

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This project review report includes findings raised during Verra's review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered for approval by Verra. The project review report will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided in separate attachments.

Project ID	120
Project Name	Aydin Salavatli Dora-1 Geothermal Power Plant
Review Type	Verification Approval
Program(s)	VCS Program
Verification Period	01 Nov 2017 to 31 Dec 2021
Project Proponent	a) Menderes Geothermal Elektrik Uretim A.S. (MEGE) b) South Pole Carbon Asset Management Ltd. (SPCM)
Methodology	AMS-I.D.: Grid connected renewable electricity generation (version 18)
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A.(Applus+ Certification)
Assessment Criteria	VCS Standard, v4.3, AMS-I.D., version 18.0
Date of First Issue	22 December 2022
Review Conclusion	Closed
Date of Final Issue	09 March 2023

FINDINGS

#	Finding Description	VVB Response	Status
1	Title – Inconsistency in reporting of the project start date <u>Issue</u> Section 1.5 of the Monitoring Report states that the project start date is 10 May 2006 which is different than the start date mentioned in the registered PD and the previous Monitoring Report (where the start date is mentioned as 4 April 2003). <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must ensure that the project start date mentioned in the Monitoring Report submitted to Verra is accurate and in line with the VCS program rules (mentioned below). - If the mentioned project start date is not accurate, the VVB must ensure that the project proponent revises the project start date in compliance with VCS program rules (mentioned below). - The VVB must ensure that the project proponent reports this as a project description deviation and updates relevant section(s) of the Monitoring Report. The VVB must update the Verification Report accordingly. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> - VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.7 - VCS Program Definitions, v4.2 <u>Background</u> As per the VCS program rules (mentioned above), the project start date (of a non-AFOLU project) is the date on which the	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The project activity was registered under VCS 2007. As explained by PP, the project start date in registered PD was determined as per definition under CDM scheme, i.e. date of real action of the project activity. As per VCS Standard, version 4.3 under which the verification of this monitoring period was conducted and version 3.7 under which the crediting period of the project activity was renewed, the project start date of a non-AFOLU project is the date on which the project began generating GHG emission reductions or removals. Therefore, project start date was determined to be 10/05/2006, when the project started commission and generating GHG emission reductions. Please refer to CL01 in Appendix 2 of the Verification Report. <u>Verra Response</u> Section 1.5 of the monitoring report has been updated to include more information about the project start date difference. This start date is in line with the VCS Standard, v4.3. Thus, this finding is closed.	Closed

	project began generating GHG emission reductions or removals.		
--	---	--	--

2 Title – Validity of calibration of the electricity meter			
	<u>Issue</u> Section 4.2 of the Monitoring Report states that the validity of calibration of the electricity meter (serial number 424848) ends on 09 Sep 2020, whereas the monitoring period ends on 31 Dec 2021. Thus, the validity of calibration of the electricity meter (and thereby the accuracy of the electricity generated/ERs achieved) is not ensured for the complete duration of the monitoring period (which is from 01 Nov 2017 to 31 Dec 2021). <u>Action Required</u> - The VVB must justify how the validity of calibration of the electricity meter is acceptable and further in compliance with VCS program rules (mentioned below). - If a valid justification cannot be provided (as per point 1 above), the VVB must ensure that the PP provides a valid calibration certificate that demonstrates complete validity of calibration of the electricity meter. If such is the case, the VVB must ensure that the PP updates relevant section(s) of the Monitoring Report. - The VVB must assess the updated Monitoring Report and update the Verification Report as needed. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> - VCS Standard, v4.3, Section 3.15 of the VCS Standard (version 4.3) - AMS-I.D., version 18, Paragraph 45 <u>Background</u>	Round 1 <u>VVB Response</u> The calibration information of electricity meter covering this monitoring period has been supplemented in the updated MR and VR. <u>Verra Response</u> Section 4.2 of the monitoring report has been updated to include the recent calibration dates, which demonstrates that the electricity meter calibration was valid during the monitoring period. This finding is closed.	
		Closed	

	As per paragraph 3.15.5 of the <i>VCS Standard</i> , it must be ensured that the monitoring equipment used by the project proponent is calibrated according to the equipment's specifications and/or relevant national or international standards.		
--	--	--	--

3 Title – Calculation of Project Emissions			
	<u>Issue</u> Section 5.2 of the monitoring report does not provide sufficient data to demonstrate (i.e., through data/parameters and calculation) that the project emissions are less than 1% of the baseline emissions. <u>Action Required</u> 1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent provides sufficient information so that a third-party reader may reproduce the calculation of project emissions in Section 5.2 of the monitoring report. 2. The VVB must assess the updated monitoring report and update the verification report as needed. <u>Program Rule(s)</u> <i>VCS Monitoring Report Template, v4.1, Section 5.2</i>	Round 1	Closed
		<u>VVB Response</u> For this monitoring period, PEFF,y is 10tCO ₂ , which is much less than 1% ($10/35,854=0.028\%$) of baseline emissions, i.e. 35,854 tCO ₂ , and thereby neglected. The description has been supplemented in the section 5.2 of the MR.	
		<u>Verra Response</u> Section 5.2 of the monitoring report and Section 4.4 of the verification report have been updated to demonstrate that the project emissions are less than 1% of the baseline emissions. This finding is closed.	