VERIFICATION REPORT
ALİZE ENERJİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.S.

VERIFICATION OF THE KELTEPE WIND FARM PROJECT - TURKEY

REPORT NO. TURKEY-VER/CER.334.11.C45.2011/2011

REVISION NO. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Great Guildford House, 30 Great Guildford Street
SE1 0ES - London – United Kingdom

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
16/05/2011	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S.	Mrs. Cağla Balcı Eriş

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 2nd periodic verification (01/03/2010 – 30/04/2011) of the Keltepe Wind Farm Project - Turkey, GS Registration Reference Number 437, project of Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S. located in Susurluk – Balıkesir Province of Turkey, and applying the methodology ACM0002 version 07, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM Methodology and GS Requirements, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The verification scope is defined as a periodic independent review and ex post determination by the Designated Operational Entity of the monitored reductions in GHG emissions during defined verification period, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion. The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

The first output of the verification process is a list of Clarification, Corrective Actions Requests, Forward Actions Requests (CL, CAR and FAR), presented in Appendix A.

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is already generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements, and the CER issued totalize 45,231 tons of CO_2eq for the monitoring period (01/03/2010 – 30/04/2011).

Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the valid and registered project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
TURKEY-ver/cer.334.11.c45/2011/2011	GS
Project title: Keltepe Wind Farm Project - Turkey	
Work carried out by: Burcu Mutman – Team Leader Yıldız Arıkan – Technical Specialist	
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Ashok Mammen Mustafa Isik – Technical Specialist	

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
26/07/2011	02	20

Indexing terms

Work approved by: Flavio Gomes – Global Product Manager

☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its Gold Standard project Keltepe Wind Farm Project - Turkey (hereafter called “the project”) at Susurluk - Balıkesir Province of Turkey.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC CDM Methodology criteria, GS Requirements as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1 Objective

In carrying out its verification work, the DOE shall ensure that the project activity complies with the requirements of paragraph 62 of the CDM modalities and procedures.

Based on the applicable requirements of paragraph 62 of the CDM modalities and procedures, this assessment shall:

(a) Ensure that the project activity has been implemented and operated as per the registered PDD and that all physical features (technology, project equipment, and monitoring and metering equipment) of the project are in place;

(b) Ensure that the monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with latest applicable version of the completeness checklist for requests for issuance of VERs and verifiable and in accordance with applicable CDM Methodology and GS requirements;

(c) Ensure that actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan and the approved methodology;

(d) Evaluate the data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology.

1.2 Scope

The verification scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project’s baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, UNFCCC CDM Methodology rules, GS Requirements and associated interpretations.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may

provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.

1.3 GHG Project Description

The project activity is renewable energy project which produces electricity from wind power. The project activity is under fully operation since 10.07.2009. The project activity is registered under GS on 18th of September 2009. This 2nd Monitoring period covers 01/03/2010 and 30/04/2011.

1.4 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	CODE HOLDER*	TASK PERFORMED
Lead Verifier	Burcu Mutman	☐Yes X No	XDR XSV XRI
Verifier	N:A:	☐Yes ☐ No	XDR ☐SV ☐RI
Technical Specialist	Yıldız Arikan	XYes ☐ No	XDR ☐SV ☐RI
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Ashok Mammen	☐Yes XNo	☐DR ☐SV XRI
Specialist supporting ITR	Mustafa Isik	☒Yes ☐ No	☐DR ☐SV ☒RI

*DR = Document Review; SV = Site Visit; RI = Report issuance

2 METHODOLOGY

The overall verification, from Contract Review to Verification Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

In order to ensure transparency, a verification protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 01.2 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual, issued by the Executive Board at its 55th meeting on 30/07/2010. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of verification and the results from verifying the identified criteria. The verification protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a GS project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent verification process where the verifier will document how a particular requirement has been verified and the result of the verification.

The completed verification protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1 Review of Documents

The verification of the project documentation provided by the project participant is based upon both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. Quantitative information comprises the reported numbers in the monitoring report submitted to the DOE. Qualitative information comprises information on internal management controls, calculation procedures, and procedures for transfer of data, frequency of emissions reports, and review and internal audit of calculations.

In addition to the monitoring documentation provided by the project participants, the DOE reviews:

(a) The registered PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation report;

(b) Previous verification reports, if any;

(c) The applied monitoring methodology;

(d) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board;

(e) Any other information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting emission reductions (e.g. IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid or laboratory analysis and national regulations).

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 14 April 2011Bureau Veritas Certification performed interviews on the project site with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S. were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Alize Enerji	➢ Management and Operational Structure ➢ Sustainable Development IndicatorsSales of Electricity ➢ Trainings
LOCAL Stakeholder	➢ Sustainable Development Indicators ➢ Employement from the village
OAK Danısmanlık	➢ Emission Reduction Calculation ➢ Sustainable Development Indicators ➢ Trainings ➢ Management of Project Activity

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

Findings established during the initial verification can either be seen as a non-fulfilment of criteria ensuring the proper implementation of a project or where a risk to deliver high quality emission reductions is identified.

Corrective Action Requests (CAR) is issued, where:

(a) Non-conformities with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;

(b) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions which will impair the estimate of emission reductions;

(c) Issues identified in a FAR during validation or previous verifications to be verified during verification have not been resolved by the project participants.

Forward Action Requests (FAR) are issued, for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

The verification team may also use the term Clarification Request (CL), if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable GS requirements have been met.

To guarantee the transparency of the verification process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the verification protocol in Appendix A.

2.4 Internal Technical Review

The verification report underwent a Internal Technical Review (ITR) before requesting issuance of VERs for the project activity.

The ITR is an independent process performed to examine thoroughly that the process of verification has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the verification scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas Certification procedures.

The Lead Verifier provides a copy of the verification report to the reviewer, including any necessary verification documentation. The reviewer reviews the submitted documentation for conformance with the verification scheme. This will be a comprehensive review of all documentation generated during the verification process.

When performing an Internal Technical Review, the reviewer ensures that:

> The verification activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the GS rules and requirements.
>
> The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans and emission reduction calculations, internal quality assurance systems of the project participant as well as the project activity, review of the stakeholder comments and responses, closure of CARs, CLs and FARs during the verification exercise, review of sample documents.

The reviewer compiles clarification questions for the Lead Verifier and Verification Team and discusses these matters with Lead Verifier.

After the agreement of the responses on the 'Clarification Request' from the Lead Verifier as well as the PP(s) the finalized verification report is accepted for further processing such as uploading on the GS Registry.

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

In the following sections, the conclusions of the verification are stated.

The findings from the desk review of the original monitoring documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are described in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A.

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 01 Corrective Action Requests, 01 Clarification Requests, and 00 Forward Action Requests.

The CARs, CLs and FARs were closed based on adequate responses from the Project Participant(s) which meet the applicable requirements. They have been reassessed before their formal acceptance and closure.

The number between brackets at the end of each section corresponds to the VVM paragraph.

3.1 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document (198)

. The starting date of operation is 10/07/2009 with 23 turbines as 20.7 MW.
The actual operation of the proposed project activity is generating electricity from the wind power and fed into the grid. Total emission reduction for the 2nd verification period is 45,231 tCO2.

Information provided in the MR is in accordance with that stated in the registered PDD (version 6 dd. 04.08.2009). Further analysis of monitored parameters as reported in the MR compared to those estimated in the PDD is developed in section 3.4 of this report.

3.2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (203)

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed GS project activity

3.3 Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan (206)

Monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD. The parameters required by the monitoring plan and the way the Verification Team has verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports are described below:

(a) Electricity Generation: Electricity generation has been verified through the monthly protocols which are signed both TEIAS and Project Owner. Protocols are signing at the last day of the month and these values are cross checked with the PMUM records which are the basis of the electricity sales invoices. Both monthly protocols and PMUM records has been provided for each month which are under the monitoring period. (01/03/2010 – 30/04/2011).

(b) Diesel Consumption: Diesel generator is using in emergency cases. The diesel consumption of the generator has been provided to DOE with the invoices (29/01/2010 - 22/03/2011) during the monitoring period. The consumption value found as 1534 litres. The total project emissions are less than 1% of emission reductions and hence negligible and considered 0. So the consumption value found acceptable by the verification team.

(c) –Job Quality: Regarding to the monitoring plan under Gold Standard number of staff trained by Enercon and Demirer Holding for the technical and security issues shall be monitored. During 2nd crediting period it is seen by the verification team that trainings like occupational safety, first aid ,high voltage has been done in the monitoring period by Demirer. The training records have been provided by the pp. Also some more technical trainings (Enercon Trainings) have been defined under training plan and done

on 11 – 15 April 2011.Also the training records have been provided to DOE. It is decided by the verification team that Job Quality has been monitored in line with the monitoring plan.

(d) Employment Quantity: Number of employment created by the project has been defined under monitoring plan as a monitoring parameter. This parameter has been verified by the social security registered employee list dd February 2011. There are 7 full time employees in the project activity. During 2nd monitoring period 1 person resigned from his dutie and new one hired employee is also local. As a total 7 people are local who works for the project activity.

(e) Water Quality: The disposal of the wastewater included to the monitoring plan. During 2nd verification the invoice of the transportation of wastewater has been provided to the verification team dd. 25.03.2011.

Two FAR's have been defined during previous verification has been closed during second verification.

FAR1(From 1st Verification) The GPRS sender is still in test period and monitoring procedures may change in future. This shall be verified during next verification.

During site visit and meeting with project owners it is verified that measurment records through GPRS technology is available for the project activity. The production data's can be recorded remotely since 08/05/2010. FAR has been closed.

FAR2(From 1st Verification): Implementation of training procedures as described in the letter by Mr. Sarper Basak (operation manager), detailing the training procedures of Demirer's wind farms shall be verified during next periodic verification.Related training procedures will be checked during the next periodic verification.

The training procedures has been provided to DOE. The content of the trainings and the frequencies has been defined in the procedure. Also the implementation of these procedures has been verified during 2nd Verification. The Forward Action Request is closed.

The accuracy of the meausring equipments are under TEIAS control. At the end of each month TEIAS people come on site and check if the main meter and the backup meter values are inline regarding to the regulation. During 2nd monitoring period there were no brake down has been recored by TEIAS.

3.4 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions (209)

All data's made available to DOE which were defined under monitoring plan. There were no assumptions used in the calculations. All electricity generation data's has been taken from the metering equipments and were signed by both TEIAS and Project Owner. Also emission factor has been used from the validated PDD which were 0,644 tCO2/Mwh.

The total emission reduction has been calculated as 45,231 tCO2.

The reported data was cross-checked by the PMUM records which were the annexes of the invoices for the sold electricity. Also invoices have been provided. The values were in line with the monthly reading protocols.

Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed. Additionally, the estimated annual emission reductions which were 46,501 tCO2 in the PDD are deemed appropriate and the difference to the verified value is deemed reasonable.
The assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the initial, 2nd periodic verification of the Keltepe Wind Farm Project - Turkey Project in Turkey, which applies the methodology ACM0002 version 07. The verification was performed based on the requirements set by the GS and relevant guidance provided by Gold Standard.

The verification consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final verification report and opinion.

The management of Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S. 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 and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 06 dd. 04 August 2009. 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.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 03 dd. 25.05.2011 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented and described in validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is ready to generate GHG emission reductions

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the valid and registered project baseline and

monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/03/2010 to 30.04.2011
Baseline emissions : 45,231 t CO_2 equivalents.
Project emissions : 0 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions : 45,231 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions in 2010: 36,157 t CO_2 equivalents
Emission Reductions in 2011: 9,074 t CO_2 equivalents

21/06/2011	16/06/2011
Ashok Mammen Internal Technical Reviewer	Burcu Mutman Lead Verifier

5 REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:
Documents provided by Type the name of the company that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Keltepe Validation Report dd.14.11.2008
/2/ Keltepe Final PDD Version 06 04.08.2009
/3/ Keltepe 1st Verification Report dd.30.09.2010
/4/ Keltepe 2nd Monitoring Report Version 1
/5/ Keltepe 2nd Monitoring Report Version 2
Keltepe 2nd Monitoring Report Version 3
/6/ Keltepe Emission Reduction Calculation Version 1
Keltepe Emission Reduction Calculation Version 2

Category 2 Documents:
Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

/1/ Keltepe Organization Chart
/2/ Keltepe Training System Document
/3/ Keltepe Training Programmes
/4/ Keltepe Training System
/5/ Keltepe Training and Attendance List
/6/ Training Certificates
/7/ Job Descriptions
/8/ Metering Reading Protocols for each month between 01/03/2010 – 30/04/2011
/9/ PMUM Records for each month between 01/03/2010 – 30/04/2011
/10/ Invoices for each month between 01/03/2010 – 30/04/2011

Metering Protocols
Waste Water Transportation Invoice

Persons interviewed:

List persons interviewed during the verification or persons that contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.

/1/ Mrs. Cagla Balcı Eris – Demirer Enerji
/2/ Mr. Kadir Altın - Local
/3/ Mr. Omer Akyurek – OAK Danısmanlık
/4/ Mr. Edip Erdoğan - Enercon
/5/ Yıldırım Beyazıt – Local Employee – Head of Village
/6/ Hamit Beyazıt – Local
Muhittin Yılmaz – Local
Mehmet Gün – Local
Mustafa Yılmaz – Local

6. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VERIFICATION TEAM MEMBERS

Dr. Ashok Mammen – PhD Oils and Lubricants
Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Over 20 years of experience in chemical and petrochemical field. Dr. Mammen is a lead auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. He is also a lead verifier and tutor for GHG projects and has been involved in the validation and verification processes of more than 100 CDM/JI/VCS and other GHG projects.

Mr. Mustafa Isık
Bureau Veritas Certification Sector Specialist

Mustafa Isık is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. He has over 5 years experience in Health Safety and Environmental management system coordination in the wind farm construction projects.

Ms. Burcu Mutman
Bureau Veritas Certification, Lead Verifier

Burcu Mutman is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. She is also lead verifier for GHG projects.

Baseline Specialist: Mrs. Yildiz Arikan - Assoc. Professor Dr

Technical Specialist

Yıldız Arıkan is an Electrical engineer and is working at Bahcesehir University. She has supported thesis related with energy . Also she has been conducting research studies on energy including ''CO2 Emission Research'' Studies. Academically, Yıldiz Arıkan is working also on GHG project since 2005.

APPENDIX A: COMPANY GS PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 Verification requirements based on the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual (Version 01.2)

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
1 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document						
a	Are all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD in place?	VVM	196	Yes, all physical features of the proposed Gold Standard project activity are in place as it is registered in the PDD.	OK	OK
b	Have the project participants operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD?	VVM	196	Yes, the operation of the project activity is in line with the registered PDD. During monitoring period (may 2010) TEIAS installed equipment to the measurement equipment for the remotely reading. During monitoring period protocols signed by TEIAS to be in line with the monitoring plan. This installation does not cause any increase or decrease to the electricity generation value. During previous verification FAR has been created for the training procedures. In this 2nd verification it is seen that training procedures has been created and FAR has been closed. Regarding to the schedule Technical and Special Electrical Training has been planned in April. Please provide the certificates for these trainings.	CAR1	OK
c	Was an on-site visit conducted?	VVM	196	Yes, on site visit has been conducted on 14th of April 2011.	OK	OK
d	If not, justify the rationale of the decision.	VVM	196	n.a.	OK	OK
e	Does the implementation or operation of CDM project activity conform with the description	VVM	197	Yes, the implementation of the project activity is in line with the registered PDD. No deviation has	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	contained in the registered PDD?			been occurred for the implementation. However for the next verification monthly records can be taken remotely since GPRS has been installed. This has no impact for the electricity generation data. Also to be on the safe site monthly readings has been signed both by PP and TEIAS during this monitoring period. The record is being done by TEIAS and the value still can be cross checked from PMUM records. FAR3 has been closed.		
f	If not, which are the potential impacts due to these changes, according to the relevant guidelines established by the Executive Board (EB48-§73)?	VVM	197	n.a.	OK	OK
g	Was a notification or a request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD submited prior to the conclusion of the verification/certification for the corresponding?	VVM	197	n.a.	OK	OK
2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology						
a	Is the validated monitoring plan in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	200	Yes, the validated monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology.	OK	OK
b	If no, was a request for revision of the monitoring plan was done? (The DOE may request for revision of the monitoring plan covering the monitoring period under verification, for approval by the CDM Executive Board)	VVM	201	n.a.	OK	OK
c	Are there any monitoring aspects of the project	VVM	202	No, there is no monitoring aspects of the project	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
activity that are not specified in the methodology, particularly in the case of small-scale methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency)?			activity that are not specified in the methodology.		
3 Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan					
a Have the monitoring plan and the applied methodology been properly implemented and followed by the project participants?	VVM	205	Yes, monitoring plan applied propoerly. Please also provide objective evidance for CAR1.	CAR1	OK
b Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable, including:	VVM	205			
i Project emission parameters?	VVM	205	Project emissions are negligable regarding to the registered PDD and approved methodology. During site visit diesel consumption value has been checked and it is found that 1534 liter diesel has been used. The value is under %1 of total emission reductions.	OK	OK
ii Baseline emission parameters?	VVM	205	Baseline emission has been calculated through the electricity generation value and the approved emission factor. Please provide the generation values for March and April 2011.	CL1	OK
iii Leakage parameters?	VVM	205	n.a.	OK	OK
iv Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the	VVM	205	Yes, the responsibilities are in line with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	monitoring plan?					
c	Is the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board and are equipment controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan?	VVM	205	The accuracy of the monitoring equipments are under TEIAS control. During the monitoring period no brake down has been recorded. Only GPRS has been installed to the measurement equipment in 08.05.2010 This installation is only for the remote recording. No increase or decrease occurred in the generation data.	OK	OK
	i Are monitoring results consistently reccorded as per approved frequency?	VVM	205	Yes, the monitoring results recorded monthly as per approved frequency.	OK	OK
	ii Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan ?	VVM	205	Yes, QA/QC procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
4 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions						
a	Is a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available? (If no, i.e., only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the DOE shall opt to either make the most conservative assumption theoretically possible in finalizing the verification report, or raise a request for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance, if appropriate).	VVM	208	Yes, the complete set from 01/03/2010 and 28/02/2011 has been provided. Please also provide the records for march and April.	CL1	OK
b	Has information provided in the monitoring report been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis?	VVM	208	The provided electricity generation values has been cross checked with the PMUM records which are the annexes of the invoices.	OK	OK
c	Have calculations of baseline emissions, proposed	VVM	208	Yes, the calculations of the baseline emissions has	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	CDM project activity emissions and leakage, as appropriate, been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document?			been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan and presented in the emission reduction calculation excel.		
d	Have any assumptions used in emission calculations been justified?	VVM	208	No assumptions have been used. The emission factor has been taken from the approved PDD and it is defined as 0,644.	OK	OK
e	Have appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values been correctly applied?	VVM	208	Yes, correct emission factor has been used.	OK	OK

Table 2 Resolution of Corrective Action / Forward Action / Clarification Requests.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
CAR1- Yes, the operation of the project activity is in line with the registered PDD. During monitoring period (may 2010) TEIAS installed equipment to the measurement equipment for the remotely reading. During monitoring period protocols signed by TEIAS to be in line with the monitoring plan. This installation does not cause any increase or decrease to the electricity generation value. During previous verification FAR has been created for the training procedures. In this 2nd verification it is seen that training procedures has been created and FAR has been closed. Regarding to the schedule Technical and Special Electrical Training has been planned in April. Please provide the certificates for these trainings.		A technical training from Enercon has been already held on 11 April 2011 and certificates are provided to the DOE.	Technical training records have been provided to DOE. Technical Trainings has been done by Enercon on 11-15 April 2011. The certificates have been provided. The corrective action request is closed.
CL1 - Baseline emission has been calculated through the electricity generation value and the approved emission factor. Please provide the generation values for March and April 2011.		The requested data for March and April 2011 have been provided to the DOE and the Monitoring Report and the excel calculation have been revised accordingly.	Evidences for March and April 2011 have been provided. The clarification request is closed.