VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.

Cemel Hydro Bundle

IN

TURKEY

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 01/03/2017 to 31/05/2019 (Both days included)

PROJECT NUMBER: 540

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd. Carbon Department		
Project Title:	Cemel Hydro Bundle		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current MR Version:**
540	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.		07
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
24/06/2019	04/03/2020	02.1	88
Verification Number:	**Registration Number:**	**Monitoring Period:**	
02	GS 1208	From: 01/03/2017	To: 31/05/2019

Summary:

Host Country: Turkey

Project is Reviewed Against:

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

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

Methodology: ACM0002 **Version:** 12.3.0

Verified Emissions Reductions: 67,487 tCO_2e

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

Project Participants:	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings:

During the verification 21 Corrective Action Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. No Clarification Requests and Forward Action Requests were issued during the verification.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Cemel Hydro Bundle" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 09 dated 07/04/2014 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 11/03/2014. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version 07 dated 02/03/2020 are fairly stated.

Verification Team Leader:	Anıl Söyler		**Indexing Terms:**
Verification Team Members:	N/A		☒ No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit
Approved By (Technical Reviewer):	**Name:**	**Signature:**	☐ Limited Distribution
	Fikriye Seda Atabek		☐ 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 second periodic verification of the “Cemel Hydro Bundle” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS1208” for the period between 01/03/2017-31/05/2019. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 07 dated 02/03/2020 of “Cemel Hydro Bundle”.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Cemel Hydro Bundle” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 09 dated 07/04/2014 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 11/03/2014. 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 12.3.0.

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 67,487 tCO_2e during the monitoring period 01/03/2017-31/05/2019.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by "Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş." to perform the second periodic verification of the "Cemel Hydro Bundle" with the contract dated 22/03/2019. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated "02/03/2020" 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 07/04/2014 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 11/03/2014.

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 12.3.0", 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

Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş. has installed and commissioned a 21.6 MWm/20.4 MWe run-of-river hydropower plant on Kızılırmak River within the boundaries of Avanos District of Nevşehir city in Turkey. This bundled project is composed of 6.567 MWe Cemel I HEPP, 7.055 MWe Cemel II HEPP and 6 MWe Cemel III HEPP on the mid-section of Kızılırmak River basin and the generated electricity through the project transferred to the national grid via Avanos Substation.

The crediting period start date of the project as verified from the initial Verification Report and project's GS registry link is 01/07/2015 with choice of renewable crediting period.

2.4. Parties Involved

Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş. and Global Tan Energy Ltd. (GTE Carbon) are the project participants and host country is Turkey.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the 2nd verification period from 01/03/2017 to 31/05/2019 (both days included).

3. METHODOLOGY

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

- Assessment of the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD, version 09 dated 07/04/2014 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 11/03/2014.
- A site visit was conducted on 17/06/2019 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 12.3.0.
- 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 08/03/2019 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*
Anıl Söyler	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	A, SV, DR, R
Fikriye Seda Atabek	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 21/05/2019 which was submitted to the verification team on the same date. This monitoring report was revised several times due to the issued CARs, version 07 dated 02/03/2020 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 09 dated 07/04/2014 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 11/03/2014, the methodology ACM0002 version 12.3.0, the relevant CDM rules and regulations, CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 2.0, Gold Standard Toolkit version 2.1 and the final validation report of RINA Services S.p.A., version 1.3Aa, dated 20/03/2014 and the initial verification report of Re Carbon Ltd., dated 02/01/2018, version 03.

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	17/06/2019	
Location	Avanos / Nevşehir	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
Murat Müftüoğlu	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.	Plant Manager
Süleyman Öz	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.	Technician
Hüseyin Sarı	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.	Cleaning Staff (Local)
Anıl Söyler	Re Carbon Ltd.	Team Leader
Ece Akay Demir	GTE Carbon Ltd.	Consultant
Esra Tıraş	Sulusaray Town (Yenimahalle Village)	Villager
Fatih Tıraş	Sulusaray Town (Yenimahalle Village)	Villager
Mustafa Çete	Yenimahalle Village	Mukhtar (Village Head)
Soner Akyürek	Avanos District	Villager
Ekrem Zeybek	Avanos District	Villager
Points Verified		**Source of Information**
Implementation and operation of the proposed GS 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 21 CARs were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol. There hasn't been any CLs and FARs 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	10/06/2019
On site assessment	17/06/2019
1st Protocol submission to client	24/06/2019
Responses received	02/10/2019
2nd Protocol submission to client	10/10/2019
Responses received	30/10/2019
3rd Protocol submission to client	13/01/2020
Responses received	14/02/2020
4th Protocol submission to client	18/02/2020
Responses received	25/02/2020
Closure of all CARs and CLs	25/02/2020
Submission for Technical Review	26/02/2020
Submission for final approval	02/03/2020
Final documents submitted to client	04/03/2020

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

There hasn't been any FAR issued during the initial verification period including its GS issuance review process.

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

As a result of the verification site visit, Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project is fully implemented according to the description given in the registered PDD.

It can be confirmed 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. 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 40,006 tCO2e and corresponding total estimated amount for the monitoring period is 90,015 tCO_2e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is 67,487 tCO_2e. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period is 25% less than the estimated emission reduction amount. However, the difference is due to the annual changes and significant deviations in the precipitation regime and so as in the water flow. Besides that, the difference in the values does not lead to a substantial increment of the ER in this period in relation to the estimates in the registered PDD.

Cemel I was commissioned on 27/06/2013, Cemel II was on 04/10/2013 and Cemel III was commissioned on 03/07/2015 which were verified by the provisional acceptance protocols.

Besides that, the I-REC Registry (https://registry.irecservices.com/Public/ReportDevices/), ha been checked by the verification team, wherein only 15 projects from Turkey are listed, namely: Bagarasi Wind Power Plant, Bayramhacili HEPP, Gundogdu Wind Power Plant, Dayıcık 1 Solar Power Plant, Kiyikoy Wind Power Plant, Kuredagi Wind Power Plant, Boreas 1 Enez Wind Power Plant, Seferihisar Wind Power Plant, Manastır Wind Power Plant, Petkim Wind Power Plant, Pamuklu Solar Power Plant, Kargı HEPP, Yedigöl HEPP, Azmak HEPP and Menzelet HEPP. Similarly, VCS project database (http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home) was checked and this project isn't available within VCS project database. Given that CDM projects are not applicable in Turkey, no domestic REC scheme is implemented yet and the project does not appear on I-REC and VCS registries, it could be confirmed that no RECs and other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project.

The project activity has not received any other form of environmental credits, as there are no such crediting schemes in the host country as declared by the PP.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, ACM0002 version 12.3.0, applied by the project activity.

In line with the methodology, the only parameters that need to be monitored are quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant to the grid (Egfacility,y), installed capacity of the hydro power plant after the implementation of the project activity (CAPPJ) and area of the reservoir (APJ) as in below:

- Egfacility,y parameter: The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPIAS (the financial settlement centre of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by TEIAS. All readings and billings are done via EPIAS system which is the legal database of the Ministry. During this verification, all EPIAS and TEIAS meter reading records have been reviewed by the verification team. The project mainly uses its own electricity however during the times when there is no generation, the project imports electricity from the grid. There are also internal reviews of the metered data which is checked by different parties. SCADA system is available from which daily reports are taken and the data collected daily is saved in plant manager computer and backed up.
- CAP_{PJ}: According to the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, the installed capacity of the power plant is monitored through checking project documents and equipment labels. Since the unit capacity of 6 turbines are 3.8 MWm/3.6 MWe (4 turbines) and 3.2 MWm/3 MWe (2 turbines) and total installed capacity of the project is 20.4 MWe (20,400,000 W) in line with the electricity generation licence of the project, this value has been taken into consideration. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that there hasn't been any change regarding the total installed capacity of the project.
- A_{PJ}: According to the monitoring plan in the registered PDD, the area of the reservoir is monitored via measured from topographical surveys or maps. In line with the site visit observations, the monitoring value can be taken 0 since there hasn't been any reservoir formed due to the project activity which is also available in the registered PDD, validation report and initial verification report.

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

CAR-14 and CAR-15 were issued regarding the monitoring and they had been closed as detailed in Annex-1.

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

The net electricity is measured continuously by one main electricity meter at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There is also one backup electricity meter.

The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. The serial numbers of the meters are 4632454 for the main meter and 4632455 for the backup meter, respectively and both are EMH brand as confirmed during the on-site visit. 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 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 2nd periodic verification are:

- Air quality
- Quality of employment
- Balance of payments and investment
- Access to clean and affordable energy services
- Quantitative employment and income generation
- Soil condition

As there are no missing parameters, monitoring is complete.

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring

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

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

Table 4-1: Sustainability monitoring parameters

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
1	Air quality	Reduction in amount of SO_2 and NO_X emissions	Annually based on net annual electricity generation and ex-ante fixed respective emission factor	The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records and the emission intensities of SO_2 and NO_X emissions due to electricity generation are taken as: 1.96 kg/MWh and 1.50 kg/MWh respectively, as fixed ex-ante in the registered Passport. Therefore, total of 244.4 tons of SO_2 and 187.5 tons of NOx emission reduction (avoidance) has been achieved during this

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
				monitoring period in line with the provided and checked calculation.
2	Quality of employment	Number of personnel certified/ trained during operation phase	Through the training attendance list and/or certificates (Annually)	As per the training records and certificates checked, the trainings were on fire fighting dated as 28/07/2017, basic HSE, occupational diseases, hygiene and working with the devices having screens and manual lifting dated as 05-06/07/2017, 21/11/2018, 28/11/2018 and 05-06/12/2019, first aid dated as 20/11/2017 and all 27 staff directly working on behalf of PP had been given the trainings.
3	Balance of payment and investments	Currency saving due to avoided fuel import	Through comparing electricity generated by the project and natural gas that would be used to produce the same amount of electricity by a thermal power plant (Annually)	The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records. The projected cost of natural gas that for electricity generation is 1.0871 TL/Sm^3. Therefore, the total payment avoided for natural gas import by the project is € 5,600,949 during the monitoring period in line with the provided and checked calculation.
4	Access to clean and affordable energy services	Fossil fuel saving	Through electricity generation statistics of Turkey to calculate avoided natural gas import	The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records. The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records. The natural gas consumption in 2010 as fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD is 21,783,414 x 1000 m^3. Therefore, the total amount avoided for natural gas import

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
				by the project is 27,688,000 m^3 during the monitoring period in line with the provided and checked calculation.
5	Quantitative employment and income generation	Payment made to the staff	Though evaluation documents for wages paid and social security documents (Annually)	As per the social security records checked and the interviews on-site, 27 employees have been employed on behalf of PP and 19 of them are local employees.
6	Soil condition	Restoration of degraded land	Through site assessment and documents for implementation of plan (Annually)	Although there hasn't been any restoration plan submitted during the verification, there hasn't been any observed degraded land due to the project activity and any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders regarding this issue during the verification site visit.

During the site visit, a septic tank for collection of wastewater has also been checked. The sewage is transferred by sewage truck to local municipality sewage system as per the "Regulation on Control of Water Contamination". The wastewater transfer record dated as 12/12/2018 was provided to DOE.

As can be seen in ex-ante and actual emission reduction calculations, there is almost 25% difference between them. Therefore, the water release as life line water was also less than the expected values during the monitoring period and this is deemed as acceptable.

Therefore, based on site visit observations and provided documents, it can be confirmed that sustainability parameters are monitored in line with the registered 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. The initial calibration of the electricity meters was done on 22/08/2014 as confirmed during the initial verification period. Although, re-calibration is required after ten years, nevertheless, in case of irregular difference between main and cross-check spare meters, TEIAS responsible are informed for the intervention. That means, TEIAS is responsible for the calibration and maintenance of the devices. There hasn't been any other meter test report provided other than the initial meter test Protocol since there hasn't been such request by TEIAS in line with the information by PP.

The serial numbers of the meters are 4632454 for the main meter and 4632455 for the backup meter, respectively and both are EMH brand as confirmed during the on-site visit. The accuracy class of the meters is 0.2s and they have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner.

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

Table 4-2: Net electricity generation

Period	Amount	Compliance check
01/03/2017 – 31/12/2017	Export to Grid: 62,175.35 MWh Import from Grid: 30.675 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 62,144.679 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2018 – 31/12/2018	Export to Grid: 45,778.22 MWh Import from Grid: 151.32 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 45,626.90 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2019 – 31/05/2019	Export to Grid: 17,063.34 MWh Import from Grid: 89.25 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 16,974.09 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.541 tCO_2/MWh and the value is same as indicated in the registered PDD and validation report.

DOE also 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.

The grid emission factor and data and parameters available before validation are also applied in line with the registered 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 90,015 tCO2e corresponding to the monitoring period. However, the project in operation totally reached 67,487 tCO2e 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)
01/03/2017 - 31/12/2017	33,620
01/01/2018 – 31/12/2018	24,684
01/01/2019 – 31/05/2019	9,183

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

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There are two electricity meters (as 1 main and 1 back up meter) 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 the electricity meters. Both these meters are bi-directional (meter the energy in two directions – consumption and production). If there is a measuring difference between these two meters and one of the parties (TEIAS or the PP) requests for calibration of the meters, in this case, the meters will be calibrated without waiting for the periodical check. This calibration process is made by an accredited party under the control of TEIAS and the PP is not responsible for calibration of the meters in Turkey according to the local standards and requirements.

4.11. Materiality

Verification DOE checked all data set (EPİAŞ records from 01/03/2017 – 31/05/2019) 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 the relevant 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” version 02. To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

N/A.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

The crediting period start date of the project has been changed from 01/09/2015 to 01/07/2015. Expected start date of crediting period was 01/09/2015. However, due to early completion of works Cemel III HEPP, actual commissioning has taken place by 03/07/2015. This has been verified from the information provided in the initial verification report and GS registry link of the project.

4.13.4. Inclusion of monitoring plan

N/A.

4.13.5. Permanent changes

N/A.

4.13.6. 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	Murat Müftüoğlu	Plant Manager	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.
I02	SV	Süleyman Öz	Technician	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.
I03	SV	Hüseyin Sarı	Cleaning Staff (Local)	Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. A.Ş.
I04	SV	Ece Akay Demir	Consultant	GTE Carbon Ltd.
I05	SV	Esra Tıraş	Villager	Sulusaray Town (Yenimahalle Village)
I06	SV	Fatih Tıraş	Villager	Sulusaray Town (Yenimahalle Village)
I07	SV	Mustafa Çete	Mukhtar (Village Head)	Yenimahalle Village
I08	SV	Soner Akyürek	Villager	Avanos District
I09	SV	Ekrem Zeybek	Villager	Avanos District

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:

- Noise due to the project activity
- Sufficiency of local employment
- Waste management practices implemented by PP
- Impact of the project activity on the biodiversity

It was also concluded that the grievance mechanism is in place and this was also confirmed by the interviewed local stakeholders during the site visit.

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

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The list of the documents which were reviewed during the verification period is given in the Table 6-1 below:

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	Registered PDD	09	07/04/2014
D02	Registered GS Passport	07	11/03/2014
D03	ACM0002	12.3.0	-
D04	Verification Service Agreement	-	22/03/2019
D05	Monitoring Report	01	21/05/2019
D06	Monitoring Report	02	01/10/2019
D07	Monitoring Report	03	23/10/2019
D08	Monitoring Report	04	12/02/2020
D09	Monitoring Report	05	20/02/2020
D10	Monitoring Report	06	25/02/2020
D11	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	21/05/2019
D12	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	01/10/2019
D13	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	23/10/2019
D14	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	04	12/02/2020
D15	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	05	20/02/2020
D16	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	06	25/02/2020
D17	CDM Validation and Verification Standard For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D18	CDM Project Standard For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D19	CDM Project Cycle Procedure For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D20	Gold Standard Toolkit	2.1	-
D21	Final Issuance Review of Previous Verification	-	13/02/2018
D22	Final Validation Report	1.3Aa	20/03/2014
D23	Initial Monitoring Period Verification Report	03	02/01/2018
D24	TEIAS Monthly Reading Protocols	-	03/2017 –05/2019
D25	EPIAS Screenshoots	-	03/2017 –05/2019
D26	Meters Initial Test Protocol	-	22/08/2014
D27	Electricity Generation Licence (Last Amendment Date)	-	13/08/2013
D28	Training Records and Certificates (As detailed in the Section 4.6)	-	28/07/2017 05-06/07/2017

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
			20/11/2017 21/11/2018 28/11/2018 05-06/12/2019
D29	Social Security Records for PP Site Employees	-	-
D30	Waste Water Transfer Receipt	-	12/12/2018
D31	Hazardous Waste Disposal Declaration Form	-	23/03/2019
D32	Environmental Monitoring Report of the Project	-	14/03/2015
D33	Fish Passage Design Expert Report	-	12/08/2012
D34	Provisional Acceptance Protocols	-	27/06/2013 04/10/2013 03/07/2015
D35	Site Visit Photos	-	17/06/2019
D36	Monitoring Report	07	02/03/2020

7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

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 totally 15 years of professional experience in environmental management, monitoring and auditing, waste and waste water management, environmental and social impact assessment, GHG emission report and projects' validation and verification, 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 and GS and VCS projects Team Leader in the context of Re Carbon.

Fikriye Seda ATABEK, B.Sc. in Chemical Engineering has completed her M.Sc. degree in Istanbul Technical University in Energy Science and Technology. She is a lead auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and has been working about management systems, ISO 14064 and energy management in industry since 2004. She has been involved in more than 80 GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier especially in the energy sector. She has been working as contracted voluntary market projects' team leader/validator/verifier and CDM validator/verifier 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 / 03.05.2017 - 00

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

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK** 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 and China	N/A	1.2

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

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

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

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

RC-003 / 05.05.2017 - 00

8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the second periodic verification of "Cemel Hydro Bundle" which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number "GS1208" for the period between 01/03/2017 and 31/05/2019. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 07 dated 02/03/2020 of "Cemel Hydro Bundle".

Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. Tic. 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 07.

The verification has been performed by a verification team consisting of "Anıl Söyler as team leader and Fikriye Seda Atabek 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 "Cemel Hydro Bundle" in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 09 dated 07/04/2014 and GS-Passport, version 07 dated 11/03/2014. 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 12.3.0.

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

Project Title	Cemel Hydro Bundle
Applicable Period	2nd Monitoring Period (From 01/03/2017 to 31/05/2019 (both days included))
Baseline Emissions	67,487 tCO_2e (01/03/2017 - 31/12/2017: 33,620 tCO_2e; 2018: 24,684 tCO_2e; 01/01/2019 -31/05/2019: 9,183 tCO_2e)
Project Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Leakage Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Emission Reductions	67,487 tCO_2e (01/03/2017 - 31/12/2017: 33,620 tCO_2e; 2018: 24,684 tCO_2e; 01/01/2019 -31/05/2019: 9,183 tCO_2e)

Anıl SÖYLER	Fikriye Seda Atabek	Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
04/03/2020	04/03/2020	04/03/2020

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 7.0	DR	Please use latest available CDM MR template.	CAR-1	OK
1.1. Title of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, title of the project (Cemel Hydro Bundle) has been provided.	OK	OK
1.2. Reference number of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the reference number (GS1208) has been provided.	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please include the version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report.	CAR-2	OK
1.4. Version number of the monitoring report;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the version number is available.	OK	OK
1.5. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the completion date is available.	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 7.0	DR	Yes, both are available.	OK	OK
1.7. Monitoring report number for this monitoring period;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please include the monitoring report number for this monitoring period.	CAR-3	OK
1.8. Project participant(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please clarify the relation of GE Carbon with Global Tan Energy Ltd stated as Project Developer in the registered PDD throughout the MR.	CAR-4	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.9. Host Party(ies);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, host Party is available.	OK	OK
1.10. Sectoral scope(s)	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the sectoral scope information (sectoral scope 1) is available.	OK	OK
1.11. Selected methodology(ies), and where applicable, applied standardized baseline(s);			Yes, the methodology including the version number is available.	OK	OK
1.12. 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 7.0	DR	Yes, information on estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for this monitoring period in the registered PDD is available but the details of the calculation of the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions in the Excel spreadsheet considering the start and end dates of the monitoring period is missing.	CAR-5	OK
1.13. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please provide the monthly EPIAS records for the monitoring period. b) Please provide March and April TEIAS monthly meter readings for 2019. c) Please indicate the grid emission factor in tCO_2 / MWh in the Excel calculation spreadsheet as in the registered PDD. d) Please include the generation and consumption values of 2019. e) Please correct the ER calculation considering the values of 2019 both in the MR and Excel spreadsheet. f) Please indicate the total emission reduction value as an integer value in the Excel spreadsheet.	CAR-6	OK
1.14. 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 7.0	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
1.15. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period from 1 January 2013 onwards.	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this information is available but please see CAR-6.	CAR-6	OK
General Requirements					
1. Has the following requirements been followed for the completion of MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
1.1. 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 7.0	DR	Yes, it is provided in English.	OK	OK
1.2. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM using the same format without modifying its font, headings or logo	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
1.3. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM without any other alteration	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
1.4. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM by deleting the Attachment of “Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form”	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
1.5. Not modifying or deleting tables and their columns in the CDM-MR-FORM	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
A. Description of the Project Activity					
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A.1.1. Has a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please correct the monitoring period and the electricity generation and achieved ER values in the section A.1 of the MR. b) Please check and correct the reference documents' links provided as footnote in the section A.1 of the MR.	CAR-7	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 7.0	DR	Yes, purpose and the measures taken are available under section A.1 of the MR.	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 7.0	DR	Please provide the reference documents for the project coordinates, location and site map in the section A.2 of the MR.	CAR-8	OK
A.3. Parties and project participant(s)					
A.3.1. Has the list of the Parties and PPs been provided under section A.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, Zeynep Enerji Üretim San. ve Tic. A.Ş. is the project participant and Turkey is the host country.	OK	OK
A.4. Reference of applied methodology and standardized baseline					
A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology or standardized baseline(s), tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the methodology and referred tools along with the relevant versions are provided in the Section A.4.	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
been provided under section A.4 including the version numbers and titles?					
A.5. Crediting period type and duration					
A.5.1. Has the crediting period including the crediting period start and end dates, choice and length of the crediting period been provided under section A.5 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please provide the reference evidence document regarding the first crediting period start date.	CAR-9	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 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §257a	DR	a) Please provide the reference evidence documents regarding the commissioning dates stated in the Section B.1 of the MR. b) Please include brief technical details about the used hydro turbines within the context of the project activity in the Section B.1 of the MR.	CAR-10	OK
B.1.2. Has the information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	The information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) hasn't been provided in tabular format.	CAR-11	OK
B.1.3. If the project activity consists of more than one site, has the status of implementation and starting date of	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR, SV	The project consists of three close sites as Cemel I, Cemel II and Cemel III HEPP.	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
operation for each site been clearly described under section B.1 of the MR?					
B.1.4. If the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed project activity achieved in each phase been indicated under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.1.5. Do the actual project activity and its operation comply with the registered PDD?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR, SV	The provided information complies with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
B.1.6. Have the PPs implemented and operated the project activity as per the descriptions contained in the registered PDD?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR, SV	The provided information complies with the registered PDD but please see CAR-10 and CAR-11.	CAR-10 CAR-11	OK
B.2. Post registration changes					
B.2.1. **Temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan, applied methodologies, standardized baselines or other methodological regulatory documents**					
B.2.1.1. Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 EB93 Report Annex 5 §282 CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.2. If there are temprorary deviations	EB93 Report	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
from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs described the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity in the MR?	Annex 4 §232 CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0				
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 7.0	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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.2. The duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.1.3.3. Justification on the conservativeness of the approach.	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	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-	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232a EB93 Report Annex 5 §284	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
estimated as a result of the deviation?					
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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §284	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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2. **Corrections**					
B.2.2.1. Is it indicated whether any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §233	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 7.0	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.2.2.3. 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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.2.4. Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual project information?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §288a	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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §288b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3. **Changes to start date of crediting period**					
B.2.3.1. Is it indicated whether any changes to the start date of the crediting period had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §236 §237 EB93 Report Annex 5 §290	DR	The change of crediting period has been changed from 01/09/2015 to 01/07/2015 due to the change in commissioning date of Cemel III HEPP.	OK	OK
B.2.3.2. Have the changes been notified to the Secretariat by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §235	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.3. If where the changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	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
the approval date and reference number provided?					
B.2.4. **Inclusion of a monitoring plan**					
B.2.4.1. Is it indicated whether the inclusion of a monitoring plan into the PDD for which the delayed submission of the monitoring plan was chosen by the PPs at the time of the registration of the project activity, has been approved by the Board prior to the submission of this monitoring report or is being submitted together with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §238 EB93 Report Annex 5 §292 §293	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.2. If the inclusion of a monitoring plan into the registered PDD has been approved by the Board prior to the submission of this monitoring report, are the date of approval and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5. **Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other methodological regulatory documents**					
B.2.6.1 Is it indicated whether any	CDM-MR-FORM	DR, SV	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
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?	version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §239				
B.2.6.2 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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §296	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3 Do the changes reduce the level of accuracy of the monitoring compared with the requirements contained in the registered monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §297	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.4 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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §298	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5 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	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	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
number provided?					
B.2.6.6 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 7.0		N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6. **Changes to project design**					
B.2.6.1 Are there proposed or actual changes to the project design of a registered project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §300	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.2 In case of actual changes, does the description of actual changes accurately reflect the implementation, operation and monitoring of the modified project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §301	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3 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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §302	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.4 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	EB93 Report Annex 5 §303	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
standardized baseline or the requirements of another methodology and/or the standardized baseline that is applicable to the project activity?					
B.2.6.5 Does the changes to project activity include the following?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5.1 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?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5.2 Addition of component or extension of technology has been occurred?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5.3 Removal or addition of one (or more) site of a project activity registered with multiple-sites?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5.4 Removal of a project activity from a bundle of small-scale CDM project activities?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5.5 Actual operational parameters which are within the control of project participants differing from	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240e	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
the expected parameters?					
B.2.6.5.6 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?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240f	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5.7 Voluntary update of the applied methodologies to a later valid version of the same methodologies, or voluntary change to other methodologies, provided all requirements in the updated/changed methodologies are met.	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240g	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6 Do the PPs report in the revised PDD the impacts of the proposed or actual changes to the registered project activity on the following:	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.1 The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243a EB93 Report Annex 5 §303c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.2 Compliance of the	EB93 Report Annex 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
monitoring plan with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;	§243b EB93 Report Annex 5 §303d				
B.2.6.6.3 The level of accuracy and completeness in the monitoring of the project activity;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.4 The additionality of the project activity;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243d EB93 Report Annex 5 §303a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.6.5 The scale of the project activity.	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243e EB93 Report Annex 5 §303b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7 If the proposed or actual changes affect the additionality of the registered project activity,	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.1 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?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244a EB93 Report Annex 5 §304a	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.2.6.7.2 In cases where only barriers have been claimed to demonstrate additionality, have PPs demonstrated that the barriers are still valid under the new circumstances?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244b EB93 Report Annex 5 §304b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.3 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,	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.4 Has PPs revised the PDD applying the latest version of the methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246a(i)	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.5 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?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246a(ii)	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.8 Is it indicated whether any	CDM-MR-	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
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?	FORM version 7.0				
B.2.6.9 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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.10 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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.7. **Changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activity**					
B.2.5.1. Are any changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activity have been applied during this monitoring period?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A (The project activity isn't a afforestation or reforestation project activity).	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 7.0 EB93 Report	DR	a) Please correct the third paragraph in the Section C of the MR. b) Please clarify whether TEIAS has been replaced with EPIAS throughout the MR.	CAR-6 CAR-12	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 4 §259		c) Please include a diagram regarding the monitoring organizational structure. Please also see CAR-6.		

*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. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, but please see in below.	OK	OK
C.2.1. Information flow including data generation	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, such details are available in the Section C of the MR.	OK	OK
C.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, such details are available but please see CAR-12	CAR-12	OK
C.2.3. Data recording	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, the data recording details are available.	OK	OK
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	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
C.2.5. Data reporting	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, such details are available but please see CAR-6.	CAR-6	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 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	The emergency procedures for the monitoring system haven't been provided in the section C of the MR.	CAR-13	OK
C.4. Regarding to the management and operational system, are the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(iv)	DR	Yes, the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364e	DR	Please provide the initial meter test and calibration and further meter test protocols associated with the monitoring period.	CAR-14	OK
C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Please include the single line diagram in the section C of the MR.	CAR-15	OK
C.7. Have the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364a	DR	Yes, but please see CAR-12, CAR-13, CAR-14 and CAR-15.	CAR-12 CAR-13 CAR-14 CAR-15	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.8. Has the monitoring of parameters (baseline / project / leakage / emission reduction) in the project activity been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(i)-(ii)-(iii)	DR	Yes, the monitoring parameters have been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD.	OK	OK
C.9. Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM EB decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b	DR	Yes, the monitoring parameters have been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD.	OK	OK
C.10. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364d	DR	Yes, the monitoring parameters have been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD.	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 7.0	DR	Yes, all are available in the Section D.1.	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	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, all parameters are available.	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.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 7.0	DR	Yes, the name of data / parameters are in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology.	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 7.0	DR	Yes, the unit of data / parameters are in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology.	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 data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the description of data / parameters are in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology.	OK	OK
D.1.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the source of data / parameters are in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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 7.0	DR	Yes, the values applied of data / parameters are in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology.	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 7.0	DR	Yes, the purpose of data / parameters are in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology.	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 7.0	DR	EGfacility,y (Annual net electricity generation), Cap_{PJ} (Installed capacity of the hydro power plant after the implementation of the project activity) and A_{PJ} (Area of the reservoir measured in the surface of the water, after the implementation of the project activity, when the reservoir is full) are the data monitoring parameters. However, the following findings have been determined: a) Please correct the Measured/calculated/default row for the EGfacility,y parameter. b) Please include the generation and consumption values of 2019 and total values for the EGfacility,y parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. c) Please provide the relevant evidence document for the electricity meters' models in the section D.2 of the MR. d) Please clarify whether there have been any meter tests performed within this monitoring period since the	CAR-16	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			mentioned date in the MR isn't within the monitoring period. e) Please clarify if PMUM still applicable as referred in the section D.2 of the MR. f) Please delete the unnecessary blank spaces under the generation and consumption values for the EGfacility,y parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. g) Please include the accuracy class of the electricity meters. h) Please explain the current status of QA/QC procedures for EGfacility,y parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. i) Please provide signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that there hadn't been any capacity increase after the initial monitoring period. j) Please include the explanation about the value(s) of monitored parameter for A_{PJ} parameter in the parenthesis. k) Regarding the sustainability monitoring, please include all required sustainability monitoring parameters in tabular format in the MR considering the data and parameters monitored table in Section D.2 and in the same order defined in the registered Passport. l) Please correct the calculations for SO_2 and NO_X parameters considering the monitoring period in the MR and Excel calculation spreadsheet. m) Please provide the relevant evidence document (independent expert report) for the functionality of fish passage parameter. n) Please include the details about the trainings handled during the monitoring period. o) Please correct the calculations for currency saving due to avoided fuel import and fossil fuel saving parameters considering the monitoring period in the MR and Excel calculation spreadsheet. p) Please provide the relevant records for the waste water coming from management activities. q) Please include the details and relevant evidences about the		

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			land restoration measures implemented parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. r) Please provide the document regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint.		

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.2. 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 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-16.	CAR-16	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 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-16.	CAR-16	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 7.0	DR	The details including the serial numbers of the meters are available in the provided tabular format.	OK	OK
D.2.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the source of data been indicated (like logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the values of the monitoring parameter been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, but the vintage wise data is available but please see CAR-6 and CAR-12.	CAR-6 CAR-16	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 7.0	DR	The calibration details of the meters are available in the provided tabular format.	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.2.8. 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 7.0	DR	Yes, please see below.	OK	OK
D.2.8.1. Details on accuracy class	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-16.	CAR-16	OKP
D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The calibration details of the meters are available in the provided tabular format.	OK	OK
D.2.8.3. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The details including the serial numbers of the meters are available in the provided tabular format.	OK	OK
D.2.8.4. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see the point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see the point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	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 7.0	DR	Yes, the measurement frequency has been provided.	OK	OK
D.2.10. Is the calibration frequency for measuring equipments specified in the monitoring methodology, in the applied standardized baselines or in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §368	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	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, in the applied standardized baselines 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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.12. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, have the international standards been used?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.13. Is the calibration of the measuring equipments that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions conducted by the PPs at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §374	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.14. Has the calibration been delayed and has the calibration been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	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	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
approaches adopted by the PPs for the calculation of emission reductions?					
D.2.8.1. Applying the maximum permissible error of the instrument to the measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration, if the results of the delayed calibration do not show any errors in the measuring equipment, or if the error is smaller than the maximum permissible error; or	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369a	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.8.2. Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment.	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369b	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.16. If calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, has the error been applied in following ways?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.16.1. The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370a	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.16.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370b	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration?					
D.2.17. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §371	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.18. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §372	DR	The calibration frequency is determined based on the relevant legal regulation but please see point d of CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.19. Have any information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of emission reductions been given in detail in the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, such information is available.	OK	OK
D.2.20. If the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 using the tabular format, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline and the monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §260	DR	Yes, all are available but please see CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.2.21. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376	DR	Yes, the complete data set is available but please see CAR-16.	CAR-16	OK
D.3. **Implementation of sampling plan**					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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 7.0 EB94 Report Annex 2 EB86 Report Annex 4	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 7.0 EB94 Report Annex 2 §29 §30 §31 §32 §33	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.1. Description of implemented sampling design;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.2. Collected data (electronic spreadsheets may be attached and referenced);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.3. Analysis of the collected data;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.3.2.4. Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met.	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E. Calculation of Emission Reductions or Net					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Anthropogenic Removals					
E.1. **Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net removals**					
E.1.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the baseline emissions been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the formulae used to calculate the baseline emissions have been provided but please see CAR-6.	CAR-6	OK
E.1.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the sample calculation for the calculation of baseline emissions is available in the Excel spreadsheet.	OK	OK
E.1.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-6.	CAR-6	OK
E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.1.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the baseline emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2. **Calculation of project emissions or actual net removals**					
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 7.0	DR	N/A (The project emissions are taken as zero in line with the applied methodology.)	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.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 7.0	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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	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 reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3. **Calculation of leakage emissions**					
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 7.0	DR	N/A (The leakage is taken as zero in line with the applied methodology.)	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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to	CDM-MR-	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
present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	FORM version 7.0				
E.3.4. Have any assumptions used in leakage emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	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)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4. **Calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals**					
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 7.0	DR	Yes, total baseline emissions have been provided but please provide the vintage wise details in the Section E.1 of the MR.	CAR-17	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 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.3. Has the total leakage emissions during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.4. Have the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks	CDM-MR-FORM	DR	Yes, total emission reductions have been provided in the Section E.4 of the MR.	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 the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	version 7.0				
E.4.5. 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 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.1. Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); and	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.2. From 1 January 2013 onwards	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	Yes, total emission reductions have been provided but please see CAR-6.	CAR-6	OK
E.4.6. 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 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.7. If there is material information that can cause overestimation of emission	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329	DR	No, there hasn't been any material information detected.	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
reductions or removals of the project activity, is this equal to higher than one of the following?					
E.4.8. 0.5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal of equal to or more than 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329a	DR	No, there hasn’t been any material information detected.	OK	OK
E.4.8.1 1 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for project activities achieving a total emission reduction or removal between 300,000 and 500,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per year?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329b	DR	No, there hasn’t been any material information detected.	OK	OK
E.4.8.2 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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329c	DR	No, there hasn’t been any material information detected.	OK	OK
E.4.8.3 5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for small-scale project activities other than project activities covered under E.4.5.5 below?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329d	DR	No, there hasn’t been any material information detected.	OK	OK
E.4.8.4 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the microscale project activities?		DR	No, there hasn’t been any material information detected.	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. **Comparison of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals achieved 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 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §268	DR	Please provide the details of the vintage wise and total comparison of actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by with estimates in registered PDD in the MR and Excel spreadsheet including the number of days during the monitoring period.	CAR-18	OK
E.5.2. If the comparison of actual values of the GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removal of the project activity achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered CDM-PDD is given under section E.5 of the MR, has this comparison been given using the tabular format provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-18.	CAR-18	OK
E.6. **Remarks on increase in achieved emission reductions**					
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 7.0	DR	Please provide the details of the referred figures available in the section E.6 of the MR in the Excel spreadsheet.	CAR-19	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.7. **Remarks on scale of small-scale project activity**					
E.7.1. Has it been demonstrated that the combined scale of the activities belonging to the same small-scale project type (Type I, II or III) remained under the limit of that type every year during the crediting period, or if, during any year of its crediting period for small scale project activities?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A (The project isn't small scale project activity).	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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	There hasn't been any FAR in the previous verification report and GS issuance review process.	OK	OK
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?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	There hasn't been any FAR in the previous verification report and GS issuance review process.	OK	OK
G.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349 §347d	DR	There hasn't been any FAR in the previous verification report and GS issuance review process.	OK	OK

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

*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	SV	There haven't been any grievances raised by the interviewed local stakeholders.	OK	OK
4. If there are any grievances raised by the local stakeholders, has the PPs responded clearly to these comments?	T 4.5	SV	There haven't been any grievances raised by the interviewed local stakeholders.	OK	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 Please use latest available CDM MR template.	Table 1 1	Template updated. Round 2: Removed	Review-1: Please remove the "Attachment. Instructions for completing this form" part in the MR. Review-2: Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-2 Please include the version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report.	Table 1 1.3	Added Round 2: Corrected	Review-1: The registered PDD's version number is different. (i.e. version 09) Review-2: Ok Closed (PDD version number has been corrected and MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-3 Please include the monitoring report number for this monitoring period.	Table 1 1.7	Added	Review-1: Ok Closed (The monitoring report number for this monitoring period has been included).
CAR-4 Please clarify the relation of GTE Carbon with Global Tan Energy Ltd stated as Project Developer in the registered PDD throughout the MR.	Table 1 1.8	GTE is abbreviation for Global Tan Energy.	Review-1: Ok Closed (The explanation has been included).
CAR-5 The information on estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for this monitoring period in the registered PDD is available but the details of the calculation of the	Table 1 1.12	Added to excel sheet. Round 2: This is how we have done so far and accepted so far by	Review-1: Please consider the number of days in each vintage instead of the months and please revise the calculation accordingly.

* 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
estimated amount of GHG emission reductions in the Excel spreadsheet considering the start and end dates of the monitoring period is missing.		many DOEs and GS.	Review-2: Ok Closed (ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet has been revised and the details about the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions have been provided).
CAR-6 a) Please provide the monthly EPIAS records for the monitoring period. b) Please provide March and April TEIAS monthly meter readings for 2019. c) Please indicate the grid emission factor in tCO_2 / MWh in the Excel calculation spreadsheet as in the registered PDD. d) Please include the generation and consumption values of 2019. e) Please correct the ER calculation considering the values of 2019 both in the MR and Excel spreadsheet. f) Please indicate the total emission reduction value as an integer value in the Excel spreadsheet.	Table 1 1.13	a) Submitted with v2 of MR b) Added c) Added d) It is available in PDD e) 2019 values updated and May 2019 added. Figures in MR and excel updated accordingly. f) Revised as requested. Round 2: a) Removed c) Unit changed as requested d) Parameter is about net generation and net generation is already available in MR D2. e) Revised	Review-1: a) Please revise "PMUM Records" term in the Excel spreadsheet. b) Ok Closed (They have been provided). c) Please indicate the grid emission factor in tCO2 / MWh in the Excel calculation spreadsheet as in the registered PDD. (e.g. please see H35 cell in the Excel spreadsheet). d) Please include the vintage based electricity generation and consumption values in the Section D.2 of MR and please correct the net generation value of 2017. e) Please indicate the annual net generation values in decimal places in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR. f) Ok Closed (Excel spreadsheet has been revised accordingly). Review-2: a) Ok Closed (PMUM records have been revised as EPIAS records and Excel spreadsheet has been revised

* 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
			accordingly). c) Ok Closed (The grid emission factor has been provided in tCO_2 / MWh in the Excel calculation spreadsheet as in the registered PDD). d) Ok Closed (Since the other details like the gross generation and consumption values have been provided in the Excel spreadsheet and the net annual generation values are available in the Section D.2 of the MR). e) Ok Closed (The values have been revised).
CAR-7 a) Please correct the monitoring period and the electricity generation and achieved ER values in the section A.1 of the MR. b) Please check and correct the reference documents' links provided as footnote in the section A.1 of the MR.	Table 1 A.1.1	a) Section updated b) Footnotes revised Round 2: a) It seems OK. 73.95 GWh/y is correct. b) The purpose/structure of timeline table is different. c) Corrected d) Added e) Section revised. f) Revised g) Updated Round 3:	Review-1: a) Please correct the annual generation value in decimal places in the Section A.1 of the MR. b) Please include the initial and second monitoring period in the timeline table. c) Please correct the table number in the section A.1 of the MR. d) Please include the capacity information reference in the section A.1 of the MR as available in the first version of MR. e) Please provide a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 as available in the first version of MR.

* 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
		a) It was revised as 124,017 GWh. b) Added under milestone table in Section A.1. e) It is not clear what detailed description means in this context. f) Wording has been revised.	f) Please remove all unnecessary wording like number 6 and 7 in the section A.1 of the MR. g) Please complete MR without modifying its font, headings or logo. (e.g. the second and third paragraphs of the Section A.1 of the MR are in different font). Review-2: a) Please include the annual net generation value in decimal places in the Section A.1 of the MR. b) Please include the initial and second monitoring period in the timeline table. c) Ok Closed (The table number has been revised). d) Ok Closed (The reference has been included). e) Please provide a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 as available in the first version of MR. f) Please remove all unnecessary wording like number 6 in the section A.1 of the MR. g) Ok Closed (The fonts in Section A.1 of the MR have been corrected). Review-3: a) Ok Closed (The gross generation value has been revised in the Section A.1 of the MR).

* 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
			b) Ok Closed (The initial and second monitoring period has been included in the timeline table). e) Ok Closed (The project details are available in the Section A.1 and B.1.1 of the MR). f) Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-8 Please provide the reference documents for the project coordinates, location and site map in the section A.2 of the MR.	Table 1 A.2.1	Reference added. Round 2: a) Updated b) Updated Round 3: b) PDD version has been revised as 09.	Review-1: a) Please correct the table number in the section A.2 of the MR. b) The registered PDD's version number is different. Review-2: a) Ok Closed (The table number has been revised in the MR). b) The registered PDD's version number is different in the footnote available in the section A.2 of the MR. Review-3: b) Ok Closed (Section A.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-9 Please provide the reference evidence document regarding the first crediting period start date.	Table 1 A.5.1	Issuance review document had been submitted. DOE can also check GS registry. Round 2: Statements corrected Round 3: End date added.	Review-1: The previous issuance review document and the initial verification report refer to another date. Review-2: The start date of crediting period has been revised but please also correct the end date of the crediting period in the Section A.5 of

* 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
			the MR. Review-3: Ok Closed (Section A.5 of the MR has been revised accordingly and the end date of the crediting period has been included).
CAR-10 a) Please provide the reference evidence documents regarding the commissioning dates stated in the Section B.1 of the MR. b) Please include brief technical details about the used hydro turbines within the context of the project activity in the Section B.1 of the MR.	Table 1 B.1.1	a) This is second monitoring period. Those documents have been submitted and confirmed by DOE and GS during first verification. b) Added. Round 2: Statements revised. This is second crediting period and requested info has been verified already. Round 3: Statements revised. This is second monitoring period and requested info has been verified already. Round 4: Revised.	Review-1: Since the provisional acceptance protocol of Cemel II refers to another date (04/10/2013), please clarify this issue. Review-2: Since the provisional acceptance protocol of Cemel II refers to another date (04/10/2013), please clarify this issue in the Section B.1 of the MR. Review-3: Since the provisional acceptance protocol of Cemel II refers to another date (04/10/2013), please correct the date in the Section B.1 of the MR. Review-4: Ok Closed (Section B.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-11 The information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) hasn't been provided in tabular format.	Table 1 B.1.2	It is already available in MR. Round 2: All required info as per the template requirements are already available in MR. Round 3:	Review-1: Please include the initial and second monitoring period in the timeline table and please give reference to the Section in which this information is available in the Section B.1 of the MR. Review-2:

* 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
		1st and 2nd monitoring periods have been added under the timetable in Section A.1 and also referred in Section B1.	Please include the initial and second monitoring period in the timeline table and please give reference to the Section in which this information is available in the Section B.1 of the MR. Review-3: Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-12 a) Please correct the third paragraph in the Section C of the MR. b) Please clarify whether TEIAS has been replaced with EPIAS throughout the MR. c) Please include a diagram regarding the monitoring organizational structure.	Table 1 C.1	a) Corrected b) Updated c) This is not a requirement of the MR.	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has been corrected accordingly). b) Ok Closed ((Section C of the MR has been corrected accordingly). c) Ok Closed (Since the roles and responsibilities have been defined, this is deemed as acceptable).
CAR-13 The emergency procedures for the monitoring system haven't been provided in the section C of the MR.	Table 1 C.3	This is the approved version of Monitoring plan Round 2: Procedures are defined as in PDD and first MR. Info provided is in compliance with requirements and have been assessed as sufficient by GS and other DOEs. Round 3: Added in Section C.	Review-1: Please provide the emergency procedures (e.g. failure of the electricity meters) for the monitoring system in the section C of the MR. Review-2: Please provide the emergency procedures (e.g. failure of the electricity meters) for the monitoring system in the section C of the MR). Review-3: Ok Closed (The emergency procedures have been provided in the Section C of the MR).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-14 Please provide the initial meter test and calibration and further meter test protocols associated with the monitoring period.	Table 1 C.5	Submitted with MR v2. Round 2: There is no new test. Regulation says " meters should not require any test etc for 10 years) Round 3: There is no such document available. Round 4: Interconnection agreement has been provided. In this agreement, there is not such a requirement.	Review-1: Please provide the meters test protocols associated with the monitoring period (i.e. 2017-2019). Since there needs to be 1 or 2 year periodic meter test handled by TEIAS or by a company authorized by TEIAS as in other projects. Review-2: Please provide the meters test protocols associated with the monitoring period (i.e. 2017-2019). Since there needs to be 1 or 2 year periodic meter test handled by TEIAS or by a company authorized by TEIAS as in other projects after the initial meter test. This is also requirement by TEIAS. Review-3: Please provide the meters test protocols associated with the monitoring period (i.e. 2017-2019) or other reference record to avoid meter testing. Since there needs to be 1 or 2 year periodic meter test handled by TEIAS or by a company authorized by TEIAS as in other projects. This is also requirement by TEIAS. Review-4: Ok Closed (Initial meter test protocols for the main and back up meters dated as 22/08/2014 have been provided).
CAR-15 Please include the single line diagram in the section C of the MR.	Table 1 C.6	It is already available in MR.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Basic diagram has been provided).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-16 The following findings have been determined: a) Please correct the Measured/calculated/default row for the EGfacility,y parameter. b) Please include the generation and consumption values of 2019 and total values for the EGfacility,y parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. c) Please provide the relevant evidence document for the electricity meters' models in the section D.2 of the MR. d) Please clarify whether there have been any meter tests performed within this monitoring period since the mentioned date in the MR isn't within the monitoring period. e) Please clarify if PMUM still applicable as referred in the section D.2 of the MR. f) Please delete the unnecessary blank spaces under the generation and consumption values for the EGfacility,y parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. g) Please include the accuracy class of the electricity meters. h) Please explain the current status of QA/QC procedures for EGfacility,y parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. i) Please provide signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that there hadn't been any capacity increase after the initial monitoring period. j) Please include the explanation about the value(s) of monitored parameter for A_{PJ} parameter in the parenthesis.	Table 1 D.2.1	a) Corrected. b) Net generation added as per definition of the parameter c) Meter installation form submitted d) No there is no new test. It is indicated that tests are valid for 10 years. e) There is no reference to PMUM f) Empty rows deleted g) Added h) QA/QC procedure in the table is still valid i) There is no such requirement. We haven't been asked for such a document before. j) Added k) Tables are already available in tabular format. Parameters have been updated as per the new monitoring period. l) Updated m) This is done only once and already confirmed by GS and during first verification n) Details are available in MR o) Updated as per the latest generation figures p) Waste declaration form was added q) We don't have such a parameter for 2nd MR r) Details are available in logbook, PDD etc. This is not a requirement of MR template. Round 2: b) The parameter is for net generation. Therefore, we	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly). b) Please include the vintage based electricity generation and consumption values in the Section D.2 of MR and please correct the net generation value of 2017. c) Ok Closed (The relevant evidence has been provided and this also checked during the verification site visit). d) Please provide the meters test protocols associated with the monitoring period (i.e. 2017-2019). Since there needs to be 1 or 2 year periodic meter test handled by TEIAS or by a company authorized by TEIAS. e) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly). f) Ok Closed (The unnecessary blank spaces have been deleted and MR has been revised accordingly). g) Ok Closed (The accuracy class information has been added and MR has been revised accordingly). h) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly). i) Please provide signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that there hadn't been any capacity increase after the initial monitoring period to confirm

* 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
k) Regarding the sustainability monitoring, please include all required sustainability monitoring parameters in tabular format in the MR considering the data and parameters monitored table in Section D.2 and in the same order defined in the registered Passport. l) Please correct the calculations for SO_2 and NO_X parameters considering the monitoring period in the MR and Excel calculation spreadsheet. m) Please provide the relevant evidence document (independent expert report) for the functionality of fish passage parameter. n) Please include the details about the trainings handled during the monitoring period. o) Please correct the calculations for currency saving due to avoided fuel import and fossil fuel saving parameters considering the monitoring period in the MR and Excel calculation spreadsheet. p) Please provide the relevant records for the waste water coming from management activities. q) Please include the details and relevant evidences about the land restoration measures implemented parameter in the section D.2 of the MR. r) Please provide the document regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint.		have provided net generation info as we always do. d) Explained above. There is no (need) for new test protocol. l) We don't need to provide such a letter. This is DOE's job to check in site visit. k) Those are once only monitored parameters, as this is 2nd MP, they are not monitored anymore. l) We couldn't see what is wrong? n)Please clarify what is not matching o)n) links seems operational p) There is no other record other than provided. q) It is "once after construction is completed" and since there is no construction activity anymore, there is no excavation etc. r) This is already explained above. Round 3: d) There is no such document available. k) Added in Sec D.2. However it was not clear what this phrase means : "please include all sustainability monitoring parameters in the Section D.2 of the MR by adding one sentence referring these parameters to comply with the original template" l) Values related SO2 has been revised. o) Revised according to data of this monitoring period. p) According to the information obtained from the project site, there is not high amount of wastewater generation. Therefore, transfer of wastewater is done quite rarely. In 2017 and 2019, there were no need for the operation of a sewage truck. A sewage truck record	whether there is any capacity increase. j) Ok Closed (The explanation has been added and MR has been revised). k) Soil condition indicator (Land restoration measures implemented as the parameter) is missing in line with the registered Passport and please include all sustainability monitoring parameters in the Section D.2 of the MR by adding one sentence referring these parameters to comply with the original template. l) Please correct the SO2 reduction value in the MR. m) Ok Closed (The fish passage report has been provided in the initial verification period.) n) Please include the dates and attendees of the trainings along with the relevant records since the provided ones don't match with the monitoring period. o) Please correct the calculations for currency saving due to avoided fuel import and fossil fuel saving parameters in the Excel spreadsheet since average currency value hasn't been calculated for the monitoring period and please provide reference sources for the natural gas prices in TRY/kWh and TRY/Sm3 since the provided links in the Excel spreadsheet

* 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
		belonging the year 2018 has been submitted. q) Please see comment for CAR-16. r) Contact details are available in logbook. Round 4: d) Interconnection agreement has been provided. In this agreement, there is not such a requirement. l) Added. n) Added to Section D.2 and related docs provided to DOE. r) Local stakeholders can reach contact info that is available on the logbook. The info was also given during stakeholder meetings.	aren't accessible. p) The provided waste water records don't match with the monitoring period. q) The monitoring frequency of the soil condition indicator (Land restoration measures implemented as the parameter) is annually in line with the registered Passport and please see option k of CAR-16. r) Please provide the signed and sealed document about the contact details of the PP relevant staff in case of any complaint by nearest villages Mukhtars (Village Heads), e.g. Büyükayhan and Yeşilöz Villages. Review-2: b) Ok Closed (Since the other details like the gross generation and consumption values have been provided in the Excel spreadsheet and the net annual generation values are available in the Section D.2 of the MR). d) Please provide the meters test protocols associated with the monitoring period (i.e. 2017-2019). Since there needs to be 1 or 2 year periodic meter test handled by TEIAS or by a company authorized by TEIAS as in other projects after the initial meter test. This is also requirement by

* 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
			TEIAS. i) Ok Closed (In line with the site visit observations, there hasn't been any observed capacity increase). k) Soil condition indicator (Land restoration measures implemented as the parameter) is missing in line with the registered Passport since its monitoring frequency is yearly monitoring and please include all sustainability monitoring parameters in the Section D.2 of the MR by adding one sentence referring these parameters to comply with the original template. l) Please correct the SO2 reduction value in the MR since it is different than the calculated value in the Excel spreadsheet. n) Please include the dates and attendees of the trainings along with the relevant records since the provided ones don't match with the monitoring period since there havnt been any training records provided for 2017 and 2019 years. o) Please correct the calculations for currency saving due to avoided fuel import and fossil fuel saving parameters in the Excel spreadsheet since average currency value hasn't been calculated for the monitoring period and please provide reference

* 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
			sources for the natural gas prices in TRY/kWh and TRY/Sm3 since the provided links in the Excel spreadsheet aren't accessible. p) The provided waste water records don't match with the monitoring period and please provide the records covering the monitoring period. q) The monitoring frequency of the soil condition indicator (Land restoration measures implemented as the parameter) is annually in line with the registered Passport and please see option k of CAR-16. r) The site visit interviews were handled but this is required as a formal document. Therefore, please provide the signed and sealed document about the contact details of the PP relevant staff in case of any complaint by nearest villages Mukhtars (Village Heads), e.g. Büyükayhan and Yeşilöz Villages as in other projects. Review-3: d) Please provide the meters test protocols associated with the monitoring period (i.e. 2017-2019) or other reference record to avoid meter testing. Since there needs to be 1 or 2 year periodic meter test handled by TEIAS or by a company authorized by TEIAS as in other projects. This is also

* 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
			requirement by TEIAS. k) q) Ok Closed (The parameter is included in the Section D.2 of the MR and although the restoration plan hasn't been submitted during the verification, there hasn't been any observed degraded land due to the project activity and any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders regarding this issue during the verification site visit). l) Please include all sustainability monitoring parameters as in the previous version of MR, e.g. air quality, quality of employment etc. parameters are missing in the new version. n) Quality of Employment parameter is missing in the new version of MR and please include the training details under the Quality of Employment parameter. o) Ok Closed (The calculation in the Excel spreadsheet has been revised and found to be correct). p) Ok Closed (There has been waste water transfer only in 2018 in line with the information by PP). r) Please provide the signed and sealed document about the contact details of the PP relevant staff in case of any complaint by nearest villages Mukhtars

* 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
			(Village Heads), e.g. Büyükayhan and Yeşilöz Villages or please provide the signed document by the Mukhtar for the submission of comment log book. Review-4: d) Ok Closed (Initial meter test protocols for the main and back up meters dated as 22/08/2014 have been provided). l) Ok Closed (All relevant sustainability monitoring parameters have been included in the MR). n) Ok Closed (Training details have been included under the Quality of Employment parameter). r) Ok Closed (Although there hasn't been any provided signed letter by the relevant village Mukhtars, since there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders and since they were in touch with the plant manager in line with the observations during the verification site visit, this is deemed acceptable).
CAR-17 Please provide the vintage based details in the Section E.1 of the MR.	Table 1 E.4.1	Added Round 2: Although there is no such requirement and this information is provided above in relevant section, it is included again to close this issue. Round 3:	Review-1: Please include the vintage base baseline values (electricity generation, consumption and net generation) in the Section E.1 of the MR. Review-2: a) Please correct the achieved and expected ER calculations in the ER calculation Excel spreadsheet since the

* 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
		a) Revised. b) Units have been revised.	emission factor unit is already MWh/t CO2 and there is no need to divide 1000. b) Please indicate the unit of achieved and expected emission reductions in the ER calculation Excel spreadsheet. Review-3: a) Ok Closed (The calculation has been revised and found to be correct). b) Ok Closed (The units have been included in the Excel spreadsheet and MR).
CAR-18 Please provide the details of the vintage wise and total comparison of actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by with estimates in registered PDD in the MR and Excel spreadsheet including the number of days during the monitoring period.	Table 1 E.5.1	Added to section E.1 and excel Round 2: a) There is no such requirement b) There is no such requirement. Please submit reference for such requirements/rules. Round 3: b) Percent difference added to the excel sheet and Section E.5. Round 4: Revised.	Review-1: a) Please consider the number of days in each vintage instead of the months and please revise the Excel spreadsheet calculation accordingly. b) Please provide the calculation including percentage difference with the estimated value as vintage wise and total and indicating the values in the Excel spreadsheet and in the Section E.5 of the MR. Review-2: a) Ok Closed (ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet has been revised and the details about the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions have been provided). b) Please provide the calculation including

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
			percentage difference with the estimated value as vintage wise and total and indicating the values in the Excel spreadsheet and in the Section E.5 of the MR. Review-3: b) Please correct the comparison calculation since it is compared with the expected reduction value. Review-4: b) Ok Closed (The comparison calculation has been revised accordingly).
CAR-19 Please provide the details of the referred figures available in the Section E.6 of the MR in the Excel spreadsheet.	Table 1 E.6.1	Section updated. Round 2: Responded above. Round 3: a) Added in Section E.6. b) Deleted. Round 4: a) Revised. b) Added.	Review-1: Please include the estimated and achieved emission reduction value comparison including percentage difference in the Section E.6 of the MR. Review-2: a) Please include the estimated and achieved emission reduction value comparison including percentage difference in the Section E.6 of the MR. b) Since there hasn't been Section E.8 in the original MR format, please delete E.8 from the provided headline. Review-3: a) Please correct the comparison calculation in the Excel spreadsheet since it is compared with the expected reduction value and please revise the

* 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
			Section E.6 of the MR accordingly. b) Please see the option l and n of CAR-16. Review-4: a) Ok Closed (The comparison calculation and Section E.6 of the MR has been revised accordingly). b) Ok Closed (All relevant sustainability monitoring parameters have been included in the MR).
CAR-20 (Raised during ITR) Please correct the version numbers of methodology and the relevant tools including the validity date in the Section A.4 of the MR.	Table 1 A.4.1	Version number of the methodology and relevant tools have been updated as stated in the registered PDD.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section A.4 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-21 (Raised during ITR) Please correct the values and the reference years for the values applied row of EGy parameter in the Section D.1 of the MR in line with the registered PDD.	Table 1 D.1.1	Values have been revised according to the registered PDD.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section D.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).

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