VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş.

Çanakkale WPP

IN

Turkey

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 01/04/2016 to 10/02/2018 (both days included)

PROJECT NUMBER: 525

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd. Carbon Department		
Project Title:	Çanakkale WPP		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current MR Version:**
525	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş.		04
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
06/12/2018	18/04/2019	03	63
Verification Number:	**Registration Number:**	**Monitoring Period:**	
05	GS906	From: 01/04/2016	To: 10/02/2018

<u>Summary:</u>

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:** 12.1.0

Verified Emissions Reductions: 88,963 tCO_2e

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

Project Participants:	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş. (ENERJISA)

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings:

During the verification 07 Corrective Action Requests, 03 Clarification Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. No Forward Action Requests were issued during the verification.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Çanakkale WPP" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 09 dated 04/09/2012. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version 04 dated 08/04/2019 are fairly stated.

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

Abbreviations

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the fifth periodic verification of the "Çanakkale WPP" which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number "GS906" for the period between 01/04/2016 and 10/02/2018. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report Version 04 dated 08/04/2019 of "Çanakkale WPP".

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity "Çanakkale WPP" in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 09 dated 04/09/2012. 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 12.1.0.

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

The implementation of the project has resulted in 88,963 tCO_2e during the monitoring period 01/04/2016 up to 10/02/2018.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by “Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş.” to perform the fifth periodic verification of the “Çanakkale WPP” with the contract dated 05/11/2018. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated “08/04/2019” 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 04/09/2012.

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 12.1.0”, 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 2.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 2.0 and CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 2.0 and GS Toolkit version 2.1.

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

2.3. Description of the Project Activity

Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş. (hereafter referred as “ENERJISA”), has installed and commissioned a 29.9 MW wind power plant with 13 Siemens SWT 101 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 2.3 MW each located between Üvecik Village and Mahmudiye Town of Çanakkale Province in Western part of Turkey (hereafter referred as “Çanakkale WPP”).

The crediting period start date of the project as verified from the information provided on GS Registry by registered PDD and Validation Report is 11/02/2011 with choice of renewable crediting period.

2.4. Parties Involved

Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş. is the project participant and host country is Turkey.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the 5th verification period from 01/04/2016 to 10/02/2018 (both days included).

3. METHODOLOGY

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

- Assessment of the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD dated 04/09/2012 version 09.
- A site visit was conducted on 03/12/2018 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, version 12.1.0.
- 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 18/09/2018 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
Anıl Söyler	Verifer & Certification Manager	☒	☒	☒	A, DR, SV, 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 26/11/2018 which was submitted to the verification team on 28/11/2018. This monitoring report was revised several times due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 04 dated 08/04/2019 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 09 dated 04/09/2012, the methodology ACM0002, version 12.1.0, the relevant CDM rules and regulations, CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 1.0, Gold Standard Toolkit version 2.1 and the final validation report of Germanischer Lloyd Certification GmbH (GLC), Report No. GS008, dated 07/02/2012, version 10 and the previous (4th) verification report of Re-consult Ltd., dated 26/09/2016, version 3.0.

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	03/12/2018
Location	Canakkale

Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
Özgür Çelebi	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.	Operation Engineer
Merve Bayraktar	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.	Energy Trading Manager
Nihat Arı	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.	Operation and Maintenance Manager
Halil Gençel	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.	Electricity Technician
Ersin Kaymak	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.	Electricity Support Technician
Gediz Kaya	Gaia Carbon Ltd.	Manager
Gamze Karaca	Gaia Carbon Ltd.	Consultant
Anıl Söyler	Re Carbon Ltd.	Verifier
Sıtkı Bilgin	Euroserve A.Ş.	Cleaning Staff (Local)
Hasan Karaca	Euroserve A.Ş.	Security Staff (Local)
Gürhan Yurter	Mahmudiye Village	Mukhtar (Village Head)
Şenol Keskin	Mahmudiye Village	Villager
Yalçın Yaşa	Mahmudiye Village	Villager

Points Verified	**Source of Information**
Implementation and operation of the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD	Document review, site visit and interviews
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Document review, site visit and 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	Document review and site visit
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of	Document review, site visit and interviews

monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Document review
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	Document review and 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 07 CARs and 03 CLs were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol. No Forward Action Requests were 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	28/11/2018
On site assessment	03/12/2018
1st Protocol submission to client	06/12/2018
Responses received	15/01/2019
2nd Protocol submission to client	17/01/2019
Responses received	18/01/2019
Closure of all CARs and CLs	20/01/2019
Submission for Technical Review	29/01/2019
Submission for final approval	30/01/2019
Final documents submitted to client	31/01/2019
Revision based on GS initial comments	18/04/2019

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

3.7. Internal Quality Control

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

The Independent Technical Review is performed by another Team Leader who hasn't 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

The previous (4th) verification report indicates 1 forward action requests (FARs) which shall be verified during the current monitoring period, namely

FAR-1: During the site visit, some villagers have complained about noise because of the nearest turbine. The PP has got an environmental noise assessment report prepared on 22/05/2015 and the noise levels are in line with the relevant legal regulation according to the report. If the villagers complain due to noise next year too, the noise assessment report will have to be prepared again and PP should receive opinion from the villagers living near the site.

Further, linked to the same aspect, GS too had raised a FAR, as follows:

Forward action Request #1: The PP shall establish a team of external experts to identify the root causes of the complaint on noise issue before the next verification. The scope of the study shall be determined in coordination with GS. The PP shall demonstrate that necessary mitigation measures are undertaken in accordance with the results of the assessment. The findings and mitigation measures shall be verified by the DOE during next verification.

The PP has got a noise measurement test conducted on 25/12/2018 by Gemar Çevre Ölçüm ve Aneliz San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti. an accredited organization by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Turkish Accreditation Agency (TURKAK). The submitted report confirms that the noise assessment were chosen according to the turbine distance closest to the settlement areas and the noise levels are in compliance with the related noise level requirements in Turkey. Therefore, the FAR has been closed.

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

The project is fully implemented according to the description presented in the registered PDD. During on-site visit 13 wind turbines were seen. 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 and 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 55,878 tCO_2e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is corresponding to 681 days. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period (88,963 tCO_2e) is slightly less than estimated emission reduction amount (104,255 tCO_2e). However, the difference is small enough to be considered as a deviation from estimated data.

The difference between the values of the data presented in the MR and the stated data in the registered PDD is not significant. The difference in the values does not lead to a substantial increment of the ER in this period or in future periods in relation to the estimates in the registered PDD.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, ACM0002, Version 12.1.0, applied by the project activity.

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

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 spare meter. The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. The serial numbers are 53035219 for the main meter and 53035221 for the back-up meter, respectively. The accuracy class of the meters is 0.2s and they 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 and there were no differences in data.

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring

All parameters required by the methodology and Gold Standard are monitored. In line with the methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity exported to the grid by the project activity. The sustainable development indicators indicated in the GS passport relevant for the 5th monitoring period are:

- Water quality and quantity;
- Soil Condition (hazardous waste);
- Other pollutants (Noise).

As there are no missing parameters, monitoring is complete.

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring

Sustainability measures are in line with Section G of the Gold Standard Passport. 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	Future target for chosen parameter	Way of monitoring (When)	Compliance check
1	Water quality and quantity	Wastewater connection to the sewage - No wastewater discharge to the environment	When required Wastewater disposal practice to comply with legal requirements	During the site visit, a septic tank for collection of wastewater has been checked. The sewage is transferred by sewage truck to local municipality sewage system as per the "Regulation on Control of Water Contamination". However, during this monitoring period the wastewater being collected in the septic tank and there hasn't been any transfer in line with the information and the signed and sealed letter on the company letterhead by the PP dated as 18/04/2019.
2	Soil condition	Storage of hazardous waste - No hazardous waste leakage	Once for each year of operation	Based on the site visit, the DOE confirms that there is a waste storage area on site for the hazardous waste. The waste oil prior to being transferred is stored in the waste storage area. The waste oil is transferred to licensed companies as checked from the waste declaration forms and records dated as 15/08/2017 and the transferred amount is 1915 kg in line with the provided records.
3	Other pollutants	Noise monitoring during daytime and nighttime including the nearest residents -	Once for each year of operation	During the site visit, interviews with local stakeholders were conducted. There has been one complaint about noise

No.	Indicator	Future target for chosen parameter	Way of monitoring (When)	Compliance check
		Limits provided in Regulation on Assessment and Management of Environmental Noise.		received from a stakeholder living close to Turbine-13. Based on that complaint and the FAR from previous monitoring period, PP has got a noise measurement test conducted on 25/12/2018 by Gemar Çevre Ölçüm ve Aneliz San. ve Tic. Ltd. Şti. an accredited organization by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization and Turkish Accreditation Agency (TURKAK). The submitted report confirms that the noise assessment were chosen according to the turbine distance closest to the settlement areas (the distance between the nearest settlement and Turbine-13 is 250 meter in line with the report) and the noise levels are in compliance with the related noise level requirements in Turkey.

Therefore, 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. The metering tests were performed on 21/11/2014, 13/08/2015, 18/08/2016, 24/08/2017 and 13/08/2018 respectively, for both the main and control meters.

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. For the part month of February 2018, apportioning based on the number of days has been applied. The same is deemed acceptable to the DOE. 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
01/04/16 – 31/12/2016	Export to Grid: 59340.48 MWh Import from Grid: 292.76 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 59047.72 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2017 – 31/12/2017	Export to Grid: 77158.32 MWh Import from Grid: 457.15 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 76701.17 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2018 – 10/02/2018	Export to Grid: 10151.23 MWh Import from Grid: 56.35 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 10094.87 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.610 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 available 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 104,255 tCO_2e. However, the project in operation totally reached 88,963 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)
01/04/2016 – 31/12/2016	36,019
01/01/2017 – 31/12/2017	46,787
01/01/2018 – 10/02/2018	6,157

Calculations have been reproduced by DOE and the source data (EPİAŞ records) are presented by PP.

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There were two electricity 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 these meters are bi-directional (meter the energy in two directions - consumption and production). The periodical check for the meters is 1 year as stated in the TEIAS System Usage Agreement. 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 01/04/2016 - 10/02/2018) 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 and 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, v02). To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

N/A.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

N/A.

4.13.4. Permanent changes

N/A.

4.13.5. Changes to the project design

N/A.

5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

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

Table 5-1: List of persons interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview[1]	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Özgür Çelebi	Operation Engineer	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.
I02	SV	Merve Bayraktar	Energy Trading Manager	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.
I03	SV	Nihat Arı	Operation and Maintenance Manager	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.
I04	SV	Halil Gençel	Electricity Technician	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.
I05	SV	Ersin Kaymak	Electricity Support Technician	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.S.
I06	SV	Gediz Kaya	Manager	Gaia Carbon Ltd.
I07	SV	Gamze Karaca	Consultant	Gaia Carbon Ltd.
I08	SV	Anıl Söyler	Verifier	Re Carbon Ltd.
I09	SV	Sıtkı Bilgin	Cleaning Staff (Local)	Euroserve A.Ş.
I10	SV	Hasan Karaca	Security Staff (Local)	Euroserve A.Ş.
I11	SV	Gürhan Yurter	Mukhtar (Village Head)	Mahmudiye Village
I12	SV	Şenol Keskin	Villager	Mahmudiye Village
I13	SV	Yalçın Yaşa	Villager	Mahmudiye Village

The local stakeholders stated in the Table 5-1 above were interviewed about the following issues and there hadn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the site visit except for the noise parameter as in below:

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

- Noise due to the project activity (There had been one complaint about noise received from a stakeholder living close to Turbine-13 and noise assessment report has been prepared as detailed in the Sections 4.1 and 4.6)
- Sufficiency of local employment
- Waste management practices implemented by PP

It was also concluded that the grievance mechanism is in place and this was also confirmed by the interviewed local villagers and Mahmudiye Village Mukhtar (Village Head) during the site visit. The document showing the contact details of the relevant person within PP with the signatures of the Mukhtars was also provided to DOE.

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	Registered PDD of Canakkale Wind Power Plant	09	04/09/2012
D02	Registered GS Passport of Canakkale Wind Power Plant	09	-
D03	ACM0002	12.1	26/11/2010
D04	Verification Service Agreement	-	-
D05	Monitoring Report	01	26/11/2018
D06	Monitoring Report	02	15/01/2019
D07	Monitoring Report	03	18/01/2019
D08	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	26/11/2018
D09	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	15/01/2019
D10	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	18/01/2019
D11	CDM Validation and Verification Standard For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D12	CDM Project Standard For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D13	CDM Project Cycle Procedure For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D14	Gold Standard Toolkit	2.1	-
D15	Final Issuance Review of Previous Verification	-	26/10/2016
D16	Final Validation Report of Germanischer Lloyd Certification Gmbh (GLC), Report No. GS008	10	07/02/2012
D17	Fourth Monitoring Period Verification report	03	26/09/2016
D18	TEIAS Monthly Reading Protocols	-	04/2016 – 02/2018
D19	EPIAS Screnshoots	-	04/2016 – 02/2018
D20	Meter Test Reports	-	21/11/2014 13/08/2015 18/08/2016 24/08/2017 13/08/2018
D21	Training Records and Certificates	-	05/10/2017 18/10/2017 23/10/2017

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
			24/11/2017 07/12/2017
D22	Social Security Records of PP Site Employees	-	-
D23	Noise Assessment Report	-	25/12/2018
D24	Hazardous Waste Disposal Records	-	15/08/2017
D25	Letters by PP (About No Transfer of Waste Water During the Monitoring Period)		10/01/2018 18/04/2019
D26	Letters by the Village Heads (Mukhtars) (About the Contact Details of PP Relevant Staff In Case of Any Complaint)	-	01/02/2016 10/04/2018
D27	Donation Records	-	30/09/2016 31/12/2017
D28	Generator Documents	-	-
D29	Site Visit Photos	-	03/12/2018
D30	Monitoring Report	04	08/04/2019

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.

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. 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

F.C.053/03/5.2017_00

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 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-053 / 05.05.2017 - 00

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

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mr. 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 - 06

8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the fifth periodic verification of Gold Standard "Çanakkale WPP" which is a project with the registry reference number "GS906" for the period between 01/04/2016 and 10/02/2018. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 04 dated 08/04/2019 of "Çanakkale WPP".

Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring Plan indicated in the final PDD. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the Project. The development and maintenance of the records and the related monitoring procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report Version 04.

The verification has been performed by a verification team consisting of "Sandeep Kanda as team leader, Anıl Söyler as 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 2.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 2.0, and CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 2.0, and GS Toolkit version 2.1.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity "Çanakkale WPP" in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD version 09 dated 04/09/2012 and GS-Passport version 09. 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 12.1.0.

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

Project Title	Çanakkale WPP
Applicable Period	5th Monitoring Period (01/04/2016 to 10/02/2018 both days included)
Baseline Emissions	88,963 tCO_2e (01/04/2016 to 31/12/2016: 36,019 tCO_2e; 2017: 46,787 tCO_2e; 01/01/2018 to 10/02/2018: 6,157 tCO_2e)
Project Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Leakage Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Emission Reductions	88,963 tCO_2e (01/04/2016 to 31/12/2016: 36,019 tCO_2e; 2017: 46,787 tCO_2e; 01/01/2018 to 10/02/2018: 6,157 tCO_2e)

Sandeep KANDA	Sukanta DAS	Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
18/04/2019	18/04/2019	18/04/2019

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 as – 'Çanakkale Wind Power Plant', as in the registered PDD and validation report.	OK	OK
1.2. Reference number of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Reference no. is GS906	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of the monitoring report;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	V01 for the first submission.	OK	OK
1.4. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Although the MR file is dated 26/11/2018, however the completion date of the monitoring report is not indicated. PP shall put the completion date of the monitoring report in DD/MM/YYYY format.	CAR-1	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	The fifth monitoring period is indicated to cover the period 01/04/2016 - 31/10/2018 (both days included). However, the first crediting period is from 11/02/2011 to 10/02/2018. The period beyond the end of the first crediting period cannot be verified before renewal.	CAR-2	OK
1.7. Project participant(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Enerjisa Enerji Üretim A.Ş.	OK	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 12.1.0	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 this monitoring period in the registered PDD has not been correctly presented, as the number of days for the monitoring period are calculated incorrectly.	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 5th monitoring period is not stated correctly as monitoring period is to be revised and round-down function to be applied in the ER calculation for each vintage.	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
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

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
2.3. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM without any other alteration	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	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	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.3. Has a brief description of the installed technology and equipments been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.4. Has the relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.1.5. Has the total emissions reductions achieved in this monitoring period been provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	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	CDM-MR-FORM	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
section A.3 of the MR?	version 5.1				
A.4. Reference of applied methodology and standardized baseline					
A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology or standardized baseline(s), tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied been provided under section A.4 including the version numbers and titles?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.5. Crediting period of project activity					
A.5.1. Has the crediting period including the crediting period start date, choice and length of the crediting period been provided under section A.5 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	The crediting period indicated in the submitted monitoring report is 11/02/2011 to 10/02/2018. This is consistent with the previous verification report.	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	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?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §244b	DR	Yes	OK	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?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §244b	DR	The project consists of only one site.	OK	OK
B.1.4. If the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase been indicated under section B.1 of the MR?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §244b	DR	The start dates of operation of wind-turbines has been provided.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.1.5. 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?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §244c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.1.6. Has a brief description of how the issues resulting from these events or situations are being addressed been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §244c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.1.7. Do the actual project activity and its operation comply with the registered PDD?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §383a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.1.8. Have the PPs implemented and operated the CDM project activity as per the descriptions contained in the registered PDD?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §383a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.2. Post registration changes					
B.2.1. **Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**					
B.2.1.1. Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §272 EB82 Report Annex 14 §298 CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.2. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs described the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming	EB82 Report Annex 13 §272 CDM-MR-FORM	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
monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity in the MR?	version 5.1				
B.2.1.3. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, do the description of deviations include the following?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.1. How it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies),	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.2. The duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.3. Justification on the conservativeness of the approach.	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.4. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §274 EB82 Report Annex 14 §300	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.5. If there are temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology or standardized baseline, is the deviation likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §300	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.6. If the deviation(s) require prior approval by the Board, do they include the date of approval and reference number?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.7. Where the changes are identified by or submitted to the re-consult to conduct the verification, are these changes solely of a type(s) listed in Appendix 1 of the Project Standard?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §299	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2. **Corrections**					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.2.1. Is it indicated whether any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 14 §303	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.2. If the correction(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.3. If the correction(s) and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.4. Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual project information?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §304a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.5. Are the corrected parameters in accordance with the applied methodology, selected monitoring plan and/or the applied standardized baseline?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §304b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3. **Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline**					
B.2.3.1. Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies or standardized baseline had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 14 §312	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.2. Are the changes to the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD in compliance with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §313	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.3.3. Do the changes reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §313	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.4. In cases where the proposed changes refer to a later version of the applied methodology and/or the applied standardized baseline in the registered PDD, does the application of any later version of the applied methodology and tools and/or the applied standardized baseline affect the conservativeness of the monitoring and verification process, including the related emission reduction calculations?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §314	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.5. If the permanent changes are likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions, do the PPs apply conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the permanent change?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §315	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.6. If the parameter is used for calculating baseline GHG emissions, is the difference between the accuracy level of the installed monitoring equipment and the accuracy prescribed by the applied methodology, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and/or the registered monitoring plan deducted from the measured value?	EB82 Report Annex 13 Appendix I §4	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.7. If the parameter is used for calculating project GHG emissions, is the difference between the accuracy level of the installed monitoring equipment and the accuracy prescribed by the applied methodology, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and/or the registered monitoring plan added to the	EB82 Report Annex 13 Appendix I §4	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
measured value?					
B.2.3.8. If the permanent changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.9. If permanent changes and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4. **Changes to project design of registered project activity**					
B.2.4.1. Are there proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered project activity?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §317	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.2. Do the proposed or actual changes affect the implementation of the project activity?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §323a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.3. In case of actual changes, does the description of actual changes accurately reflect the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified project activity?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §318	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.4. Do the actual changes comply with the monitoring plan, the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline, and/or the level of accuracy of the monitoring activity?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §319	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.5. Does the revised PDD comply with the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or standardized baseline or any later version of the methodology and/or standardized baseline or the requirements of another methodology and/or the standardized baseline that is applicable to the	EB82 Report Annex 14 §324	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
project activity?					
B.2.4.6. Does the changes to project activity include the following?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §289	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.6.1. Changes in the effective output capacity due to increased installed capacity or increased number of units, or installation of units with lower capacity or units with a technology which is less advanced than that described in the PDD?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §289a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.6.2. Addition of component or extension of technology has been occurred?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §289b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.6.3. Removal or addition of one (or more) site of a project activity registered with multiple-sites?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §289c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.6.4. Actual operational parameters which are within the control of project participants differing from the expected parameters?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §289d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.6.5. Any consequential changes to the baseline methodology, including changing or adding another baseline methodology or applying a baseline scenario that is more appropriate as a result of the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §289e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.7. Do the PPs report in the revised PDD the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered project activity on the following:	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.7.1. The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered;	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292a EB82 Report Annex 14 §320c	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.4.7.2. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292b EB82 Report Annex 14 §320d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.7.3. The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity;	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.7.4. The additionality of the project activity;	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292d EB82 Report Annex 14 §320a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.7.5. The scale of the project activity.	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292e EB82 Report Annex 14 §320b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.8. If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered project activity,	EB82 Report Annex 13 §292d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.8.1. In the case of investment analysis, have PPs modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §321a EB82 Report Annex 13 §294a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.8.2. In cases where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, have PPs demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §321b EB82 Report Annex 13	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
	§294b				

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.4.9. If the PPs can't demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered,	EB82 Report Annex 13 §296	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.9.1. Has PPs revised the PDD applying the latest version of the methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §296a-i	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.9.2. If another methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline is applied to the project activity, has PPs demonstrated compliance with the requirements of the selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §296b EB82 Report Annex 14 §323c-ii	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.10. Is it indicated whether any changes to the project design of the project activity from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.11. If the changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.12. If the changes and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	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	EB82 Report Annex 14	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
during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	§306 EB82 Report Annex 13 §277 §278 §280				
B.2.5.2. Have the changes been notified to the Secretariat by the PPs?	EB82 Report Annex 13 §279	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, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C. Description of the Monitoring System					
C.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	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 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.1. Information flow including data generation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.3. Data recording	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report	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
	Annex 13 §246				

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.5. Data reporting	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.3. Has organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §390b-iv	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §390e	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 EB82 Report Annex 13 §246	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.7. Have the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the PPs?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §389	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	EB82 Report Annex 14 §390b-(i)-(ii)-(iii)	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
registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?					
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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §390	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.10. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §390d	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D. Data and Parameters					
D.1. **Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period**					
D.1.1. Has all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, been listed under section D.1 using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.2. If all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the description of the	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?					
D.1.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the values applied of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what the data/parameters are used for (baseline/project /leakage emission calculations)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2. **Data and parameters monitored**					
D.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.2. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been described how the data is monitored?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
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	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
indicated (like logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.)?					
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 has been explicitly presented vintage wise. Please submit the EPIAS records covering the monitoring period.	CL-1	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	The MR indicates that latest metering test was performed on 06/12/2017. As this is between the monitoring period, the previous test and the validity should also be included.	CAR-5	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	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8.1. Details on accuracy class	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8.3. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.8.4. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-5	OK
D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-5	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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §398	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.2.11. If the calibration frequency for measuring equipments isn't specified in the monitoring methodology, guidance provided by the Board or the monitoring plan, are the equipments calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §399	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.12. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, have the international standards been used?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §399	DR	N/A	OK	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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §394	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.14. Has the calibration been delayed and has the calibration been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §395	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.15. If the calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, are one of the following approaches adopted by the PPs for the calculation of emission reductions?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §395	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.15.1. Applying the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error; or	EB82 Report Annex 14 §395a	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
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.	EB82 Report Annex 14 §395b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16. If calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, has the error been applied in following ways?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §396	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16.1. The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §396a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §396b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.17. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, is there any plan to conduct the required calibration?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §397	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.18. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §397	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.19. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PPs?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §398	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.20. Have any information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of emission reductions been given in detail in the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.21. 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	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §247	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
monitoring plan?					
D.2.22. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.3. Implementation of sampling plan					
D.3.1. If data and parameters monitored described in section D.2 of the MR are determined by a sampling approach, has the description on how PPs implemented the sampling for those data and parameters according to the sampling plan been provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB74 Report Annex 6 EB75 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2. If data and parameters monitored described in section D.2 of the MR are determined by a sampling approach, has the following been included?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB74 Report Annex 6 §25 §26 §27	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.1. Description of implemented sampling design;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.2. Collected data (electronic spreadsheets may be attached and referenced);	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.3. Analysis of the collected data;	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.4. Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met.	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	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	CDM-MR-FORM	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
emissions been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	version 5.1				
E.1.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.1.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402d	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)	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402e	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.2. **Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks**					
E.2.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the project emissions been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of project emissions or or actual net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project emission calculations been justified?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the project emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402e	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
reference values)					
E.3. **Calculation of leakage**					
E.3.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the leakage emissions been provided under section E.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage emissions, applying actual values been provided under section E.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.4. Have any assumptions used in leakage emission calculations been justified?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the leakage emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB82 Report Annex 14 §402e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4. **Summary of calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks**					
E.4.1. Have the total baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	Yes	OK	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	Yes	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	Yes	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	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
MR?					
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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §362 §363 §366	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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §361a	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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §361b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.3. 2 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for large-scale project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of 300,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year or less?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §361c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
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?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §361d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.5. 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the microscale project activities?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §361e	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 EB82 Report Annex 13 §256	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.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	Yes	OK	OK
E.6. **Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD**					
E.6.1. Has an explanation of the cause of any increase in the actual emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water availability, higher load plant factor, etc.), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in the registered CDM-PDD, been provided under section E.6 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1	DR	It should be elaborated about the reasons for the variation in performance in comparison to the wind energy yield predictions.	CAR-6	OK
E.7. **Actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards**					
E.7.1. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, has actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved for the following two periods been provided under section E.7 of MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §254	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.7.1.1. Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); and	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §254a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.7.1.2. From 1 January 2013 onwards	CDM-MR-FORM version 5.1 EB82 Report Annex 13 §254a	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
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 EB82 Report Annex 13 §254b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. **Forward action requests (FARs) identified during validation and/or previous verification**					
G.1.1. Is there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §28 §379	DR, SV	The previous (4th) verification report indicates 1 forward action requests (FARs) which shall be verified during the current monitoring period, namely FAR-1: During the site visit, some villagers have complained about noise because of the nearest turbine. The PP has got an environmental noise assessment report prepared on 22/05/2015 and the noise levels are in line with the relevant legal regulation according to the report. If the villagers complain due to noise next year too, the noise assessment report will have to be prepared again and PP should receive opinion from the villagers living near the site. Forward action Request #1: The PP shall establish a team of external experts to identify the root causes of the complaint on noise issue before the next verification. The scope of the study shall be determined in coordination with GS. The PP shall demonstrate that necessary mitigation measures are undertaken in accordance with the results of the assessment. The findings and mitigation measures shall be verified by the DOE during next verification.	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
			PP shall respond to the same and include the response in the MR too.		
G.1.2. If there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PPs addressed these FARs in the MR?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §28 §379	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-7	OK
G.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB82 Report Annex 14 §28 §379 §376d	DR	Refer to CAR above	CAR-7	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. There is a complaint by one stakeholder about noise from Turbine-13 during the interview with Mahmudiye villagers. There has been one FAR from the previous verification and one FAR from GS issuance review too about the noise issue. The PP shall clarify how this is being addressed. Further, the document regarding the contact details of the responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint shall be provided.	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	Refer to CL above	CL-2	OK
5. Are all the SD monitoring parameters included and the supporting documents submitted.	-	DR, SV	Please submit the following documents pertaining to the monitoring period: - Social security records of the employees including the ones proving the local employment; - Wastewater discharge records; - Hazardous waste records; - Noise assessment report;	CL-3	OK

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

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-1 Although the MR file is dated 26/11/2018, however the completion date of the monitoring report is not indicated. PP shall put the completion date of the monitoring report in DD/MM/YYYY format.	1.4	Corrected as requested.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-2 The fifth monitoring period is indicated to cover the period 01/04/2016 - 31/10/2018 (both days included). However, the first crediting period is from 11/02/2011 to 10/02/2018. The period beyond the end of the first crediting period cannot be verified before renewal.	1.6	The necessary changes have been done. Response to Review-1: Corrected.	Review-1 a) The monitoring period has been corrected; however, the electricity export and import values too should correspond to the monitoring period. b) The electricity value in section A.1 of the MR is to be corrected. c) In section D.2 and E.1 of the MR, the period (for 2018) and electricity values are to be corrected. d) The ER spreadsheet should present the values pertaining to the monitoring period; the values for January-March 2016 may be removed. Review-2 Ok Closed
CAR-3 The estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for this monitoring period in the registered PDD has not been correctly presented, as the number of days for the	1.10	The number of days for the monitoring period is corrected.	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
monitoring period is calculated incorrectly.			
CAR-4 The emission reductions achieved during the 5th monitoring period is not stated correctly as monitoring period is to be revised and round-down function to be applied in the ER calculation for each vintage.	1.11	The round-down function is applied for each vintage.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-4 Please provide the diesel consumption of the Teksan diesel gen set. if these emissions contribute for 1% of baseline emissions, the emissions due to emergency diesel generator shall be considered as project emissions and deducted from the baseline emissions to calculate the emission reductions of the project activity in a most conservative way.	E.2.1	Diesel generator emission during the verification period was 2.66 tCO_2 which is 0,003 % of the baseline emission. Therefore, its emission can be neglected.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CAR-5 The MR indicates that latest metering test was performed on 06/12/2017. As this is between the monitoring period, the previous test and the validity should also be included.	D.2.7	The latest metering test was performed on 24/08/2017 and provided to the DOE. Response to Review-1: The metering tests (prior and covering the monitoring period) have been added into the MR.	Review-1 The calibration date(s) of the meters is to be stated in the MR and the metering tests prior and covering the monitoring period are to be stated. Review-2 Ok Closed
CAR-6 It should be elaborated about the reasons for the variation in performance in comparison to the wind energy yield predictions.	E.6.1	Events which affected electricity generation at the wind park in this monitoring period are listed Section E.6.	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-7 The previous (4th) verification report indicates 1 forward action requests (FARs) which shall be verified during the current monitoring period, namely FAR-1: During the site visit, some villagers have complained about noise because of the nearest turbine. The PP has got an environmental noise assessment report prepared on 22/05/2015 and the noise levels are in line with the relevant legal regulation according to the report. If the villagers complain due to noise next year too, the noise assessment report will have to be prepared again and PP should receive opinion from the villagers living near the site. Further, linked to the same aspect, GS too had raised a FAR, as follows: Forward action Request #1: The PP shall establish a team of external experts to identify the root causes of the complaint on noise issue before the next verification. The scope of the study shall be determined in coordination with GS. The PP shall demonstrate that necessary mitigation measures are undertaken in accordance with the results of the assessment. The findings and mitigation measures shall be verified by the DOE during next verification. PP shall respond to the same with the relevant evidence and include the response in the MR too.	F.1.1	During the site visit with DOE, only one villager has complained about the noise because of one turbine, the nearest one to his house (Turbine-13). Therefore; project owner conducted a new noise measurement test (25/12/2018). In the noise assessment test, the noise measurement points were chosen according to the turbine distance which is the closest to the settlement areas. (T01, T04, T13) Report confirms compliance with the related noise requirements in Turkey. Response to Review-1: The signed and sealed version of the noise measurement report is provided to the DOE.	Review-1 The signed and sealed version of the noise measurement report is to be submitted. Review-2 Ok Closed
CL-1 Please submit the TEIAS meter reading records covering the monitoring period.	D.2.6	TEIAS meter reading protocols are provided to the DOE.	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
CL-2 During the site visit, the DOE conducted interviews with the local stakeholders. There is a complaint by one stakeholder about noise from Turbine-13 during the interview with Mahmudiye villagers. There has been one FAR from the previous verification and one FAR from GS issuance review too about the noise issue. The PP shall clarify how this is being addressed. Further, the document regarding the contact details of the responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint shall be provided.	Table 2, 3	In case of any complaint, local people can report their complaints via telephone or come directly to the plant. The document containing the contact details of the responsible personnel is presented to the DOE.	Review-1 Ok Closed
CL-3 Please submit the following documents pertaining to the monitoring period: - Social security records of the employees including the ones proving the local employment; - Wastewater discharge records; - Hazardous waste records; - Noise assessment report; - Ornithology report; and - Training records and donation to support education of the nearby village	Table 2, 5	All requested documents are submitted to the DOE. Response to Review-1: The hazardous waste disposal declaration has not yet been made for 2018. The quantity of hazardous waste added.	Review-1 The hazardous waste disposal records for 2018 are to be submitted. Besides that, the MR should state the respective quantity. Review-2 Ok Closed

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