# VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

BOREAS ENERJİ ÜRETİM SİSTEMLERİ SANAYİ VE TİCARET A.Ş.

# BOREAS-1 ENEZ WIND POWER PLANT

IN

TURKEY

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 01/05/2011 to 31/07/2013 (both days included)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Organizational Unit:** | re-consult Ltd. Carbon Department | | | |
| **Project Title:** | Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant | | | |
| **Project Number:** | **Client:** | | | **Current MR Version:** |
| 220 | Boreas Enerji Üretim Sistemleri Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. | | | 5 |
| **Date of First Issue:** | **Date of Current Version:** | **Version Number:** | | **Number of Pages:** |
| 15/10/2013 | 26/03/2014 | 05 | | 80 |
| **Verification Number:** | **Registration Number:** | **Monitoring Period:** | | |
| 01 | GS702 | From: 01/05/2011 | To: 31/07/2013 | |

## Summary:

**Host Country:**

**Project is Reviewed Against:**

☒ Kyoto Protocol ☒ UNFCCC CDM Rules and Regulations and associated documents

☒ Gold Standard Rules and Regulations ☐ VCS Rules and Regulations

☐ Other (Please Specify)

**Methodology:** AMS-ID **Version:** 17

**Verified Emissions Reductions:** 80,690 $tCO_2e$

(2011: 23,534 $tCO_2e$,

2012: 37,803 $tCO_2e$,

2013: 19,353 $tCO_2e$)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project Participants:** | Boreas Enerji Üretim Sistemleri Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. |

**Verification Stages:**

☒ Desk Review ☐ Site Visit ☒Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

**Verification Findings:**

During the verification 12 Corrective Action Requests, 15 Clarification Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. 1 Forward Action Request was issued during the verification all of which shall be addressed during the next verification of the project activity.

In summary, it is re-consult's opinion that the project activity "Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 7 dated 14/02/2013 /D1/ and Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology /D2/ and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version 5 dated 19/03/2014 /D24/ is fairly stated.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Verification Team Leader:** | Seda YUCEL | **Indexing Terms:** |
| **Verification Team Members:** | Anıl SÖYLER | ☒ No distribution without permission of the client or |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | responsible organizational unit |
| **Approved By (Technical Reviewer):** | **Name:** | **Signature:** | ☐ Limited Distribution |
| | Praveen PYATA |  | ☐ Unrestricted Distribution |

## Abbreviations

**CAR** : Corrective Action Request
**CDM** : Clean Development Mechanism
**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
**FAR** : Forward Action Request
**GHG** : Greenhouse gas(es)
**GS** : Gold Standard
**I** : Interview
**kWh** : Kilo Watt Hour
**MP** : Monitoring Plan
**MoV** : Means of Verification
**MW** : Mega Watt
**MWh** : Mega Watt Hour
**NGO** : Non-governmental Organisation
**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 ..... 7

2. INTRODUCTION ..... 8

2.1. Objective ..... 8

2.2. Scope ..... 8

2.3. Description of the Project Activity ..... 8

2.4. Parties Involved ..... 9

2.5. Verification Period Covered ..... 9

3. METHODOLOGY ..... 10

3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection ..... 12

3.2. Desk Review of Documents ..... 12

3.3. On-Site Visits ..... 13

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol ..... 14

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews ..... 15

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues ..... 15

3.7. Internal Quality Control ..... 16

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS ..... 17

4.1. Remaining Issues From Previous Validation or Verifications ..... 17

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD ..... 17

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology ..... 17

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan ..... 19

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring ..... 19

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring ..... 20

4.7. Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments ... 21

**4.8. Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions ..... 22**

**4.9. Quality of Evidence ..... 22**

**4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance ..... 22**

**4.11. Materiality ..... 23**

**4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan ..... 23**

**4.13. Post Registration Changes ..... 23**

4.13.1. Temporary deviations ..... 23

4.13.2. Corrections ..... 23

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period ..... 23

4.13.4. Permanent changes ..... 23

4.13.5. Changes to the project design ..... 23

**5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED ..... 24**

**6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED ..... 25**

**7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE ..... 27**

**7.1. Appointment Certificates ..... 28**

**8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION ..... 31**

**ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL ..... 32**

# 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

re-consult Ltd. has performed the 1st verification of the “Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS702” for the period from 01/05/2011 to 31/07/2013 (both days included). The scope of the activities cover the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions and sustainability measures reported in Monitoring Report Version 5 dated 19/03/2014 /D24/ of “Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant”.

re-consult Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 7 dated 14/02/2013 /D1/ and Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/ . The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is AMS-ID Version 17 /D2/.

re-consult confirms the following based on the results of document review:

The implementation of the project has resulted in 80,690 tCO2e during the monitoring period from 01/05/2011 to 31/07/2013 (both days included). (2011: 23,534 $tCO_2e$, 2012: 37,803 $tCO_2e$, 2013: 19,353 $tCO_2e$).

# 2. INTRODUCTION

## 2.1. Objective

re-consult Ltd. has been appointed by "Boreas Enerji Üretim Sistemleri Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş." to perform the 1st verification of the "Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant" in Turkey with the contract dated 22/05/2012. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated "19/03/2014" /D24/ conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan of the registered PDD /D1/, Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/ and the approved methodology /D2/
- 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 and sustainability measures. The verification activity is based on the validated and registered PDD version 7 dated 14/02/2013 /D1/ and Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/.

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, "AMS-I.D. version 17" /D2/, 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 version 5.0 /D5/, CDM Project Standard version 5.0 /D6/ , CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 5.0 /D7/, Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit version 2.1 /D8/ 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-consult 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

"Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant" (hereinafter referred as the Boreas) is constructed by "Boreas Enerji Üretim Sistemleri Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş." (hereinafter referred as Boreas Enerji) near Hisarlı Village in Edirne province, North West of Turkey. In Boreas, there are six Nordex N90 turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MWs.

Boreas will have renewable crediting period, 7 years and renewed twice. Electricity production started on 09/04/2010 but first crediting period starts on 01/05/2011. Reference for electricity production date is "Provisional Acceptance" document /D9/ and reference for crediting period start date is "GS review report dated 13 February 2014". As verified from GS, project is registered on 31/07/2013.

## 2.4. Parties Involved

Turkey is the host party for the project. Boreas Enerji is the private entity investing in the project.

## 2.5. Verification Period Covered

Verification period is from 01/05/2011 to 31/07/2013 (both days included).

# 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 14/02/2013 version 7 /D1/ and Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/.
- A separate site visit is not conducted for this verification because the validation site visit was already conducted (2012) in the first 2 years after the commissioning of the project (2010). Also the verification DOE and auditor are the same as the validation DOE and auditor and validation site visit was conducted only a year ago by the same team on 09/07/2012. Even then Boreas was commenced and verification practices were also observed from commissioning date 09/04/2010 to validation site visit date 09/07/2012. Site visit was then realized both for validation and verification. As DOE has seen the physical site and monitoring practices and personnel, for the remaining part of the monitoring period (from 09/07/2012 to 01/08/2013), additional data on monitoring provided by project owner are found sufficient for verification.
- DOE made the site visit 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 AMS-ID v17 /D2/
- 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 /D10/
- 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 17/02/2012 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* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Praveen PYATA | ITR | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | ITR |
| Seda YUCEL | Team Leader | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | DR, SV, R |
| Anıl SOYLER | Verifier | ☒ | ☒ | ☒ | DR, A |

* 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

## 3.2. Desk Review of Documents

The basis for the verification activity is the monitoring report version 01, dated 19/08/2013 /D3/ which was submitted to the verification team on 19/08/2013. This monitoring report was revised several times due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 5 dated 19/03/2014 /D24/ being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 7 dated 14/02/2013 /D1/, Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/, AMS-ID v17 /D2/, the relevant CDM rules and regulations /D11/, CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 5.0 /D5/, Gold Standard Toolkit version 2.1 /D8/ and the final validation report of re-consult, dated 21/05/2013, v3 /D12/.

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

A separate site visit is not conducted for this verification because the validation site visit was already conducted (2012) in the first 2 years after the commissioning of the project (2010). Also the verification DOE and auditor are the same as the validation DOE and auditor and validation site visit was conducted only a year ago by the same team on 09/07/2012. Even then Boreas was commenced and verification practices were also observed from commissioning date 09/04/2010 to validation site visit date 09/07/2012.

Boreas was commenced during validation site visit because validation for Boreas was rejected by the previous DOE due to wrong claims on additionality by the previous consultant. A second attempt of validation was successfully completed by re-consult in February 2013. When second validation started (July 2012) Boreas was already producing electricity and validation team (same team as todays' verification team), besides observing for validation, observed existing monitoring practices and data recording system in practice.

Site visit was then realized both for validation and verification. As DOE has seen the physical site and monitoring practices and personnel, for the remaining part of the monitoring period (from 09/07/2012 to 01/08/2013), additional data on monitoring provided by project owner are found sufficient for verification.

Therefore, a seperate site visit for verification was not organized.

**Table 3-5:** Site visit details

| **Date** | 09/07/2012 | |
|---|---|---|
| **Location** | Edirne | |
| **Participant** | **Company Name** | **Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit** |
| Emin Nas | Hisarlı Village | Former Muhtar of Hisarlı Village |
| Vedat Algül | Yazır Village | Villager |
| Sedat Uzun | Büyükevren Village | Villager |
| Ahmet Çayır | Enez Municipality | Mayor of Enez |
| Osman Gülcan | Enez Municipality | Environmental Services |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Director |
| **Points Verified** | **Source of Information** | |
| Local employment rate, PP contributions to local economy, construction of a fountain for the village by PP, safety wires for the cemetery area by PP, no grazing problem generated by Boreas. | interview | |
| PP has reconstructed damaged roads, no negative effect of the project on animal farming | interview | |
| PP shops from local shops, village has better electricity quality doe to investment of PP for infrastructure | interview | |
| Municipality helps the PP to dispose wastewater and solid waste | interview | |
| PP has some donations for the municipality and has helped by means of vehicles and labor force | interview | |

## 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 /D10/ was used to submit the findings to the project participants.

In line with the CDM Validation and Verification Standard /D5/ 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 12 CARs, 15 CLs and 1 FAR were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol.

## 3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

During the verification period follow-up interviews were realized by questionnaires /D13/. Questionnaires are presented as attachment to the monitoring report and there are no negative comments or complaints. A list of persons interviewed is given in Section 5 of this 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-consult 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.

| | |
|---|---|
| Desk review started | 19/08/2013 |
| Desk review finished | 20/08/2013 |
| On site assessment | 09/07/2012 |
| 1st Protocol started, finished and sent to client | 29/08/2013 - 03/09/2013 |
| Responses received | 17/09/2013 |
| 2nd Protocol started, finished and sent to client | 17/09/2013 - 30/09/2013 |
| Responses received | 31/09/2013 |
| Final Responses received-All CAR-CL closed | 31/09/2013 |
| Report writing | 15/10/2013-16/10/2013 |
| Submission for Technical Review | 16/10/2013 |
| Technical Review started | 24/10/2013 |
| Technical Review finished | 25/10/2013 |
| Draft report submitted to TL | 25/10/2013 |
| Submission for 2nd Technical Review | 12/11/2013 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Technical Review started | 13/11/2013 |
| Technical Review finished | 13/11/2013 |
| Draft report submitted to TL | 13/11/2013 |
| Submission for Final Approval | 19/11/2013 |
| Date sent to client | 06/12/2013 |

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-consult. 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 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

This is 1st verification and there are no previous issues from validation.

## 4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

Project is in operation since 09/04/2010. Verification of the project started in August 2013. As known from validation site visit, Boreas consists of only one site with 4 turbines of 2.5 MW each. As declared by the client during 1st verification (this verification), in end of 2014, capacity will be increased from 15 MW to 20 MW with 2 additional turbines (revised licence dated 26/06/2013.

Besides replacing fossil fuel power generation and reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Turkey, project has contributions to local economy by providing local employment and income and increasing the quality of the electricity infrastructure which is also a direct benefit to Hisarli village.

DOE had met the operation stage employees during validation. The social security records of current employees are provided to DOE as evidence /D15/.

Annually, 32,330 tons of $CO_2e$ of emission reductions were estimated in the PDD. In reality 80,690 tons of $CO_2e$ of emission reductions are achieved for whole monitoring period (2011: 23,534 $tCO_2e$, 2012: 37,803 $tCO_2e$, 2013: 19,353 $tCO_2e$). Calculations have been reproduced by DOE. Source data (monthly meter readings and PMUM records /D16/) are presented by PP.

Annual expected electricity generation was 52,742 MWh according to the micrositing report. Real values recorded are 38,391.92 MWh for 2011, 61,668.61 MWh for 2012 and 31,570.96 MWh for 2013. The estimated annual electricity generation in PDD is the average annual electricity generation for 20 years, which is the economic life of wind turbines. This value of 52,742 MWh, equals to the capacity factor for P90 from Micrositing Report. The early years of generation are generally higher than the average as the equipment is new. By the time the turbines are worn out, the annual generation generally decrease below the average.
In 2011 and 2012 Boreas has generated 38,391.92 MWh and 61,668.6 MWh electricity, respectively. As stated above, the performance of equipment would be higher in early years of production and will decrease later on the following years.
The third year of operation, 2013, the total generation was 31,571 MWh for 7 months, which is slightly higher than the expected average of 7 months 30,766 MWh. This is again due to the performance of the new equipment.

Differences are small enough to be considered as a deviation from estimated data.

## 4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

Monitoring is implemented in line with the monitoring plan that is previously approved during validation. Methodology AMS-ID v17 /D2/ is used for the monitoring.

Data and variables reported in the monitoring report /D24/are not different than the PDD /D1/ and Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/.

In line with the methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity exported to the grid by Boreas.

For sustainable development indicators, the following are monitored:

- Air quality
- Water quality and quantity
- Soil condition
- Other pollutants
- Biodiversity
- Quality of employment
- Livelihood of the poor
- Access to affordable and clean energy services
- Human and institutional capacity
- Quantitative employment and income generation
- Technology transfer and technological self-reliance

## 4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

In line with the monitoring plan, net electricity exported to the grid in the year y, is the only parameter to be monitored for determining emission reductions. The net electricity is measured continuously by a power meter at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There is also a spare meter. Meter readings are provided to DOE /D16/.

Besides, hourly readings are done and noted to a log book by the personnel. At the same time, readings are automatically transferred to the website of "Market Financial Settlement Center" or PMUM. In addition to metering devices every single wind turbine generation will be monitored and thedata will be stored through a SCADA system. Log books were checked and sampled during validation site visit for the period from commissioning date 09/04/2010 to validation site visit date 09/07/2012. As there are no differences in data, no further sampling is done for the rest of the monitoring period.

PMUM records are used to cross check the data /D16/.

Sustainable development indicators are verified in section 4.6. their compliance is assessed against Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/.

## 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 Boreas.

For sustainable development indicators, the following are monitored:

- Air quality
- Water quality and quantity
- Soil condition
- Other pollutants
- Biodiversity
- Quality of employment
- Livelihood of the poor
- Access to affordable and clean energy services
- Human and institutional capacity

Quantitative employment and income generation

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 Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/.

For verification of sustainability parameters from commissioning date 09/04/2010 to validation site visit date 09/07/2012, validation site visit observations and interviews with stakeholders are used.

For verification of sustainability parameters from validation site visit date 09/07/2012 to end of 1st monitoring period 01/08/2013, answers to stakeholders to questionnaires and legal documents like waste disposal records are used. Questionnaires were distributed by project owner to stakeholders at the end of 1st monitoring period so that when stakeholders fill them in, DOE can get an idea on their complaints, if any.

During on site visit, a very clean operation was observed. As the electricity generation had already started, working and site conditions during operation stage were very clean. During site visit Mayor of Enez was also interviewed and he confirmed that Enez Municipality collected solid waste and wastewater related to project both in the construction period and still.

**Air quality:** Air quality was only to be monitored during construction phase by means of dust dispersion. At validation site visit after commissioning, stakeholders reported no complaints on dust emissions. In questionnaires they also didn't record any complaints.

**Water quality and quantity**: For waste water disposal, disposing bills of the municipality for this monitoring period are provided to DOE /D17/.

As confirmed by the Mayor of Enez during validation site visit, wastewater produced by workers during construction and operation is not released to the environment but is periodically transferred via sewage truck by Enez Municipality for proper handling with required fee.

**Soil Condition**: Excavation materials were stored in site area near to each hole drilled for base of towers for later usage for landscaping. This was verified during validation site visit as the site was already cleaned off construction waste.

**Other pollutants:** Questionnaires filled out by local stakeholders indicate that they don't have complaint on noise pollution, no disturbance is recorded /D13/. The noise levels were measured by licenced lab during validation and as there are no complaints these measurements are not repeated.

For solid waste, disposing bills of the municipality for this monitoring period are provided to DOE /D17/.

**Biodiversity:** This parameter is to be monitored via observation of any harm to the natural life. In questionnaires, stakeholders did not claim any dead birds nearby.

**Quality of employment:** Attendance sheets and certificates of trainings done in this monitoring period are provided to DOE. Trainings are for work safety and first aid /D18/.

**Livelihood of the poor:** Questionnaires filled out by local stakeholders indicate the contributions made by the PP /D13/.

Up to now, the project owner also made contributions for improved living conditions in the villages:

-The cemeteries are covered with fence to avoid wild animals enter and damage graves

-The local water fountain have been improved by pouring concrete

-Village roads are renewed by the project owner.

-Contributed to local economy by shopping from local market and renting houses

-Help municipality by giving heavy construction equipment for their use.

**Human and institutional capacity:** Donation bill for the local basketball team is presented to DOE /D19/.

**Access to affordable and clean energy services:** The project has contributed to maintain high voltage level in the region. This has caused reduced blackout and fluctuations in the region. Stakeholders approve that in the questionnaire and also claimed so during validation site visit.

**Quantitative employment and income generation:** During construction and operational period, the project has created employment opportunities for the local community. Social security records for current local employees /D15/ are provided to DOE.

**Technology transfer and technological self-reliance:** Nordex has given technical trainings to staff and certificates are provided to DOE /D18/.

Based on validation site visit observations, provided documents and questionnaires, 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. Re calibration is only required after ten years.

The accuracy class for main and spare power meters are defined as 0.5S class. The calibration will be implemented in accordance with the related standard procedures (IEC-EN 60687) by either TEIAS or the provider company in the name of TEIAS. Both power meters are ELSTER A-1500 model. The serial number for main power meter is 00395381 and the back-up power meter is 00395382. They were calibrated on 18/01/2010 /D20/.

When the main meter has a breakdown, the readings of the back-up meter will be used. If both meters failed, conservative data substitution procedures based on the internal SCADA data will be used.

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

Monthly meter readings signed between plant and TEIAS are presented to DOE for all months of the monitoring period. All data in emission reductions table are checked with monthly meter readings /D16/.

PMUM screens are used for cross check of data. There are no inconsistencies between 2 sets of documents/D16/.

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct.

DOE confirms that the methods and formulae used for calculating baseline emissions are in line with the methodology and the registered PDD /D1/.

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

## 4.9. Quality of Evidence

An annual of 32,330 tons of $CO_2e$ of emission reductions were estimated in the PDD. In reality 80,690 tons of $CO_2e$ of emission reductions are achieved (2011: 23,534 $tCO_2e$, 2012: 37,803 $tCO_2e$, 2013: 19,353 $tCO_2e$). Emission reductions are presented in excel files /D21-D22/. Calculations have been reproduced by DOE. Source data (monthly meter readings and PMUM records) are presented by PP.

## 4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There are two meters installed to monitor electricity delivered to the grid. First meter (Serial number: 00395381) is used for billing purposes. Second meter (Serial number: 00395382) is used to control the first meter.

Plant technicians can read the meters but as the meters are only sealed and unsealed by TEIAS, they are not allowed to do any changes or maintenance on the meters. Meters were seen on site visit.

When the main meter has a breakdown, the readings of the back-up meter will be used. If both meters failed, conservative data substitution procedures based on the internal SCADA data will be used.

Calculations have been reproduced by DOE. Source data (monthly meter readings and PMUM records) are presented by PP /D16/.

Each month TEIAS personnel comes to the plant and together with plant technicians, they read the meters and prepare the monthly meter readings. Other than this, plant technicians read the meters hourly. Logbooks are presented to DOE during site visit. SCADA system also stores all data related to the system. SCADA system data is also sampled during site visit. Monthly data from TEIAS are stored electronically on TEIAS website (PMUM) and this data can be accessed by login of Project Developer.

At first commissioning of the plant, meters were calibrated under supervision of TEIAS. All documents regarding meter quality and approvals/acceptance had been presented at validation /D20/.

According to the regulations, calibrations for electricity meters are done every 10 years. While there is no failure of the meter since first calibration and 10 years are not complete yet, there has been no need for calibration during first monitoring period.

## 4.11. Materiality

Verification DOE checked all data set (meter reading records from 01/05/2011-31/07/2013 /D16/) and each day of production is included in these readings. These readings are exact and are the base for billing. They are prepared by reading the meters and preparing a protocol signed at the presence of PP and government officers. There is no base for any option of material information.

## 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

A revised licence dated 26/06/2013 /D14/ is presented to DOE. Capacity will be increased from 15 MW to 20 MW with 2 additional turbines. This plan is declared in the 1st MR with revised license in the attachments. New turbines will be operational in Q3 2014 and they are not operational for this monitoring period. For next verification a revised PDD and revised additionality shall be submitted.

## 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 | Questionnaire | Ali Oner | Farmer | Hisarlı Village |
| I02 | Questionnaire | Yusuf Kartal | Religious Officer | Hisarlı Village |
| I03 | Questionnaire | Vedat Avcı | Muhtar-Farmer | Hisarlı Village |
| I04 | Questionnaire | Ahmet Tezcan | Farmer | Hisarlı Village |
| I05 | Questionnaire | Emin Nas | Former Muhtar | Hisarlı Village |
| I06 | Questionnaire | Şevket Pelvan | Forest Officer | Hisarlı Village |
| I07 | Questionnaire | Ali Osman Ozunlu | | Hisarlı Village |
| I08 | Questionnaire | Sabriye Onen | | Hisarlı Village |

[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 | PDD | 7 | 14/02/2013 |
| D02 | AMS-ID | 17 | 03/06/2011 |
| D03 | Monitoring Report | 1 | 19/08/2013 |
| D04 | Monitoring Report | 2 | 01/10/2013 |
| D05 | CDM Validation and Verification Standard | 5 | - |
| D06 | CDM Project Standard | 5 | - |
| D07 | CDM Project Cycle Procedure | 5 | - |
| D08 | Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit | 2.1 | - |
| D09 | Provisional Acceptance | - | April 2010 |
| D10 | Verification Report | 1 | October 2013 |
| D11 | UNFCCC CDM Rules and Regulations and associated documents | - | - |
| D12 | Validation Report | 3 | 21/05/2013 |
| D13 | Questionnaires by stakeholders | - | 15-16/03/2013 |
| D14 | Revised licence | - | 26/06/2013 |

| Document Number | Document Name | Version | Date (dd/mm/yyyy) |
|---|---|---|---|
| D15 | Social security records | - | - |
| D16 | Monthly meter readings and PMUM records | - | - |
| D17 | Waste and waste water disposal bills | - | 2012-2013 |
| D18 | Attendance sheets and certificates of trainings | - | 2013 |
| D19 | Donation bill for the local basketball team | - | October 2011 |
| D20 | Documents regarding meter quality and approvals/acceptance | - | 18/10/2010 |
| D21 | Gold Standard Passport | 5 | 18/05/2013 |
| D22 | Monitoring Report | 3 | 12/11/2013 |
| D23 | Monitoring Report | 4 | 24/02/2014 |
| D24 | Monitoring Report | 5 | 19/03/2014 |

## 7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Praveen PYATA, has B.Sc in Biology and Chemistry from Osmania University and M.Sc in Environmental Science and Technology from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University in India. He is a certified lead auditor for ISO 14001. He has more than eleven years of work experience, initially for six years he worked on waste-to-energy, renewable energy, livestock-agro waste management projects in India supported by UNDP/GEF, Ministry of New and Renewable Energy. Later at TUV SUD he was CDM divisional in charge for South Asia region and for 5 years he was involved in more than 50 CDM, PoA, and Gold Standard, VER projects as a team leader/technical reviewer / validator / verifier covering the sectoral scopes 1, 13 and 15. He has been working as a team leader, technical reviewer and biomass and renewable energy expert in the context of re-consult.

Fikriye Seda YÜCEL, B.Sc. in Chemical Engineering has completed her M.Sc. degree in Istanbul Technical University in Energy Science and Technology. She is an auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and auditor for ISO 14001 and has about 2 years of experience in management systems and 7 years of experience in energy management in industry. She has been involved in more than 40 CDM, GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier/trainee validator/verifier especially in the energy sector. She has been working as voluntary market projects' team leader/validator/verifier and CDM validator/verifier under observation in the context of re-consult.

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-consult.

## 7.1. Appointment Certificates

| re-consult<br>Rüzgar Enerjisi Danışmanlık İç ve Dış Tic. Ltd. Şti.<br><br>Bagi's Plaza<br>Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/14<br>TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara<br><br>Tel.: 0090-312-287 51 22<br>Fax: 0090-312-287 33 73 | Certificate of Appointment | re-consult<br>part of the Natural Power group |
|---|---|---|
| | Carbon Department | Page: 1/1 |

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

| Clean Development Mechanism | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Validator** | **Verifier** | **Team leader** | **Technical reviewer** | **Technical Expert** |
| Under observation<br>04-03-2013 | Under observation<br>04-03-2013 | N/A | N/A | 04-03-2013 |

| Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Validator** | **Verifier** | **Team leader** | **Technical reviewer** | **Technical Expert** |
| 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | N/A | 04-03-2013 |

| **Speciality** | **Regional expertise** | **Financial expertise** | **Technical area** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **1.1** | **1.2** |
| N/A | 6 and 8 | N/A | N/A | 04-03-2013 |

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

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

The validity of each appointment is 1 year from the dates indicated above. The Certificate may be updated, suspended or withdrawn at any time, subject to changes in Appointee's qualification, changes in the requirements for appointment or expiry of one of the appointments above.

| APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Anıl SOYLER | Certification Manager | 4 March 2013 | |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Date** | **Signature** |

re-consult
Rüzgar Enerjisi Danışmanlık İç ve Dış Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Bagi's Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/14
TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara

Tel.: 0090-312-287 51 22
Fax: 0090-312-287 33 73

# Certificate of Appointment

re-consult
part of the Natural Power group

Carbon Department

Page: 1/1

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

| Clean Development Mechanism | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Validator** | **Verifier** | **Team leader** | **Technical reviewer** | **Technical Expert** |
| 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 |

| Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Validator** | **Verifier** | **Team leader** | **Technical reviewer** | **Technical Expert** |
| 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 |

| **Speciality** | **Regional expertise** | **Financial expertise** | **Technical area** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **1.1** | **1.2** |
| N/A | 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 | 04-03-2013 |

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

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

The validity of each appointment is 1 year from the dates indicated above. The Certificate may be updated, suspended or withdrawn at any time, subject to changes in Appointee's qualification, changes in the requirements for appointment or expiry of one of the appointments above.

**APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY**

| Mr. Anıl SÖYLER | Certification Manager | 4 March 2013 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Name** | **Position** | **Date** | **Signature** |

F-C-691 / 14.02.2012 -00

re-consult
quality in carbon auditing

| re-consult<br>Rüzgar Enerjisi Danışmanlık İç ve Dış Tic. Ltd. Şti.<br><br>Bagi's Plaza<br>Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/14<br>TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara<br><br>Tel.: 0090-312-287 51 22<br>Fax: 0090-312-287 33 73 | **Certificate of Appointment** | re-consult part of the Natural Power group |
|---|---|---|
| | Carbon Department | Page: 1/1 |

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

| Clean Development Mechanism | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Validator** | **Verifier** | **Team leader** | **Technical reviewer** | **Technical Expert** |
| Under observation 10-09-2013 | Under observation 10-09-2013 | N/A | N/A | 10-09-2013 |

| Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Validator** | **Verifier** | **Team leader** | **Technical reviewer** | **Technical Expert** |
| 10-09-2013 | 10-09-2013 | N/A | N/A | 10-09-2013 |

| **Speciality** | **Regional expertise** | **Financial expertise** | **Technical area** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **1.1** | **1.2** |
| N/A | 6, 8 and 15 | N/A | N/A | 10-09-2013 |

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

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

The validity of each appointment is 1 year from the dates indicated above. The Certificate may be updated, suspended or withdrawn at any time, subject to changes in Appointee's qualification, changes in the requirements for appointment or expiry of one of the appointments above.

| **APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Christian JOHANNES | General Manager | 10 September 2013 | |
| **Name** | **Position** | **Date** | **Signature** |

F-I-C-091 / 14.02.2012 -00

## 8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

re-consult Ltd. has performed the 1st verification of Gold Standard "Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant" which is a project with the registry reference number "GS702" for the period from 01/05/2011 to 31/07/2013 (both days included). The scope of the activities cover the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions and sustainability measures reported in Monitoring Report Version 5 dated 19/03/2014 of "Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant".

Ceres (Ceres Cevre Muh.Dan.Ltd.Sti.) 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 and Gold Standard Passport. 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 5.

The verification has been performed by a verification team consisting of "Seda YUCEL as Team Leader, Anıl SOYLER as Verifier and Praveen PYATA 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 version 5.0, CDM Project Standard version 5.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 5.0 and GS Toolkit version 2.2.

re-consult Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity "Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant" in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 7 dated 14/02/2013 and Gold Standard Passport v5 dated 18/05/2013 /D21/. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is AMS-ID Version 17.

re-consult confirms the following based on the results of document review and on-site assessment:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project Title** | Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant |
| **Applicable Period** | 09/04/2010-31/07/2013 |
| **Baseline Emissions** | 32,330 $tCO_2e$ annual |
| **Project Emissions** | 0 $tCO_2e$ |
| **Leakage Emissions** | 0 $tCO_2e$ |
| **Emission Reductions** | 80,690 $tCO_2e$ for first crediting period<br>(2011: 23,534 $tCO_2e$, 2012: 37,803 $tCO_2e$, 2013: 19,353 $tCO_2e$) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Seda YÜCEL | Praveen PYATA | Anıl SÖYLER |
| Team Leader | ITR | Certification Manager |
| 26.03.2014 | 26.03.2014 | 26.03.2014 |

**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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please use appropriate template available at CDM website for Monitoring Report and insert SD Matrix issues where appropriate. | CAR1 | OK |
| 1.1. Title of the project activity; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Title is "15MW Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant". Please make the name same with the last approved PDD and VR. | CAR2 | OK |
| 1.2. Reference number of the project activity; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided: GS Reference No: GS 702 | OK | OK |
| 1.3. Version number of the monitoring report; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Stated as: Version .1 | OK | OK |
| 1.4. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Stated as: Date 19/08/2013 | OK | OK |
| 1.5. Registration date of the project activity (DD/MM/YYYY); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state registration date of the project activity in DD/MM/YYYY. | CAR3 | OK |
| 1.6. Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period (first and last days included (DD/MM/YYYY– DD/MM/YYYY)); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Stated as:<br><br>1st Verification of 1st Crediting Period<br><br>Monitoring Period: 09.04.2010-01.08.2013 | OK | OK |
| 1.7. Project participant(s); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state project participants on cover of MR. | CAR4 | OK |
| 1.8. Host Party(ies); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state Host Parties on cover of MR. | CAR5 | OK |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.9. Sectoral scope(s) and applied methodology(ies); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state sectoral scope(s) and applied methodology(ies)on cover of MR. | CAR6 | OK |
| 1.10. Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state estimated ER's on cover of MR. | CAR7 | OK |
| 1.11. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided on cover page. | OK | OK |
| 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; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please also state in the MR, ER's realized up to 31 December 2012 and from 1 January 2013 onwards. | CL1 | 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. | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided in MR. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided. | OK | OK |
| A.1.2. Has the purpose of the project activity | EB70 Report | DR | Purpose is explained as "The purpose of the Project is to produce | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions been provided under section A.1 of the MR? | Annex 11 | | renewable electricity using wind as the power source and to contribute to Turkey's growing electricity demand through a sustainable and low carbon technology. The project will displace the same amount of electricity generated by the grid dominated with fossil fired power plants." | | |
| A.1.3. Has a brief description of the installed technology and equipments been provided under section A.1 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | There are six Nordex N90 turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MWs.<br>The electricity is transmitted to substation Enez TM, 154 KV bara via<br>10 km transmission line. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | The project is operational since 09/04/2010. | OK | OK |
| A.1.5. Has the total emissions reductions achieved in this monitoring period been provided under section A.1 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please also provide achieved emission reductions in summary section. | CAR8 | 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 been provided under section A.2 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please provide coordinates in the MR. | CAR9 | OK |
| | | | | | |
| **A.3. Project participants** | | | | | |
| A.3.1. Has the list of the PPs been provided under section A.3 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state project participants on cover of MR. | CAR4 | OK |
| | | | | | |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A.4. Reference of applied methodology** | | | | | |
| A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology, tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied been provided under section A.5 including the version numbers and titles? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state sectoral scope(s) and applied methodology(ies)on cover of MR. | CAR6 | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please clearly state the total crediting period, too. | CAR10 | OK |
| | | | | | |
| **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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | There are six Nordex N90 turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MWs. The electricity is transmitted to substation Enez TM, 154 KV bara via 10 km transmission line. | OK | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-b | DR | The project is operational since 09/04/2010. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B.1.3. Does the project activity consist of more than one site? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-b | DR, SV | No | OK | OK |
| B.1.4. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-b | DR, SV | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.1.5. Is the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases? (Phased implementation) | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-b | DR, SV | No | OK | OK |
| B.1.6. 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? | EB EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-b | DR, SV | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.1.7. Has a brief description of the events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period, which may affect the applicability of the methodology been provided under section B.1 of the MR? | EB EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-c | DR | Please state if there are any “events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period, which may affect the applicability of the methodology”. | CL2 | OK |
| B.1.8. Has a brief description of how the issues resulting from these events or situations are being addressed been provided under section B.1 of the MR? | EB EB70 Report Annex 2 § 191-c | DR, SV | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.1.9. Do the actual project activity and its operation comply with the registered PDD and/or an approved revised PDD?? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 226 § 230 | DR, SV | Yes, wind turbines generate electricity and is fed to the grid. | OK | OK |
| B.1.10. Have the PPs implemented and | EB70 Report | DR, SV | Yes, wind turbines generate electricity and is fed to the grid. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| operated the CDM project activity as per the descriptions contained in the registered PDD? | Annex 3 § 226 | | | | |
| B.1.11. Is actual capacity and output of GHG emission reducing unit(s) or plant(s) in accordance with the registered PDD? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 226 | DR, SV | There are six Nordex N90 turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MWs. The actual capacity during monitored period was same as in PDD however the output was higher in each year as compared to that of 52,742 MWh/yr mentioned in PDD. The actual annual output in 2011 and 2012 was respectively 60,008 and 61,668 MWh, as stated in MR. | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| **B.2.** ***Post registration changes*** | | | | | |
| B.2.1. **Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology** | | | | | |
| B.2.1.1. Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 209 EB70 Report Annex 3 § 251 EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please state in MR if "any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period" | CL3 | OK |
| B.2.1.2. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology, 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 209 EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| B.2.1.3. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No deviations occurred. | 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 or applied methodology, do the description of deviations include the following? | | | | | |
| B.2.1.3.1. How it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies), | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| B.2.1.3.2. The duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| B.2.1.3.3. Justification on the conservativeness of the approach. | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| B.2.1.4. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology, 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 211 EB70 Report Annex 3 § 253 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| B.2.1.5. If there are temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology, is the deviation likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 253 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| B.2.1.6. If the deviation(s) require prior approval by the Board, do they | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No deviations occurred. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| include the date of approval and reference number? | | | | | |
| B.2.1.7. Where the changes are identified by or submitted to the re-consult to conduct the verification, are these changes solely of a type(s) listed in Appendix 1 of the Project Standard? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 252 § 226 | DR | No deviations occurred. | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 3 § 257 | DR | Please state in the MR if any “corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report”. | CL4 | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | There are no corrections . | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | There are no corrections . | OK | OK |
| B.2.2.4. Is the corrected information an | EB70 Report Annex 3 | DR | There are no corrections . | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| accurate reflection of actual project information? | § 258 | | | | |
| B.2.2.5. Are the corrected parameters in accordance with the applied methodology and/or selected monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 258 | DR | There are no corrections . | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| B.2.3. **Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology** | | | | | |
| B.2.3.1. Are there permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan and/or methodology? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 262 | DR | Please state in MR if “there are permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan and/or methodology” | CL5 | OK |
| B.2.3.2. Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No permanent changes. | OK | OK |
| B.2.3.3. Are the changes to the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD in compliance with the applied methodology? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 263 | DR | No permanent changes. | OK | OK |
| B.2.3.4. Do the changes reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 263 | DR | No permanent changes. | OK | OK |
| B.2.3.5. In cases where the proposed changes refer to a later version of | EB70 Report Annex 3 | DR | No permanent changes. | 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 applied methodology in the registered PDD, does the application of any later version of the applied methodology and tools affect the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction calculations? | § 264 | | | | |
| B.2.3.6. Are the permanent changes likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 265 | DR | No permanent changes. | OK | OK |
| B.2.3.7. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 266 | DR | No permanent changes. | OK | OK |
| B.2.3.8. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No permanent changes. | OK | OK |
| B.2.3.9. If permanent changes and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No permanent changes. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| B.2.4. **Changes to project design of registered project activity** | | | | | |
| B.2.4.1. Are there proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered project activity? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 269 | DR | Please state in MR if there are "proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered project activity" | CL6 | OK |
| B.2.4.2. Do the proposed or actual changes affect the implementation of the project activity? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 275 | DR | Capacity will be increased from 15 MW to 20 MW with 2 additional turbines. This plan is declared in the 1st MR with revised license in the attachments. New turbines will be operational in Q3 2014 and they are not operational for this monitoring period. For next verification a revised PDD and revised additionality shall be submitted. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.3. In case of actual changes, does the description of actual changes accurately reflect the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified project activity? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 271 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.4. Do the actual changes comply with the monitoring plan, the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 272 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.5. Does the revised PDD comply with the applied monitoring methodology and tools or any later version of the methodology or the requirements of another methodology that is applicable to | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 276 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | 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 project activity? | | | | | |
| B.2.4.6. Does the CDM project activity conform to the description contained in the registered PDD with respect to additionality of the project activity in terms of following issues (especially for the cases where additionality of the project activity has been proven using the investment analysis option)? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.6.1. Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221a | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.6.2. Addition of component or extension of technology has been occurred? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221b | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.6.3. Removal or addition of one (or more) site of a project activity registered with multiple-sites? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221c | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.6.4. Actual operational parameters which are within the control of project participants differing from the expected parameters? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221d | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | 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.2.4.6.5. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221e | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.7. Do the PPs report in the revised PDD the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered CDM project activity on the following: | EB70 Report Annex 2 §222 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.7.1. The applicability and application of the applied methodology under which the project activity has been registered; | EB70 Report Annex 2 §222a EB70 Report Annex 3 § 273 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.7.2. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology; | EB70 Report Annex 2 §222b EB70 Report Annex 3 § 273 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.7.3. The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity; | EB70 Report Annex 2 §222c | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.7.4. The additionality of the project activity; | EB70 Report Annex 2 §222d | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 273 | | | | |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B.2.4.7.5. The scale of the project activity. | EB70 Report Annex 2 §222e EB70 Report Annex 3 § 273 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.8. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered CDM project activity, | EB70 Report Annex 2 §221 §223 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.8.1. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §223a EB70 Report Annex 3 § 274 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.8.2. In cases where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, have PPs demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §223b EB70 Report Annex 3 § 274 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.9. If the PPs can't demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the applied methodology under which the CDM project activity has been registered, | EB70 Report Annex 2 §224 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.9.1. Has PPs revised the PDD applying the latest version of | EB70 Report Annex 2 §224 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | 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 methodology? | | | | | |
| B.2.4.9.2. Has PPs applied another methodology that is applicable to the project activity? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §224 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.9.3. If another methodology is applied to the project activity, has PPs demonstrated compliance with the requirements of the selected methodology? | EB70 Report Annex 2 §224 EB70 Report Annex 3 § 273 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.10. Is it indicated whether any 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.11. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | OK | OK |
| B.2.4.12. If the 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 | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Planned capacity increase will occur in Q3 2014 and will not effect this monitoring period. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| provided? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| B.2.5. **Changes to start date of crediting period** | | | | | |
| B.2.5.1. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 260 | DR | Start date of the crediting period is as approved in the PDD and VR. | OK | OK |
| B.2.5.2. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 260 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| **C. Description of the Monitoring System** | | | | | |
| C.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Description is provided and is in line with the approved VR. | OK | OK |
| C.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Provided. | OK | OK |
| C.2.1. Information flow including data generation | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report | DR | Hourly readings are done and noted to a log book by the personnel. At the same time, readings are automatically transferred to the website of “Market Financial Settlement Center” or PMUM. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Annex 2<br>§ 193 | | Monthly power meter readings will be basis for monitoring net electricity fed into the grid. Those readings are done by governmental officers accompanied with an observer from the project owner company at the end of each month. A report is prepared including day, peak and night hour electricity generation of the plant and signed and approved by both parties.<br><br>In addition to metering devices every single wind turbine generation will be monitored and the data will be stored through a SCADA system. | | |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C.2.2. Data aggregation | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Data is aggregated and recorded in SCADA System and PMUM. | OK | OK |
| C.2.3. Data recording | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Data is aggregated and recorded in SCADA System and PMUM. | OK | OK |
| C.2.4. Data calculation | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | The consultant will calculate emission reductions based on these monitored data and prepare monitoring report. | OK | OK |
| C.2.5. Data reporting | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Data is aggregated and recorded in SCADA System and PMUM. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Provided. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 234 | DR | As stated in the PDD and VR, the Project Owner will be responsible for the overall management of the monitoring procedures including recording, data collection and store. The consultant will calculate emission reductions based on these monitored data and prepare monitoring report. | 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.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 234 | DR | A spare meter is used for crosschecking the accuracy and both meters are calibrated if required.<br>Data measured by meters and will be crosschecked with the data uploaded to PMUM.<br><br>These measures are in line with the PDD and VR. | OK | OK |
| C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11<br>EB70 Report Annex 2 § 193 | DR | Please insert a line diagram showing monitoring points and system. | CL7 | OK |
| C.7. Have the monitoring plan and the applied methodology been properly implemented and followed by the PPs? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 229 § 233 | DR | Monitoring plan is followed. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 234 | DR | All are in line with the monitoring plan. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 234 | DR | In line with the PDD and VR, only $EG_{y,}$ net electricity exported to the grid in the year y is monitored. | OK | OK |
| C.10. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 234 | DR | Hourly readings are done and noted to a log book by the personnel.<br><br>Monthly power meter readings will be basis for monitoring net electricity fed into the grid. | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| **D. Data and Parameters** | | | | | |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D.1. **Data and parameters determined at registration and not monitored during the monitoring period, including default values and factors** | | | | | |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | $EF_{grid,CM,y}$value is fixed as 0.613t$CO_2$/MWh for the crediting period of seven years. This is the only value determined only once for the crediting period. | OK | 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 leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | $EF_{grid,CM,y}$value is fixed as 0.613t$CO_2$/MWh for the crediting period of seven years. This is the only value determined only once for the crediting period. | OK | OK |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information provided in line with the registered PDD. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information provided in line with the registered PDD. | OK | OK |
| D.1.5. In the data/parameter tables provided | EB70 Report | DR | Information provided in line with the registered PDD. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | Annex 11 | | | | |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information provided in line with the registered PDD. | 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 data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information provided in line with the registered PDD. | OK | OK |
| 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)? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Use of parameter is indicated. | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| D.2. **Data and parameters monitored** | | | | | |
| D.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 using the tabular format? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Only $EG_y$ , Net electricity exported to the grid in the year y, is monitored and is included in tabular format. | OK | OK |
| D.2.2. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please use appropriate template available at CDM website for Monitoring Report and insert SD Matrix issues where appropriate. | CAR1 | 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 has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology? | | | | | |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information is provided correctly. Unit is *MWh/yr.* | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information is provided correctly. Data is measured. | OK | OK |
| 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.)? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information is provided correctly. Source is Meter Reading Forms issued by governmental officers and signed by both parties. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information is provided correctly. Values are stated. | OK | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information is provided correctly. | 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 | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Information is provided correctly. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| parameter, including following, if applicable as per the monitoring plan? | | | | | |
| D.2.8.1. Details on accuracy class | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Accuracy class is 0.5S class. | Ok | OK |
| D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Please also indicate when the next calibration is. | CL8 | OK |
| D.2.8.3. Serial number | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Not provided. | OK | OK |
| D.2.8.4. Calibration date | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | The power meters were calibrated on 18/01/2010 before the commissioning date of the power plant. | OK | OK |
| D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Stated and validated as 10 years. | OK | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Not stated in table. | OK | OK |
| D.2.10. Is the calibration frequency for measuring equipments specified in the monitoring methodology, guidance provided by the Board or in the monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 241 | DR | According to regulations, calibration frequency is 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.11. If the calibration frequency for measuring equipments isn't specified in the monitoring methodology, guidance provided by the Board 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 242 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.12. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are | EB70 Report Annex 3 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| available, have the international standards been used? | § 242 | | | | |
| D.2.13. Is the calibration of the measuring equipments that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions conducted by the PPs at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 237 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 238 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 238 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.15.1. 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 | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 238 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | 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; or | | | | | |
| D.2.15.2. Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment. | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 238 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 239 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.16.1. The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 239 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 239 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.17. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, is there any plan to conduct the required calibration? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 240 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.18. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 240 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | OK | OK |
| D.2.19. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PPs? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 241 | DR | Calibration is valid for 10 years. | 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. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | $EF_{grid,CM,y}$value is fixed as 0.613t$CO_2$/MWh for the crediting period of seven years. This is the only value determined only once for the crediting period. It is used correctly in monitoring. | OK | OK |
| D.2.21. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what the data/parameters are used for? (baseline/project /leakage emission calculations) | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 195g | DR | Use of parameter is indicated. | OK | OK |
| D.2.22. 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 the monitoring plan? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | All data are provided. | OK | OK |
| D.2.23. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 245 | DR | Monitoring data should start from 9 April 2010. Please provide date in DD/MM/YYYY format in emission reductions table. | CAR11 | OK |
| | | | | | |
| D.3. **Implementation of sampling plan** | | | | | |
| D.3.1. If data and parameters monitored described in section D.2 of the MR are determined by a sampling approach, has the description on how PPs implemented the sampling for those data and | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB69 Report Annex 4 | DR | No sampling is used. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| parameters according to the sampling plan been provided? | | | | | |
| D.3.2. If data and parameters monitored described in section D.2 of the MR are determined by a sampling approach, has the following been included? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB69 Report Annex 4 | DR | No sampling is used. | OK | OK |
| D.3.2.1. Description of implemented sampling design; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No sampling is used. | OK | OK |
| D.3.2.2. Collected data (electronic spreadsheets may be attached and referenced); | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No sampling is used. | OK | OK |
| D.3.2.3. Analysis of the collected data; | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No sampling is used. | OK | OK |
| D.3.2.4. Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met. | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No sampling is used. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 EB70 Report Annex 3 | DR | Formula is provided: $ER_y = BE_y - (PE_y + LE_y)$<br>$ER_y = BE_y$ | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | § 245 | | The baseline emissions are the product of electrical energy baseline $EG_{BL,\ y}$ expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor:<br>$BE_y=EG_{PJ,y}*EF_{grid,CM,y}$ | | |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E.1.2. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Calculations are provided in MR. | OK | OK |
| E.1.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Please provide exactly the excel used to prepare table of ER's in the MR. | CL9 | OK |
| E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified? | EB70 Report Annex 3 §245d | DR | No assumptions used. | OK | 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) | EB70 Report Annex 3 §245e | DR | Emission factor is used correctly. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 EB70 Report Annex 3 § 245 | DR | Project emissions are taken as zero as per the methodology. | OK | OK |
| E.2.2. Has sample calculations for all | EB70 Report | DR | Project emissions are taken as zero as per the methodology. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | Annex 11<br>EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | | | | |
| E.2.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached? | EB70 Report Annex 11<br>EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Project emissions are taken as zero as per the methodology. | OK | OK |
| E.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project emission calculations been justified? | EB70 Report Annex 3<br>§ 245 | DR | Project emissions are taken as zero as per the methodology. | OK | OK |
| 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) | EB70 Report Annex 3<br>§ 245 | DR | Project emissions are taken as zero as per the methodology. | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| E.3. **Calculation of leakage** | | | | | |
| E.3.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the leakage emissions been provided under section E.3 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11<br>EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197<br>EB70 Report Annex 3 § 245 | DR | Please state in MR that leakage is also considered as 0 as per the methodology. | CL10 | OK |
| E.3.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Leakage is 0. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| emissions, applying actual values been provided under section E.3 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | | | | |
| E.3.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Yes. | OK | OK |
| E.3.4. Have any assumptions used in leakage emission calculations been justified? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 245 | DR | Leakage is 0. | OK | OK |
| E.3.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the leakage emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values) | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 245 | DR | Leakage is 0. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | There is error in electricity generation data for January 2011. Please correct ER's where relevant and provide corrected excel. | CAR12 | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Project emissions is considered as zero as per the methodology. | 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.4.3. Has the total leakage emissions during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Leakage is considered as zero as per the methodology. | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Provided. | OK | OK |
| E.4.5. Are there any material information detected? | EB69 Report Annex 6 §8 §15 §19 | DR | There is no error in data. | OK | OK |
| E.4.6. 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? | EB69 Report Annex 6 §10 §12 §15 §17 | DR | There is no overestimation. All electricity generation data is verified with government records, PMUM. | OK | OK |
| E.4.6.1. 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 year? | EB69 Report Annex 6 §10 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| E.4.6.2. 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 | EB69 Report Annex 6 §10 | 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.4.6.3. 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? | EB69 Report Annex 6 §10 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| E.4.6.4. 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the microscale project activities? | EB69 Report Annex 6 §10 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| E.4.6.5. 5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for small-scale project activities other than project activities covered under E.4.6.4 above? | EB69 Report Annex 6 §10 | 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | DR | Please provide comparison on “actual values of the GHG emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the PDD”. | CL11 | OK |
| 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 | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 197 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 EB70 Report Annex 2 § 199 | DR | Expected electricity generation was 52,742 MWh according to the micrositing report. Real values recorded are 34,985.9 MWh for 2010, 60,008.28 MWh for 2011, 61,668.61 MWh for 2012 and 31,570.96 MWh for 2013. The estimated annual electricity generation in PDD is the average annual electricity generation for 20 years, which is the economic life of wind turbines. This value of 52,742 MWh, equals to the capacity factor for P90 from Micrositing Report. The early years of generation are generally higher than the average as the equipment is new. By the time the turbines are worn out, the annual generation generally decrease below the average.<br>For 2010, 34,985.9 MWh is slightly lower than expected. The electricity generation is higher in spring and autumn seasons; during January to May and September to December. The power production missing for January and March decreased the average expected monthly amount.<br>The second and third years of operation (2011 and 2012) have generated 60,008.3 MWh and 61,668.6 MWh electricity, respectively. As stated above, the performance of equipment would be higher in early years of production and will decrease later on the following years.<br>The fourth year of operation, 2013, the total generation was 31,571 MWh for 7 months, which is slightly higher than the expected average of 7 months 30,766 MWh. This is again due to the performance of the new equipment.<br>Differences are small enough to be considered as a deviation from | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | estimated data. | | |

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

| Question | Reference | Means of verification* | Findings, comments, references and document sources | Draft opinion | Final opinion |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| 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** | | | | | |
| E.7.1. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, has actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved for the following two periods been provided under section E.7 of MR? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided correctly. | OK | OK |
| E.7.1.1. Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); and | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided correctly. | OK | OK |
| E.7.1.2. From 1 January 2013 onwards | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | Provided correctly. | OK | OK |
| E.7.2. 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? | EB70 Report Annex 11 | DR | No caps for Turkey. | OK | 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 | EB70 Report Annex 3 | DR | No FARs were raised in validation. | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| activities? | § 27 § 213 § 220 § 223 | | | | |
| 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? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 27 § 213 § 220 § 223 | DR | No FARs were raised in validation. | OK | OK |
| F.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved? | EB70 Report Annex 3 § 27 § 213 § 220 § 223 | DR | No FARs were raised in validation. | 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 | No | 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 | Please state in MR if any comments/requests are raised by stakeholders after validation site visit and verification. | CL12 | OK |
| 4. If there are any grievances raised by the local stakeholders, has the PPs responded clearly to these comments? | T 4.5 | DR | For verification, interviews are carried out with local residents. Their comments are used to verify SD Indicators. | OK | OK |
| 5. | | DR | Please provide training certificates that are held during first monitoring period to employees of the operational stage. | CL13 | OK |
| 6. | | DR | Please provide Social Security Records for employees | CL14 | OK |
| 7. | | DR | Please provide local stakeholder interview forms as Annex to MR and please explain shortly in MR text, the documents provided and how they satisfy the SD Matrix Indicator requirements. | CL15 | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| CAR1<br>Please use appropriate template available at CDM website for Monitoring Report and insert SD Matrix issues where appropriate. | T1<br>1.1 | Response 1<br>The template for monitoring report has been implemented for the project file.<br>Response 2<br>The section D.2 has been revised and more information regarding measuring has been added to section D.3. | Review 1<br>The template is revised. For section D2 please fill in more details in the MR.<br>Request is not closed.<br>Review 2<br>Format is applied correctly.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR2<br>Title is "15MW Boreas-1 Enez Wind Power Plant". Please make the name same with the last approved PDD and VR. | T1<br>1.1 | Response 1<br>The title is revised. | Review 1<br>The title is revised.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR3<br>Please state registration date of the project activity in DD/MM/YYYY. | T1<br>1.5 | Response 1<br>The registration date is stated on the cover page of the report. | Review 1<br>The registration date is stated on the cover page of the report.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR4<br>Please state project participants on cover of MR. | T1<br>1.7 | Response 1<br>Project participant is Boreas Enerji Üretim Sistemleri Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş., stated on the cover page. | Review 1<br>Project participant is Boreas Enerji Üretim Sistemleri Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş., stated on the cover page.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR5<br>Please state Host Parties on cover of MR. | T1<br>1.8 | Response 1<br>Host party is Turkey, stated on the cover page. | Review 1<br>Host party is Turkey, stated on the cover page. |

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Request is closed. |
| CAR6<br>Please state sectoral scope(s) and applied methodology(ies)on cover of MR. | T1<br>1.9 | Response 1<br>Sectoral scope is Type (i). Renewable Energy Projects, Category I.D.: "Grid Connected Renewable Electricity Generation" and the methodology is AMS-1.D version 17.0, stated on the cover page. | Review 1<br>Scope and methodology are stated on cover page.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR7<br>Please state estimated ER's on cover of MR. | T1<br>1.10 | Response 1<br>Estimated ERs for this period is 107,717 tons $CO_2$eq stated on the cover page.<br>Response 2<br>The ER volume is estimated on a monthly bases (32,330/12=2,694). For April 2010, full month capacity is assumed. The total estimated volume<br>add up to 107,767 VERs. Revised in the report and added to the excel sheet. | Review 1<br>Estimated ERs for this period is 107,717 tons $CO_2$eq stated on the cover page. Please update ER's excel file to include determination of this number also.<br>Request is not closed.<br>Review 2<br>Estimated ER's are added.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR8<br>Please also provide achieved emission reductions in summary section. | T1<br>A.1.5 | Response 1<br>Achieved emission reductions are 115,387 tons $CO_2$ eq, stated on the cover page. | Review 1<br>Achieved emission reductions are 115,387 tons $CO_2$ eq, stated on the cover page. Calculation and electricity production data documents (monthly power meter readings) are provided to DOE.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR9<br>Please provide coordinates in the MR. | T1<br>A.2.1 | Response 1<br>Turbine coordinates are provided in section A.2. | Review 1<br>Coordinates are provided. |

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Location of project activity. | Request is closed. |
| CAR10<br>Please clearly state the total crediting period, too. | T1<br>A.5.1 | Response 1<br>The total crediting period is 7 years, as stated in section A.5. Crediting period of project activity. | Review 1<br>Total crediting period is provided.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR11<br>Monitoring data should start from 9 April 2010. Please provide date in DD/MM/YYYY format in emission reductions table. | T1<br>D.2.23 | Response 1<br>The emission reductions for April 2010 comprises dates 9-30 April 2010, stated in the table under section D.3. Implementation of sampling plan. | Review 1<br>Dates are correctly stated.<br>Request is closed. |
| CAR12<br>There is error in electricity generation data for January 2011. Please correct ER's where relevant and provide corrected excel. | T1<br>E.4.1 | Response 1<br>The electricity generation data is corrected as 3,832,880 kWh. The total amount of emission reductions for 2011 and grand total or all years are corrected as well. | Review 1<br>Electricity production data is corrected.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL1<br>Please also state in the MR, ER's realized up to 31 December 2012 and from 1 January 2013 onwards. | T1<br>1.12 | Response 1<br>ERs realized up 31 December 2012 and from 1 January 2013 onwards are stated in section E.7. | Review 1<br>Stated correctly in section e7.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL2<br>Please state if there are any "events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period, which may affect the applicability of the methodology". | T1<br>B.1.7 | Response 1<br>No events or situation have been occurred, which may affect applicability of the methodology. The project has been implemented as described in the PDD. | Review 1<br>Clarification provided.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL3<br>Please state in MR if "any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period" | T1<br>B.2.1.1 | Response 1<br>No deviations has been applied during this monitoring period. | Review 1<br>Clarification provided.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL4<br>Please state in the MR if any "corrections to project | T1<br>B.2.2.1 | Response 1<br>No corrections are applied for this monitoring period. | Review 1<br>Clarification provided. No corrections are |

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report". | | | applied for this monitoring period.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL5<br>Please state in MR if "there are permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan and/or methodology" | T1<br>B.2.3.1 | Response 1<br>No changes has been applied to the registered monitoring plan. | Review 1<br>Clarification provided. No changes have been applied to the registered monitoring plan.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL6<br>Please state in MR if there are "proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered project activity" | T1<br>B.2.4.1 | Response 1<br>The generation license of the project has been revised in terms of installed capacity which is raised to 20 MW. New turbines are planned to be added to the project, which will be operational in Q3 2014. Please see section B.2.4. Changes to project design of registered project activity in the monitoring report and attached generation license. | Review 1<br>Boreas is validated for 15 MW. Revised license is for 2 more turbines (20 MW). According to GS, Boreas is still small scale. Change is explained in MR. Capacity increase is not affecting data on this monitoring period.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL7<br>Please insert a line diagram showing monitoring points and system. | T1<br>C.6 | Response 1<br>Line diagram showing meters and system is attached | Review 1<br>Line diagram is provided as additional document.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL8<br>Please also indicate when the next calibration is. | T1<br>D.2.8.2 | Response 1<br>The first calibration was done on 18/01/2010 just before the commissioning of the power plant. Please see the attached report.<br>The periodical maintenance is fixed by 10 years in | Review 1<br>Calibration details are provided in MR.<br>Request is 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | accordance with Article.9 of Measure and Metering Devices Regulation2 and the next calibration will be in 2020. | |
| CL9<br>Please provide exactly the excel used to prepare table of ER's in the MR. | T1<br>E.1.3 | Response 1<br>The excel "Boreas_VER" provided.<br>Response2<br>The text has been revised according to the table in excel file. | Review 1<br>Excel file is provided. In section D3 of MR, please check numbers **in the text and also the table** for consistency.<br>Request is not closed.<br>Review 2<br>Corrected.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL10<br>Please state in MR that leakage is also considered as 0 as per the methodology. | T1<br>E.3.1 | Response 1<br>Leakage is taken as zero as stated in section E.3. | Review 1<br>Leakage is taken as zero as stated in section E.3.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL11<br>Please provide comparison on "actual values of the GHG emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the PDD". | T1<br>E.5.1 | Response 1<br>The actual value of ERs is higher than estimated. The difference is explained in section E.6. | Review 1<br>Expected electricity generation was 52,742 MWh according to the micrositing report. Real values recorded are 34,985.9 MWh for 2010, 60,008.28 MWh for 2011, 61,668.61 MWh for 2012 and 31,570.96 MWh for 2013. The estimated annual electricity generation in PDD is the average annual |

[2] http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/21179.html

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | electricity generation for 20 years, which is the economic life of wind turbines. This value of 52,742 MWh, equals to the capacity factor for P90 from Micrositing Report. The early years of generation are generally higher than the average as the equipment is new. By the time the turbines are worn out, the annual generation generally decrease below the average.<br>For 2010, 34,985.9 MWh is slightly lower than expected. The electricity generation is higher in spring and autumn seasons; during January to May and September to December. The power production missing for January and March decreased the average expected monthly amount.<br>The second and third years of operation (2011 and 2012) have generated 60,008.3 MWh and 61,668.6 MWh electricity, respectively. As stated above, the performance of equipment would be higher in early years of production and will decrease later on the following years.<br>The fourth year of operation, 2013, the total generation was 31,571 MWh for 7 months, which is slightly higher than the expected average of 7 months 30,766 MWh. This is again due to the performance of the new equipment.<br>Differences are small enough to be |

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | considered as a deviation from estimated data.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL12<br>Please state in MR if any comments/requests are raised by stakeholders during monitoring period? | T2<br>3 | Response 1<br>No comments or request were raised after validation site visit and implementation of the project. | Review 1<br>No comments or request were raised during monitoring period.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL13<br>Please provide training certificates that are held during first monitoring period to employees of the operational stage. | T2<br>5 | Response 1<br>The trainings of all personnel have been listed in an excel file Please see attached.<br>All certificates are attached. Some of them have to be renewed in 2013.<br>1. EKAT certificate for working in high voltage areas is renewed in every 5 years by TEDAS (Turkish Electricity Distribution Company)[3]. Three technicians are working in high voltage areas, Please see their certificates and the formal letter for renewal for two personnel from training center.<br>2. One of the personnel will take training on September for his renewal of the certificate.<br>3. Theoretical and practical safety instructions | Review 1<br>Renewed training certificates are provided.<br>Request is closed. |

[3] http://performans.tedas.gov.tr/index.php/component/content/article/12-eitim-belgeleri/25-ekat

* 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 First Aid certificate are renewed for Nordex personnel.<br>4. Health and Safety training has been renewed for all personnel in 2013. | |
| CL14<br>Please provide Social Security Records for employees | T2<br>6 | Response 1<br>The social security records are attached for: 1)Boreas personnel,2) Nordex personnel and 3) Security Guards | Review 1<br>Social security records for all employees are provided.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL15<br>Please provide local stakeholder interview forms as Annex to MR and please explain shortly in MR text, the documents provided and how they satisfy the SD Matrix Indicator requirements. | T2<br>7 | Response 1<br>The interview questions are explained in section D.3. Implementation of the sampling plan. The interview forms are added as Annex.1. | Review 1<br>Original forms are provided. Questions are provided in English and results are summarized. There are no complaints from local stakeholders.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL16<br>In section C of MR, pleased insert a line diagram showing monitoring points and system. | | Response1<br>The line diagram showing main meter and back-up meter has been added as Annex.2 to the MR. | Review 1<br>Inserted.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL17<br>Please compare in MR the estimated and actual electricity production data and explain why it is higher than expected.<br>Justify the difference as acceptable by referring to the PDD, Validation report and/or micro-siting report/PLF at validation etc. | | Response 1<br>The difference actual electricity generation and estimated one is explained in section E.6 of the MR with refer to the validated PDD. | Review 1<br>Section E.6 of the MR now gives detailed explanation.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL18<br>Please provide information on quality control within the | | Response 1<br>For monitoring electricity generation data, the quality | Review 1<br>Explanations are clearer now. |

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| team and in the verification process | | measures mentioned in B.7.3. Other elements of monitoring plan of the PDD, page 42 for the team.<br>SD matrix indicators which have been followed by formal letter and records have been documented by the power plant staff on site and checked by the consultant.<br>Other indicators which have been followed by interviewing with local residents have also been documented by the project team on site and the consultant. The contact details of the participated villagers have been stated on the interview forms so that quality cross-check for the answers could be done. Answers acquired from on-site interviews have been re-checked by the consultant. A number of attendees to the stakeholder randomly selected and interviewed on phone. Sabriye Özünlü and Ali Osman Özünlü have been interviewed by the consultant for the cross checking of answers. | Request is closed. |
| CL19<br>In each place where "115,387 $tCO_2e$" is stated in MR, please report reductions separately per year. | | Response 1<br>Reductions per year have been added in places where the total reduction has been mentioned. | Review 1<br>Done.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL20<br>Referring to MR section A.1- usage of the word "will" do not represtent correct tensefor a project already under operation as on date of the MR (i.e. 01/10/2013). Please revise. | | Response 1<br>Section A.1 has been revised. | Review 1<br>Done.<br>Request is closed. |
| CL21<br>In the table under section C of MR refer to text included | | Response 1<br>The indicator has been revised. | Review 1<br>Indicator is correct. |

* 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| under "period" against "Quality of Employment"- Please revise the text in line with the GS passport. The same parameter in D.1 below is said to be monitored "Once for each year of operation". | | | Request is closed. |
| FAR1<br>A site visit is not conducted in 1st verification because according to Toolkit 4.6 "Under The Gold Standard a site-visit is mandatory in one of the first two years after the start of the crediting period". A verification site visit must be conducted in 2nd verification so that capacity increase and physical site can be verified. | | Response 1<br>As per the Gold Standard rules, the first verification of small scale projects could be done by the same DOE validated the project. GS Toolkit, 4.2 Select DOE or AIE for the verification page 72 states: *Small---scale and micro---scale projects can make use of the same DOE or AIE for validation and verification.*<br><br>The site visit will be conducted for the second verification. | |

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