



VERIFICATION REPORT AKENERJI ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.

VERIFICATION OF THE AY-YILDIZ 15 MW WPP

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

62/71 Boulevard du Château

REPORT No.BVC/TURKEY-
VR/CER.TR1542923.13.C45

REVISION No. 02
92571 Neuilly Sur Seine Cdx - France



VERIFICATION REPORT



Date of first issue: 14/11/2013	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS.	Client ref.: Onur Altindere

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has conducted the 3rd verification of Ay-Yıldız 15 MW WPP, GS Registration Reference Number GS634 - Markit ID:103000000002293 owned by Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS., located in Edincik Town in the Balıkesir Province of Republic of Turkey, and applying the methodology ACM0002 Version 09, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM methodology, Gold Standard v.2.1, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria.

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction run reliably and are calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements, and the emission reductions verified totalize 43,644 tons of CO₂e for the monitoring period.

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

Reporting period:	01/03/2012 - 31/08/2013	
Baseline emissions:	43,649	t CO ₂ equivalents.
Project emissions:	5	t CO ₂ equivalents.
Leakage emissions:	0	t CO ₂ equivalents.
Emission Reductions:	43,644	t CO ₂ equivalents.

Report No.: BVC-Turkey/VR/CER.TR1542923.13.C45	Subject Group: GS-VER
Project title: Ay-Yıldız 15 MW Wind Power Plant	
Work carried out by: Mr. Mustafa UNAL - Team Leader	
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Mrs. Burcu MUTMAN BORAN	
Date of this revision: 29/11/2013	Rev. No.: 02
Number of pages: 62	

Indexing terms

Work approved by:

Matthieu Martini

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
DRR	Daily Reading Record
ETN	Electricity Transaction Note
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
MRR	Monthly Reading Record
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard
TEIAS	Turkish Electricity Transmission Corporation (Türkiye Elektrik İletim A.Ş.)
PMUM	Market Financial Settlement Center (Piyasa Mali Uzlastirma Merkezi)
WTG	Wind turbine generator
SGK	Social Security Agency (Sosyal Güvenlik Kurumu)



Table of Contents	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Objective	5
1.2. Scope	5
1.3. GHG Project Description	6
1.4. Verification Team	6
2. METHODOLOGY	7
2.1. Review of Documents	7
2.2. Follow-up Interviews	7
2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	8
2.4. Internal Technical Review	9
3. VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS.....	9
3.1. Remaining issues from validation or previous verification (213)	10
3.2. Compliance of the project implementation with the registered project design document (228)	10
3.3. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) (232)	11
3.4. Compliance of monitoring activities with the monitoring plan (235-236)	11
3.5. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments (243)	14
3.6. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions (246)	15
4. VERIFICATION OPINION.....	19
5. REFERENCES	20
6. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VERIFICATION TEAM MEMBERS	22

APPENDIX A: CDM PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL (REV 08)**ERREUR ! SIGNET NON DEFINI.**



1. INTRODUCTION

Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its GS-VER project Ay-Yıldız 15 MW WPP (hereafter called “**the Project**”) at Bezirci Village of in Edincik Town at the Balıkesir Province of Republic of Turkey.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the Project, performed on the basis of applicable UNFCCC criteria, Gold Standard (GS) v.2.1 as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1. Objective

The objective of GS-VER verification is to conduct a thorough, independent assessment of the registered project activities.

In carrying out its verification work, the DOE shall ensure that the project activity complies with the requirements of paragraph 62 of the CDM modalities and procedures. In particular, this assessment shall:

- (a) Ensure that the project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered GS-VER-PDD or any approved revised GS-VER-PDD, and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;
- (b) Ensure that the monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with latest applicable version of the completeness checklist for requests for issuance of VERs, verifiable, and in accordance with applicable CDM and GS requirements;
- (c) Ensure that actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan or any revised approved monitoring plan, and the approved methodology including applicable tool(s);
- (d) Evaluate the data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s).

1.2. Scope

The verification scope is defined as an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored GHG emission reductions. The verification is based on the validated and registered project design document, the monitoring report, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet, and supporting documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC and GS v.2.1 rules and associated interpretations.

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

1.3. GHG Project Description

The Project consists of 5 sets of Vestas V90/3000 kW wind turbine generators (WTG) with a unit installed capacity of 3000 kW, providing a total installed capacity of 15 MWe. The annual expected electricity supplied to Turkish National Grid is 51,320 MWh and the annual estimated emission reductions are 30,997 tCO₂e, according to validated GS-VER-PD. Realized figures for the monitoring period of 18 months, concerning this verification report are 72,268 MWh of electricity supplied and 43,644 tCO₂ of reductions. No post registration changes have been requested.

Project title:	Ay-Yıldız 15 MW Wind Power Plant		
GS ref number:	GS634 - Markit ID:103000000002293		
Registration Date:	05/07/2010		
Crediting Period:	05/09/2009 - 05/09/2016 (renewable)		
Monitoring Period:	01/03/2012 - 31/08/2013		
Project Participants:	Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS.		
Methodologies used	ACM0002 Version 09		
Location of the Project:	Bezirci Villages of Edincik Town in the Balıkesir		
Geo coordinates:	Turbine No.	Turbine coordinates	
	T1	E 574.923"	N 4.467.686
	T2	E 575.171	N 4.467.514
	T3	E 575.482	N 4.468.079
	T4	E 575.774	N 4.467.996
	T5	E 576.023	N 4.467.825

1.4. Verification Team

The assessment team and internal technical reviewer team consist of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	TA 1.2	TASK PERFORMED*
Team Leader	Mr. Mustafa UNAL	☒	☒ DR ☒ SV ☒ RI ☐ TR
Team Member (Trainee)	N/A	☐	☒ DR ☒ SV ☐ RI ☐ TR
Technical Specialist	N.A.	☐	☒ DR ☒ SV ☐ RI ☐ TR
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Mrs. Burcu MUTMAN BORAN	☒	☐ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI ☒ TR
Specialist supporting ITR	N.A.	☐	☐ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI ☐ TR

*DR = Document Review; SV = Site Visit; RI = Report issuance; TR = Internal Technical Review



2. METHODOLOGY

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

In order to ensure transparency, a verification protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 03.0 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, issued by CDM Executive Board at its 70th meeting on 23/11/2012 /9/. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

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

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

2.1. Review of Documents

The assessment of the project documentation provided by the project participant is based upon both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. Quantitative information comprises the reported numbers in the monitoring report (MR) version 05 dated 29/11/2013 /6/ and emission reduction calculation spreadsheet version 04 dated 13/11/2013 /7/. Qualitative information comprises information on internal management controls, calculation procedures, and procedures for transfer of data, frequency of emissions reports, and review and internal audit of calculations.

In addition to the monitoring documentation provided by the project participants, the DOE reviews:

- (a) The registered GS-VER-PDD and the monitoring plan /1/;
- (b) The validation report /2/;
- (c) Previous verification reports /3/;
- (d) The applied monitoring methodology /8/;

2.2. Follow-up Interviews

On 03/09/2013, Bureau Veritas Certification performed a site visit and interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS. and plant personnel as well as locals were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in

Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics



Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS. (the Project Owner)	➤ Project Design and implementation ➤ Technical equipment, calibration and operation ➤ Monitoring Plan and management procedures ➤ Data uncertainty and residual risks (QA/QC) ➤ Environmental Impacts
Residents at project site	➤ Compliance with National Laws and Regulations ➤ Monitored data and Monitoring Report ➤ GHG Calculations ➤ Sustainability issues

From the nearest settlement, the TOKI blocks by the project site, residents were interviewed. The Bezirci village and Edincik town are the closest administrative settlements and were visited during previous verification. Hence the TOKI blocks were preferred for the purposes of this verification site visit as this settlement is the closest and with most direct access to the project site and its possible impacts. No dust pollution were indicated. Residents expressed that the although the WTGs are audible at times they create no noise disturbance. Access to project site was confirmed by on site observations of the verifier and interviews. Site is being used for grazing, there are numerous actively used watering troughs and other herding infrastructure

2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification is to resolve issues related to the monitoring, implementation and operations of the registered project activity that could impair the capacity of the registered project activity to achieve emission reductions or influence the monitoring and reporting of emission reductions prior to Bureau Veritas Certification's positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

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

A Corrective Action Request (CAR) is raised, if one of the following situations occurs:

- (a) Non-compliance with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- (b) Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;
- (c) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;
- (d) Issues identified in a FAR during validation to be verified during verification or previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the project participants.

A Clarification Request (CL) is raised, if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.



A Forward Action Request (FAR) is raised, for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

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

2.4. Internal Technical Review

The verification report underwent an Internal Technical Review (ITR) before requesting issuance of CERs for the project activity.

The ITR is an independent process performed to examine thoroughly that the process of verification has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the verification scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas Certification procedures.

The Team Leader provides a copy of the verification report to the reviewer, including any necessary verification documentation. The reviewer reviews the submitted documentation for conformance with the verification scheme. This will be a comprehensive review of all documentation generated during the verification process.

When performing an Internal Technical Review, the reviewer ensures that:

- The verification activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the CDM rules and requirements.
- The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans and emission reduction calculations, internal quality assurance systems of the project participant as well as the project activity, review of the stakeholder comments and responses, closure of CARs, CLs and FARs during the verification exercise, review of sample documents.

The reviewer may raise Clarification Requests to the verification team and discusses these matters with Team Leader.

After the agreement of the responses on the Clarification Requests from the verification team as well as the PP(s), the finalized verification report is accepted for further processing such as uploading via the UNFCCC interface.

3. VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 10 CAR(s), 09 CL(s) and 1 FARs (please see section 3.1 of this report).

The CARs, CLs and FARs were closed based on adequate responses from the Project Participant(s) which meet the applicable requirements. They have been reassessed before their formal acceptance and closure.

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

3.1. Remaining issues from validation or previous verification (213)

All CARs and CLs raised were successfully closed during the validation stage of the Project, no remaining issues were left.

A single FAR has been transferred to this verification period from the initial verification regarding the government approval on the effect of the project on radar signals. No result was obtained during the second verification period and the FAR was carried onto this monitoring period. However, PP indicates that there is still no result for the topic. FAR remains open:

“According to news published on newspaper on 30/09/2010, all wind energy plants are under consideration by Turkish General Staff and the effects of wind turbines to the radar signal is being researched”

3.2. Compliance of the project implementation with the registered project design document (228)

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a site visit and found that the Project has been put into operation and the electricity generated is supplied to Turkish National Grid according to the signed Equipment Agreement. 5 sets of 90 m, Vestas V90 wind turbine generators (WTG) with a unit installed capacity of 3000 kW, providing a total installed capacity of 15 MW have been in operation during the monitoring period.

No changes to the project design have been identified during this verification. The implementation and operation of the project activity have been conducted in accordance with the description contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.

As per the initial provisional acceptance protocol of the Project /12/, for the commissioning of 5 units of the Project were put into operation on 01/09/2009.

[Power System]

As shown in the diagram of the power connection system, the electricity generated by the Project is delivered to the grid substation Bandırma II TM through an 154 kV line and then delivered to Turkish National Grid as verified through the project grid connection agreement /11/.

[Metering System]

There are two meters installed for the Project.

The main meter was installed at the output of the on-site substation to measure the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project.

VERIFICATION REPORT

The main meter has the serial number 53064316, an Acteris SL700 , also verified on site as well as through MMPs and PMUM screens.

The backup meter was installed beside the main meter to measure the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project.

The backup meter has the serial number 53064340, an Acteris SL700 , also verified on site as well as through MMPs and PMUM screens.

[Management and Operation]

The PP has operated the Project as per the registered GS-VER-PDD. The monitoring organization has been set up and all monitoring staff have been trained. Meter reading records of all the meters are based on continuously measurement and monthly recorded by the PP and TEIAS. The grid company issues the Monthly Measurement Protocols (MMPs) to the PP every month to confirm the electricity exported to and imported from the grid. Employment records of personnel /19/ and internal training records /20/ have been provided and verified by the verification team.



Corresponding to the paragraph 228 of VVS version 03.0, Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that:

- The implementation of the Project is consistent with the registered GS-VER-PDD.
- The Project is operated as per the registered GS-VER-PDD by the PP.

3.3. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) (232)

The verification team has verified the monitoring plan, including the data and parameters required to be monitored, measurement procedures, monitoring frequency and QC/QA procedures as described in the registered GS-VER-PDD.



Corresponding to the paragraph 232 of VVS version 03.0, Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) applied by the Project.

3.4. Compliance of monitoring activities with the monitoring plan (235-236)

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

[Parameters and information flow]

The parameters required by the monitoring plan and how Bureau Veritas Certification has verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and



reporting) for these parameters including the values in the monitoring report are described below:

Parameters monitored:

(1) EG_y , net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project

The net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project is the electricity exported to the grid minus the electricity imported from the grid by the Project which is measured by the bidirectional main meter. Therefore EG_y can be calculated as below:

$$EG_y = [EG_y - EG_{\text{baseline}}] \times EF_{\text{grid CM } y} \quad \text{where } EG_{\text{baseline}} = 0 \text{ as the plant is greenfield}$$

As described above, the meters have been installed in accordance with the registered GS-VER-PDD. The verification team has checked on-site the location of the meters against the diagram of power connection system and found them to be consistent.

The readings of the meters are continuously monitored and monthly recorded by the PP and the grid company. The grid company provided the PP with the Monthly Measurement Protocols (MMPs) monthly, which contain the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project. For a cross-check with PMUM portal for 2012 and 2013 vintage, the project owner provided the screenshots of PMUM portal. PMUM data were found to be conservative and were used for the calculations.

The verification team has verified the values provided in the monitoring report and ER spreadsheet against the relevant documented evidences i.e. the PMUM screens /13/ and the MMPs /14/ and found them to be consistent with the evidences. The PMUM screens and the MMPs can cover this monitoring period from 01/03/2012 - 31/08/2013.

(2) $FC_{i,j,y}$, Quantity of fuel type I combusted in Diesel power generator during year y

Project emissions produced by the operation of the emergency generator were calculated based on a conservative approach using the maximum consumption specified by the equipment manufacturer and equipment indicated total working hours. No invoices were available for crosschecking.

Generator manufacturer, AKSA, specified the hourly fuel consumption for the unit as 42 lt/hr under 100% load /15/. Total working hrs verified from the current monitored total working hrs displayed by the equipment on site (**46.42 hrs.**)

Fuel quantity has been found to be:

$$46.42 \text{ hrs} \times 42 \text{ lt/hr} = \mathbf{1950 \text{ liters of diesel}}$$

(3) SDI-1: Air Quality: SO_2 and NO_x Emission reductions

Relevant calculations were transparently shown in the calculations spreadsheet with relevant sources of data /7/. 2011 National Inventory of Turkey was used to determine the electricity generation related emission amounts of SO_2 and NO_x . 2011 total generation

figures were used to derive kg/MWh value for each emission. These values were used with ex-post verified net generation figures (72,268 MWh) for this monitoring period to find that:

SO₂ reduction for Generation in this Monitoring Period: **195.7 tons.**

NO_x reduction for Generation in this Monitoring Period: **83.2 tons.**

(4) SDI-2: Water quality and quantity: Records for transport of wastewater

Project site uses a sealed septic tank that is disposed of by the Edincik Municipality. Waste water is sucked by contractors, as verified through the invoice /24/, and transferred to and disposed in Edincik Municipality sewage system.

(5) SDI-3: Soil Condition: Accessibility to grassland around turbines for grazing activities.

Site is in close relation and integration with many herding and grazing infrastructures such as cowsheds and watering troughs. On-site observations of the verifier as well as photo evidence taken and provided clearly shows that the project site is accessible and is in use for grazing and herding.

(6) SDI-4: Soil Condition: Use of grassland around the turbines for grazing activities

As also indicated above, on-site observations of the verifier clearly show that the site is grassland and is actively used for grazing and herding.

(7) SDI-5: Biodiversity: Impact on bird population

.Previous ornithological survey and reports, covering a period from Autumn 2009 to end of August 2011, reveal no interaction between the WTGs and migratory and local bird species /17/. PPs continued observations did not reveal any contradictory information.

(8) SDI-6: Quality of employment: Number of people trained

Training records for the plant's 12 operational personnel were made available to BVC /20/. During this monitoring period, 4 operators, 1 chief of operations and 7 contracted security personnel, have received trainings from in-house and third party providers on topics related to their operational duties. These trainings were reported in the Monitoring Report, v.04, pages 18-20 and all were verified through hardcopy records of participation, certificates and exam results /20/

(9) SDI-7: Balance of payments: Currency saving

Based on 2011 natural gas (NG) consumption values provided by the TEIAS, NG based generation figures provided by the National GHG Inventory Report 1990 – 2011, 2011 natural gas prices and the net generation figures monitored in this period, the amount of NG imports avoided through use of renewables were calculated. Relevant sources and calculations were depicted in detail in the spreadsheet provided /7/.

In this monitoring period, a duration of 18 months:

NG savings corresponding to the 72,268 MWh of generation: **15,859,000 m3.**

Corresponding currency savings: **4,106,022 €**

(10) SDI-6: Technology transfer and self-reliance: Equipment expenditures

The maintenance and service agreement between the PP and Nordex, the WTG provider was verified as well as an invoice for E&M equipment spare parts purchase /22 and 25/as evidences of ongoing technology transfer.

Parameters determined ex-ante:

(1) $EF_{grid,CM,y}$, emission factor of the grid

The emission factor of the 1st crediting period of the Project has been determined ex-ante in the registered GS-VER-PDD as 0.604 tCO₂e/MWh. The emission factor used in the monitoring report has been verified against the GS-VER-PDD and found them to be consistent.



Corresponding to the paragraph 235 and 236 of VVS version 03.0, Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that:

- The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.
- All parameters required by the monitoring plan have been sufficiently monitored and correctly listed. The monitored data for required parameters have been verified by checking the whole information flow.

3.5. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments (243)

The registered monitoring plan requires that as the meters are sealed by TEIAS, PP cannot intervene with the devices by themselves. TEIAS performs maintenance on a regular basis. TEIAS is the main responsible for calibration and maintenance of the devices. TEIAS performs the necessary maintenance and calibration. Regional TEIAS annually checks devices as determined by the grid connection agreement /11/.

During this monitoring period, the installed measuring instruments have been operating well and did not require out of schedule calibration and the first periodic calibration has not yet arrived /.

Table 3 The calibration records of the meters

Meter ID	Serial number	Accuracy	Calibration date	Calibration entity
Main (Acteris SL700)	S/N: 53064316	0.2S	07/10/2010	TEIAS

Back-up (Acteris SL700)	S/N: 53064340	0.2S	07/10/2010	TEIAS
----------------------------	------------------	------	------------	-------

[Instrument accuracy]

The verification team has verified the calibration records and TEIAS is the sole responsible. All the meters meet the rated accuracy level as described in the monitoring plan and are in compliance with the Turkish Standards and International Electro technical Commission standards/10/.

[Calibration frequency]

The calibration frequency fulfills the requirement as described in the monitoring plan and is in compliance with the Turkish Standards and International Electro technical Commission standards /10/.

3.6. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions (246)

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

The critical parameter used for the determination of the Emission Reductions is the net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project. The data pertaining to the above parameter are maintained in the identified records. All the data are in compliance with that stated in the Monitoring Report version 05.

As per the methodology ACM0002 Version 09 and the registered GS-VER-PDD, the emission reductions for the Project are calculated as the baseline emissions minus the project emissions and leakage. Hence the emission reduction is determined by the following formula:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y \quad \text{Leakage is not considered per methodology requirements}$$

Where,

ER_y : Emission reductions

BE_y : Baseline emissions

PE_y : Project emissions

[Baseline emissions]

The baseline emissions are the baseline emission factor times the net electricity supplied to the grid. Therefore,

$$EG_{y,y} = [EG_y - EG_{\text{baseline}}] \times EF_{\text{grid CM } y} \quad \text{where } EG_{\text{baseline}} = 0 \text{ as the plant is greenfield}$$

$EF_{\text{grid,CM,y}}$: GHG emission factor of the Turkish National Grid, calculated ex-ante in the registered GS-VER-PDD as 0.604 tCO₂e/MWh



EG_y: Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity

The net electricity delivered to the grid (EG_{PJ,y}) can be calculated as:

$$EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{\text{export}} - EG_{\text{import}}$$

The verification team has cross-checked the values from the MMPs /13/ with the PMUM portal screens /14/ and sampled daily reports /15/ for the period from 01/03/2012 - 31/08/2013. The conservative values are used for emission reductions calculation. The verified values are shown in the following.

Table 4 The verified net electricity exported to the grid by the Project

Period	Export (MWh)	Import (MWh)	Verified EGy (MWh)
2012			
January	--	--	--
February	--	--	--
March	3,504.223	13.030	3,491.193
April	4,367.461	8.750	4,358.711
May	1,916.769	23.810	1,892.959
June	4,475.303	16.470	4,458.833
July	4,578.183	5.710	4,572.473
August	3,775.384	9.830	3,765.554
September	4,783.184	14.050	4,769.134
October	3,583.099	14.330	3,568.769
November	5,066.166	5.740	5,060.426
December	4,080.368	7.640	4,072.728
2013			
January	4,765.241	12.350	4,752.891
February	3,447.847	7.090	3,440.757
March	4,063.882	9.200	4,054.682
April	2,664.370	19.140	2,645.230
May	2,777.850	14.790	2,763.060
June	2,901.715	15.470	2,886.245
July	5,442.726	2.290	5,440.436
August	6,276.971	2.250	6,274.721
Total	72,470.742	201.940	72,268.802

$$EG_{2012} = EG_{\text{export}2012} - EG_{\text{import}2012} = 40,130.140 - 119.360 = 40,010.780 \text{ MWh}$$

VERIFICATION REPORT

$$EG_{2013} = EG_{\text{export}2013} - EG_{\text{import}2013} = 32,340.602 - 82.580 = 32,258.022 \text{ MWh}$$

$$EG_{3\text{rdMP}} = EG_{2012} + EG_{2013} = 40,010.780 + 32,258.022 = 72,268 \text{ MWh}$$

The baseline emissions of the Project are calculated as:

$$BE_{2012} = EF_{1\text{st CP}} * EG_{2012} = 0.604 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} \times 40,010.780 \text{ MWh} = 24,167 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

$$BE_{2013} = EF_{1\text{st CP}} * EG_{2013} = 0.604 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/MWh} \times 32,258.022 \text{ MWh} = 19,484 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

$$BE_{3\text{rdMP}} = BE_{2012} + BE_{2013} = 24,167 + 19,484 = 43,649 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

[Project emissions]

The Project is a newly built wind project, thus according to ACM0002 Version 09 the project emissions are zero.

However the emissions due to the emergency generator on-site was calculated. Total amount of diesel consumed during the 18 months monitoring period is used to calculate the total project emissions. Calculations and data sources are indicated in the spreadsheet and was verified here. All related assumptions were deemed conservative.

$$PE_{\text{diesel generator}} = 5 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

[Leakage emissions]

No leakage needs to be considered according to ACM0002 Version 09.

[Emission reductions]

The emission reductions during the monitoring period from 01/03/2012 - 31/08/2013 are calculated as:

$$ER_{1\text{stMP}} = BE_{2012} + BE_{2013} - PE_{\text{diesel generator}} = 24,167 + 19,484 - 5 \sim 43,644 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

[Comparison of ERs]

The annual estimated emission reductions are 30,997 tCO₂e as per the registered GS-VER-PDD. The actual operation days of the Project in the monitoring period are 549 days. The corresponding estimate in the monitoring period are 46,622 (=30,997*549/365) tCO₂e. The actual emission reductions are 6% less than the estimated value in the monitoring period.



Corresponding to the paragraph 246 of VVS version 03.0, Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that:

- Data used for the determination of the emission reductions are available and monitored in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.
- Information and data provided in the monitoring report have been cross-checked with other sources such as plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis.



- Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed.
- Assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.



4. VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the 3rd periodic verification of Ay-Yıldız 15 MW WPP, GS Registration Reference Number GS684, which is located in Bezirci Villages of EdincikTown in the Balıkesir Province of Republic of Turkey, and applying the methodology ACM0002 Version 09. The verification was performed based on the requirements set by the CDM methodology, GS v.2.1 and relevant guidance provided by CMP and the CDM Executive Board.

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

The management of Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emission reductions of the project on the basis set out within the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-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.

Bureau Veritas Certification has verified the project Monitoring Report version 05 dated 29/11/2013 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as described in the validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reductions run reliably and are calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the Project is generating GHG emission reductions as a GS-VER project.

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the projects' GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the validated and registered project baseline, monitoring plan and its associated documents. Based on the evidence and information that are considered necessary to guarantee that GHG emission reductions are appropriately calculated, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms the following statement:

Reporting period:	01/03/2012 - 31/08/2013	
Baseline emissions:	43,649	t CO ₂ equivalents
Project emissions:	5	t CO ₂ equivalents
Leakage emissions:	0	t CO ₂ equivalents
Emission Reductions:	43,644	t CO ₂ equivalents

Mrs. Burcu MUTMAN BORAN
Internal Technical Reviewer
29/11/2013

Mr. Mustafa UNAL
Team Leader
29/11/2013



5. REFERENCES

Documents reviewed:

- /1/ Registered GS-VER-PDD version 05.1 dated 31/05/2010,
- /2/ Validation Report revision 01, #TURKEY-VAL/CER.163.09.C71.Rev.1/2009, dated 28/06/2010
- /3/ Verification Report, rev.02, # TURKEY-VER/CER.2092.11.C45.Rev1/2010/2012, dd. 22/05/2012
- /4/ ---
- /5/ Monitoring Report version 01, dated 24/07/2013
- /6/ Monitoring Report version 05, dated 29/11/2013
- /7/ ER Calculation Spreadsheet version 04, dated 13/11/2013
- /8/ ACM0002 Version 09, applied approved CDM methodology
- /9/ Validation and Verification Standard Version 03.0 dated 23/11/2012
- /10/ <http://www.epdk.gov.tr/mevzuat/teblig/elektrik/sayac/sayacson.doc>
- /11/ Grid Connection Agreement btw Akenerji Elektrik Uretim AS. and TEIAS
- /12/ Provisional acceptance protocols of the Project
- /13/ PMUM portal screens of the Project (01/03/2011 – 31/08/2013)
- /14/ Monthly Measurement Protocols (MMPs) issued by the Grid Company
- /15/ AKSA Jenerator APD 200C Spec sheet / <http://www.aksa.com.tr/tr/urunler/dizel-jeneratorler/180>
- /16/ --
- /17/ Ayyıldız WPP Ornithological Monitoring Reports by Prof. Dr. M. Karakaya
- /18/ First Index Protocol by TEIAS, for energy meters,
- /19/ Employment records of personnel – SGK reports
- /20/ Internal Training Records and Qualification Certificate of Operation Staff
- /21/ Records of wage payments, dd. 07/2013 and 08/2013
- /22/ Vestas Maintenance and Service Agreement, dd.
- /23/ --
- /24/ Kaya Tic. – septic tank suction invoice – dd 04/04/2013
- /25/ Ormazabal velatia invoice dd. 31/05/2013

Persons interviewed:

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------|--|
| | Bursa Temiz | |
| /1/ | Osman ELCİ | Chief of Operations |
| /2/ | Unal USTUN | Environmental Representative / Technician. |
| | GTE | |
| /3/ | Kemal DEMİRKOL | |
| /4/ | Gani Eldeleklioğlu | |



Locals

/5/	Unal BARIS	Retired , TOKI resident (+90 505 727 1787)
/6/	Aziz AKIN	Teacher at the local school inside TOKI (+90 505 755 01 22)
/7/	Abdullah DEDEKOY	Muhktar / +90 542 571 9426



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

Mr. Mustafa UNAL	Bureau Veritas Certification, Turkey	Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier, Mustafa Unal is a Metallurgical and Materials Engineer and an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. He has experience in automotive and civil aviation industries. He has participated online seminars in the Gold Standard Academy in 2011, 2012.
Mrs. Burcu MUTMAN BORAN	Bureau Veritas Certification, Turkey	Technical Reviewer, Climate Change Lead Verifier. Burcu Mutman is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. Has participated various online trainings, seminars and personal trainings on Gold Standard also participated in the Gold Standard Academy in 2009 and 2010.

APPENDIX A: CDM PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL (Rev 08)

Table 1 Verification requirements based on VVS version 03.0 (EB 70 Annex 3), PS version 02.1 (EB 70 Annex 2), PCP version 03.1 (EB 70 Annex 4), and Guidelines for completing the Monitoring Report Form version 03.1 (EB 70 Annex 11)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
Part I Cover Page					OK
(a) Is the title of the project activity provided?	MR		Project name reported in market registry is not consistent with the monitoring report (MR)	CAR01	OK
(b) Is the reference number of the project activity provided?	MR		GS ID GS683, market registry ID: 103000000002244	OK	OK
(c) Is the version number of the monitoring report indicated?	MR		Version 01	OK	OK
(d) Is the completion date of the monitoring report provided in DD/MM/YYYY format?	MR		Report has been completed on 24/07/2013	OK	OK
(e) Is the registration date of the project activity provided in DD/MM/YYYY format?	MR		Given as 11/01/2011 Please confirm that this date is the end of the 8-week registration period	CL01	OK
(f) Are the monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period (first and last days included in DD/MM/YYYY format) provided?	MR		Second MP between dates 01/07/2011-31/05/2013	OK	OK
(g) Are project participants indicated?	MR		1. Bursa Temiz Enerji Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
			Ticaret A.Ş.(Private Entity, Project Owner) 2. Global Tan Energy Ltd. (Private Entity, Project Developer)		
(h) Is the host party(ies) indicated?	MR		Turkey	OK	OK
(i) Are the sectoral scope(s) and applied methodology(ies) indicated?	MR		Sectoral scope 1: Energy Industries (Renewable-/non-renewable sources) Applied methodology: ACM0002 v.09	OK	OK
(j) Is the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD indicated?	MR		Please justify the amount of estimated generation value: 114,609 tCO ₂ e	CAR02	OK
(k) Are the actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period indicated?	MR		Reported value 82,022 tCO ₂ e is not consistent with the provided excel sheet value (135,801.9 MWh)	CAR03	OK
(l) Are the actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period up to 31 December 2012 indicated (if applicable)?	MR		VER project, N/A	OK	OK
(m) Are the actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period from 1 January	MR		VER project, N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
2013 onwards indicated (if applicable)?					
Part II Monitoring Report					OK
A. Description of project activity					OK
A.1 Purpose and general description of project activity					OK
A.1.1 Is the description of the project activity to be presented in this section a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 Implementation status of the project activity?	MR		Bursa Temiz Enerji Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. 's project 10 x 2.5 MW Nordex N90		OK
A.1.2 Does this description include:					OK
A.1.2.1 Purpose of the project activity and the measures taken for GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks?	MR		Purpose of the project activity and the measures taken for GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks not indicated in section A.1	CL02	OK
A.1.2.2 Brief description of the installed technology and equipments?	MR		10 x 2.5 MW Nordex N90ü No reference given for equipment specs. given under section A.1	CL03	OK
A.1.2.3 Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning,	MR		A timeline is given.	CL04	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
continued operation periods, etc.)?			continued operation periods not indicated in timeline section A.1		
A.1.2.4 Total GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period?	MR		Total GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period not given under section A.1	CL05	OK
A.2 Location of project activity					OK
A.2.1 Is the information on the location of the project activity provided, including Host Party(ies), Region/State/Province, City/Town/Community, Physical/Geographical location etc.?	MR		Marmara Region in Turkey. Nearest settlements are Çarikköy and Bezirci villages which are contained within the boundaries of Bandırma town of Balıkesir province. Given coordinates verified through the EMRA license and on-site observations	OK	OK
A.3 Parties and project participant(s)					OK
A.3.1 Is the Party(ies) and project participant(s) involved in the project activity listed in the provided table?	MR		Yes, the table depicts the party and PP as: Turkey 1- Bursa Temiz Enerji Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.(Private Entity, Project Owner) 2-Global Tan Energy Ltd. (Private Entity, Project Developer)	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
A.4 Reference of applied methodology					OK
A.4.1 Is the exact reference (number, title, version) of the methodology(ies) indicated?	MR		Applied methodology is ACM0002 "Consolidated methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 9 In line with the registered PDD	OK	OK
A.4.2 Is the exact reference (number, title, version) of any tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) refers indicated?	MR		Applied tools are: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 05.2, and "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", Version 01.1 In line with the registered PDD	OK	OK
A.5 Crediting period of project activity					OK
A.5.1 Are the type, start date and length of the crediting period corresponding to this monitoring period provided?	MR		The project uses two times renewable crediting periods(7years). Start date and length of the crediting period corresponding to this monitoring period: 01/07/2011-31/05/2013	OK	OK
B. Implementation of project activity					OK
B.1 Description of implemented registered					OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
project activity					
B.1.1 Is the description of the installed technology, technical processes and equipments provided, include diagrams where appropriate?	MR PS	191(a)	10 x 80 meter high wind turbines, each 2.5 MW and a 154 kV switchyard Gönen TM substation. Expected generation value instead of monitored value reprinted in tsection B.1	CL06	OK
B.1.2 Is the information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity, including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) provided?	PS	191(b)	Timeline given in sction A.1 Please see CL04		OK
B.1.3 Is the description of: (i) the events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period that may impact the applicability of the methodology (ii) how the issues resulting from these events or situations have been addressed provided?	PS	191(c)	Please provide a description of description of: (i) the events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period that may impact the applicability of the methodology (ii) how the issues resulting from these events or situations	CAR04	OK
B.1.4 Have the project participants addressed the FARs identified during validation or previous verification(s)?	VVS	213	FARs identified during validation or previous verification not indicated	CAR05	OK
B.1.5 Have the implementation and operation of the project activity been conducted in accordance with the description contained	VVS	226	Project implementation is in line with the registered PDD	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
in the registered PDD?					
B.1.6 Are all physical features of the project activity in the registered PDD in place?	VVS	227	Verified during the site visit	OK	OK
B.1.7 Have the project participants operated the project activity as per the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD?	VVS	227	Operational activities are in line with the registered PDD	OK	OK
B.1.8 Was an on-site visit conducted?	VVS	227	A site visit was performed on 03/09/2013 with the participation of reps. of GTE, the PP and BVC	OK	OK
B.1.9 If an on-site visit is not conducted, is the rationale of the decision justified?	VVS	227	N/A	OK	OK
B.2 Post registration changes					OK
B.2.1 Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology					OK
B.2.1.1 Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period?	MR		None reported nor observed	OK	OK
B.2.1.2 Is a description of the deviation(s) in accordance with applicable provisions in the Project standard provided?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3 Are the reasons for the deviation(s),	MR		N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
how it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies), the duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable and justification on the conservativeness of the approach included in the description?					
B.2.1.4 For deviation(s) that require prior approval by the Board, are the date of approval and reference number included in the description?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2 Corrections					OK
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?	MR		No corrections reported	OK	OK
B.2.2.2 In cases where 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? Otherwise, are the version number and the completion date of the	MR		N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
revised PDD provided?					
B.2.3 Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology					OK
B.2.3.1 Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	MR		No permanent changes reported nor observed	OK	OK
B.2.3.2 In cases where the change(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? Otherwise, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4 Changes to project design of registered project activity					OK
B.2.4.1 Is it indicated whether any changes to the project design of the project activity have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this	MR		No changes indicated	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
monitoring report?					
B.2.4.2 In cases where the change(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? Otherwise, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5 Changes to start date of crediting period					OK
B.2.5.1 Is it indicated whether any changes to the start date of the crediting period have been approved during this monitoring period?	MR		No changes	OK	OK
B.2.5.2 In cases 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?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6 Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activity					OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
B.2.6.1 Is it indicated whether any changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities have been applied during this monitoring period based on applicable provisions in the Project standard that do not require prior approval by the Board?	MR		Project is a WPP, n/a	OK	OK
B.2.6.2 If changes were applied, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		Project is a WPP, n/a	OK	OK
C. Description of monitoring system					OK
C.1 General requirements					OK
C.1.1 Have project participants described the monitoring system and provided line diagrams (graphical schemes) showing all relevant monitoring points?	MR PS	193	MR in line with registered PDD and previous monitoring periods' practices. Fig. 4 represents the organizational structure	OK	OK
C.1.2 Does this description where appropriate include data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculations and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and	MR PS	193	Net electricity generation has been measured and recorded by both TEIAS Accounting Manager: Responsible for keeping data about power sales, invoicing and purchasing. GTE who is be responsible for calculating the emission	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
emergency procedures for the monitoring system?			reduction subject to verification.		
C.1.3 Is the monitoring plan of the project activity in accordance with the applied methodology including applicable tool(s)?	VVS	229	Monitoring plan complies with the applied methodology and tools	OK	OK
C.1.4 For monitoring aspects that are not specified in the methodology, particularly in the case of small-scale methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency), are there any issues which may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the monitoring plan and should bring to the attention of the Board?	VVS	231	N/A	OK	OK
C.1.5 Has the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the project participants?	VVS	234(a)	No information has been given regarding calibration activities in this monitoring period	CL07	OK
C.1.6 Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan and relevant Board decisions been monitored and updated as applicable, including:	VVS	234(b)		-	OK
C.1.6.1 Project emission parameters?	VVS	234(b)	Will be answered later	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
			All parameters were monitored and updated as applicable		
C.1.6.2 Baseline emission parameters?	VVS	234(b)	Will be answered later All parameters were monitored and updated as applicable	OK	OK
C.1.6.3 Leakage parameters?	VVS	234(b)	N/A	OK	OK
C.1.6.4 Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	VVS	234(b)	Will be answered later All parameters were monitored and updated as applicable	OK	OK
D. Data and parameters					OK
D.1 Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period					OK
D.1.1 For "Purpose of data", is one of the following options chose: (a) Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; (b) Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks; (c) Calculation of leakage?	MR		EGy: Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; EGy, Total: Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; EFCO ₂ , i, y I; Calculation of project emissions or actual	OK	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
			net GHG removals by sinks; FC i, y: Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; GE: Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; NCV: Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks		
D.1.2 For "Value(s) applied", if applicable, is one table used to report multiple values referring to the same data and parameter? If necessary, are reference(s) to electronic spreadsheets used?	MR		EGy: ; 99,000 EGy, Total: 183,339.7; EFCO2, i, y I; IPCC lower limit; [fixed for crediting per.] FC i, y: annex3 of registered PDD; [fixed for crediting per.] GE: See Annex 3 of registered PDD [fixed for crediting per.] NCV: See Annex 3 of registered PDD [fixed for crediting per.]		OK
D.1.3 Is the source of data provide and/or identified?	PS	195(d)	EGy: Feasibility Report for Bandırma-3 WPP; EGy, Total: TEIAS web page http://www.teias.gov.tr/ist2007/30(84-07).xls ; [fixed for	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
			crediting per.] EFCO ₂ , i, y I; ;IPCC lower limit; [fixed for crediting per.] FC i, y;; TEIAS web page (http://www.teias.gov.tr/ist2007/43.xls) GE: GS Annex I- Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity NCV: TEIAS web page (http://www.teias.gov.tr/ist2007/45.xls) [fixed for crediting per.]		
D.1.4 Is information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided?	PS	195(g)	Such values have been fixed for the crediting period.	OK	OK
D.2 Data and parameters monitored					OK
D.2.1 For “Purpose of data”, is one of the following options chose: (a) Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; (b) Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks; (c) Calculation of leakage?	MR		For EGy: Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; For FC _{i,j,y} : Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks	OK	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
D.2.2 For "Value(s) of monitored parameter", if applicable, is one table used to report multiple values referring to the same data and parameter? If necessary, are reference(s) to electronic spreadsheets used?	MR		For EGy: 136.18 GWh; For FCi,j,y: 1347.6 Litres Parameter is not gross generation, but the applied value is in MR section D.2	OK	OK
D.2.3 Are the values of the monitored parameter for the purpose of calculating GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided? Where data are measured continuously, are they presented using an appropriate time interval? For default values (such as an IPCC value), where it is ex post confirmed, is the most recent value applied?	PS	195(a)	Please see above; EGy monitored continuously, reported monthly as determined by the registered MP and best practice; However, both meter readings and PMUM values not reported in the excel. A comparison must be available to ensure that the most conservative data set is opted for.	CAR07	OK
D.2.4 Is the equipment used to monitor each parameter described, including details on accuracy class, and calibration information (frequency, date of calibration and validity), if applicable as per monitoring plan?	PS	195(b)	ELSTER A1500 395363 13.06.2008 < 0.05 % ELSTER A1500 395364 13.06.2008 < 0.05 % Please see CL07		OK
D.2.5 Is the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with	VVS	234(c)	Please see CL07		OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
the monitoring plan, the applied methodology, the Board guidance, local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?					
D.2.6 Is the calibration of those measuring equipments that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions conducted by the project participants at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan?	VVS	237	Please see CL07		OK
D.2.7 If, during verification of a certain monitoring period, the calibration has been delayed and the calibration has been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available), is the following conservative approach adopted in the calculation of emission reductions:	VVS	238	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.7.1 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	VVS	238(a)	N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error?					
D.2.7.2 Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment?	VVS	238(b)	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.8 Has the error has been applied:	VVS	239	-	-	OK
D.2.8.1 In a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	VVS	239(a)	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.8.2 For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.	VVS	239(b)	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.9 In cases where the results of the delayed calibration are not available, or the calibration has not been conducted at the time of verification, prior to finalizing verification, were the project participants requested to conduct the required calibration have the project participants	VVS	240	N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
calculated the emission reductions conservatively using the approach mentioned in item "0" above?					
D.2.10 In cases where it is not possible for the project participants to conduct the calibration at a frequency specified by either the applied methodology, guidance provided by the Board, and/or the registered monitoring plan due to reasons beyond the control of PPs, are the requirements for post registration changes, in section 9.5 of the VVS, followed?	VVS	241	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.11 In cases where neither the monitoring methodology nor the monitoring plan specify any requirements for calibration frequency for measuring equipments, are the equipments calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification? If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, were international standards used?	VVS	242	N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
D.2.12 Is it described how the parameters are measured/calculated and the measurement and recording frequency?	PS	195(c)	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.13 Are monitoring results consistently recorded as per approved frequency?	VVS	234(d)	EGy: monthly protocols are available monthly, PMUM values as well. No evidence for the equipment working hours given	CL08	OK
D.2.14 Is the source of data (e.g. logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.) provide and/or identified?	PS	195(d)	EGy tTEIAS protocols and PMUM records, FCi,j,y: Please see CL08. A conservative invoice is supplied.		OK
D.2.15 Where relevant is the calculation method of the parameter provided?	PS	195(e)	EGy: calculation method not given. FCi,j,y: Number of working hours x max. hourly consumption	CL09	OK
D.2.16 Are the QA/QC procedures applied described (if applicable per monitoring plan)?	PS	195(f)	EGy: please see CL07 FCi,j,y: invoices made available Please see CL08	OK	OK
D.2.17 Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan or the revised monitoring plan?	VVS	234(e)	Will be answered later QA/QC procedures in place and applied	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
D.2.18 Is information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided?	PS	195(g)	No information on values used for consumed fuel amount calculations.	CAR08	OK
Sustainability monitoring plan	Registered passport		1. Impact on bird population: please provide the most current observation report 2. Number of people trained (certificates): Trainings and personnel listed in MR. Hardcopies of participation records were verified. However: a. Please provide the SGK records for the plant 3. Numbers of locally recruited staff: no evidence of local employment provided; 4. Currency saving: no source indicated for data used; 5. supply and installation agreement made available as well as maintenance and service agreement. No records of tech transfer for the MP provided	CAR09	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
D.3 Implementation of sampling plan					OK
D.3.1 Is a description provided on how project participants implemented the sampling efforts and surveys for those data and parameters according to the sampling plan, Include:	MR		N/A	OK	OK
D.3.1.1 Description of implemented sampling design?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
D.3.1.2 Collected data (electronic spreadsheets may be attached and referenced)?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
D.3.1.3 Analysis of the collected data?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
D.3.1.4 Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met?	MR		N/A	OK	OK
E. Calculation of emission reductions or GHG removals by sinks					OK
E.1 Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks					OK
E.1.1 Are the sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks	MR PS	197(a)	Will be answered after CAR07 In detail in the spreadsheet	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
provided, applying actual values?					
E.1.2 Are the electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report attached?	MR		Will be answered after CAR07 Yes, 3 versions were prepared during verification	OK	OK
E.2 Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks					OK
E.2.1 Are the sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks provided, applying actual values?	MR PS	197(b)	Will be answered after CAR07 Yes available in the spreadsheet	OK	OK
E.2.2 Are the electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report attached?	MR		Will be answered after CAR07 Yes available in the spreadsheet	OK	OK
E.3 Calculation of leakage					OK
E.3.1 Are the sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage provided, applying actual values?	MR PS	197(c)	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.2 Are the electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report attached?	MR		N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
E.4 Summary of calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks					OK
E.4.1 Are the results of above sections summarized and GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period presented, using the provided table?	MR PS	197(d)	A table has been given however, Will be answered after CAR07 Summarized and compared with normalized values from the registered PDD estimation.	OK	OK
E.4.2 Is a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available?	VVS	245(a)	Complete data corresponding to the MP has been made available.	OK	OK
E.4.3 Has information provided in the monitoring report been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis?	VVS	245(b)	Complete set of generation and c/check data available for the complete MP	OK	OK
E.4.4 Have calculations of baseline emissions, and project activity emissions and leakage, as appropriate, been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document?	VVS	245(c)	TEIAS readings and PMUM screens for the generation values made available. Fuel invoices have been presented.	OK	OK
E.4.5 Have any assumptions used in emission	VVS	245(d)	calculations of baseline emissions, and project activity	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
calculations been justified?			emissions and leakage, as appropriate, been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the applied methodology ACM0002 v.09		
E.4.6 Have appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values been correctly applied?	VVS	245(e)	Please see CAR08	OK	OK
E.5 Comparison of actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD					OK
E.5.1 Is a comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removal of the project activity achieved during this monitoring period with the estimates in the registered PDD provided?	MR PS	198	Please see CAR07 Summarized and compared with normalized values from the registered PDD estimation.	OK	OK
E.6 Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD					OK
E.6.1 For any registered CDM project activity, except A/R project activities, have project participants explained the cause of any increase in the actual GHG emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water	MR PS	199	N/A	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
availability, higher plant load factor, etc.), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in the registered PDD?					
E.7 Actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards					OK
E.7.1 If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, are actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved for the following two periods provided respectively? (a) Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); (b) From 1 January 2013 onwards.	MR		a) up to 31/12/2012 – 67,715 tCO ₂ e b) from 01/01/2013 – 27,820 tCO ₂ e	OK	OK
E.7.2 Is it ensured that the achieved GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks are calculated proportionally for each period? In cases where annual caps were applied in the calculations, is it ensured that the annual	MR		N/A	OK	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Conc
caps are pro-rated to each period?					

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

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CAR01 Project name reported in market registry is not consistent with the monitoring report (MR)		Project name has been corrected in line with the registry	Msu131108: Revised for consistency with registry, OK. Closed.
CL01 Please confirm that this date is the end of the 8-week registration period		Registration date has been changed in line with the 8-week registration period	Msu131108: Revised, OK. Closed.
CAR02 Please justify the amount of estimated generation value: 114,609 tCO ₂ e		The given figure was for 23 months' estimation. Annual estimation from the registered PDD is added as justification 2 nd round response: Cover page and other relevant sections are	Msu131108: Monitoring period has been revised as 26 months while the cover shows 23 and a corresponding emission estimation

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
		updated as 26-months	Still open Msu131112: All references to MP duration of 23 months revised, OK Closed.
CAR03 Reported value 82,022 tCO₂ e is not consistent with the provided excel sheet value (135,801.9 MWh)		ERs revised and data belonging to 3months prior to site visit also added in calculations	Msu131108: Achieved ER revised as 95,355 tCO₂, Closed
CL02 Purpose of the project activity and the measures taken for GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks not indicated in section		Explanatory paragraph has been added in section A1	Msu131108: Added, OK. Closed.

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
A.1			
CL03 No reference given for equipment specs. given under section A.1		Reference is already given in footnote 1. The provided data is from the manufacturer's official website.	Msu131108: Linked to manuf.s specs for equipment validated at the site visit, OK. Closed.
CL04 continued operation periods not indicated in timeline section A.1		Continued operation start date has been added in milestones table	Msu131108: Added, OK. Closed.
CL05 Total GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period not given under section A.1		Net emission reductions were added in section A1	Msu131108: This MP has been completed with 95,352 tCO2 of ER.OK Closed.

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CL06 Expected generation value instead of monitored value reported in tsection B.1		Monitored values are added in section B1	Msu131108: Monitored value of approx.. 158 GWh was reported, OK. Closed.
CAR04 Please provide a description of description of: (i) the events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period that may impact the applicability of the methodology (ii) how the issues resulting from these events or situations		Statement added regarding the events / situations that may have prevented the application of selected methodology Section B1	Msu131108: No events to affect the applicability of methodology reported Closed.
CAR05 FARs identified during validation or previous verification not indicated		Statement added regarding FARs	Msu131108: No outstanding FARs from previous verification Closed.
CL07		Calibration information and up-to-date calibration test report has been submitted to	Msu131108:

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
No information has been given regarding calibration activities in this monitoring period		DOE	Tested on 25/07/2012, records received, OK. Closed.
CAR06 Parameter is not gross generation, but the applied value is in MR section D.2		Gross generation parameter is updated with addition of recent months prior to site visit 2 nd round response: Parameter updated to its correct value.	Msu131108: The parameter EGy is the NET electricity delivered to the grid, while the 'value of monitored parameter' reported in the table for EGy quotes GROSS generation and provides that value. Still open Msu131112: Value revised as 157,774 and references to gross production removed, OK.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
			Closed.
CAR07 However, both meter readings and PMUM values not reported in the excel. A comparison must be available to ensure that the most conservative data set is opted for.		Meter readings and PMUM records are provided in the excel sheet and supportive documents for gross electricity generation, however the internal consumption column for PMUM records is not included as it shows the amount of electricity which has been sold through bilateral agreements as "Internal consumption". Gross generation figures are presented for cross-checking. The most conservative data set has been chosen for calculations 2nd round response: a) Missing PMUM records were submitted with revised MR. b) Gross ER calculations for annual vintages were changed, and re-calculated using conservative PMUM data set.	Msu131108: Justification accepted and the data set that is conservative has been used in the v2. However: a) the PMUM records for June and July have not been provided; b) gross emission reductions for annual vintages in the excel have not been calculated from the conservative PMUM data set. Still open Msu131112: a. provided and checked against

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
			excel, OK. b. Revised appropriately, OK Closed.
CL08 No evidence for the equipment working hours given		The available diesel generator site forms are already submitted to DOE and also these figures were verified during site visit. 2nd round response: Since there were no other site forms available for the diesel generator, pictures were taken as a proving document. Diesel working hours were updated and relevant photo is submitted to the DOE.	Msu131108: Only one form has been submitted which reports the august 2012 value which is identical to the monitored value for the whose MP. Also although 3 more months have been added, the equipment working hours have not increased. Please clarify Still open Msu131112: Photo evidence available at site visit, rest of the assumptions are

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
			conservative enough to ensure an appropriate result. Closed.
CL09 EGy: calculation method not given.		EGy refers to "Net Electricity delivered to the grid by the Bandirma-3 WPP in year y" This figure is directly taken from the feasibility report as stated in MR. Monitoring of this parameter is achieved by measurements, not calculations. 2 nd round response: Further information added about calculating net electricity.	Msu131108: The parameter is the net electricity provided to the grid. This is not monitored but calculated. Still open Msu131112: Revised, OK. Closed.
CAR08		Sources added for fuel consumption	Msu131108:

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
No information on values used for consumed fuel amount calculations.		calculations and excel sheet has been revised 2 nd round response: Tech. specs sheet of the equipment has been submitted to the DOE with the revised MR.	No reference for the max fuel consumption value was given. Still open Msu131112: Sheet received, 110 % load consumption validated, OK. Closed.
CAR09 1. Impact on bird population: please provide the most current observation report 2. Number of people trained (certificates): Trainings and personnel listed in MR. Hardcopies of participation records were verified. However: a. Please provide the SGK records for the plant		1. There are no observation reports in this period. Video record of the project site analyzing the turbine whereabouts is submitted to the DOE during site visit 2. Most up to date SGK reports and proving documents for the same employees were submitted to DOE previously 3. Most up to date SGK reports and	Msu131108: 1. OK; 2. No SGK records are available. 3. No SGK records are available. 4. Gross generation was used in

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
3. Numbers of locally recruited staff: no evidence of local employment provided; 4. Currency saving: no source indicated for data used; 5. supply and installation agreement made available as well as maintenance and service agreement. No records of tech transfer for the MP provided		proving documents for the same employees were submitted to DOE previously 4. References added in the excel sheet as well as the MR Annex I 5. Regular maintenance and the payments made are presented as tech transfer. 2nd round response: 2.Documents are being sent to the DOE 3.Documents are being sent to the DOE 4.Net generation figures are used 5.Maintenance agreement is provided, no purchase of new equipment commenced in the MP.	calculations; 5. No records of payment were provided. Still open Msu131112: 2. high voltage safety certificates for Ahmet Oz, erkut topraksever, recaı karatay not available, though reported as attended in MR, please clarify; 3. three staff were verified to be locals, OK; 4. revised, OK; 5. accepted, OK. Still open

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
			Msu131114:Ç 2. mentioned names were removed, OK, Closed.
CAR10 Sections E.4 E.5 of the MR are not consistent with the other reported generation, emission reduction and monitoring period durations.		2 nd round response: Sections E.4 and E.5 are corrected.	Msu131112: Revised, OK. Closed.
ITR FINDINGS			
CL10 Calculations in section E.1 of the M.R. uses ex-ante values.		Actual figures also shown in section E.1	Review: Realized figures reported
CL11 Realized values of generation and reduction not reported in section B.1 of the MR		Actual values of generation and reductions are added in section B.1	Review: Actual figures also reported

VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CL12 Parameters and formulae are not in line with the implemented version of the methodology		Baseline emissions formula and notations revised as per the methodology. Other parameters are taken from registered PDD.	Review: Revised for compliance with the methodology

