectors in the areas of environmental management, waste management, environmental impact assessment, environmental reports, monitoring of legal comformity, quality management systems, occupational health and safety and food safety management systems, auditing and training. She has been working as a validator/verifier in the context of Re Carbon.

Sukanta DAS, has done M. SC in Physics and M. Tech in Energy technology from Tezpur Central University in India. He is a certified lead auditor for ISO 14001 EMS LA. He has more than five years of work experience at TUV NoRD under various categories of projects stating from Renewable to waste to supercritical projects. He was JI/CDM Lead Assessor in TUV NoRD and was involved in more than 80 CDM validation and verifications activities and Gold Standard, VER projects as a team leader/technical reviewer / validator / verifier covering the sectoral scope 1 technical area 1.2. He has been working as a contracted team leader, technical reviewer and renewable energy expert in the context of Re Carbon.

7.1. Appointment Certificates

Re Carbon Gozetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.

Bugi's Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/11
TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara

Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122
Fax: 0090 312 287 3373

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mr. Sandeep KANDA** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	**Verifier**	**Team leader**	**Technical reviewer**	**Technical Expert**
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	**Verifier**	**Team leader**	**Technical reviewer**	**Technical Expert**
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area
N/A	Mexico, China, Indonesia, Thailand, Philippines, Vietnam, Tanzania	05-05-2017	1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 9.1, 9.2, 13.1, 13.2 & 15.1

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointment indicated above, the bearer can:

1. Participate in the assessments conducted by Re Carbon Ltd.
2. Take the roles within and outside of the assessment team
3. Bring specific expertise to the assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated and there is no defined validity period for this Certificate.

However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Anil SÖYLER	Certification Manager	05-05-2017	
Name	**Position**	**Date**	**Signature**

F-C-053 / 05.05.2017 - 00

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.
Bagi's Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/11
TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara
Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122
Fax: 0090-312-287 3373

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mr. Anıl SÖYLER** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	N/A	N/A	05-05-2017

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	N/A	05-05-2017

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area
N/A	Turkey, China and Saudi Arabia	N/A	1.2 and 13.1

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointment indicated above, the bearer can:

1. Participate in the assessments conducted by Re Carbon Ltd.
2. Take the roles within and outside of the assessment team
3. Bring specific expertise to the assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated and there is no defined validity period for this Certificate.

However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Christian JOHANNES	General Manager	05-05-2017	
Name	Position	Date	Signature

F.C.053/03/05.2017_00

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.
Bagi's Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/11
TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara
Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122
Fax: 0090-312-287 3373

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Ms. Göknil TÜFEKÖZDEMİR** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	N/A	N/A	05-05-2017

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	N/A	N/A	05-05-2017

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area
N/A	Turkey	N/A	1.2

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointment indicated above, the bearer can:

1. Participate in the assessments conducted by Re Carbon Ltd.
2. Take the roles within and outside of the assessment team
3. Bring specific expertise to the assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated and there is no defined validity period for this Certificate.

However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Anıl SÖYLER	Certification Manager	05-05-2017	
Name	Position	Date	Signature

F-C.398 / 25.05.2017 - 00

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.

Bagi's Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/11
TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara

Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122
Fax: 0090-312-287 3373

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mr. Sukanta DAS** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017	05-05-2017

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area
N/A	Saudi Arabia, Morocco and India	N/A	1.1, 1.2 & 13.1

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointment indicated above, the bearer can:

1. Participate in the assessments conducted by Re Carbon Ltd.
2. Take the roles within and outside of the assessment team
3. Bring specific expertise to the assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated and there is no defined validity period for this Certificate.

However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Anıl SÖYLER	Certification Manager	05-05-2017	
Name	Position	Date	Signature

F-C-033 / 03.05.2017 - 00

8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the fourth periodic verification of Gold Standard “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP” which is a project with the registry reference number “GS 634” for the period between 01/09/2013 and 31/08/2016. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report Version 04 dated 23/01/2018 of “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP”.

Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş. 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 Plan indicated in the final PDD. 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. The development and maintenance of the records and the related monitoring procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report Version 04.

The verification has been performed by a verification team consisting of “Sandeep Kanda as team leader, Göknil Tüfeközdemir as trainee verifier and Sukanta Das as ITR”, and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including Section I of CDM Modalities and Procedures, the relevant guidance and decisions of the COP/MOP, CDM EB and CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities, version 1.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 1.0, and CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 1.0 and GS version 2.2.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP” in Turkey is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 5.1 dated 31/05/2010. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is ACM0002 Version 9.

Re Carbon Ltd. confirms the following based on the results of document review and on-site assessment:

Project Title	AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP
Applicable Period	4th Monitoring Period (01/09/2013 to 31/08/2016 both days included)
Baseline Emissions	01/09/2013 to 31/08/2014: 0 tCO_2e; 01/09/2014-31/12/2014: 8,172.6 tCO_2e; 2015: 27,116.5 tCO_2e; 01/01/2016-31/08/2016: 19,176.9 tCO_2e; Total: 54,466 tCO_2e
Project Emissions	01/09/2013 to 31/08/2014: 0 tCO_2e; 01/09/2014-31/12/2014: 1.4 tCO_2e; 2015: 4.1 tCO_2e; 01/01/2016-31/08/2016: 2.7 tCO_2e; Total: 8.2 tCO_2e
Leakage Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Emission Reductions	01/09/2013 to 31/08/2014: 0 tCO_2e; 01/09/2014-31/12/2014: 8,171 tCO_2e; 2015: 27,112 tCO_2e; 01/01/2016-31/08/2016: 19,174 tCO_2e; Total: 54,457 tCO_2e

Sandeep KANDA
Team Leader
24/01/2018

Sukanta DAS
ITR
24/01/2018

Anıl SÖYLER
Certification Manager
24/01/2018

ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – CDM Monitoring Report (MR) Form Requirements

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Cover Page					
1. Has the following information been provided on the cover page of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR			
1.1. Title of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The title of the project as per the registered PDD is 'AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP'. The title of the project activity is to be corrected.	CAR-1	OK
1.2. Reference number of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	GS 634	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of the monitoring report;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The first submitted MR is version 01	OK	OK
1.4. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Completion date of first submitted MR is 07/08/2017	OK	OK
1.5. Registration date of the project activity (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Registration date of the project activity is 05/07/2010	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.6. Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period (first and last days included (DD/MM/YYYY– DD/MM/YYYY));	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The monitoring period stated in the first submitted MR of this fourth periodic verification is 01/09/2014 to 31/06/2017. The previous (third) periodic verification was from 01/03/2012 to 31/08/2013. Also, the crediting period of the project is ending on 30/08/2016. a) Please clarify and correct the monitoring period stated. b) Since there are some months falling into the second crediting period, there needs to be two different monitoring reports for the months falling into the first and second crediting period respectively. Please provide the mentioned monitoring reports separately. c) Please provide the relevant evidence about the notification to Gold Standard regarding the capacity increase of the project.	CAR-2	OK
1.7. Project participant(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The registered PDD indicates Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş. and Global Tan Energy Ltd. as the project participants. The MR indicates Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş. as the project owner and GTE Carbon as the project developer. Please clarify the change in project participant from Global Tan Energy Ltd. to GTE Carbon.	CAR-3	OK
1.8. Host Party(ies);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Turkey	OK	OK
1.9. Sectoral scope and selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, applied standardized baseline(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Energy industries, ACM0002, version 9.0 is referred	OK	OK
1.10. Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period as per the registered PDD is not presented correctly.	CAR-4	OK
1.11. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The actual GHG emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period are to be corrected, taking into account the end date of the previous monitoring period and the end of the first crediting period.	CAR-5	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.12. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period up to 31 December 2012;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N.A.	OK	OK
1.13. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period from 1 January 2013 onwards.	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N.A.	OK	OK
General Requirements					
1. Has the following requirements been followed for the completion of MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR			
1.1. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM and all attached documents in English or containing a full translation of relevant sections in English	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
1.2. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM using the same format without modifying its font, headings or logo	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
1.3. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM without any other alteration	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
1.4. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM by deleting the Attachment of “Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form”	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.5. Not modifying or deleting tables and their columns in the CDM-MR-FORM	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A. Description of the Project Activity					
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity					
A.1.1. Has a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 provided under section A.1of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.2. Has the purpose of the project activity and the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.3. Has a brief description of the installed technology and equipments been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.4. Has the relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.5. Has the total emissions reductions achieved in this monitoring period been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The total emission reduction achieved are to be corrected taking into account the previous CAR regarding the start and end date of the monitoring period.	CAR-6	OK
A.2. Location of the project activity					
A.2.1. Has complete information on the location of the project activity, including town, city, country and GPS coordinates	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The location of the four new turbines added in 2017 has also been indicated. However, it should be clarified that these have been commissioned beyond the first crediting period end date.	CAR-7	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
been provided under section A.2 of the MR?					
A.3. Parties and project participant(s)					
A.3.1. Has the list of the Parties and PPs been provided under section A.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR-3	CAR-3	OK
A.4. Reference of applied methodology and standardized baseline					
A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology or standardized baseline(s), tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied been provided under section A.4 including the version numbers and titles?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.5. Crediting period of project activity					
A.5.1. Has the crediting period including the crediting period start date, choice and length of the crediting period been provided under section A.5 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The MR states in section A.5 that the "This monitoring period also covers a duration beyond first crediting period, which is included in second crediting period". The monitoring period cannot extend beyond the first crediting period without the renewal of the project activity.	CAR-8	OK
A.6. Contact information of responsible persons/ entities					
A.6.1. Is the contact information of the person(s)/ entity(ies) responsible for	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
completing the CDM-MR-FORM been provided under section A.6 of the MR?					
B. Implementation of the Project Activity					
B.1. Description of implemented registered project activity					
B.1.1. Has the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment, including the diagrams, where appropriate, been included in section B.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §257a	DR	The technical details of the four new turbines added in 2017 has also been indicated. However, it should be clarified that these have been commissioned beyond the first crediting period end date.	CAR-9	OK
B.1.2. Has the information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	Please include details of any break-downs/stoppages apart from scheduled maintenance that have happened during the monitoring period.	CAR-10	OK
B.1.3. If the project activity consists of more than one site, has the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site been clearly described under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	The project consists of only one site.	OK	OK
B.1.4. If the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase been indicated under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.1.5. Do the actual project activity and its operation comply with the registered PDD?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.1.6. Have the PPs implemented and operated the CDM project activity as per the descriptions contained in the registered PDD?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.2. Post registration changes					
B.2.1. **Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**					
B.2.1.1. Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 EB93 Report Annex 5 §282 CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.2. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs described the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity in the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, do the description of deviations include	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the following?					
B.2.1.3.1. How it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies),	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.2. The duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.3. Justification on the conservativeness of the approach.	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.4. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232a EB93 Report Annex 5 §284	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.5. If there are temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology or standardized baseline, is the deviation likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §284	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.6. If the deviation(s) require prior approval by the Board, do they include the date of approval and	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
reference number?					
B.2.2. **Corrections**					
B.2.2.1. Is it indicated whether any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §233	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.2. If the correction(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.3. If the correction(s) and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.4. Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual project information?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §288a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.5. Are the corrected parameters in accordance with the applied methodology, selected monitoring	EB93 Report Annex 5 §288b	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
plan and/or the applied standardized baseline?					
B.2.3. **Changes to start date of crediting period**					
B.2.3.1. Is it indicated whether any changes to the start date of the crediting period had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §236 §237 EB93 Report Annex 5 §290	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.2. Have the changes been notified to the Secretariat by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §235	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.3. If where the changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4. **Inclusion of a monitoring plan to the registered PDD that was not included at registration**					
B.2.4.1. Is it indicated whether the inclusion of a monitoring plan into the PDD for which the delayed submission of the monitoring plan was chosen by the PPs at the time of the registration of the project activity, has been approved by the	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §238 EB93 Report	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Board prior to the submission of this monitoring report or is being submitted together with this monitoring report?	Annex 5 §292 §293				
B.2.4.2. If the inclusion of a monitoring plan into the registered PDD has been approved by the Board prior to the submission of this monitoring report, are the date of approval and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5. **Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**					
B.2.5.1 Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies or standardized baseline had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §239	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.2 Are the changes to the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD in compliance with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §296	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.3 Do the changes reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §297	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4 If the permanent changes are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, do the PPs apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §298	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5 If the permanent changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.6 If permanent changes and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6. **Changes to project design of registered project activity**					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.5.1. Are there proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §300	DR	As the changes to the project design – capacity addition has not happened during the forst crediting period and the associated monitoring period, therefore the sentence should be corrected in section B.2.6 of the MR.	CAR-11	OK
B.2.5.2. In case of actual changes, does the description of actual changes accurately reflect the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §301	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.3. Do the actual changes comply with the monitoring plan, the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, and/or the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §302	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.4. Does the revised PDD comply with the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or standardized baseline or any later version of the methodology and/or standardized baseline or the requirements of another methodology and/or the standardized baseline that is applicable to the project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §303	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5. Does the changes to project activity include the following?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.1. Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240a	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD?					
B.2.1.3.2. Addition of component or extension of technology has been occurred?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.3. Removal or addition of one (or more) site of a project activity registered with multiple-sites?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.4. Removal of a project activity from a bundle of small-scale CDM project activities?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.5. Actual operational parameters which are within the control of project participants differing from the expected parameters?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.6. Any consequential changes to the baseline methodology, including changing or adding another baseline methodology or applying a baseline scenario that is more appropriate as a result of the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240f	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.1.3.7. Voluntary update of the applied methodologies to a later valid version of the same methodologies, or voluntary change to other methodologies, provided all requirements in the updated/changed methodologies are met.	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240g	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.6. Do the PPs report in the revised PDD the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered project activity on the following:	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.1 The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243a EB93 Report Annex 5 §303c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243b EB93 Report Annex 5 §303d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.3 The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.4 The additionality of the project activity;	EB93 Report Annex 4	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	§243d EB93 Report Annex 5 §303a				

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.6.6.5 The scale of the project activity.	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243e EB93 Report Annex 5 §303b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.7. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered project activity,	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.1 In the case of investment analysis, have PPs modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244a EB93 Report Annex 5 §304a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.2 In cases where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, have PPs demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244b EB93 Report Annex 5 §304b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.8. If the PPs can't demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered,	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.6.8.1 Has PPs revised the PDD applying the latest version of the methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246a(i)	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.8.2 If another methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline is applied to the project activity, has PPs demonstrated compliance with the requirements of the selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246a(ii)	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.9. Is it indicated whether any changes to the project design of the project activity from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.10. If the changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.11. If the changes and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?					
C. Description of the Monitoring System					
C.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.1. Information flow including data generation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.3. Data recording	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	§259				

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.5. Data reporting	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.3. Has organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.4. Regarding to the management and operational system, are the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(iv)	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364e	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.7. Have the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.8. Has the monitoring of parameters (baseline / project / leakage / emission reduction) in the project activity been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(i)-(ii)-(iii)	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.9. Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM EB decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.10. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364d	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D. Data and Parameters					
D.1. **Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period**					
D.1.1. Has all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, been listed under section D.1 using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The parameter EGy, 'Net Electricity delivered to the grid by the Ayyildiz WPP in year y', is to be removed from section D.1 of the MR.	CAR-12	OK
D.1.2. If all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the monitoring plan?					
D.1.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the description of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the values applied of the	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?					
D.1.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what the data/parameters are used for (baseline/project/leakage emission calculations)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2. **Data and parameters monitored**					
D.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.2. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been described how the data is monitored?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the source of data been indicated (like logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the values of the monitoring parameter been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The value of the net electricity generated and delivered to the grid is to be corrected, taking into account the end date of the previous monitoring period and the end of first crediting period. Also please clarify how the data has been arrived at for the part month of August 2016.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the QA/QC procedures being applied been given?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what types of equipment are used to monitor each parameter, including following, if applicable as per the monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Please clarify the change of the meters during the monitoring period.	CAR-14	OK
D.2.8.1. Details on accuracy class	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	0.2S	OK	OK
D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	10 years	OK	OK
D.2.8.3. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-14	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.8.4. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-14	OK
D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-14	OK
D.2.9. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the measurement and recording frequency been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.10. Is the calibration frequency for measuring equipments specified in the monitoring methodology, in the applied standardized baselines or in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §368	DR	No	OK	OK
D.2.11. If the calibration frequency for measuring equipments isn't specified in the monitoring methodology, in the applied standardized baselines or the monitoring plan, are the equipments calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.12. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, have the international standards been used?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.13. Is the calibration of the measuring equipments that have an impact on the	EB93 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
claimed emission reductions conducted by the PPs at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan?	§374				
D.2.14. Has the calibration been delayed and has the calibration been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.15. If the calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, are one of the following approaches adopted by the PPs for the calculation of emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.8.1. Applying the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error; or	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.8.2. Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369b	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
permissible error of the measuring equipment.					
D.2.16. If calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, has the error been applied in following ways?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16.1. The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.17. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §371	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.18. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §372	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.19. Have any information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of emission reductions been given in detail in the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.20. If the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 using the tabular format, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and the monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §260	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.21. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376	DR	The vintage break-up of the diesel fuel consumption is to be provided.	CAR-15	OK
D.3. **Implementation of sampling plan**			N/A	OK	OK
E. Calculation of Emission Reductions or GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.1. **Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks**					
E.1.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the baseline emissions been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.1.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.1.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The spreadsheet for the corrected monitoring period is to be submitted.	CAR-16	OK
E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-16	OK
E.1.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the baseline emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2. **Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks**					
E.2.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the project emissions been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.2.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of project emissions or or actual net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.2.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-16	OK
E.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.2.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the project emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.3. **Calculation of leakage**			N/A	OK	OK
E.4. **Summary of calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks**					
E.4.1. Have the total baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The summary of calculation of emission reduction are to be corrected corresponding to the applicable monitoring period.	CAR-17	OK
E.4.2. Has the total project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-17	OK
E.4.3. Has the total leakage emissions during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.4. Have the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-17	OK
E.4.5. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, has actual GHG emission	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved for the following two periods been provided under section E.7 of MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §266				
E.4.5.1. Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); and	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.2. From 1 January 2013 onwards	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.4.6. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter and the annual caps are applied in the GHG emission reduction or net anthropogenic GHG removal' calculations, has the annual caps been pro-rated to each period?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.7. If there is material information that can cause overestimation of emission reductions or removals of the project activity, is this equal to higher than one of the following?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.8. 0.5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of equal to or more than 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329a	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
year?					
E.4.8.1 1 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal between 300,000 and 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.8.2 2 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for large-scale project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of 300,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year or less?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.8.3 5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for small-scale project activities other than project activities covered under E.4.5.5 below?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.8.4 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the microscale project activities?		DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.5. **Comparison of actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD**					
E.5.1. Has a comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removal of the project activity achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered CDM-PDD been given under section E.5 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §268	DR	The comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions are to be compared with the estimations in the registered PDD for the corrected monitoring period.	CAR-18	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.5.2. If the comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removal of the project activity achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered CDM-PDD is given under section E.5 of the MR, has this comparison been given using the tabular format provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-18	OK
E.6. **Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD**					
E.6.1. Has an explanation of the cause of any increase in the actual emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water availability, higher load plant factor, etc.), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in the registered CDM-PDD, been provided under section E.6 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-16	OK
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. **Forward action requests (FARs) identified during validation and/or previous verification**					
F.1.1. Is there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	The previous third periodic verification report does not present any FAR. However, one FAR was raised by GS during the 3-week issuance review period, as follows: FAR#1: During verification site visits, DOE shall ensure interviewing muhtar and/or people living in the vicinity of the project and not directly involved in the project management (either as employee or supplier). The PP shall ensure that at next verification, DOE will interview muhtar and provide feedback about the project with official records.	CL-1	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			The PP shall clarify on the same.		
F.1.2. If there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PPs addressed these FARs in the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	Please refer to CL above	CL-1	OK
F.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349 §347d	DR	Please refer to CL above	CL-1	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV=Site Visit

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Appendix-1 Contact information of project participants and responsible persons/ entities					
1. Is the contact information of PPs listed in Section A.3 of monitoring report provided in Appendix 1?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2. Is the contact information of responsible person/entity for application of the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baselines to the project activity provided in Appendix 1?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3. Is it indicated whether the person(s)/ entity(ies) responsible for the application of the selected methodology(ies) and, where applicable, the selected standardized baseline(s) to the project activity is a PP?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV= Site Visit

Table 2 – Additional Gold Standard Requirements (In the Reference section, Gold Standard references are given by stating T for the Toolkit and R for the Requirements and the section number. All references given are from Gold Standard Toolkit Version 2.2 unless otherwise stated)

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Has the host country implemented a cap on its GHG emissions, after the registration of the project activity?	T 1.2.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
2. If the host country implemented a cap on its GHG emissions after the registration of the project activity, has a proof of retirement of an equal amount of allowances been submitted by the project owners?	T 1.2.7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3. Has there been any grievances raised by the local stakeholders?	T 4.5	DR, SV	The site visit to the project was conducted on 15/08/2017. During the site visit the DOE interacted with the local people. The local villager have no complaints in general. Although no official complaint has been raised, however, during the site visit it was found that the comment book for the feedback is not available at the site. What actions are being taken by the PP to address this concern?	CL-2	OK
4. If there are any grievances raised by the local stakeholders, has the PPs responded clearly to these comments?	T 4.5	DR	Refer to CL above	CL-2	OK
5. Are all the parameters as listed in the registered documents monitored?			The PP needs to submit the following records/documents as an evidence to the implementation of monitoring parameters: - Wastewater disposal records; - Bird monitoring report; - Social security records of the employees; and - Hazardous and domestic waste disposal records. The SD monitoring parameters are to be presented corresponding to the corrected monitoring period.	CL-3, CAR-19	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview, SV= Site Visit

Table 3 – Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-1 The title of the project as per the registered PDD is 'AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP'. The title of the project activity is to be corrected.	1.1	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-2 The monitoring period stated in the first submitted MR of this fourth periodic verification is 01/09/2014 to 31/06/2017. The previous (third) periodic verification was from 01/03/2012 to 31/08/2013. Also, the crediting period of the project is ending on 30/08/2016. a) Please clarify and correct the monitoring period stated. b) Since there are some months falling into the second crediting period, there needs to be two different monitoring reports for the months falling into the first and second crediting period respectively. Please provide the mentioned monitoring reports separately. c) Please provide the relevant evidence about the notification to Gold Standard regarding the capacity increase of the project.	1.6	- Monitoring period has been revised as 01/09/2014 to 31/08/2016 -Months falling into second crediting period have been removed. -Notification email has been shared with DOE on 20/09/2017 --Review-1 1. First statement was for estimated generation, second statement was for actual generation. Paragraph has been simplified to prevent confusion. 2. Round down function has been applied and documents updated accordingly 3. Referred column is removed to prevent double counting 4. Columns were for internal comparison and removed to prevent confusion	Review-1 PP chose the monitoring period in continuation with last monitoring period, and is revised from 01/09/2014 to 31/06/2016. 1. Section A.1 does not provide consistent value of ERs. Please correct. 2. Revised calculation sheet is submitted with ERs calculated for the days included in the current monitoring period. Vintage-wise details are also added. However, rounddown function should be applied to the values. 3. 'Lossy delivery' column is unclear. 4. Please clarify the data for column L and column M of the worksheet, which are currently left blank. Review-2 Corresponding to the GS requirement of verification site visiting frequency, i.e. by default once every three years, it can be noticed that last onsite during the 3rd periodic verification was on 03/09/2013

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			and for this 4th periodic verification it was conducted on 15/08/2017. Therefore, PP has revised the MR for clarity stating that this 4th monitoring period starts from 01/09/2013 however the credits will only be claimed for latest 3 years corresponding to verification site visit, i.e., could have been from 16/08/2014 however taken conservatively from 01/09/2014. Ok Closed
CAR-3 The registered PDD indicates Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş. and Global Tan Energy Ltd. as the project participants. The MR indicates Akenerji Elektrik Uretimi A.Ş. as the project owner and GTE Carbon as the project developer. Please clarify the change in project participant from Global Tan Energy Ltd. to GTE Carbon.	1.7	GTE Carbon is trade name of **G**lobal **T**an **E**nergy. Section has been updated.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-4 The estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period as per the registered PDD is not presented correctly.	1.10	In this monitoring period, estimated generation is 52.32*2= 102.64 GWh, and emission reduction is 30,997*2=61,994 tCO2.	Review-1 The estimated amount of ERs is correctly presented in the MR (cover page as well as section E.5), though not in the response. Ok Closed
CAR-5 The actual GHG emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period are to be corrected, taking into account the end date of the previous monitoring period	1.11	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
and the end of the first crediting period.			
CAR-6 The total emission reduction achieved are to be corrected taking into account the previous CAR regarding the start and end date of the monitoring period.	A.1.5	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-7 The location of the four new turbines added in 2017 has also been indicated. However, it should be clarified that these have been commissioned beyond the first crediting period end date.	A.2.1	New turbine additions have been commissioned beyond the first crediting period end date. So, it has been removed from this report.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-8 The MR states in section A.5 that the "This monitoring period also covers a duration beyond first crediting period, which is included in second crediting period". The monitoring period cannot extend beyond the first crediting period without the renewal of the project activity.	A.5.1	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-9 The technical details of the four new turbines added in 2017 has also been indicated. However, it should be clarified that these have been commissioned beyond the first crediting period end date.	B.1.1	New turbine specifications have been removed. Clarification added.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-10 Please include details of any break-downs/stoppages apart from scheduled maintenance that have happened during the monitoring period.	B.1.2	Statement added. Review-1 Statement added to end of section B.1	Review-1 The statement could not be found. The same should be included in the sec. B.1 Review-2

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			Ok. Closed
CAR-11 As the changes to the project design – capacity addition has not happened during the first crediting period and the associated monitoring period, therefore the sentence should be corrected in section B.2.6 of the MR.	B.2.5.1	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-12 The parameter EGy, 'Net Electricity delivered to the grid by the Ayyildiz WPP in year y', is to be removed from section D.1 of the MR.	D.1.1	Revised as estimated amount.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-13 The value of the net electricity generated and delivered to the grid is to be corrected, taking into account the end date of the previous monitoring period and the end of first crediting period. Also, please clarify how the data has been arrived at for the part month of August 2016.	D.2.6	Second crediting period generation is removed.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-14 Please clarify the change of the meters during the monitoring period.	D.2.8	Meter change request is coming from grid operator usually for Renovation or remote reading.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-15 The vintage break-up of the diesel fuel consumption is to be provided.	D.2.21	It has been uploaded.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-16 The spreadsheet for the corrected monitoring period is to be submitted.	E.1.3	Spreadsheet has been uploaded.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-17	E.4.1	Revised.	Review-1

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
The summary of calculation of emission reduction are to be corrected corresponding to the applicable monitoring period			Ok Closed
CAR-18 The comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions are to be compared with the estimations in the registered PDD for the corrected monitoring period.	E.5.1	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-19 The SD monitoring parameters are to be presented corresponding to the corrected monitoring period.	5	Revised.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CL-1 The previous third periodic verification report does not present any FAR. However, one FAR was raised by GS during the 3-week issuance review period, as follows: FAR#1: During verification site visits, DOE shall ensure interviewing muhtar and/or people living in the vicinity of the project and not directly involved in the project management (either as employee or supplier). The PP shall ensure that at next verification, DOE will interview muhtar and provide feedback about the project with official records. The PP shall clarify on the same.	F.1.1	This is DOE's responsibility and already performed as stated in CL2. So this comment seems redundant.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CL-2 The site visit to the project was conducted on 15/08/2017. During the site visit the DOE interacted with the local people. The local villager have no complaints in general. Although no official complaint has been raised,	3	There is no requirement for book as per the version of the project. Project is far from settlement and has no impact in general but project managers have communication and contact info of muhtar/ mayor etc. in case there is any need or concern.	Review-1 Ok Closed

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
however, during the site visit it was found that the comment book for the feedback is not available at the site. What actions are being taken by the PP to address this concern?			
CL-3 The PP needs to submit the following records/documents as an evidence to the implementation of monitoring parameters: - Wastewater disposal records; - Bird monitoring report; - Social security records of the employees; and - Hazardous and domestic waste disposal records.	5	Those had been shared already. Those documents will be shared again with revised MR and protocol. Statements about bird monitoring report are available in previous monitoring &verification reports.	Review-1 Ok Closed

* CAR= Corrective Action Request, FAR= Forward Action Request, CL= Clarification Request