VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Tokat Enerji A.Ş.

Killik Wind Power Plant

IN

TURKEY

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 28/08/2016 to 12/10/2018 (Both days included)

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd. Carbon Department		
Project Title:	Killik Wind Power Plant		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current MR Version:**
562	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.		05
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
06/09/2019	10/06/2020	03.1	80
Verification Number:	**Registration Number:**	**Monitoring Period:**	
02	GS 947	From: 28/08/2016	To: 12/10/2018

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:** 12.1.0

Verified Emissions Reductions: 120,869 tCO_2e

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

Project Participants: Tokat Enerji A.Ş.

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings:

During the verification 12 Corrective Action Requests and 04 Clarification Requests were issued, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this verification report. 01 Forward Action Request was issued during the verification.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Killik Wind Power Plant" in Turkey, is in compliance with the monitoring plan described in the registered PDD, version 05 dated 24/04/2012 and GS-Passport, dated 01/04/2014. The GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the monitoring report version 06 dated 17/04/2020 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	**Name:**	**Signature:**	☐ Limited Distribution
(Technical Reviewer):	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 6

2. INTRODUCTION 7

2.1. Objective 7

2.2. Scope 7

2.3. Description of the Project Activity 7

2.4. Parties Involved 7

2.5. Verification Period Covered 7

3. METHODOLOGY 9

3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection 10

3.2. Desk Review of Documents 11

3.3. On-Site Visits 12

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol 13

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews 13

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues 14

3.7. Internal Quality Control 14

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS 16

4.1. Remaining Issues From Previous Validation or Verifications 16

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD 16

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

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan 17

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring 18

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring 18

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

4.8. Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions ... 21
4.9. Quality of Evidence ... 23
4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance ... 23
4.11. Materiality ... 23
4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan ... 23
4.13. Post Registration Changes ... 24
4.13.1. Temporary deviations ... 24
4.13.2. Corrections ... 24
4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period ... 24
4.13.4. Permanent changes ... 24
4.13.5. Changes to the project design ... 24
5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED ... 25
6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED ... 27
7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE ... 30
7.1. Appointment Certificates ... 31
8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION ... 33
ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL ... 34

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the second periodic verification of the “Killik Wind Power Plant” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS947” for the period between 28/08/2016-12/10/2018. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 06 dated 17/04/2020 of “Killik Wind Power Plant”.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Killik Wind Power Plant” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 05 dated 24/04/2012 and GS-Passport, dated 01/04/2014. 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 12.1.0.

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

The implementation of the project has resulted in 120,869 tCO_2e during the monitoring period 28/08/2016-12/10/2018.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by "Tokat Enerji A.Ş." to perform the second periodic verification of the "Killik Wind Power Plant" with the contract dated 22/07/2019. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated "17/04/2020" 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 05 dated 24/04/2012 and GS-Passport, dated 01/04/2014.

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 12.1.0", subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other related rules, according to the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities, version 2.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 2.0 and CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 2.0 and GS Toolkit version 2.1.

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

2.3. Description of the Project Activity

Tokat Enerji A.Ş. has installed and commissioned a 40 MW wind power plant with 16 Nordex N100 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MW and located in the central district of city of Tokat, Turkey. The electricity is transmitted to substation Tokat OSB TM, 154 kV bara.

The crediting period start date of the project as verified from the information provided on GS Registry by initial Verification Report is 13/10/2011 with choice of renewable crediting period.

2.4. Parties Involved

Tokat Enerji A.Ş.[1] is the project participant and host country is Turkey.

[1] The PP's name was changed on 23/01/2013 as Tokat Enerji A.Ş. (previously PEM Enerji A.Ş.) as available in the electricity generation licence.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the 2nd verification period from 28/08/2016 to 12/10/2018 (both days included).

3. METHODOLOGY

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

- Assessment of the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PDD, version 05 dated 24/04/2012 and GS-Passport, dated 01/04/2014.
- A site visit was conducted on 28/08/2019 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 12.1.0
- Assessment of the compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions
- Issuance of the verification report
- Independent technical review
- Approval of the verification report and request of issuance

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

The Verification Protocol consists of three tables:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the verification team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience required amongst team members for the verification of the emission reductions achieved by the project activity in the relevant monitoring period for this verification. The relevant GS verification and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The verification team and ITR are assigned to this verification activity on 10/07/2019 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 22/08/2019 which was submitted to the verification team on the same date. This monitoring report was revised several times due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 06 dated 17/04/2020 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PDD, version 05 dated 24/04/2012 and GS-Passport, dated 01/04/2014, the methodology ACM0002 version 12.1.0, 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 Bureau Veritas Certification (BVC), version 02, dated 29/05/2012 and the initial verification report of RINA Services S.p.A., dated 11/07/2014, version 1.2 Aa.

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	28/08/2019	
Location	Tokat	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
Orçun Altınbaş	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.	Meteorological Engineer (Head Office)
Salih Odabaş	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.	Plant Manager
Onur Karakuş	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.	Operator
Murat Şahin	Atak Güvenlik A.Ş.	Security Staff (Local)
İbrahim Köten	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.	Administrative Staff (Local)
Sıla Duran	Sekans Danışmanlık Ltd.	Consultant
Anıl Söyler	Re Carbon Ltd.	Team Leader
Alpaslan Dursunluer	Çayören Village	Mukhtar (Village Head)
Ömer Yılmaz	Çayören Village	Villager
İsmail Polat	Çayören Village	Villager
Aslı Dursunluer	Çayören Village	Villager
Gülay Dursunluer	Çayören Village	Villager
Hüseyin Uyar	Killik Village	Mukhtar (Village Head)
Hatice Uyar	Killik Village	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 12 CARs, 04 CLs and 01 FAR were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

During the verification period follow-up interviews were realized by 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	23/08/2019
On site assessment	28/08/2019
1st Protocol submission to client	06/09/2019
Responses received	21/10/2019
2nd Protocol submission to client	22/10/2019
Responses received	30/12/2019
Closure of all CARs and CLs	04/02/2020
Submission for Technical Review	07/02/2020
Submission for final approval	18/02/2020
Final documents submitted to client	18/02/2020
Revision of the report based on GS initial comments	22/04/2020
Revision of the report based on GS review 2nd round comments	10/06/2020

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 are two FARs from the initial verification period, one is during the initial verification and one from its GS review stage as in below in line with the provided final verification report and GS issuance review final document:

FAR-1:

"The verification DOE for the next monitoring period shall check if the roads damaged by the construction activities are fixed."

There hasn't been any observation about the road damage during the verification site visit. Besides that, there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders regarding this issue. Hence, this FAR has been closed.

FAR-2:

"PP has guaranteed to plant totally 3,000 trees for this project activity. However, in validation stage only 250 and in first verification 45 trees were planted. Related to that, a letter of permission to plant pine saplings is provided to the verification team. Therefore, a FAR is raised to monitor this parameter in the next verification."

1900 pine tree purchasing invoice dated as 27/06/2014 has been provided by PP and the plantation photos were taken during the site visit and so, FAR-1 was issued as indicated in the Annex-1 Verification Protocol and the records for the plantation of remaining 805 trees shall be checked during the next verification.

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

The project is fully implemented according to the description presented in the registered PDD and 16 wind turbines were seen during the site visit as in the registered project. The verifier confirms, through the visual inspection that all physical features of the project activity including data collecting systems and storage have been implemented in accordance with the registered PDD. Electricity meters were also seen on-site. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed on-site.

The project was operational on 13/10/2011 as confirmed during the initial verification period. The implementation of the 1st phase (8 wind turbines) was on 13/10/2011, the 2nd phase (6 wind turbines) was on 01/12/2011 and the 3rd phase (2 wind turbines) was on 17/12/2011.

Subsequently, in total eighteen additional turbines were commissioned on 21/07/2017 (7 wind turbines as T-17,18,19,28,29,32 and 34), 04/08/2017 (4 wind turbines as T-25,26,27 and 33) and 08/09/2017 (7 wind turbines as T-20,21,22,23,24,30 and 31), respectively. Besides that, the generation license of the project was revised on 04/08/2016 and the installed capacity of the project has been raised to 94MWm/85MWe with this revision. As a result, new turbine numbers' are T-17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33 and 34 which are Nordex N117/3000 wind turbines. As it's in the project license, three turbines have been capped by 2 MWe and three turbines by 1 MWe. However, the capacity addition (design change) process hasn't been initiated by PP in line with the Gold Standard rules, the capacity addition component is not eligible and this verification has been handled without the capacity addition component. Gold Standard registered capacity of the project (40 MW) is considered and the electricity generation and the emission reduction of the added units (18 turbines in total) hadn't been included for this verification.

According to the registered PDD, the estimated annual emission reduction is 52,087 tCO_2e and corresponding total estimated amount for the monitoring period is 110,738 tCO2e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is 120,869 tCO_2e. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period is 9.1% more than estimated emission reduction amount. However, considering the yearly fluctuations in wind and the uncertainty value (10.4% for 10 year electricity generation period) provided in the project's feasibility report dated as 27/10/2010, the average increase throughout the monitoring period as 9.1% is deemed acceptable.

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.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

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

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

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

The net electricity is measured continuously by two main electricity meters at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There are also two backup electricity meters.

The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. The serial numbers of the meters are 3574741 and 3574743 for the main meters and 3574742 and 3574744 for the backup meters, respectively and all are Itron 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 serial numbers of the electricity meters that were changed on 18/07/2017 are 424798 for the main meter and 424799 for the back up one and both were Elster brand and accuracy class of both were 0.5s in line with the provided meter change protocols. EPIAS records are the main data source and TEIAS meter reading protocol records are the cross check source. Besides that, SCADA system values are derived from the turbine supplier company and gross electricity generation values of additional turbines are subtracted from the total net electricity generation of the plant since EPIAS and TEIAS meter reading values belong to whole plant.

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
- Water Quality and Quantity
- Other Pollutants (Noise
- Biodiversity
- Quality of Employment
- Quantitative Employment and Income Generation
- Tree Plantation
- Domestic Waste
- Waste Oil

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	Dust emissions during the construction phase	On site observation (Continuously)	There hasn't been any construction activity in the project site in line with the site visit observations. Besides that, there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the verification site visit regarding this issue.
2	Water quality and quantity	Water Contamination	Project activity site visit (Continuously)	The net electricity generation has been checked from the EPİAŞ records. During the site visit, a septic tank for

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
				collection of wastewater has been checked. The sewage is transferred by sewage truck to local municipality sewage system as per the "Regulation on Control of Water Contamination". The wastewater transfer record dated as 23/10/2018 was provided to DOE. There hasn't been any waste water transfer in 2016 and 2017 in line with the signed and sealed declaration by PP.
3	Other Pollutants (Noise)	The noise level in the region after the project implementation	By noise level measurement (In case of a complaint)	There hadn't been any complaint about the noise during the site visit by the interviewed local stakeholders.
4	Biodiversity	Impact on migration of birds	Monitoring and reporting of bird collisions (Monitored continuously and reported yearly)	The ornithology report prepared by the relevant experts and dated as 22/02/2010 has been provided and it was stated in the report that significant impact on birds wasn't anticipated and there are less number of turbines for the implemented project activity than those stated in the report. Besides that, there hadn't been any complaint on this issue during the site visit by the interviewed local stakeholders.
5	Quality of employment	Training provided to employees	Through the training attendance list and/or certificates (Annually) (Once at the end of the each monitoring	As per the training records and certificates checked, the trainings were on occupational diseases, hygiene and first aid dated as 10/03/2016, 02/06/2016, 10/02/2017, basic HSE, work

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
			period). After first verification period, only new cases and refreshment trainings will be reported).	permit systems, risk analysis and working with the devices having screens 11/05/2017, 18/05/2017, 14/03/2018, 28/01/2019, 11/04/2019 and all 11 staff directly working on behalf of PP had been given the trainings.
6	Quantitative employment and income generation	Household income generated from the project	Social security system records (Annually)	As per the social security records checked and the interviews on-site, 16 employees (11 directly on behalf of PP including the plant operation manager and 5 for the subcontractors including the security and turbine companies) have been employed and 12 of them are local employees.
7	Tree Plantation	Number of trees planted in the project region	Project activity site visit (Before the initial verification)	1900 pine tree purchasing invoice dated as 27/06/2014 has been provided by PP and the plantation photos were taken during the site visit and so, FAR-1 was issued as indicated in the Annex-1 Verification Protocol and the records for the plantation of remaining 805 trees shall be checked during the next verification.
8	Domestic Waste	Waste disposal records	Project activity site visit (Continuously)	The signed and sealed declaration by PP and dated as 19/09/2019 and 04/06/2020 about the proper transfer of domestic waste to the Municipality waste disposal site has been provided. Besides that, there hadn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the verification site

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
				visit regarding the waste management practices.
9	Waste Oil	Waste disposal records	Project activity site visit (Continuously)	The hazardous waste transfer and disposal records dated as 11/06/2016, 15/05/2017, 22/06/2017 and 05/01/2018 have been provided. Besides that, there hadn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the verification site visit regarding the waste management practices.

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 13/10/2011 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. Last three meter tests for the meters were performed on 14/07/2017, 18/07/2017 and 27/08/2018, respectively.

The serial numbers of the meters are 3574741 and 3574743 for the main meters and 3574742 and 3574744 for the backup meters, respectively and all are Itron brand. All documents regarding meter quality and test have been presented for the second verification period.

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
28/08/2016 – 31/12/2016	Export to Grid: 28,153.06 MWh Import from Grid: 116.63 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 28,036.43 MWh	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2017 – 31/12/2017	Export to Grid: 147,883.76 MWh Import from Grid: 327.03 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 147,556.73 MWh Adjusted net electricity supplied to grid: 95,929.70 MWh (Considering GS registered capacity of the project (40 MW) and excluding the electricity generation of the added 18 turbines in 2017)	Monthly EPİAŞ records
01/01/2018 – 12/10/2018	Export to Grid: 180,240.49 MWh Import from Grid: 374.55 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 179,865.94 MWh Adjusted net electricity supplied to grid: 74,799.51 MWh (Considering GS registered capacity of the project (40 MW) and excluding the electricity generation of the added 18 turbines in 2018)	Monthly EPİAŞ records

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.6081 tCO_2/MWh and the value is same as indicated in the initial verification report and monitoring 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.

Besides that, the DOE has checked the I-REC Registry (https://registry.irecservices.com/Public/ReportDevices/), 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.

4.9. Quality of Evidence

According to the PDD, the estimated emission reduction for this monitoring period would be 110,738 tCO2e corresponding to the monitoring period. However, the project in operation totally reached 120,869 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)
28/08/2016 - 31/12/2016	17,049
01/01/2017 – 31/12/2017	58,335
01/01/2018 – 31/12/2018	45,486

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

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There were four electricity meters attached to the power plant for measurement of the generated electricity which were installed to the plant (2 main and 2 back-up). 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 28/08/2016 – 12/10/2018) and each day of production is included in these readings. These readings are exact and are the basis for billing. They are recorded and saved automatically by 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, v02). To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

N/A.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

N/A.

4.13.4. Permanent changes

The project was operational on 13/10/2011 as confirmed during the initial verification period. The implementation of the 1st phase (8 wind turbines) was on 13/10/2011, the 2nd phase (6 wind turbines) was on 01/12/2011 and the 3rd phase (2 wind turbines) was on 17/12/2011.

Subsequently, in total eighteen additional turbines were commissioned on 21/07/2017 (7 wind turbines as T-17,18,19,28,29,32 and 34), 04/08/2017 (4 wind turbines as T-25,26,27 and 33) and 08/09/2017 (7 wind turbines as T-20,21,22,23,24,30 and 31), respectively. Besides that, the generation license of the project was revised on 04/08/2016 and the installed capacity of the project has been raised to 94MWm/85MWe with this revision. As a result, new turbine numbers' are T-17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33 and 34 which are Nordex N117/3000 wind turbines. As it's in the project license, three turbines have been capped by 2 MWe and three turbines by 1 MWe. However, the capacity addition (design change) process hasn't been initiated by PP in line with the Gold Standard rules, the capacity addition component is not eligible and this verification has been handled without the capacity addition component. Gold Standard registered capacity of the project (40 MW) is considered and the electricity generation and the emission reduction of the added units (18 turbines in total) hadn't been included for this verification.

4.13.5. Changes to the project design

The project was operational on 13/10/2011 as confirmed during the initial verification period. The implementation of the 1st phase (8 wind turbines) was on 13/10/2011, the 2nd phase (6 wind turbines) was on 01/12/2011 and the 3rd phase (2 wind turbines) was on 17/12/2011.

Subsequently, in total eighteen additional turbines were commissioned on 21/07/2017 (7 wind turbines as T-17,18,19,28,29,32 and 34), 04/08/2017 (4 wind turbines as T-25,26,27 and 33) and 08/09/2017 (7 wind turbines as T-20,21,22,23,24,30 and 31), respectively. Please see the Sections 4.2 and 4.13.4 of this report for further details.

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[2]	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Orçun Altınbaş	Meteorological Engineer (Head Office)	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.
I02	SV	Salih Odabaş	Plant Manager	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.
I03	SV	Onur Karakuş	Operator	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.
I04	SV	Murat Şahin	Security Staff (Local)	Atak Güvenlik A.Ş.
I05	SV	İbrahim Köten	Administrative Staff (Local)	Tokat Enerji A.Ş.
I06	SV	Sıla Duran	Consultant	Sekans Danışmanlık Ltd.
I07	SV	Alpaslan Dursunluer	Mukhtar (Village Head)	Çayören Village
I08	SV	Ömer Yılmaz	Villager	Çayören Village
I09	SV	İsmail Polat	Villager	Çayören Village
I10	SV	Aslı Dursunluer	Villager	Çayören Village
I11	SV	Gülay Dursunluer	Villager	Çayören Village
I12	SV	Hüseyin Uyar	Mukhtar (Village Head)	Killik Village
I13	SV	Hatice Uyar	Villager	Killik Village

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

- Noise due to the project activity
- Sufficiency of local employment
- Waste management practices implemented by PP
- Dust emissions and usage of access roads (Due to the construction activities of extension and replacement of existing turbines)
- Impact of the project on flora and fauna including bird life

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. The document showing the contact details of

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

the relevant person within PP with the signature of Killik, Çayören and Tekneli Villages' Mukhtars (Village Heads) and dated as 19/09/2019 was also provided to DOE.

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

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

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	Registered PDD	05	24/04/2012
D02	Registered GS Passport	-	01/04/2014
D03	ACM0002	12.1.0	-
D04	Verification Service Agreement	-	22/07/2019
D05	Monitoring Report	01	22/08/2019
D06	Monitoring Report	02	15/10/2019
D07	Monitoring Report	03	30/12/2019
D08	Monitoring Report	04	03/02/2020
D09	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	22/08/2019
D10	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	15/10/2019
D11	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	30/12/2019
D12	CDM Validation and Verification Standard For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D13	CDM Project Standard For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D14	CDM Project Cycle Procedure For Project Activities	2.0	29/11/2018
D15	Gold Standard Toolkit	2.1	-
D16	Final Issuance Review of Previous Verification	-	04/11/2014
D17	Final Validation Report	02	29/05/2012
D18	Initial Monitoring Period Verification Report	1.2Aa	10/07/2014
D19	TEIAS Monthly Reading Protocols	-	08/2016 –10/2018
D20	EPIAS Screenshoots	-	08/2016 –10/2018
D21	Scada Program Screenshoots of Electricity Generation of Additional Turbines	-	-
D22	Meter Initial Calibration Records	-	13/10/2011
D23	Meter Test Reports	-	14/07/2017 18/07/2017 27/08/2018
D24	Training Records and Certificates (As detailed in the Section 4.6)	-	10/03/2016 02/06/2016 10/02/2017 11/05/2017 18/05/2017

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
			14/03/2018 28/01/2019 11/04/2019
D25	Social Security Records for PP Site Employees	-	-
D26	Wastewater Transfer Records	-	23/10/2018
D27	Signed Declaration by PP (About there hasnt been any waste water transfer in 2016 and 2017)	-	03/02/2020
D28	Hazardous Waste Disposal Records	-	11/06/2016 15/05/2017 22/06/2017 05/01/2018
D29	Signed Declaration by PP (About domestic waste transfer to disposal site by PP)		19/09/2019 04/06/2020
D30	PIF Report	-	12/2009
D31	EIA Positive Decision (Capacity increase)	-	31/03/2017
D32	EIA Report ((Capacity increase)	-	02/03/2017
D33	Pine Tree Purchasing Invoice	-	27/06/2014
D34	Ornithology Report	-	22/02/2010
D35	Expropriation Payment Guarantee Letter by the Relevant Bank	-	17/10/2016
D36	Turbine Layout Document	-	-
D37	Electricity Generation Licence (Last Amendment Date)		04/08/2016
D38	Wind Data Analysis and Energy Generation Assessment Report	-	27/10/2010
D39	Technical Description Document of Nordex N100/2500 Turbines	-	17/06/2011
D40	Letter by the Village Heads (Mukhtars) (About the Contact Details of PP Relevant Staff in case of Any Complaint)	-	19/09/2019
D41	Provisional Acceptance Protocols of 16 Turbines (Registered Project)	-	13/10/2011 01/12/2011 17/12/2011
D42	Provisional Acceptance Protocols of Additional Turbines (T-17, T-18, T-19, T-20,T-21,T-22, T-23, T-24, T-25, T-26, T-27, T-28, T-29, T-30, T-31, T-32, T-33 and T-34 Turbines)	-	21/07/2017 04/08/2017 08/09/2017
D43	Single Line Diagram of the Project	-	13/06/2017
D44	Site Visit Photos	-	28/08/2019
D45	Monitoring Report	05	13/02/2020

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D46	Monitoring Report	06	17/04/2020
D47	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	04	17/04/2020

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. Anil 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**

[illegible]

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

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Division

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **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. Anil SOYLER	Certification Manager	05-05-2017	
Name	**Position**	**Date**	**Signature**

F-C-003 / 05.05.2017 - 03

8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the second periodic verification of “Killik Wind Power Plant” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS947” for the period between 28/08/2016 and 12/10/2018. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 06 dated 17/04/2020 of “Killik Wind Power Plant”.

Tokat Enerji 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 05.

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 “Killik Wind Power Plant” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 05 dated 24/04/2012 and GS-Passport, dated 01/04/2014. 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 12.1.0.

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

Project Title	Killik Wind Power Plant
Applicable Period	2nd Monitoring Period (From 28/08/2016 to 12/10/2018 (both days included))
Baseline Emissions	120,869 tCO_2e (28/08/2016 - 31/12/2016 :17,049 tCO_2e; 2017: 58,335 tCO_2e; 01/01/2018 -12/10/2018: 45,486 tCO_2e)
Project Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Leakage Emissions	0 tCO_2e
Emission Reductions	120,869 tCO_2e (28/08/2016 - 31/12/2016 :17,049 tCO_2e; 2017: 58,335 tCO_2e; 01/01/2018 -12/10/2018: 45,486 tCO_2e)

Anıl SÖYLER	Fikriye Seda Atabek	Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
10/06/2020	10/06/2020	10/06/2020

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 see in below.	OK	OK
1.1. Title of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the title is available as Killik Wind Power Plant.	OK	OK
1.2. Reference number of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the reference number (GS 947) has been provided.	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please clarify the version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report in the cover page since the provided version is version 04. b) Please also clarify the version number or date of GS Passport since the provided one is dated as 24/02/2012.	CAR-1	OK
1.4. Version number of the monitoring report;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this is available as 01.	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	Yes, monitoring report number for this monitoring period is available as 1.	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
1.8. Project participant(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this is available.	OK	OK
1.9. Host Party(ies);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, host Party is available.	OK	OK
1.10. Applied methodology(ies), and where applicable, applied standardized baseline(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this is available.	OK	OK
1.11. Sectoral scope(s)	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, sectoral scope information 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	Please provide the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD in the cover page.	CAR-2	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 value of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period in the cover page. b) Please provide the ER calculation spreadsheet along with the relevant details. c) Please provide EPIAS records for the monitoring period. d) Please provide the relevant evidence document for the commissioning dates of all turbines including additional ones. e) Please provide total electricity generation values of additional turbines in decimal values in the Excel spreadsheet. f) Please correct the net electricity and ER values in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections.	CAR-3	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.14. 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
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	Please see CAR-3.	CAR-3	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

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A. Description of the Project Activity					
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity					
A.1.1. Has a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, but please see option d of CAR-3.	CAR-3	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	a) Please provide the reference evidence document for the turbine coordinates provided in the Section A.2 of the MR. b) Please provide the approved planning permission document in kmz format.	CAR-4	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, this is available.	OK	OK
A.4. References to applied methodologies and standardized baselines					
A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the	CDM-MR-	DR	Yes, the methodology and referred tools along with the relevant	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
methodology or standardized baseline(s), tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied been provided under section A.4 including the version numbers and titles?	FORM version 7.0		versions have been provided in the Section A.4 of the MR.		
A.5. Crediting period of project activity					
A.5.1. Has the crediting period including the crediting period start date, choice and length of the crediting period been provided under section A.5 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, all these are available.	OK	OK
B. Implementation of the Project Activity					
B.1. Description of implemented registered project activity					
B.1.1. Has the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment, including the diagrams, where appropriate, been included in Section B.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §257a	DR	a) Please provide the reference document about the brief technical details for the used wind turbines within the context of the project activity. b) Please include the initial and current monitoring periods including the relevant dates into the provided timeline in the Section B.1 of the MR. c) Please provide the relevant reference document for the operational date of the project. d) Please clarify if there is GS design change process including the correspondences with GS in the Section B.1 of the MR.	CAR-5	OK
B.1.2. Has the information on the implementation and actual operation of	EB93 Report Annex 4	DR	The information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction,	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	§257b		commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) has been provided.		
B.1.3. If the project activity consists of more than one site, has the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site been clearly described under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR, SV	The project consists of only one site.	OK	OK
B.1.4. If the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed 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.	OK	OK
B.2. Post registration changes					
B.2.1. **Temporary deviations from 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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 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
period?	Annex 5 §282 CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0				
B.2.1.2. If there are temprorary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs described the nature, extent and duration of the non-conforming monitoring and the proposed alternative monitoring of the project activity in the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232a	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, have PPs applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §284				
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	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
PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	FORM version 7.0				
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	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.3.2. Have the changes been notified to	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
the Secretariat by the PPs?	§235				
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 the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4. **Inclusion of 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**					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other methodological regulatory documents					
B.2.5.1 Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies or standardized baseline had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §239	DR, SV	Please provide the latest available generation licence. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-1 CAR-3	OK
B.2.5.2 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	Please provide the latest available generation licence. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-1 CAR-3	OK
B.2.5.3 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	Please provide the latest available generation licence. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-1 CAR-3	OK
B.2.5.4 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	Please provide the latest available generation licence. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-1 CAR-3	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.2.5.5 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 number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please provide the latest available generation licence. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-1 CAR-3	OK
B.2.5.6 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		Please provide the latest available generation licence. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-1 CAR-3	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	Please see option d of CAR-3 and CL-1.	CL-1 CAR-3	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	Please see option d of CAR-3 and CL-1.	CL-1 CAR-3	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	Please see option d of CAR-3 and CL-1.	CL-1 CAR-3	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.2.6.4. 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 standardized baseline or the requirements of another methodology and/or the standardized baseline that is applicable to the project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §303		Please see option d of CAR-3 and CL-1.	CL-1 CAR-3	OK
B.2.6.5. Does the changes to project activity include the following?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240	DR	Please see option d of CAR-3 and CL-1.	CL-1 CAR-3	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	Please see option d of CAR-3 and CL-1.	CL-1 CAR-3	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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240d	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
activities?					
B.2.6.5.5. Actual operational parameters which are within the control of project participants differing from the expected parameters?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243a 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
applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered;	Annex 5 §303c				
B.2.6.6.2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243b EB93 Report Annex 5 §303d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
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 (The additional capacity and the net electricity generation through this additional capacity haven't been included in this verification).	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 (The additional capacity and the net electricity generation through this additional capacity haven't been included in this verification).	OK	OK
B.2.6.7.6 In the case of investment analysis, have PPs modified the key parameters in the	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244a	DR	N/A (The additional capacity and the net electricity generation through this additional capacity haven't been included in this verification).	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
original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §304a				
B.2.6.7.7 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 (The additional capacity and the net electricity generation through this additional capacity haven't been included in this verification).	OK	OK
B.2.6.8. 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.2.6.8.8 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.2.6.8.9 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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246a(ii)	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
selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline?					
B.2.6.9. Is it indicated whether any changes to the project design of the project activity from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies had been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.10. 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.2.6.11. 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

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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 Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, the description of the monitoring system has been provided in the Section C of the MR.	OK	OK
C.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	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, this is available.	OK	OK
C.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, such details are available.	OK	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

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, this is available.	OK	OK
C.2.5. Data reporting	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, such details are available.	OK	OK
C.3. Has organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, such details are available in the Section C of the MR.	OK	OK
C.4. Regarding to the management and operational system, are the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(iv)	DR	Yes, such details are available but please include a monitoring organizational chart according to the roles and responsibilities in the Section C of the MR.	CAR-6	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364e	DR	Yes, these procedures have been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4	DR	Yes, single line diagram is 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
	§259				

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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-6.	CAR-6	OK
C.8. Has the monitoring of parameters (baseline / project / leakage / emission reduction) in the project activity been implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered PDD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(i)-(ii)-(iii)	DR	Yes, 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 and recorded 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	a) Please correct the unit of EGgross,y, NCVi,y and EFCO2i,y parameters in the Section D.1 of the MR. b) Please correct the value applied part of FCi,y parameter. c) Please include EFgrid,CM,y parameter in the Section D.1 of the MR.	CAR-7	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	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the monitoring plan?					
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	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	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	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	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	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	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	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	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	Please see CAR-7.	CAR-7	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	Yes, EG,y (Annual net electricity generation) is the data monitoring parameter. However, the following findings have been determined: a) Please include the monitored values of EGfacility,y parameter throughout the MR. b) Please correct the last sentence of the QA/QC procedures part of EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR. c) Regarding the sustainability monitoring, please include all required sustainability monitoring parameters in tabular format in the MR. d) The environmental noise assessment report, if any, is missing. e) The bird monitoring results and ornithology reports, if any, with regards to the monitoring period are missing. f) Please provide the training records associated with the	CAR-8	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			monitoring period. g) Please provide the current letter with regards to domestic waste. h) Please check and correct the number of total employees. i) The social security records (statement of employment) of the subcontractors proving the local employment for the monitoring period are missing. j) The expropriation records for the existing and additional turbines are missing. k) The documents regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint for Killik, Cayoren and Tekneli villages are missing.		

*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-8.	CAR-8	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-8.	CAR-8	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	Yes, this is available.	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	Yes, this is available.	OK	OK
D.2.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the values of the monitoring parameter been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the values of the monitoring parameters have been indicated.	OK	OK
D.2.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the QA/QC procedures being applied been given?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this is 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
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	This is available in the Section C of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
D.2.8.3. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The serial numbers of the electricity meters are available but please correct the serial number of replaced back-up meter in the Section D.2 of the MR.	CAR-9	OK
D.2.8.4. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The initial test report dates are available but please provide the meter test protocols dated as 27/08/2018.	CL-2	OK
D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
D.2.9. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the measurement and recording frequency been indicated?	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	This is 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
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	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.13. Is the calibration of the measuring equipments that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions conducted by the PPs at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §374	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.14. Has the calibration been delayed and has the calibration been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	DR	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.15. If the calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, are one of the following	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369	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
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	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16. If calibration is delayed and if the calibration is implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available) for the certain monitoring period, has the error been applied in following ways?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370	DR	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	OK
D.2.16.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370b	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
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	N/A	OK	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	N/A	OK	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-8.	CAR-8	OK
D.2.21. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376	DR	Please see CAR-8.	CAR-8	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-3.	CAR-3	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-3.	CAR-3	
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	Please see CAR-3.	CAR-3	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	Please provide the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period in the Section E.4	CAR-10	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	version 7.0		of the MR.		
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	Please see CAR-10.	CAR-10	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 correct the amount estimated ex ante for this monitoring period in the Section E.5 of the MR.	CAR-11	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	Yes, this is available.	OK	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		Please provide the relevant reference document (e.g. feasibility report) if the increase in terms of expected electricity generation is within the acceptable range. Please also see CAR-3.	CL-3 CAR-3	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 a 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 are two FARs from the initial verification period, one is during the initial verification and one from its GS review stage as in below: a) "The verification DOE for the next monitoring period shall check if the roads damaged by the construction activities are fixed." Therefore, please provide the relevant evidence to confirm that there hasn't been any damage on the roads. b) "PP has guaranteed to plant totally 3,000 trees for this project activity. However, in validation stage only 250 and in first verification 45 trees were planted. Related to that a letter of permission to plant pine saplings is provided to the verification team. Therefore, a FAR is raised to monitor this parameter in the next verification." Therefore, please provide the relevant evidence to confirm 3,000 trees have been planted.	CL-4	OK
G.1.2. If there any remaining FARs from the	EB93 Report	DR	Please see CL-4.	CL-4	

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

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PPs addressed these FARs in the MR?	Annex 5 §38 §349				
G.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349 §347d	DR	Please see CL-4.	CL-4	OK

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

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Has the host country implemented a cap on its GHG emissions, after the registration of the project activity?	T 1.2.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
2. If the host country implemented a cap on its GHG emissions after the registration of the project activity, has a proof of retirement of an equal amount of allowances been submitted by the project owners?	T 1.2.7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3. Has there been any grievances raised by the local stakeholders?	T 4.5	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 a) Please clarify the version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report in the cover page since the provided version is version 04. b) Please also clarify the version number or date of GS Passport since the provided one is dated as 24/02/2012.	Table-1 1.3	a) Version number has been changed. b) The latest version of the GS Passport is available to the DOE.	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The final version has been corrected as version 04 in the MR). b) Ok Closed (The latest one, version 04 dated 24/02/2012, as referred in the validation report has been provided).
CAR-2 Please provide the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD in the cover page.	Table 1 1.12	Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions have been provided. Review-1: The cover page has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Please include the unit of estimated amount of GHG emission reductions in the cover page. Review-2: Ok Closed (The cover page of MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-3 a) Please provide the value of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period in the cover page. b) Please provide the ER calculation spreadsheet along with the relevant details. c) Please provide EPIAS records for the monitoring period. d) Please provide the relevant evidence document for the commissioning dates of all turbines including additional ones. e) Please provide total electricity generation values of	Table 1 1.13	a) The value of actual GHG emission reductions has been provided. b) ER calculation spreadsheet along with the relevant details have been provided. c) EPİAS records have been provided. d) Regarding the registered capacity, Killik WPP first Index Protocol (Meterdetails)_13.10.2011 and regarding the added turbines, Ministry Acceptance Protocols are available to the DOE. e) Electricity generation values of additional turbines have been provided in decimal values. f) Net electricity and ER values have been corrected	Review-1: a) Please include the unit of achieved amount of GHG emission reductions in the cover page. b) Ok Closed (ER calculations have been provided and been checked). c) Ok Closed (EPIAS records have been provided and been checked). d) -Please include the details of additional turbines including the turbine number, its electric capacity, relevant commissioning date and the displacement of the turbines, if any, in

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

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
additional turbines in decimal values in the Excel spreadsheet. f) Please correct the net electricity and ER values in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections.		in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR. Review-1: a) The unit of achieved amount of GHG emission reductions has been included in the cover page. d)-The details have been added in Section A.1. - Column F has been corrected. - The first meter index protocol date has been corrected.	the MR. -Please include commissioning dates of all additional turbines in the provided SCADA screenshots. - Please provide vintage total column F values as an integer value in the ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet. -Please correct the first meter index protocol date in the Section B.1 of the MR. e) Ok Closed (The generation values of additional turbines have been provided in decimal values and Excel spreadsheet has been revised). f) Ok Closed (ER calculation Excel spreadsheet and MR have been revised accordingly). Review-2: a) Ok Closed (The cover page of MR has been revised accordingly). d) -Ok Closed (The details of additional turbines including the turbine number, its electric capacity, relevant commissioning date have been included in the Section A.1 of the MR). -Ok Closed (The details about commissioning dates have been provided in the Excel spreadsheet and MR). -Ok Closed (The vintage total in the column F have been corrected).

* 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
			-Ok Closed (The mentioned date in the Section B.1 of the MR has been corrected).
CAR-4 a) Please provide the reference evidence document for the turbine coordinates provided in the Section A.2 of the MR. b) Please provide the approved planning permission document in kmz format.	Table 1 A.2.1	a) The generation license including the coordinates is available to the DOE. b) The approved planning permission document is available to the DOE. Please see the files named as “killik_res_tüm_proje_ed50_25000” and “Killik RES-Türbin Yerleşimi”.	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The generation licence has been provided). b) Ok Closed (The relevant permission documents have been provided).
CAR-5 a) Please provide the reference document about the brief technical details for the used wind turbines within the context of the project activity. b) Please include the initial and current monitoring periods including the relevant dates into the provided timeline in the Section B.1 of the MR. c) Please provide the relevant reference document for the operational date of the project. d) Please clarify if there is GS design change process including the correspondences with GS in the Section B.1 of the MR.	Table 1 B.1.1	a) Reference documents are available to the DOE. b) Project timeline has been revised accordingly. c) Please see the file Killik WPP first Index Protocol (Meterdetails)_13.10.2011. d) No design change process has been initiated, yet. Review-1: d) Section B.1 has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The relevant evidence documents have been provided). b) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly and the dates are available in the timeline). c) Ok Closed (The provisional acceptance documents and initial meter index protocol have been provided to confirm the operational date). d) Please include information with regards to the design change process in the Section B.1 of the MR. Review-2: d) Ok Closed (Section B.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-6 Please include a monitoring organizational chart according to the roles and responsibilities in the Section C of the MR.	Table 1 C.4	Monitoring organizational chart has been added in the Section C. Review-1:	Review-1: Please include the roles and responsibilities of the project site staff with regards to the monitoring 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
		Section C has been revised accordingly.	Review-2: Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-7 a) Please correct the unit of EGgross,y, NCVi,y and EFCO2i,y parameters in the Section D.1 of the MR. b) Please correct the value applied part of FCi,y parameter. c) Please include EFgrid,CM,y parameter in the Section D.1 of the MR.	Table 1 D.1.1	a) Related sections have been revised accordingly. b) The value applied part of FCi,y parameter has been corrected. c) EFgrid,CM,y parameter has been included.	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The units have been corrected and MR has been revised accordingly). b) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly). c) Ok Closed (The mentioned parameter has been included in the Section D.1 of the MR).
CAR-8 EG,y (Annual net electricity generation) is the data monitoring parameter. However, the following findings have been determined: a) Please include the monitored values of EGfacility,y parameter throughout the MR. b) Please correct the last sentence of the QA/QC procedures part of EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR. c) Regarding the sustainability monitoring, please include all required sustainability monitoring parameters in tabular format in the MR. d) The environmental noise assessment report, if any, is missing. e) The bird monitoring results and ornithology reports, if any, with regards to the monitoring period are missing. f) Please provide the training records associated with	Table 1 D.2.1	a) The monitored values of EGfacility,y parameter have been included. b) The sentence has been corrected. c) Air quality and other pollutant (noise) parameters have been added to the MR. d) There is no environmental noise assessment report after the first monitoring period. During site visit, there wasn't any complaint about noise from local people. e) The ornithology report is available to the DOE. f) The training records associated with the monitoring period have been provided to the DOE. g) The current letter with regards to domestic waste is available to the DOE. h) The number of total employees has been corrected. i) The social security records are available to the	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The values have been included in the Section D.2 of the MR). b) Ok Closed (The sentence has been corrected). c) Ok Closed (All parameters are available in the revised MR). d) Ok Closed (There hadn't been any complaint about the noise during the site visit, so it is deemed as acceptable). e) Ok Closed (The ornithology report dated as 22/02/2010 has been provided and it was stated in the report that significant impact on birds wasn't anticipated and there are less number of turbines for the implemented project activity than

* 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 monitoring period. g) Please provide the current letter with regards to domestic waste. h) Please check and correct the number of total employees. i) The social security records (statement of employment) of the subcontractors proving the local employment for the monitoring period are missing. j) The expropriation records for the existing and additional turbines are missing. k) The documents regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint for Killik, Cayoren and Tekneli villages are missing.		DOE. j) The expropriation records are available to the DOE. k) The documents regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint for Killik, Cayoren and Tekneli villages are available to the DOE. Review-1: f) The training details have been added as Annex I. g) Signed and sealed declaration about the domestic waste has been provided. h) The number of total employees has been corrected. j) Since the process has not been completed yet, the payments have not been finalized. However, a guarantee letter has been given that warrants the payment. Please see the "Guarantee Letter for Expropriation".	those stated in the report. Besides that, there hadn't been any complaint on this issue by the interviewed local stakeholders.) f) Please include the provided training details including the training name, number of attendees and dates in the Section D.2 of the MR. g) Please provide signed and sealed declaration about the domestic waste transfer and disposal by PP. h) Please check and correct the number of total employees in line with provided social security records. i) Ok Closed (The social security records (statement of employment) of the subcontractors have been provided). j) Please provide the expropriation payment records. k) Ok Closed (The signed letters by Killik, Cayoren and Tekneli Villages' Mukhtars (Village Heads) have been provided). Review-2: f) Ok Closed (The training details have been provided in the MR). g) Ok Closed (The signed and sealed declaration dated as 19/09/2019 and confirming that domestic waste has been transferred properly by PP has been provided). h) Ok Closed (The total number 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
			employees has been corrected in the MR). j) Ok Closed (Although the expropriation payment process hasn't been finalized, the expropriation payment guarantee letter by the relevant bank and dated as 17/10/2016 has been provided).
CAR-9 Please correct the serial number of replaced back-up meter in the Section D.2 of the MR.	Table 1 D.2.8.3	The serial number of replaced back-up meter has been corrected in the Section D.2 of the MR. Review-1: The serial number has been corrected.	Review-1: Please correct the serial number of replaced back-up meter in the Section D.2 of the MR. Review-2: Ok Closed (The serial number has been corrected and Section D.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-10 Please provide the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period in the Section E.4 of the MR.	Table 1 E.4.4	The total emission reductions have been provided.	Review-1: Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly and total emission reductions value has been provided).
CAR-11 Please correct the amount estimated ex ante for this monitoring period in the Section E.5 of the MR.	Table 1 E.5.1	The amount estimated ex ante has been corrected.	Review-1: Ok Closed (The estimated value has been revised in in the Section E.5 of the MR and the calculation is found to be correct).
CAR-12 (Raised during ITR) Please correct the sentence "The total electricity production of the project was calculated 151,302 MWh between the dates 28/08/2016 and 12/10/2018, both days are included." in the Section A.1 of the MR.	Table 1 A.1.1	MR has been revised.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised 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
CL-1 Please provide the latest available generation licence.	Table 1 B.2.5.1	The latest available generation license is available to the DOE. Review-1: a) It's been included. b) Please see Section A.1.	Review-1: a) Please include the latest license revision date in the MR. b) Please include the latest capacity (mechanical and electrical) along with the relevant license date in the MR. Review-2: a) Ok Closed (This information has been provided in the Section B.1 of the MR). b) Ok Closed (This information has been provided in the Section A.1 of the MR).
CL-2 Please provide the meter test protocols dated as 27/08/2018.	Table 1 D.2.8.4	The meter test protocols dated as 27/08/2018 are available to the DOE. Please see pages 10-13 of the file *Tokat Karbon DeğerlendirmeSayaç Test ve Değişim TutanaklarıSayaç Test Tutanağı* Review-1: Please check the pages 10-13 of the file, Tokat Karbon Değerlendirme Sayaç Test ve Değişim TutanaklarıSayaç Test Tutanağı, provided.	Review-1: Please provide the meter test protocols dated as 27/08/2018 since those aren't available among the provided documents. Review-2: Ok Closed (The mentioned meter test protocols have been provided).
CL-3 Please provide the relevant reference document (e.g. feasibility report) if the increase in terms of expected electricity generation is within the acceptable range.	Table 1 E.6.1	Please see the generation license for the expected electricity generation.	Review-1: Ok Closed (The feasibility report dated as 27/10/2010 has been provided and the achieved emission reduction is slightly higher than the expected amount and difference is in the acceptable range (10.4% for 10 year period as stated in the feasibility report) considering fluctuations in wind and the high uncertainty for wind speed estimation.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CL-4 There are two FARs from the initial verification period, one is during the initial verification and one from its GS review stage as in below: a) "The verification DOE for the next monitoring period shall check if the roads damaged by the construction activities are fixed." Therefore, please provide the relevant evidence to confirm that there hasn't been any damage on the roads. b) "PP has guaranteed to plant totally 3,000 trees for this project activity. However, in validation stage only 250 and in first verification 45 trees were planted. Related to that, a letter of permission to plant pine saplings is provided to the verification team. Therefore, a FAR is raised to monitor this parameter in the next verification." Therefore, please provide the relevant evidence to confirm 3,000 trees have been planted.	Table 1 F.1.1	Review-1: a) The roads damaged by the construction activities have been fixed with the company's own means, construction plant and equipment. Therefore, there isn't any document for this, however, it's been seen that the roads were fixed during the verification by the DOE. b) In total, 1,900 units of tree have been planted. The records are available to the DOE.	Review-1: a) Please provide the relevant evidence to confirm that there hasn't been any damage on the roads since the provided document is relevant with land usage permit. b) Ok Closed (1900 pine tree purchasing invoice dated as 27/06/2014 has been provided and the plantation photos were taken during the site visit and so please see FAR-1). Review-2: Ok Closed (There hasn't been any observation about the road damage during the verification site visit. Besides that, there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders regarding this issue).
FAR-1: Since 3000 tree plantation works hasn't been completed yet, the records for the plantation of remaining 805 trees shall be checked during the next verification.	Table 1 F.1.1		Review-1: This shall be checked during the next verification.

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