VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.

Çamlıca II HEPP

IN

Turkey

MONITORING PERIOD: 1st Monitoring Period
From 01/01/2015 to 28/02/2017 (both days included)

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd. Carbon Department		
Project Title:	Camlica II HEPP		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current MR Version:**
438	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.		06
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
20/06/2017	11/12/2017	02	56
Verification Number:	**Registration Number:**	**Monitoring Period:**	
01	GS1173	From: 01/01/2015	To: 28/02/2017

Summary:

Host Country: Turkey

Project is Reviewed Against:

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

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

Methodology: ACM0002 **Version:** 13.0

Verified Emissions Reductions: 78,606 tCO_2e

(2015: 45,718 tCO_2e; 2016: 31,614 tCO_2e; 01/01/2017 to 28/02/2017: 1,274 tCO_2e)

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

Project Participants: Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş., GTE Carbon Inc.

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings:

During the verification 19 Corrective Action Requests, 02 Clarification Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. There hasn't been any Forward Action Request issued during the verification.

In summary, it is Re Carbon's opinion that the project activity "Camlica II HEPP" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 09 dated 08/07/2015 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 08/07/2015. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version 06 dated 07/12/2017 are fairly stated.

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

Abbreviations

CAR : Corrective Action Request
CDM : Clean Development Mechanism
CEF : Carbon Emission Factor
CER : Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL : Clarification request
CO_2 : Carbon dioxide
CO_2e : Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA : Designated National Authority
DOE : Designated Operational Entity
DR : Document Review
EF : Emission Factor
ER : Emission Reductions
ERPA : Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
FAR : Forward Action Request
GHG : Greenhouse gas(es)
GS : Gold Standard
GWP : Global Warming Potential
I : Interview
IPCC : Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
kWh : Kilo Watt Hour
MP : Monitoring Plan
MoV : Means of Verification
MW : Mega Watt
MWh : Mega Watt Hour
NGO : Non-governmental Organisation
ODA : Official Development Assistance
PDD : Project Design Document
PP : Project Participant(s)
tCO_2e : Tonnes of CO_2 equivalents
UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the first periodic verification of the “Camlica II HEPP” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS1173” for the period between 01/01/2015 and 28/02/2017. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report Version 06 dated 07/12/2017 of “Camlica II HEPP”.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Camlica II HEPP” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 09 dated 08/07/2015 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 08/07/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is ACM0002 Version 13.0.

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

The implementation of the project has resulted in 78,606 tCO_2e during the monitoring period 01/01/2015 up to 28/02/2017.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by "Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş." to perform the first periodic verification of the "Camlica II HEPP" with the contract dated 13/04/2017. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated "07/12/2017" conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan of the registered PDD and the approved methodology
- if the project activity conforms with the monitoring report and the registered PDD, and
- if the data reported in the monitoring report are complete and transparent.

2.2. Scope

The scope of the verification is the independent and objective review of the monitored GHG reductions. The verification activity is based on the validated and registered PDD, version 09 dated 08/07/2015 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 08/07/2015.

The project activity and the monitoring report are assessed against the requirements of the Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, CDM Modalities and Procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes to this decision, "ACM0002 version 13.0", subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other related rules, according to the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities, version 1.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 1.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 1.0, Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit version 2.2 and other relevant GS requirements.

The only purpose of the verification and certification is its usage during the issuance process as part of the GS project cycle. Therefore, Re Carbon 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

Derin Enerji Üretim San. Ve Tic. A.Ş., has installed and commissioned a 17.58 MW run-of-river hydropower plant on river Zamanti with 3 Francis turbines, each having a capacity of 5.86 MW located near Çamlıca Village in Yahyalı District, Central Anatolia, Kayseri province, Turkey (hereafter referred as "Çamlıca II HEPP"). Çamlıca II HEPP utilizes the tail water from Çamlıca I Regulator and HEPP.

The crediting period start date of the project has been changed 02/05/2014 to 01/01/2015. Although the provisional acceptance of the project was on 02/05/2014, the missing works delayed the commissioning towards end 2014, however with insignificant generation. Therefore, the crediting period start date has been taken as 01/01/2015 with renewable crediting period.

2.4. Parties Involved

Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş. and GTE CARBON are the project participants and host country is Turkey.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the 1st verification period from 01/01/2015 to 28/02/2017 (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, version 09 dated 08/07/2015 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 08/07/2015.
- A site visit was conducted on 09/06/2017 to assess that all physical features of the project activity proposed in the registered PDD are in place and that the project participants has operated the project activity as per the registered PDD.
- Assessment of the compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology ACM0002.
- Assessment of the compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions
- Issuance of the verification report
- Independent technical review
- Approval of the verification report and request of issuance

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

The Verification Protocol consists of three tables:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the verification team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience required amongst team members for the verification of the emission reductions achieved by the project activity in the relevant monitoring period for this verification. The relevant GS verification and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The verification team and ITR are assigned to this verification activity on 01/03/2017 taking all the above factors into consideration and as a result of the contract review process.

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

Table 3-4: Verification team and ITR details

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

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

A : Administrative
DR : Desk Review
SV : Site Visit
R : Reporting
ITR : Independent Technical Review

3.2. Desk Review of Documents

The basis for the verification activity is the monitoring report version 01, dated 01/06/2017 which was submitted to the verification team on 05/06/2017. This monitoring report was revised several times due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 06 dated 07/12/2017 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 09 dated 08/07/2015 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 08/07/2015, the methodology ACM0002, version 13.0, the relevant CDM rules and regulations, CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 1.0, Gold Standard Toolkit version 2.2 and final validation report of RINA, version 1.4Aa, dated 20/04/2015.

The following actions were involved in the desk review:

- A review of the data and information presented to verify their completeness
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions

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

3.3. On-Site Visits

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

Table 3-5: Site visit details

Date	09/06/2017	
Location	Yahyalı / Kayseri	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
Mustafa KAYA	Makro Güvenlik Ltd.	Security Staff
İsmet TAŞYÜREK	Eltemtek Ltd.	Operation Technician
İlyas KAHVECİ	Çamlıca Village	Villager
Duran GEDİZ	Çamlıca Village	Villager
Mikail KAHVECİ	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Security Staff
Fethi AKGÜNDÜZ	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Operation Chief
Murat MÜFTÜOĞLU	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	Operation Manager
Cansu PERDELİ	GTE Carbon Ltd.	Consultant
Mustafa ÇETİN	Yahyalı Village	Villager

Points Verified	Source of Information
Implementation and operation of the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD	Interviews
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Interviews
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD	Interviews
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	Interviews
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Interviews
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Interviews
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Interviews

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol

During the verification period, a Verification Protocol which is attached in Annex 1 to this verification report was used to submit the findings to the project participants. In line with the CDM Validation and Verification Standard the team reports the non-conformities in the forms of Corrective Action Requests (CARs), Clarification Requests (CLs) and Forward Action Requests (FARs). When and for which type of non-conformities CARs, CLs and FARs are issued are explained below:

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

According to these principles total of 19 CARs and 02 CLs were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol. There hasn't been any Forward Action Request issued during the verification.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

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

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

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

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

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

Table 3-6: Timeline of verification activities

Activity	Date
Desk review started	05/06/2017
On site assessment	09/06/2017
1st Protocol submission to client	21/06/2017
Responses received	14/07/2017
2nd Protocol submission to client	20/07/2017
Responses received	28/07/2017
2nd Protocol submission to client	31/07/2017
Responses received	31/07/2017
3rd Protocol submission to client	01/08/2017
Responses received	12/09/2017
Closure of all CARs and CLs	14/09/2017
Submission for Technical Review	14/09/2017
Submission for final approval	15/09/2017
Final documents submitted to client	15/09/2017
GS review response revisions	10/12/2017

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

3.7. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report and its annexes have to undergo an internal quality control by the Re Carbon. 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 Gold Standard Organization 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

No FAR has been presented in the validation report or raised by GS during the 8-week registration review period,

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

The project is fully implemented according to the description presented in the registered PDD. During on-site visit, a 17.58 MW run-of-river hydropower plant with 3 Francis turbines, each having a capacity of 5.86 MW each were seen at the Çamlıca II HEPP. The verifier confirms, through the visual inspection that all physical features of the project activity including data collecting systems and storage have been implemented in accordance with the registered PDD. Electric meters were also seen on-site. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed on-site.

According to the registered PDD, the estimated annual emission reduction is 49,436 tCO_2e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is corresponding to 26 months. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period (78,606 tCO_2e) is less than the estimated emission reduction amount (107,111 tCO_2e), and is attributed to seasonal variations.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, ACM0002, Version 13.0, applied by the project activity.

In line with the methodology, the information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity, capacity of the project and area of reservoir.

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

The net electricity is measured continuously by a main meter at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There is also a cross-check control meter. The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. The serial numbers are 4241381 for the main meter and 4241382 for the control meter respectively. The accuracy class of the meters is 0.5s. The electricity meters have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner. The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPİAŞ (the financial settlement centre of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by TEIAS. All readings and billings are done via EPİAŞ system which is the legal database of the ministry.

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

The capacity of the project as verified during on-site and through the electricity generation licence is 17.58 MWe and as per the reservoir map, the area of the reservoir measured in the surface of the water is 10091.016 m^2 after the implementation of the project activity, when the reservoir is full, corresponding to maximum area.

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring

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

- Air quality
- Biodiversity
- Quality of employment
- Balance of payments and investment
- Water Quality and Quantity
- Quantitative employment and income generation
- Soil condition
- Other Pollutants

As there are no missing parameters, monitoring is complete.

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring

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

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

Table 4-1: Sustainability monitoring parameters

No.	Indicator	Chosen parameter	Way of monitoring (When)	Compliance check
1	Air quality	Reduction in amount of SO2 emissions Reduction in amount of NOx emissions	Annually based on net annual electricity generation and ex-ante fixed respective emission factor	The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records and the emission intensities of SO_2 and NO_x emissions due to electricity generation are taken as: 2.71 kg/MWh and 1.15 kg/ MWh respectively, as fixed ex-ante in the Passport. The calculations have been correctly performed presenting the SO_2 and NO_x emission reductions corresponding to the monitoring period as 385.9 tSO_2 and 163.9 tNO_x.
2	Biodiversity	Number of effected	Once after the project is completed	No species has been affected by the project, as confirmed from the Fish passage expert report and the

No.	Indicator	Chosen parameter	Way of monitoring (When)	Compliance check
		species	based on assessment / opinion of an independent expert	ecosystem assessment report.
3	Quality of employment	Number of certificates issued/trainings provided	Annual check of the training records	All employees have been trained for the operation of the plant during the first monitoring period, as confirmed through the training records and certificates dated as 06/02/2015, 04-06/03/2015 and 13/01/2017 and interviews conducted during on-site visit. Further, 3 staff members are holders of high voltage working permit certificate in high current facilities.
4	Balance of payments and investment	Currency saving due to avoided fuel import	Annually based on electricity generated by the project and natural gas that would be used to produce the same amount of electricity by a thermal power plant	The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records and the NG savings and monetary saving factors are taken as: 22.8 bn m^3 NG use for 103.916 GWh electricity generation as indicated in the Passport, NG price of 0.04862152 TRY/Sm^3 prevalent then and TRY/EUR exchange as average for the monitoring period as 3.179 thereby corresponding to a saving of € 5,085,629.
5	Water Quality and Quantity	Amount of water released	Continuous monitoring and recording of flow by the gauging device	The water flow monitored and recorded by the Regional Directorate of State Hydraulic Works (DSI) has been checked to confirm that the minimum quantity of water released is met. The flow regime of the channel is operating according to water usage agreement with DSI; and minimum amount of water to maintain for aquatic life in riverbeds has been checked by the ecosystem assessment report and minimum flow values documents submitted by

No.	Indicator	Chosen parameter	Way of monitoring (When)	Compliance check
				the PP.
6	Quantitative employment and income generation	Payment made to the staff	Annual check of the pay checks and other employment documents	There are 12 employees within the context of the project activity. This has been confirmed during on-site visit and through the social security records of the employees.
7	Soil Condition	Storage of excavation	Once after construction works are complete, through site visits, pictures taken on site	Excavation aggregates have been appropriately used for landscaping as observed during the on-site visit.
8	Soil Condition	Afforestation	Once after construction works are complete, through site visits, pictures taken on site	Around 250 trees have been planted and landscaping is restored as observed during the on-site visit and the photos provided to DOE.
9	Other Pollutants	Noise and dust pollution	Once after construction works are complete, through site visits, pictures taken on site or interviews with locals	Based on the site visit interviews with the local stakeholders, the DOE confirms that no grievance regarding noise or dust has been received.
10		Solid waste and waste oil treatment	Annual check based on service receipts or operation logs	Based on the site visit findings, the DOE confirms that there is a septic tank for waste water on site. The wastewater transfer receipt dated as 06/04/2015 has been provided to DOE. Besides that, there is a separate waste storage area which is in compliance with the legal requirements. However, there is no hazardous waste transfer record provided to DOE since there hasn't been any transfer in the monitoring

No.	Indicator	Chosen parameter	Way of monitoring (When)	Compliance check
				period.

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

4.7. Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments

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

All documents regarding meter quality and approvals/acceptance have been presented for the third verification.

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

4.8. Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions

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

Table 4-2: Net electricity generation

Period	Amount	Compliance check
01/01/2015 – 31/12/2015	Export to Grid: 82,840.267 MWh Import from Grid: 17.571 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 82,822.696 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2016 – 31/12/2016	Export to Grid: 57,314.662 MWh Import from Grid: 41.287 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 57,273.375 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2017 – 28/02/2017	Export to Grid: 2,337.731 MWh Import from Grid: 28.123 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 2,309.608 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.552 tCO_2/MWh. The value is same as fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD.

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

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

4.9. Quality of Evidence

According to the PDD the estimated emission reduction for this monitoring period would be 107,111 tCO_2e. However, the project in operation totally reached 78,606 tCO_2e in this period. The vintage break-up of the emission reductions during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-3 below:

Table 4-3: Emission reduction

Period	Emission reductions (tCO_2e)
01/01/2015 – 31/12/2015	45,718
01/01/2016 – 31/12/2016	31,614
01/01/2017 – 28/02/2017	1,274

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

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

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

4.11. Materiality

Verification DOE checked all data set (EPİAŞ records from 01/01/2015 - 28/02/2017) and each day of production is included in these readings. These readings are exact and are the basis for billing. They are recorded and saved automatically by government authority. There is no base for any option of material information.

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

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

N/A.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

The crediting period start date of the project has been changed 02/05/2014 to 01/01/2015. Although, the provisional acceptance of the project was on 02/05/2014, the missing works delayed the commissioning towards end 2014, however with insignificant generation. Therefore, the crediting period start date has been taken as 01/01/2015 with renewable crediting period. This has been verified from the information provided by registered PDD, Validation Report, provisional acceptance and generation records.

4.13.4. Permanent changes

N/A.

4.13.5. Changes to the project design

N/A

5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

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

Table 5-1: List of persons interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview[1]	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Mustafa KAYA	Security Staff	Makro Güvenlik Ltd.
I02	SV	İsmet TAŞYÜREK	Operation Technician	Eltemtek Ltd.
I03	SV	İlyas KAHVECİ	Villager	Çamlıca Village
I04	SV	Duran GEDİZ	Villager	Çamlıca Village
I05	SV	Mikail KAHVECİ	Security Staff	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.
I06	SV	Fethi AKGÜNDÜZ	Operation Chief	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.
I07	SV	Murat MÜFTÜOĞLU	Operation Manager	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş.
I08	SV	Cansu PERDELİ	Consultant	GTE Carbon Ltd.
I09	SV	Mustafa ÇETİN	Villager	Yahyalı 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 'Camlica II HEPP'	09	08/07/2015
D02	GS-Passport 'Camlica II HEPP'	07	08/07/2015
D03	ACM0002	13.0	11/05/2012
D04	Verification Service Agreement	-	13/04/2017
D05	Monitoring Report	01	01/06/2017
D06	CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities	1.0	03/03/2017
D07	CDM Project Standard for project activities	1.0	03/03/2017
D08	CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities	1.0	03/03/2017
D09	Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit	2.2	-
D10	Final validation report of RINA	1.4Aa	20/04/2015
D11	GS Final Registration Review Document	-	14/07/2015
D12	Ecosystem Assessment Report	-	03/2013
D13	Emission Reduction Calculations	01	23/05/2017
D14	Hydrogeology and Hydrobiology Report	-	09/2015
D15	Life Water Line Records by State Hydraulic Works	-	2015-2016
D16	Meter Test Protocol	-	03/05/2014
D17	TEİAS Meter Reading Records	-	2015 (January-December) 2016 (January-December) 2017 (January-February)
D18	PMUM Records	-	2015 (January-December) 2016 (January-December) 2017 (January-February)
D19	Fish Passage Design Expert Report	-	12/08/2012
D20	Electricity Generation Licence	-	

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D21	Announcement to Local About Contact Person (In case of any complaints)	-	07/01/2014
D22	Social Security Records of PP	-	-
D23	Training Certificates of PP Site Staff	-	06/02/2015 04-06/03/2015 13/01/2017
D26	Wastewater Records	-	06/04/2015
D27	Photos of Waste Temporarily Storage Area	-	09/06/2017
D28	Monitoring Report	02	04/08/2017
D29	Monitoring Report	03	12/09/2017
D30	Monitoring Report	04	12/09/2017
D31	Monitoring Report	06	07/12/2017

7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

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

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

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

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

7.1. Appointment Certificates

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

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

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

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

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

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

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

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

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personne's work agreement is terminated and there is no defined validity period for this Certificate.
However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

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

F.C.053 / 05.05.2017 - 00

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. Bagi's Plaza Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/11 TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122 Fax: 0090-312-287 3373	Certificate of Appointment	re-carbon
	Carbon Division	Page: 1/1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RC 053/03/05.2017 00

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. Bagi's Plaza Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/11 TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122 Fax: 0090-312-287 3373	Certificate of Appointment	re-carbon
	Carbon Division	Page: 1/1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F-C-399 / 05.05.2017 - 00

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

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F-C-033 / 03.05.2017 - 00

8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the 1st periodic verification of Gold Standard “Camlica II HEPP” which is a project with the registry reference number “GS1173” for the period between 01/01/2015 and 28/02/2017. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report Version 06 dated 07/12/2017 of “Camlica II HEPP”.

GTE CARBON 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 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 06.

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

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Camlica II HEPP” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 09 dated 08/07/2015 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 08/07/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is ACM0002 Version 13.0.

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

Project Title	Camlica II HEPP
Applicable Period	1st Monitoring Period (01/01/2015 to 28/02/2017 both days included)
Baseline Emissions	78,606 tCO_2e (2015: 45,718 tCO_2e; 2016: 31,614 tCO_2e; 01/01/2017 to 28/02/2017: 1,274 tCO_2e)
Project Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Leakage Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Emission Reductions	78,606 tCO_2e (2015: 45,718 tCO_2e; 2016: 31,614 tCO_2e; 01/01/2017 to 28/02/2017: 1,274 tCO_2e)

Sandeep KANDA	Sukanta DAS	Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
11.12.2017	11.12.2017	11.12.2017

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – CDM Monitoring Report (MR) Form Requirements

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Cover Page					
1. Has the following information been provided on the cover page of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
1.1. Title of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Title indicated in the MR is ‘Camlica II HEPP’. This is same as in the registered PDD and GS-Passport	OK	OK
1.2. Reference number of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Reference no. is GS1173	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of the monitoring report;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The title of the first submitted MR file indicates version 1. However, the version on the cover page is 09. Please clarify and correct accordingly.	CAR-1	OK
1.4. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	01/06/2017 is the date indicated for first submission.	OK	OK
1.5. Registration date of the project activity (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.6. Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period (first and last days included (DD/MM/YYYY– DD/MM/YYYY));	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	First monitoring period covering 01/01/2015 - 01/02/2017. The end date has been revised to 28/02/2017	OK	OK
1.7. Project participant(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The MR indicates Derin Enerji Üretim San. Ve Tic. A.Ş. (Project Owner- Private Entity) and GTE Carbon Inc. (Project Developer- Private Entity) as the project participants. In the registered PDD, the PPs are Derin Enerji Üretim San. Ve Tic. A.Ş. (Project Owner- Private Entity) and Global Tan Energy Ltd (Project Developer- Private Entity). Please clarify and correct accordingly.	CAR-2	OK
1.8. Host Party(ies);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Turkey	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.9. Sectoral scope and selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, applied standardized baseline(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Energy industries, ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 13.0	OK	OK
1.10. Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period in the registered PDD has not been correctly presented. Further, use an internationally recognized format for presentation of values in the CDM-MR-FORM, for example use digit grouping in thousands and mark a decimal point with a dot (.), not with a comma (,).	CAR-3	OK
1.11. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period are not stated correctly. Also, the format of the MR is not to be altered.	CAR-4	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;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N.A.	OK	OK
1.13. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period from 1 January 2013 onwards.	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N.A.	OK	OK
General Requirements					
2. Has the following requirements been followed for the completion of MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2.1. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM and all attached documents in English or containing a full translation of relevant sections in English	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
2.2. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM using the same format without modifying its font, headings or logo	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2.3. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM without any other alteration	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-4	OK
2.4. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM by deleting the Attachment of "Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form"	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2.5. Not modifying or deleting tables and their columns in the CDM-MR-FORM	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A. Description of the Project Activity					
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity					
A.1.1. Has a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 provided under section A.1of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.2. Has the purpose of the project activity and the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The Monitoring Report section A is to describe the project activity at the period of monitoring. Therefore, the PP shall describe what has happened rather than what is anticipated/planned during the registration. In other words, the monitoring report shall use past tense rather than future tense. The Monitoring report shall be revised accordingly. Further, the following information is missing: Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. continued operation periods, etc.); Total GHG emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period.	CAR-5	OK
A.1.3. Has a brief description of the installed technology and equipments been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	A brief description of the installed technology and equipment has not been provided under section A.1 of the MR	CAR-6	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.1.4. Has the relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.5. Has the total emissions reductions achieved in this monitoring period been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-4	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?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.3. Parties and project participant(s)					
A.3.1. Has the list of the Parties and PPs been provided under section A.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Derin Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş. (Project Owner- Private Entity) and GTE Carbon Inc. (Project Developer- Private Entity) are stated as the project participants and Turkey as host country. Refer to CAR-2	CAR-2	OK
A.4. Reference of applied methodology and standardized baseline					
A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology or standardized baseline(s), tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied been provided under section A.4 including the version numbers and titles?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.5. Crediting period of project activity					
A.5.1. Has the crediting period including the crediting period start date, choice and length of the crediting	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The crediting period indicated in the submitted monitoring report is 02/05/2014 – 01/05/2021,	CAR-7	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
period been provided under section A.5 of the MR?			with renewable crediting period. However, the monitoring period is indicated as 01/01/2015 – 01/02/2017. The change in crediting period start date is to be clarified and corrected.		
A.6. Contact information of responsible persons/ entities					
A.6.1. Is the contact information of the person(s)/ entity(ies) responsible for completing the CDM-MR-FORM been provided under section A.6 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes, the details of contact persons from Derin Enerji Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi. and GTE Carbon Inc. are presented as Serkan Veziroğlu and M. Kemal Demirkol respectively. The latter being the project consultant.	OK	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?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §257a	DR	Yes	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?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	The commissioning date as stated in the PDD is presented in the MR as 02/05/2014. Please clarify if the commissioning of Çamlıca II HEPP happened on 02/05/2014 as expected along with supporting document.	CL-1	OK
B.1.3. If the project activity consists of more than one site, has the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site been clearly described under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	Refer to CL above	CL-1	OK
B.1.4. If the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase been indicated under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	Refer to CL above	CL-1	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.1.5. Has a brief description of the events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period, which may affect the applicability of the methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.1.6. Have the PPs implemented and operated the CDM project activity as per the descriptions contained in the registered PDD?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.2. Post registration changes					
B.2.1. **Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2. **Corrections**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3. **Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4. **Changes to project design of registered project activity**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
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?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §236 §237 EB93 Report Annex 5 §290	DR	The start date of crediting period has been changed from 02/05/2014 as in registered PDD to 01/01/2015 as start date for the moniotring period. The reason for the change in the start date is also to be stated.	CAR-8	OK
B.2.5.2. Have the changes been notified to the Secretariat by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §235	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.3. If where the changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance,	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
are the approval date and reference number provided?					
C. Description of the Monitoring System					
C.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.1. Information flow including data generation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.3. Data recording	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.5. Data reporting	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.3. Has organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.4. Regarding to the management and operational system, are the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(iv)	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364e	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	The MR shall include the line diagram showing all relevant monitoring points including main and control meters.	CAR-9	OK
C.7. Have the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.8. Has the monitoring of parameters (baseline / project / leakage / emission reduction) in the project activity been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(i)-(ii)-(iii)	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.9. Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM EB decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.10. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364d	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D. Data and Parameters					
D.1. **Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period**					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.1.1. Has all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, been listed under section D.1 using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	As the grid emission factor, has been calculated and fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD, it should be included in section D.1 of the MR instead of the background parameters used for the calculation.	CAR-10	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?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	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?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	OK
D.1.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	OK
D.1.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the description of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	OK
D.1.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	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.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?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	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)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-10	OK
D.2. **Data and parameters monitored**					
D.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The data that are monitored have not been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the appropriate tabular format.	CAR-11	OK
D.2.2. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been described how the data is monitored?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the source of data been indicated (like logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the values of the monitoring parameter been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The electricity supplied to the grid and electricity consumed from the grid should be explicitly presented vintage wise.	CAR-12	OK
D.2.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the QA/QC procedures being applied been given?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what types of equipment are used to monitor each parameter, including following, if applicable as per the monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The details about the meter numbers, accuracy class, metering test reports and calibration including validity and frequency shall be indicated in the MR.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.8.1. Details on accuracy class	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.8.3. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.8.4. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.9. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the measurement and recording frequency been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.10. Is the calibration frequency for measuring equipments specified in the monitoring methodology, guidance provided by the Board or in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §368	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.11. If the calibration frequency for measuring	EB93 Report Annex 5	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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?	§373				
D.2.12. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, have the international standards been used?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §374	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.15. If the calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, are one of the following approaches adopted by the PPs for the calculation of emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	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 permissible error; or	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369a	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	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.2.15.2. Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment.	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369b	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.16.1. The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370a	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.16.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370b	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.17. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §371	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.18. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §372	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.19. Have any information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of emission reductions been given in detail in the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.20. If the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 using the tabular format, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and the monitoring	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §260	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
plan?					
D.2.21. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.3. **Implementation of sampling plan**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
E. Calculation of Emission Reductions or GHG Removals by Sinks					
E.1. **Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks**					
E.1.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the baseline emissions been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.1.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions, applying actual values has not been provided under section E.1 of the MR	CAR-14	OK
E.1.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The electronic spreadsheet submitted does not correspond fully to the period covered in the monitoring report. Further, round-down function has not been used for each vintage.	CAR-15	OK
E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	N/A	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)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.2. **Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3. **Calculation of leakage**		DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4. **Summary of calculation of emission reductions or net**					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks					
E.4.1. Have the total baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The emissions are to be presented conservatively without decimals and for 1000 separator comma (,) is to be used instead of decimal (.) symbol. Round-down function is to be used for each vintage.	CAR-16	OK
E.4.2. Has the total project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.3. Has the total leakage emissions during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.4. Have the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-16	OK
E.4.5. If there is material information that can cause overestimation of emission reductions or removals of the project activity, is this equal to higher than one of the following?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329	DR	No	OK	OK
E.4.5.1. 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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.2. 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 year?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.3. 2 per cent of the emission reductions or	EB93 Report Annex 5	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
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?	§329c				
E.4.5.4. 5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for small-scale project activities other than project activities covered under E.4.6.5 below?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.5. 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the microscale project activities?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.5. **Comparison of actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD**					
E.5.1. Has a comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removal of the project activity achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered CDM-PDD been given under section E.5 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §268	DR	Comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions of the project activity achieved with the estimations in the registered PDD for each vintage covering the monitoring period is to be provided	CAR-17	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 monitoring period with the estimations in the registered CDM-PDD is given under section E.5 of the MR, has this comparison been given using the tabular format provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-17	OK
E.6. **Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD**					
E.6.1. Has an explanation of the cause of any increase in the actual emission reductions achieved during	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The actual ER is lower than the PDD estimate due to lower water flow. Further, details about the lower generation are to be provided.	CAR-18	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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?					
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 achieved for the following two periods been provided under section E.7 of MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.7.1.1. Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); and	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.7.1.2. From 1 January 2013 onwards	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	N/A	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?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. **Forward action requests (FARs) identified during validation and/or previous verification**					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
F.1.1. Is there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR, SV	The validation report does not have any FAR.	OK	OK
F.1.2. If there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PPs addressed these FARs in the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349 §347d	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

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

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Has the host country implemented a cap on its GHG emissions, after the registration of the project activity?	T 1.2.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
2. If the host country implemented a cap on its GHG emissions after the registration of the project activity, has a proof of retirement of an equal amount of allowances been submitted by the project owners?	T 1.2.7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3. Has there been any grievances raised by the local stakeholders?	T 4.5	DR, SV	During the site visit, the DOE conducted interviews with the local stakeholders from Camlica village. No complaints were received. PP shall clarify, about the comment book for stakeholder feedback as it was not seen available on-site for obtaining local stakeholder grievance.	CL-2	OK
4. If there are any grievances raised by the local stakeholders, has the PPs responded clearly to these comments?	T 4.5	SV	No grievances were raised by the local stakeholders	OK	OK
5. Are all the parameters as listed in the registered documents monitored?	T	DR	The indicators and associated parameters have been included in the monitoring report, however, the details for the current monitoring period has not been stated for some, along with submission of supporting documents, as follows: • The employment records are to be submitted; • Why the currency conversion factor has been applied for calculating the currency savings for the parameter 'Balance of payments and investments'; • Provide details and supporting documents to confirm that the flow regime of the channel has been operated according to water usage agreement with DSI; and Minimum amount of water to maintain for aquatic life in riverbeds has been met. • The chosen parameter for the indicator 'Water Quality and Quantity' has not been stated correctly. • Waste water transfer records are to be submitted; • The pay checks and other employment documents are to be submitted	CAR-19	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			for the indicator ‘Quantitative employment and income generation’ • The current situation of the parameters for the indicator ‘Soil condition’ are to be stated. • The current situation of the parameter ‘Noise and dust pollution’ for the indicator ‘Other pollutants’ are to be stated. • The assessment/opinion of independent expert on effectiveness of the fish passage will be included in monitoring report.		

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

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-1 The title of the first submitted MR file indicates version 1. However, the version on the cover page is 09. Please clarify and correct accordingly.	1.3	Version and date of the monitoring report has been updated.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-2 The MR indicates Derin Enerji Üretim San. Ve Tic. A.Ş. (Project Owner- Private Entity) and GTE Carbon Inc. (Project Developer-Private Entity) as the project participants. In the registered PDD, the PPs are Derin Enerji Üretim San. Ve Tic. A.Ş. (Project Owner-Private Entity) and Global Tan Energy Ltd (Project Developer-Private Entity). Please clarify and correct accordingly.	1.7	The name of the company updated. GTE Carbon is trade name of Global Tan Energy	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-3 The estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for the monitoring period in the registered PDD has not been correctly presented. Further, use an internationally recognized format for presentation of values in the CDM-MR-FORM, for example use digit grouping in thousands and mark a decimal point with a dot (.), not with a comma (,).	1.10	According to PDD, 49,436 tCO2 emission reduction is expected annually. Our monitoring period is 26 month so, the expected emission reduction value in this period is 107,111 tCO2. Correction for digit grouping has been made for one figure. Please specify the exact page number, figure etc. if further corrections are requested.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-4 The emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period are not stated correctly. Also, the format of the MR is not to be altered.	1.11	MR format is corrected. Comment about ER value is not understood.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-5 The Monitoring Report section A is to describe the project activity at the period of monitoring. Therefore, the PP shall	A.1.2	Revised. Achieved emission reduction values have been added.	Review-1 OK

* 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
describe what has happened rather than what is anticipated/planned during the registration. In other words, the monitoring report shall use past tense rather than future tense. The Monitoring report shall be revised accordingly. Further, the following information is missing: Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. continued operation periods, etc.); Total GHG emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period.		Second comment is not understood.	Closed
CAR-6 A brief description of the installed technology and equipment has not been provided under section A.1 of the MR.	A.1.3	-Further detail added about turbine specifications & water channel specifications have been added.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-7 The crediting period indicated in the submitted monitoring report is 02/05/2014 – 01/05/2021, with renewable crediting period. However, the monitoring period is indicated as 01/01/2015 – 01/02/2017. The change in crediting period start date is to be clarified and corrected.	A.5.1	Statement has been added for change of crediting period. -Revised -The date has been changed as 31/02/2017.	Review-1 Section A.5 of the MR has not been corrected. Review-2 The revised crediting period is to be stated in section A.5 of the MR. Review-3 The monitoring period end date is to be corrected. The electricity generation for the entire month of February 2017 has been considered in the emission reduction calculation whereas the end date is stated as 01/02/2017. Review-4 OK Closed

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-8 The start date of crediting period has been changed from 02/05/2014 as in registered PDD to 01/01/2015 as start date for the moniotring period. The reason for the change in the start date is also to be stated.	B.2.5.1	Justification has been added for change of crediting period. -Revised	Review-1 The justification of change in crediting period start date is to be indicated in section B.2.3 of the MR. Review-2 OK Closed
CAR-9 The MR shall include the line diagram showing all relevant monitoring points including main and control meters.	C.6	Diagram has been added.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-10 As the grid emission factor, has been calculated and fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD, it should be included in section D.1 of the MR instead of the background parameters used for the calculation.	D.1.1	EF has been moved to D.1	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-11 The data that are monitored have not been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the appropriate tabular format.	D.2.1	Tabular format has been updated.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-12 The electricity supplied to the grid and electricity consumed from the grid should be explicitly presented vintage wise.	D.2.6	Revised.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-13 The details about the meter numbers, accuracy class, metering test reports and calibration including validity and frequency shall be indicated in the MR.	D.2.8.1	Specifications of the metering devices have been added.	Review-1 OK Closed

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-14 Sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions, applying actual values has not been provided under section E.1 of the MR	E.1.2	Realized baseline emissions have been added. - Estimated generation part is removed. -References to the methodology has been corrected.	Review-1 The calculation for the estimated generation is not to be included. Also the reference to the methodology in section E.2 is to be corrected. Review-2 OK Closed
CAR-15 The electronic spreadsheet submitted does not correspond fully to the period covered in the monitoring report. Further, round-down function has not been used for each vintage.	E.1.3	Round-down function has been used for each vintage. -Total ER value has been given as sum of each vintage.	Review-1 Round-down function has been used for each vintage and for the entire monitoring period separately resulting in discrepancy of 1 unit. The value for the monitoring period should be the summation of the vintages. Values are to be corrected accordingly in the ER and MR throughout. Review-2 OK Closed
CAR-16 The emissions are to be presented conservatively without decimals and for 1000 separator comma (,) is to be used instead of decimal (.) symbol. Round-down function is to be used for each vintage.	E.4.1	Revised.	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-17	E.5.1	Actual values achieved during this monitoring	Review-1

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
Comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions of the project activity achieved with the estimations in the registered PDD for each vintage covering the monitoring period is to be provided		period have been added.	OK Closed
CAR-18 The actual ER is lower than the PDD estimate due to lower water flow. Further, details about the lower generation are to be provided.	E.6.1	More detailed information have been added to section E.6.1	Review-1 OK Closed
CAR-19 The indicators and associated parameters have been included in the monitoring report, however, the details for the current monitoring period has not been stated for some, along with submission of supporting documents, as follows: • The employment records are to be submitted; • Why the currency conversion factor has been applied for calculating the currency savings for the parameter 'Balance of payments and investments'; • Provide details and supporting documents to confirm that the flow regime of the channel has been operated according to water usage agreement with DSI; and Minimum amount of water to maintain for aquatic life in riverbeds has been met. • The chosen parameter for the indicator 'Water Quality and Quantity' has not been stated correctly. • Waste water transfer records are to be submitted; • The pay checks and other employment documents are to be submitted for the indicator 'Quantitative employment and income generation' • The current situation of the parameters for the	Table 2, 5	-Employment records are submitted. -Original MP is given in euro, therefore it is also converted using exchange rate. -Expert report, Ecosystem_assessment_report and min. flow values documents are submitted. -Chosen parameter content for the indicator 'Water Quality and Quantity has been revised. -Only construction of water transfer channel has been cause excavation of soil which was placed on top of present landscape and the area was afforested. Project does not have any impact on erosion. - The pay checks and other employment documents have been submitted for the indicator 'Quantitative employment and	Review-1 OK Closed except for point 3 Review-2 The current situation of the parameter 'Amount of water released' is to be stated in the MR and the associated supporting document is to be submitted. Also, the indicator 'Air quality' in the MR and spreadsheet is to be corrected following the GS passport. The emission intensities of SO2 and NOx emissions due to electricity generation are indicated as: 2.71 kg/MWh and 1.15 kg/ MWh respectively, in the Passport. Review-3 OK Closed

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
indicator 'Soil condition' are to be stated. • The current situation of the parameter 'Noise and dust pollution' for the indicator 'Other pollutants' are to be stated. • The assessment/opinion of independent expert on effectiveness of the fish passage will be included in monitoring report.		income generation' - The current situation of the parameter 'Noise and dust pollution' for the indicator 'Other pollutants' has been added. - The assessment/opinion of independent expert on effectiveness of the fish passage has been added. Review-2 Indicator Revised. -Flow records had been submitted to DOE already. Assessment report and mandate for min. flow also submitted to DOE. Statement also added to the MR:	
CL-1 The commissioning date as stated in the PDD is presented in the MR as 02/05/2014. Please clarify if the commissioning of Çamlıca II HEPP happened on 02/05/2014 as expected along with supporting document.	B.1.2	Provisional acceptance of plant has been completed on 02/05/2014 however, due to completion of missing works during startup phase, actual commissioning has taken place by end of 2014 and no significant generation has occurred in 2014. Therefore, crediting period has been postponed to 2015.	Review-1 OK Closed
CL-2 PP shall clarify, about the comment book for stakeholder feedback as it was not seen available on-site for obtaining local stakeholder grievance.	Table 2, 3	Logbook has been delivered to village head. Confirmation letter will be obtained and submitted to DOE -Submitted with revised MR.	Review-1 The confirmation letter is to be submitted. Review-2 OK Closed

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