VERIFICATION REPORT
GALATA WIND ENERJİ A.Ş.

VERIFICATION OF THE
SAH WIND POWER PLANT

REPORT NO.BVC/TURKEY-VR/ CER. TR.3174529.18.C45/2018

REVISION NO. 03

BUREAU VERITAS (INDIA) PVT LTD
72 BUSINESS PARK, 9TH FLOOR, MAROL INDUSTRIAL AREA,
MIDC CROSS ROAD 'C', ANDHERI (EAST), MUMBAI–400093 INDIA

Report No: BVC/TURKEY CER.TR.3174529.18.C45/2018 rev. 03

VERIFICATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 26/07/2017	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas (India) Pvt Ltd
Client: Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş	Client ref.: Mr. Cem Cagri LEVENT

Summary:

Bureau Veritas has conducted the 2nd periodic verification of Şah Wind Power Plant, GS Registration Reference Number GS905, owned by Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş., which is located in Bandirma district of Balikesir province and in Karacabey district of Bursa province in Turkey and applying the methodology ACM0002 Version 12.1.0, on the basis of Gold Standard v.2.2, UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria.

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in the validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction run reliably and are calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements, and the emission reductions verified totalize 566,318 tons of CO2e for the monitoring period.

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

Reporting period	: 01/06/2015 – 31/05/2018
Baseline emissions	: 566,318 t CO_2 equivalents.
Project emissions	: 0 t CO_2 equivalents.
Leakage emissions	: 0 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions Before 2013	: 0 t CO_2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions after 2013 (01/06/2015 – 31/05/2018)	: 566,318 t CO_2 equivalents
Emission Reduction Total	: 566,318 tCO_2 equivalents.

Report No.: BVC/CER.TR. 3174529.18.C45/2018	Subject Group: GS-VER	
Project title: Şah Wind Power Plant		
Work carried out by: Mr. Furkan SADIKOĞLU – Team Leader		
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Mrs. Seda YÜCEL		
Date of this revision: 28/08/2018	Rev. No.: 03	Number of pages: 54

Indexing terms

Work approved by: Ms. Sapana Pednekar

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Abbreviations

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
VER	Voluntary Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
CO2e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
MR	Monitoring Report
PDD	Project Design Document
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
TEIAS	Turkish Electricity Transmission Corporation (Turkiye Elektrik İletim A.S.)
PMUM	Market Financial Settlement Center (Piyasa Mali Uzlastirma Merkezi)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard

Table of Contents *Page*

1. INTRODUCTION

Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. (Galata hereafter) has commissioned Bureau Veritas to verify the emissions reductions of its GS-VER project Sah Wind Power Plant (hereafter called “Sah”) at Bandirma district of Balikesir province and in Karacabey district of Bursa province in Turkey.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the Project, performed on the basis of Gold Standard v.2.2 and UNFCCC criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1. Objective

The objective of GS-VER verification is to conduct a thorough, independent assessment of the registered project activities.

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

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

(b) Ensure that the monitoring report and other supporting documents provided are complete in accordance with latest applicable version of the completeness checklist for requests for issuance of VERs, verifiable, and in accordance with applicable Gold Standard v.2.2 and CDM requirements;

(c) Ensure that actual monitoring systems and procedures comply with the monitoring systems and procedures described in the monitoring plan or any revised approved monitoring plan, and the approved methodology including applicable tool(s);

(d) Evaluate the data recorded and stored as per the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s).

1.2. Scope

The verification scope is defined as an independent and objective review and ex-post determination of the monitored GHG emission reductions. The verification is based on the validated and registered project design document, the monitoring report, emission reduction calculation spreadsheet, and supporting documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against Kyoto Protocol requirements, Gold Standard v.2.2, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting service towards the PPs. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project monitoring towards reductions in the GHG emissions.

1.3. GHG Project Description

Şah Wind Power Plant consists 35 Wind Turbines with 3 MW for each capacity and 105 MWm / 105 MWe for total capacity. In the beginning 31 turbines are commissioned. Additional 4 turbines are added to project and capacity increased. The project was taken over by Doğan Enerji Yatırımları San. ve Tic. A.Ş. in June 2012. Estimated electricity generation is confirmed through the Deutsche WindGuard GmbH, Energy Yield Assessment Report dated December 2008 as 341,275 MWh/year. Estimated emission reduction has been confirmed as 207,188 tCO2e during the validation.

Project title:	Sah Wind Power Plant
GS ref number:	GS 905
1st Crediting Period:	15/11/2011 to 14/11/2018 (renewable)
Monitoring Period:	01/06/2015 to 31/05/2018
Project Participants:	Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.
Methodologies used	ACM0002 Version 12.1.0
Location of the Project:	Bandirma district of Balikesir and Karacabey district of Bursa, Turkey
Geo coordinates:	Between (Turbine 1 and Turbine 35) East: 601446, North: 4469492 and East: 601498, North: 4470370
GS view page:	https://mer.markit.com/br-reg/public/project.jsp?project_id=103000000002024

The GPS coordinates of the 35 turbines of the project are verified regarding the EMRA Generation License dated 10/04/2008 /1/, the registered GS-VER-PDD /2/ and the registered GS Passport /3/. The crediting period start date is defined in line with the Gold Standard Requirements, Section V.a.2.1: “For VER project activities proceeding under the regular project cycle, the start date of the Gold Standard Crediting Period shall be the date of start of operation or a maximum of two years prior to Gold Standard registration, whichever occurs later”. Since the first phase commissioning date of the project activity is 19/05/2011 and the registration date of the project is 06/11/2013, the crediting period start date is defined as 15/11/2011.

No post registration changes have been requested.

1.4. Verification Team

The assessment team and internal technical reviewer team consist of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	TA 1.2	TASK PERFORMED*
Team Leader	Mr. Furkan SADIKOĞLU	☒	☒**DR** ☒**SV** ☒**RI** ☐**TR**
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Mrs. Seda YÜCEL	☒	☐**DR** ☐**SV** ☐**RI** ☒**TR**
Report Issuance	Ms. Sapana PEDNEKAR	☒	☐**DR** ☐**SV** ☒**RI** ☐**TR**

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

2. METHODOLOGY

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

In order to ensure transparency, a re-validation protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 09.0 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, issued by CDM Executive Board after its 4/CMP.10 on 15/02/2015 (Ref-04). The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The re-validation protocol serves the following purposes:

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

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

2.1. Review of Documents

The assessment of the project documentation provided by the project participant is based upon both quantitative and qualitative information on emission reductions. Quantitative information comprises the reported numbers in the monitoring report (MR) version 0.3 dated 27/08/2018 /6/ and emission reduction calculation spreadsheet version 0.2 dated 21/06/2018 /7/. Qualitative information comprises information on internal management controls, calculation procedures, procedures for transfer of data, frequency of emissions reports, and review and internal audit of calculations.

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

(a) The registered GS-VER-PDD, the registered GS Passport and the monitoring plan, /2,3,6/;

(b) The verification report /8/

(c) The applied monitoring methodology /8/;

2.2. Follow-up Interviews

On 04/06/2018, Bureau Veritas performed a site visit and interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. (Project Owner)	➢ Project Design and implementation ➢ Technical equipment, calibration and operation ➢ Monitoring Plan and management procedures ➢ Monitoring data ➢ Data uncertainty and residual risks (QA/QC) ➢ GHG Calculation ➢ Environmental Impacts ➢ Compliance with National Laws and Regulations
Rüzgar Danışmanlık (the Consultant)	➢ Monitoring Plan ➢ Monitored data and Monitoring Report ➢ GHG Calculations
Stakeholders	➢ Project background in details ➢ Stakeholder comments ➢ Social and environmental impact of the project ➢ GS Sustainability matrix

2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the verification is to resolve issues related to the monitoring, implementation and operations of the registered project activity that could impair the capacity of the registered project activity to achieve emission reductions or influence the monitoring and reporting of emission reductions prior to Bureau Veritas Certification's positive conclusion on the GHG emission reduction calculation.

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

A Corrective Action Request (CAR) is raised, if one of the following situations occurs:

(a) Non-compliance with the monitoring plan or methodology are found in monitoring and reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;

(b) Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project activity has not been sufficiently documented by the project participants;

(c) Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission reductions that will impact the quantity of emission reductions;

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

A Clarification Request (CL) is raised, if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM requirements have been met.

A Forward Action Request (FAR) is raised, for actions if the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next verification period.

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

2.4. Internal Technical Review

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

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

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

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

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

The reviewer may raise Clarification Requests to the verification team and discusses these matters with Team Leader.

After the agreement of the responses on the Clarification Requests from the verification team as well as the PP(s), the finalized verification report is accepted for further processing such as uploading via the UNFCCC interface.

3. VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 04 CAR(s), 00 CL(s) and 00 FAR(s).

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

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

3.1. Remaining issues from validation or previous verification (213)

All CARs and CLs raised were successfully closed during the validation stage, no remaining issues were left.

3.2. Compliance of the project implementation with the registered project design document (228)

Bureau Veritas has performed a site visit and found that the Project has been put into operation and the electricity generated is supplied to Turkish National Grid according to the signed commissioning of the project activity. 35 wind turbines each with a unit installed capacity of 3 MW, providing a total installed capacity of 105 MWm / 105 MWe have been in operation during the monitoring period.

EIA is not Required Certificate dd. 21/03/2008 and commissioning records are provided to validation team. All milestones of the project activity has been confirmed during the first crediting period. The turbines commissioning dates are confirmed as below during first crediting period;

- Commissioning date of first phase (21 x 3 = 63 MW) – 19/05/2011
- Commissioning date of second phase (9 x 3 = 27 MW) – 03/06/2011
- Commissioning date of last phase (1 x 3 = 3 MW) – 29/07/2011
- Commissioning date of additional 4 turbine phase (21 x 3 = 63 MW) – 24/05/2013

Estimated electricity generation is confirmed through the Deutsche WindGuard GmbH, Energy Yield Assessment Report dated December 2008 as 341,275 MWh/year. Estimated emission reduction has been confirmed as 207,188 tCO2e during the validation. /11/. Provisional acceptance documents are provided for each phase.

The first 7-year renewable crediting period was from 15/11/2011 to 14/11/2018.The implementation and operation of the project activity have been conducted in accordance with the description contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD. There are no events or emergencies situations occurred during the monitoring period, which may affect the applicability of the methodology. But, during the 1st monitoring period, a few events happened that affects the production of electricity but not the applicability of the methodology. They are documented in the Monitoring Report section B.1.

[Power System]

As shown in the Grid connection agreement dd. 14/05/2010 /12/, The voltage is raised to 154 kV and is transferred to the National Electricity System (Gobel Transformer Station).

[Metering System]

There are two ELSTER A1500 meters installed for the Project.

TR-1 main meter (serial number 00419695) was installed at the output of the on-site substation to measure the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project. TR-1 backup meter (serial number 00419696) was installed beside the main meter to measure the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project.

TR-2 main meter (serial number 00419697) was installed at the output of the on-site substation to measure the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project. TR-2 backup meter (serial number 00419698) was installed beside the main meter to measure the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the Project.

[Management and Operation]

The PP has operated the Project as per the registered GS-VER-PDD. The monitoring organization has been set up and all monitoring staffs have been trained. Training records are presented to DOE /13/. Meter reading records of all the meters are based on continuous measurements and Remotely Reading by the PP and TEIAS. The grid company issues the EPIAS records which are added to EPIAS web site by sellers. EPIAS records /14/ and OSF Forms /15/ have been provided and verified by the verification team.

- Corresponding to the Validation requirements based on VVS version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 14), Bureau Veritas can confirm that:

- The implementation of the Project is consistent with the registered GS-VER-PDD.
- The Project is operated as per the registered GS-VER-PDD by the PP.

3.3. Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s) (232)

The verification team has verified the monitoring plan, including the data and parameters required to be monitored, measurement procedures, monitoring frequency and QC/QA procedures as described in the registered GS-VER-PDD.

✌ Corresponding to the Validation requirements based on VVS version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 14), Bureau Veritas can confirm that the monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology including applicable tool(s) applied by the Project.

3.4. Compliance of monitoring activities with the monitoring plan (235-236)

Monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.

[Parameters and information flow]

The parameters required by the monitoring plan and how Bureau Veritas has verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting) for these parameters including the values in the monitoring report are described below:

Parameters monitored:

(1) $EG_{facility,y}$, net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project

The net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project is the electricity exported to the grid minus the electricity imported from the grid by the Project which is measured by the bidirectional main meter. Therefore EGy can be calculated as below:

$EG_y = EG_{export} - EG_{import}$

As described above, the meters have been installed in accordance with the registered GS-VER-PDD. The verification team has checked on-site the location of the meters against the diagram of power connection system and found them to be consistent.

The readings of the meters are continuously monitored and monthly recorded by the PP and the grid company. The grid company issues the EPIAS records which are added to EPIAS web site by PP, which contain the electricity exported to and imported from the grid by the project. After a cross-check of OSF records with EPIAS for 2015,2016,2017 and 2018 vintage, emission reduction data is found to be consistent.

The verification team has verified the values provided in the monitoring report and ER spreadsheet against the relevant documented evidences i.e. the OSF Records /15/ and the EPIAS screens /14/ and found them to be consistent with the evidences. The OSF Records and the EPIAS screens can cover this monitoring period from 01/06/2015 to 31/05/2018.

(2) SDI-1: Air Quality

The air quality at project activity sites

This parameter is monitored during the first verification period. During the construction phase all necessary measures are taken by project owner. Also related photos has been submitted to DOE which shows the project activity has no negative effect on air quality parameter. It is calculated by the investor that the dust emission is below the legal limits. The Dedeoba village headman has no negative opinion on air quality parameters. The DOE convinced the air quality parameter measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period.

(3) SDI-3: Water Quality and Quantity

It is confirmed that the company has not discharged any waste water to the surface or ground water. Some photos of transfer of waste water from power plant by vacuum truck and official records (invoices) have been provided to the DOE.

(4) SDI-4: Soil Condition

This parameter is monitored during the first verification period. During the construction phase all necessary measures are taken by project owner. The project owner has been removed the excavated earth in line with the “Regulation on Control of Solid Wastes, Art.23”. Stakeholder has no negative opinion on Soil Condition parameter. The DOE convinced the soil condition parameter measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period.

(5) SDI-4: Other Pollutants

Noise

The company has hired a third party which is accredited by the ministry in order to measure the noise level and according to noise report results which is prepared during operation of plant by third party the project is not exceed the noise limits which are set by “Turkish Regulation on assessment and Management of Environmental Noise.” This parameter is monitored during the first verification period through Noise Measurement Report. The nearest settlement is 8 km far away from the turbines. Also during the site visit Muhtar and locals declared that they have no adverse situation regarding to the noise. The DOE convinced the noise parameter measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period.

(6) SDI-6: Other Pollutants (FAR #3)

New Level of Roads

It is confirmed that the company has been improved the conditions of roads to mitigate the effect of rough road condition after the construction of the project. After the improving of the roads the stakeholders can pass to the opposite site and they can reach the slip roads that they use for moving into the forest. The project owner has made their commitment that the

soil stacks and corrections has been made to reduce the elevation difference. The photographs are provided to DOE. Also Dedeoba village headman has declared stakeholders positive opinions on condition of road. The DOE convinced the new level of roads measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period. The FAR 3 has been closed during the second monitoring period by DOE.

(7) SDI-7: Biodiversity

Design and Location of the Turbines

According to expert reports and ornithology report, the project area is far away the migration routes and the bats does not be affected by the project. However, in order to mitigate the possible negative impacts of the project, some precautions are planned to be taken, such as: the site is selected in an area where there are no important bird areas, wetlands or high bird activity; sufficient distance (from 250 m to 300 m) is placed between the turbines; appropriate storm water management measures have been implemented to avoid creating small ponds which can attract birds and bats for feeding or nesting near the wind farm and turbine blades have been painted by reflecting color. Ornithology report (August 2013) has been submitted to DOE. The turbines paintings and lightings has been seen by DOE. The DOE convinced the Design and Location of the Turbines measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period.

(8) SDI-8 Biodiversity (FAR #1)

Plantation and Landscaping Activities

The project area has been planted with the appropriate vegetation's and tree by the project owner. Project owner has made payment for reforestation. Provisional acceptance dd. 16/04/2012 provides that the project activity needs to plant 10.000 tree. The payment records for tree plantation has been submitted to DOE. The DOE convinced the Plantation and Landscaping Activities measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period. The mitigation measure for this hazard is putting warning signs on the road. It is confirmed that there is no Injury or deaths records for animals during the seven years in operation.

(9) SDI-9 Biodiversity

Warning signs and pictures

It is confirmed that there is no Injury or deaths records for animals. Furthermore, the related logbook has prepared for the monitoring this parameter and there is no injury or death records of animals. The logbooks provided that there is no injury or death since 2013.

(10) SDI-10 Quality of Employment

It is confirmed that the project proponent aims for improvement of safety for labour providers. 1 Electrical Engineer, 7 service technician, 5 HV Switchgear Operator, 5 Security and 7 Operation Crew are employed in the facility. Health and Safety Trainings are provided to the 25 employees. Training records /13/ for each employee are provided to DOE.

The main training details are confirmed as below;

Mehtap AÇILDI Hayrettin KUŞ Mehmet DUMAN Ufuk AYDIN Ayla DURMUŞ İbrahim İBİL Fikri YILMAZ Tuncay DER Burek YILMAZ Necmi EROL	Health and Safety	14/08/2015

Yasin USUĞ Faik Tamer ONAT Zafer ÖZMEN İ.Hakkı OKUR Yaşar Özgür DEMİR Emrah PARLAK İrfan TURNA	Fire Basic Education	14/09/2015

Recep FİLİZ Durali DEMİRTAŞ Akif SÖNMEZ Aziz KAYMAKÇI	Fire Basic Education	14/09/2015

The other training dates are listed as below;

- 25.05.2015, 25.12.2015
- 05.05.2016, 06.05.2016, 12.04.2016, 28.03.2016, 22.03.2016, 16.03.2016
- 06.04.2017, 16.05.2017, 23.05.2017
- 19.04.2018, 25.04.2018

(11) SDI-12: Quantitative Employment and Income Generation

The company has been provided job opportunities and as a result increase income generation. 25 workers are working for the operation of the plant. Social security records /19/ are provided to DOE as evidence to local employment.

It is confirmed that the locals has no negative opinion for the project activity. DOE observed that project owners have good relationship with the locals. During site visit dd. 04/06/2018 DOE gave the phone number for possible complaints but no negative feedback is forwarded to DOE.

(12) SDI-14: Technology transfer and technological self-reliance

Electromechanical equipment agreement and training records of technicians and engineers had been provided to the DOE during the first verification period. The DOE was checking all of them and there has been no change since the first monitoring period. The DOE convinced the Technology transfer and technological self-reliance measures are followed by project owner and no need to monitor this parameter during second crediting period.

(13) SDI-15: Vehicle Donation to the National p

It is confirmed that a 4x4 land vehicle is to be donated to the National Parks of Ministry of Environment and Forestry to be used to provide emergency aid to injured wild animals. The

offical letter which shows the Project owners fulfill the requirements dd. 23/05/2018 has been submitted to DOE.

(14) SDI-16: Employment of workers for Rescue Centre, and Phesant Production Station, and a PR expert

It is confirmed that 5 workers are working for Rescue Centre and Pheasant Production Station in the Sah WPP. The offical letter which shows the Project owners fulfill the requirements dd. 23/05/2018 has been submitted to DOE.

(15) SDI-17: Shooting of a documentary film biannually

The National Parks of Ministry of Environment and Forestry has requested one documentary and the project owner has made their request. The decont is dated on 18/12/2017.

(16) SDI-18: Waste Management

The hazardous solid wastes and waste oils originated from waste filters piles etc. have been storaged in an impermeable and full closed container and delivered to licenced hazardous waste disposal firm.The disposal record are also provided to DOE. The DOE convinced the Waste Management measures are followed by project owner.

FAR#2 : **The training, research, symposiums fort he Nature Protection and National Parks employees**

The training records are provided to DOE. It is confirmed that the project proponent aims for improvement of safety for labour providers. Health and Safety Trainings are provided to the 25 employees. This FAR has been closed through training records and SGK records.

FAR#4: **Informational meeting correspondance of the Nature Protection and National Parks Administration**

The informative meetings organized in collaboration with the Bursa Provisional Directorate of Environment and Forestry. The meeting photographs are provided to DOE and this FAR has been closed accordingly.

Parameters determined ex-ante:

(1) $EF_{grid,CM,y}$, emission factor of the grid

The emission factor of the 1st crediting period of the Project has been determined ex-ante in the registered GS-VER-PDD as 0.6071 tCO_2e/MWh. The emission factor used in the monitoring report has been verified against the GS-VER-PDD and found them to be consistent.

✌ Corresponding to the Validation requirements based on VVS version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 14), Bureau Veritas can confirm that:

- The monitoring has been carried out in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.
- All parameters required by the monitoring plan have been sufficiently monitored and correctly listed. The monitored data for required parameters have been verified by checking the whole information flow.

3.5. Compliance with the calibration frequency requirements for measuring instruments (243)

The registered monitoring plan requires that as the meters are sealed by TEIAS, Sah Wind Power Plant cannot intervene with the devices by themselves. TEIAS performs a regular maintenance on a regular basis. TEIAS is the main responsible for calibration and maintenance of the devices. TEIAS performs the necessary maintenance and calibration.

The project activity consists of two meters. During the second monitoring period meters are controlled by TEİAŞ on 04.10.2017. TEİAŞ control form is provided as evidence to last calibration of meters /21/. Besides, TEIAS performs yearly tests on meters for consistency. Results of these reports /21/ are also provided to DOE. There are no misalignments between meters.

The calibration records are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 The calibration records of the meters

Meter ID	Serial number	Accuracy	Calibration date	Validity	Calibration entity
TR-1 Main	419695	0.5S	04/10/2017	Yes	TEIAS
TR-1 Back-up	419696	0.5S	04/10/2017	Yes	TEIAS
TR-2 Main	419697	0.5S	04/10/2017	Yes	TEIAS
TR-2 Back-up	419698	0.5S	04/10/2017	Yes	TEIAS

[Instrument accuracy*]*

The verification team has verified the calibration records and TEIAS is the sole responsible. All the meters meet the rated accuracy level as described in the monitoring plan and are in compliance with the Turkish Standards and International Electro technical Commission standards.

[Calibration frequency]

The calibration frequency fulfills the requirement as described in the monitoring plan and is in compliance with the Turkish Standards and International Electro technical Commission standards.

3.6. Assessment of data and calculation of emission reductions (246)

A complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available.

The critical parameter used for the determination of the Emission Reductions is the net electricity supplied to the grid by the Project. The data pertaining to the above parameter are maintained in the identified records. All the data are in compliance with that stated in the Monitoring Report Version 0.3.

As per the methodology ACM0002 Version 12.1.0 and the registered GS-VER-PDD, the emission reductions for the Project are calculated as the baseline emissions minus the project emissions and leakage. Hence the emission reduction is determined by the following formula:

$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - L_y$

Where,

ER_y: Emission reductions

BE_y: Baseline emissions

PE_y: Project emissions

L_y: Emissions due to leakage

[Baseline emissions]

The baseline emissions are the baseline emission factor times the net electricity supplied to the grid. Therefore,

$BE_y = EGPJ,y * EFgrid,CM,y$

EFgrid,CM,y : GHG emission factor of the Turkish National Grid, calculated ex-ante in the registered GS-VER-PDD as 0.6071 tCO_2e/MWh

EGPJ,y: Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity

The net electricity delivered to the grid (EG_y) can be calculated as:

$EG_y = EG_{export} – EG_{import}$

The verification team has cross-checked the values from the OSF records /15/ with the EPIAS Screens /14/ for the period from 01/06/2015 to 31/05/2018. The conservative values are used for emission reductions calculation. The verified values are shown in the following Table.

Table 3 The verified electricity exported to the grid by the Project (kWh)

Month	**(A) Electricity supplied to the grid [kWh]**	**(B) Electricity consumption from the grid [kWh]**	**(C) = (A) - (B) EG (ID 8) Net electricity supplied to the grid [kWh]**
June 2015	22,534,684	43,202	22,491,482
July 2015	30,790,191	40,105	30,750,086
August 2015	35,392,973	42,726	35,350,247
September 2015	23,541,829	59,493	23,482,336
October 2015	30,488,189	41,910	30,446,279
November 2015	23,185,575	58,801	23,126,774
December 2015	25,083,197	80,649	25,002,548
January 2016	24,174,131	55,243	24,118,888
February 2016	26,791,901	53,044	26,738,857
March 2016	26,264,906	40,495	26,224,411
April 2016	15,221,078	63,594	15,157,484
May 2016	17,405,699	86,371	17,319,328
June 2016	21,080,384	82,883	20,997,501
July 2016	39,446,316	17,627	39,428,689
August 2016	44,911,688	8,800	44,902,888
September 2016	27,965,099	25,394	27,939,705
October 2016	23,934,201	64,213	23,869,988
November 2016	30,624,002	40,169	30,583,833
December 2016	27,979,854	45,550	27,934,304
January 2017	29,317,593	40,788	29,276,805
February 2017	32,886,084	55,927	32,830,157
March 2017	24,006,730	43,844	23,962,886
April 2017	11,494,850	114,132	11,380,718
May 2017	20,697,695	70,224	20,627,471
June 2017	9,937,035	127,823	9,809,212

July 2017	33,076,961	41,599	33,035,362
August 2017	40,777,823	10,610	40,767,213
September 2017	18,387,619	78,386	18,309,233
October 2017	16,428,330	81,755	16,346,575
November 2017	16,287,872	85,473	16,202,399
December 2017	41,288,244	15,034	41,273,210

January 2018	27,838,879	61,347	27,777,532
February 2018	30,048,283	39,599	30,008,684
March 2018	30,750,402	36,133	30,714,269
April 2018	15,962,119	141,082	15,821,037
May 2018	18,908,059	88,177	18,819,882

Sum (01/06/2015 - 31/12/2015)	191,016,638	366,886	190,649,752	0.6071	**115,743**
Sum (01/12/2016 - 31/12/2016)	325,799,259	583,383	325,215,876	0.6071	**197,438**
Sum (01/01/2017 - 31/12/2017)	294,586,836	765,595	293,821,241	0.6071	**178,378**
Sum (01/01/2018- 31/05/2018)	123,507,742	366,338	123,141,404	0.6071	**74,759**
Sum (01/06/2015 - 31/05/2018)	934,910,475	2,082,202	932,828,273	0.6071	**566,318**

$EG_{PJ,2015} = EG_{export2015} – EG_{import2015}$ = 191,016,638 – 366,886 = 190,649,752 kWh

$EG_{PJ,2016} = EG_{export2016} – EG_{import2016}$ = 325,799,259 – 583,383 = 325,215,876 kWh

$EG_{PJ,2017} = EG_{export2017} – EG_{import2017}$ = 294,586,836 – 765,595 = 293,821,241 kWh

$EG_{PJ,2018} = EG_{export2018} – EG_{import2018}$ = 123,507,742 – 366,338 = 123,141,404 kWh

$EG_y = EG_{export} – EG_{import}$ = 934,910.475 – 2,082.202 = 932,828.273 MWh

The baseline emissions of the Project are calculated as:

$BE_{2015} = EF_{1st\ CP} * EG_{PJ,2015}$= 0.6071 tCO_2e/MWh* 190,649.752 MWh = 115,743 tCO2e
$BE_{2016} = EF_{1st\ CP} * EG_{PJ,2016}$= 0.6071 tCO_2e/MWh* 325,215.876 MWh = 197,438 tCO2e
$BE_{2017} = EF_{1st\ CP} * EG_{PJ,2017}$= 0.6071 tCO_2e/MWh* 293,821.241 MWh = 178,378 tCO2e
$BE_{2018} = EF_{1st\ CP} * EG_{PJ,2018}$= 0.6071 tCO_2e/MWh* 123,141. MWh = 74,759 tCO2e
$BE_{2nd\ MP}$ $BE_{2015+}BE_{2016}+ BE_{2017} + BE_{2018}$ = 566,318 tCO2e

[Project emissions]

The Project is a newly built wind project, thus according to ACM0002 Version 12.1.0 the project emissions are zero.

[Leakage emissions]

No leakage needs to be considered according to ACM0002 Version 12.1.0.

[Emission reductions]

The emission reductions during the monitoring period from 01/06/2015 to 31/05/2018 are calculated as:

$ER_{2015} = BE_{2015}-PE_{2015}-L_{2015}$= 115,743 - 0 – 0 = 115,743 tCO_2e

$ER_{2016} = BE_{2016}-PE_{2016}-L_{2016}$= 197,438 - 0 - 0 = 197,438 tCO_2e

$ER_{2017} = BE_{2017}-PE_{2017}-L_{2017}$= 178,378 - 0 - 0 = 178,278 tCO_2e

$ER_{2018} = BE_{2018}-PE_{2018}-L_{2018}$= 74,759 - 0 - 0 = 74,759 tCO_2e

ER_{2ndMP} = ER_{2015} +ER_{2016} + ER_{2017} + ER_{2018} = **115,743 + 197,438 + 178,278 + 74,759 = 566,318 tCO_2e**

[Comparison of ERs]

The annual estimated emission reductions are 207,188 tCO_2e as per the registered PDD. Considering 1096 day of operation, estimated emission reductions for monitoring period is 621,561 tCO_2e. The actual emission reductions are 566,318 tCO2e and are %8.8 lower than the expectations. This result caused by low wind speed and very bad cold weather condition.

Corresponding to the Validation requirements based on VVS version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 14), Bureau Veritas can confirm that:

- Data used for the determination of the emission reductions are available and monitored in accordance with the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-PDD.
- Information and data provided in the monitoring report have been cross-checked with other sources such as plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis.
- Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed.
- Assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.

4. VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas has performed the 2nd periodic verification of Sah Wind Power Plant, GS Registration Reference Number GS905, which is located in Bandirma district of Balikesir province and in Karacabey district of Bursa province in Turkey and applying the methodology ACM0002 Version 12.1.0. The verification was performed based on the requirements set by the CDM methodology, GS v.2.2 and relevant guidance provided by CMP and the CDM Executive Board.

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

The management of Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emission reductions of the project on the basis set out within the monitoring plan contained in the registered GS-VER-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.

Bureau Veritas has verified the project Monitoring Report version 0.3 dated 27/08/2018 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas confirms that the project is implemented as described in the validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reductions run reliably and are calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the Project is generating GHG emission reductions as a GS-VER project.

Bureau Veritas can confirm that the GHG emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the projects' GHG emissions and resulting GHG emission reductions reported and related to the validated and registered project baseline, approved monitoring plan and its associated documents. Based on the evidence and information that are considered necessary to guarantee that GHG emission reductions are appropriately calculated,

Bureau Veritas confirms the following statement:

Reporting period: 01/06/2015 to 31/05/2018

ER_{2015} = 115,743 tCO_2e

ER_{2016} = 197,438 tCO_2e

ER_{2017} = 178,378 tCO_2e

ER_{2017} = 74,759 tCO_2e

ER_{2ndMP} = 566,318 tCO_2e

Project emissions:	0	t CO_2 equivalents
Leakage emissions:	0	t CO_2 equivalents
Emission Reductions:	566,318	t CO_2 equivalents

28/08/2018
Seda YÜCEL
Internal Technical Reviewer

28/08/2018
Furkan SADIKOĞLU
Team Leader

5. REFERENCES

Documents reviewed:

/1/ EMRA Generation License – 10/04/2007
/2/ Registered PDD Version 11 dated 18/03/2013
/3/ Registered GS Passport
/4/ Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, Ver.09
/5/ Monitoring Report version 0.1, dated 29/05/2018
/6/ Monitoring Report version 0.2 and version 0.3 dated 21/06/2018 and 27/08/2018
/7/ ER Calculation Spreadsheet version 0.2, dated 21/06/2018
/8/ 1st Verification report dated 09/07/2014
/9/ ACM0002 Version 12.1.0
/10/ Commissioning Date of first phase of the plant (21 x 3 = 63 MW)
/11/ Commissioning Date of the second phase (9 x 3 = 27 MW)
Commissioning Date of the third phase (1 x 3 = 3 MW)
Commissioning Date of the last additional 4 turbines phase (4 x 3= 12 MW)
/12/ Grid connection agreement dated 14/05/2010
/13/ Internal Training Records and Certificates of Operation Staff
/14/ EPIAS records (01/06/2015 – 31/05/2018)
/15/ OSF Records (01/06/2015 – 31/05/2018)
/16/ Ornithology Report July – August 2013
/17/ Waste Declarations – 2015-2016-2017
/18/ Recycle Delivery Records – 2015-2016-2017-2018
/19/ Social security records for local employees
/20/ Sewage Truck Bills.
/21/ Last Test Report – 04/10/2017
/22/ Afforestation Bills
/23/ Vehicle use Records
/24/ Ministry of Forestry Commitment Record – 23/05/2018

Persons interviewed:

Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş

/1/	Cem Çağrı LEVENT	Ass. General Menager
/2/	Aziz KAYMAKÇI	Operation Manager
/3/	Yasin USUĞ	Administrative work staff

Rüzgar Danışmanlık

/4/	Çağla Balcı ERİŞ	Consultant - +90 (554) 388 59 49

Local Stakeholders

/5/	Ali YAĞDI	Headman of Dedeoba Village -+90 (0532) 496 22 89
/6/	Şenol KÖSE	Stakeholder of Dedeoba Village- +90 (537) 942 62 86

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

Ms. Seda YUCEL	Bureau Veritas Certification, Turkey	Internal Technical Reviewer, Climate Change Lead Verifier Fikriye Seda YÜCEL, B.Sc. in Chemical Engineering has completed her M.Sc. degree in Istanbul Technical University in Energy Science and Technology. She is auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and auditor for ISO 14001 and has about 2 years of experience in management systems and 7 years of experience in energy management in industry. She has been involved in more than 20 GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier especially in the energy sector. She has been working as Gold Standard team leader/validator/verifier and CDM trainee validator/verifier in the context of re-consult.
Mr. Furkan SADIKOGLU	Bureau Veritas Certification, Turkey	Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier Furkan Sadıkoğlu is an Electrical & Electronics Engineer. His M.Sc. degree in Necmettin Erbakan University in Energy Systems Engineering. He has an experience in renewable energy and LED lightning sectors and he has over 5 years' experience in energy sectors. He has participated online seminars in the Gold Standard Academy in 2012 ,2013,2015 and 2017 and is a lead verifier for GHG emission reduction projects. He completed more than 75 GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier. He is also MRV Lead verifier. He has been working with Bureau Veritas as a subcontractor lead auditor since September 2014.

APPENDIX A: CDM PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 Verification requirements based on VVS version 03.0 (EB 70 Annex 3), PS version 02.1 (EB 70 Annex 2), PCP version 03.1 (EB 70 Annex 4), and Guidelines for completing the Monitoring Report Form version 03.1 (EB 70 Annex 11)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Part I Cover Page					
(a) Is the title of the project activity provided?	MR		Title is given as “Sah Wind Power Plant” in line with GS Registry.	**OK**	**OK**
(b) Is the reference number of the project activity provided?	MR		GS project ID is given as GS 905.	**OK**	**OK**
(c) Is the version number of the monitoring report indicated?	MR		01	**OK**	**OK**
(d) Is the completion date of the monitoring report provided in DD/MM/YYYY format?	MR		29/05/2018	**OK**	**OK**
(e) Are the monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period (first and last days included in DD/MM/YYYY format) provided?	MR		2nd Period 01/06/2015 – 31/05/2018	**OK**	**OK**
(f) Are project participants indicated?	MR		Doğan Enerji Yatırımları San. ve Tic. A.Ş	**OK**	**OK**
(g) Is the host party(ies) indicated?	MR		Turkey	**OK**	**OK**
(h) Are the sectoral scope(s) and applied methodology(ies) indicated?	MR		Sectoral Scope 1, Energy Industries (Renewable-/non – renewable sources). Applied methodology : ACM0002 v.12.1	**OK**	**OK**
(i) Is the estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD indicated?	MR		Estimated amount of GHG emission reduction is not provided on cover page of monitoring report.	**CAR01**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
(j) Are the actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period indicated?	MR		On cover page actual GHG emission reduction is given as 335,594 tCO2e before 1 January 2013 and 566,689 tCO2e from 1 January 2013.	**OK**	**OK**
(k) Are the actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period up to 31 December 2012 indicated (if applicable)?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
(l) Are the actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period from 1 January 2013 onwards indicated (if applicable)?	MR		On cover page actual GHG emission reduction is given as 335,594 tCO2e before 1 January 2013	**OK**	**OK**
Part II Monitoring Report					
A. Description of project activity					
A.1 Purpose and general description of project activity					
A.1.1 Is the description of the project activity to be presented in this section a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 Implementation status of the project activity?	MR		Section briefly summarizes implemented project while B.1 points out to specific updates in the implementation during this monitoring period.	**OK**	**OK**
A.1.2 Does this description include:					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.1.2.1 Purpose of the project activity and the measures taken for GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks?	MR		The main goals of the project activity is provided under section A.1 of the monitoring report. The Project aims to generate electricity from wind energy and feed it to the national electricity grid. The project helps reduce GHG emissions generated from the national grid, which is significantly based on fossil fuel electricity generation.	**OK**	**OK**
A.1.2.2 Brief description of the installed technology and equipments?	MR		Under section A.1 a brief description of the installed technology and equipments is provided.	**OK**	**OK**
A.1.2.3 Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.)?	MR		Construction start date is given as 06/08/2010 which is line with the registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
A.1.2.4 Total GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period?	MR		Under section A.1 total GHG emission reductions during the monitoring period is provided as 566,689 tCO2e.	**OK**	**OK**
A.2 Location of project activity					
A.2.1 Is the information on the location of the project activity provided, including Host Party(ies), Region/State/Province, City/Town/Community, Physical/ Geographical location etc.?	MR		Under section A.2 the information on the location (Country, Region/State/Province, City/Town/community) of the project activity is provided.	**OK**	**OK**
A.3 Parties and project participant(s)					

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.3.1	Is the Party(ies) and project participant(s) involved in the project activity listed in the provided table?	MR		The project activity is listed under section A.3 of the monitoring report.	**OK**	**OK**
A.4	**Reference of applied methodology**					
A.4.1	Is the exact reference (number, title, version) of the methodology(ies) indicated?	MR		Approved consolidated baseline methodology ACM0002 " Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 12.1.0	**OK**	**OK**
A.4.2	Is the exact reference (number, title, version) of any tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) refers indicated?	MR		Under section A.4 used Tools and versions are provided.	**OK**	**OK**
A.5	**Crediting period of project activity**					
A.5.1	Are the type, start date and length of the crediting period corresponding to this monitoring period provided?	MR		Crediting period of the project is 7 years which is twice renewable. Crediting period is provided as 15/11/2011 - 14/11/2018 under section A.5.	**OK**	**OK**
B.	**Implementation of project activity**					
B.1	**Description of implemented registered project activity**					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.1.1 Is the description of the installed technology, technical processes and equipments provided, include diagrams where appropriate?	MR PS	191(a)	Under section B.1 of the monitoring report the description of the installed technology, technical processes and equipments is provided. Also Single line diagram of the project activity is provided.	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.2 Is the information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity, including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) provided?	PS	191(b)	Relevant dates are provided under section A.1 of the monitoring report. The dates are line with the registered PDD. The commissioning date reference is provided to verification team.	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.3 Is the description of: (i) the events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period that may impact the applicability of the methodology (ii) how the issues resulting from these events or situations have been addressed provided?	PS	191(c)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.4 Have the project participants addressed the FARs identified during validation or previous verification(s)?	VVS	213	All FARs are identified during previous verification. During site visit all FARs are evaluated by verification team and has been closed.	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.5 Have the implementation and operation of the project activity been conducted in accordance with the description contained in the registered PDD?	VVS	226	Operation has been conducted in accordance with the registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.1.6 Are all physical features of the project activity in the registered PDD in place?	VVS	227	All physical features were observed to be in place in line with the registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.7 Have the project participants operated the project activity as per the registered PDD or any approved revised PDD?	VVS	227	Project was operated in line with the registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.8 Was an on-site visit conducted?	VVS	227	An onsite visit was conducted on 04/06/2018	**OK**	**OK**
B.1.9 If an on-site visit is not conducted, is the rationale of the decision justified?	VVS	227	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2 Post registration changes					
B.2.1 Temporary deviations from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology					
B.2.1.1 Is it indicated whether any temporary deviations have been applied during this monitoring period?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.1.2 Is a description of the deviation(s) in accordance with applicable provisions in the Project standard provided?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.1.3 Are the reasons for the deviation(s), how it deviates from the monitoring plan and/or applied methodology(ies), the duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable and justification on the conservativeness of the approach included in the description?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.1.4 For deviation(s) that require prior approval by the Board, are the date of approval and reference number included in the description?	MR		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?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.2.2 In cases where the correction(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided? Otherwise, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.3 Permanent changes from registered monitoring plan or applied methodology					
B.2.3.1 Is it indicated whether any permanent changes from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodologies have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.3.2 In cases where the change(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided? Otherwise, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.4 Changes to project design of registered project activity					
B.2.4.1 Is it indicated whether any changes to the project design of the project activity have been approved during this monitoring period or submitted with this monitoring report?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.4.2 In cases where the change(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided? Otherwise, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.5 Changes to start date of crediting period					
B.2.5.1 Is it indicated whether any changes to the start date of the crediting period have been approved during this monitoring period?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.5.2 In cases 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?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.6 Types of changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activity					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
B.2.6.1 Is it indicated whether any changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activities have been applied during this monitoring period based on applicable provisions in the Project standard that do not require prior approval by the Board?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
B.2.6.2 If changes were applied, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
C. Description of monitoring system					
C.1 General requirements					
C.1.1 Have project participants described the monitoring system and provided line diagrams (graphical schemes) showing all relevant monitoring points?	MR PS	193	The project participant have described the monitoring system but (graphical schemes) showing all relevant monitoring points are provided under section B.1 of the monitoring report. The latest test of meters was done by TEIAS on 04/10/2017.	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.2 Does this description where appropriate include data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculations and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system?	MR PS	193	Data collection procedures, organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel and emergency procedures for the monitoring system is provided.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
C.1.3 Is the monitoring plan of the project activity in accordance with the applied methodology including applicable tool(s)?	VVS	229	Monitoring plan is line with the applied methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.4 For monitoring aspects that are not specified in the methodology, particularly in the case of small-scale methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency), are there any issues which may enhance the level of accuracy and completeness of the monitoring plan and should bring to the attention of the Board?	VVS	231	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.5 Has the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the project participants?	VVS	234(a)	As description above all production figures which are subject to sales to the grid are agreed with EPIAS (Market Financial Reconciliation Centre). These figures can be accessed from EPIAS's web site by the seller. Therefore, net electricity production figures announced by EPIAS is used in emission calculation figures. These figures are also cross checked with the production and internal electricity usage figures provided from the OSF forms which are provided to the company by TEIAS after the remote measurement of the meters.	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.6 Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan and relevant Board decisions been monitored and updated as applicable, including:	VVS	234(b)		**-**	**-**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
C.1.6.1 Project emission parameters?	VVS	234(b)	Project emissions are 0 in line with the applied methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.6.2 Baseline emission parameters?	VVS	234(b)	EF has been fixed ex-ante for the crediting period and EG was monitored as defined.	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.6.3 Leakage parameters?	VVS	234(b)	Leakage is 0 in line with the applied methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
C.1.6.4 Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	VVS	234(b)	No discrepancies were observed.	**OK**	**OK**
D. Data and parameters					
D.1 Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period					
D.1.1 For “Purpose of data”, is one of the following options chose: (a) Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; (b) Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks; (c) Calculation of leakage?	MR		Under section D.1 ex ante parameters are provided in line with registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.1.2 For "Value(s) applied", if applicable, is one table used to report multiple values referring to the same data and parameter? If necessary, are reference(s) to electronic spreadsheets used?	MR		Under section D.1 ex ante parameters are not provided in line with registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
D.1.3 Is the source of data provide and/or identified?	PS	195(d)	The source of data is provided in line with the registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
D.1.4 Is information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided?	PS	195(g)	The references are provided in line with the registered PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
D.2 Data and parameters monitored					
D.2.1 For "Purpose of data", is one of the following options chose: (a) Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks; (b) Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks; (c) Calculation of leakage?	MR		The parameter is Electricity Production /EGfacility,y and it will be used for baseline emission calculations. The QA/QC procedures are line with the PDD.	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.2 For "Value(s) of monitored parameter", if applicable, is one table used to report multiple values referring to the same data and parameter? If necessary, are reference(s) to electronic spreadsheets used?	MR		The monitored value for the parameter is given correctly year by year.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.3 Are the values of the monitored parameter for the purpose of calculating GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided? Where data are measured continuously, are they presented using an appropriate time interval? For default values (such as an IPCC value), where it is ex post confirmed, is the most recent value applied?	PS	195(a)	Please provide the reference for May 2018 electricity production.	**CAR02**	**OK**
D.2.4 Is the equipment used to monitor each parameter described, including details on accuracy class, and calibration information (frequency, date of calibration and validity), if applicable as per monitoring plan?	PS	195(b)	The main source is EPIAS (Market Financial Settlement Center) records (Meter reading records-OSF forms of main meters are cross-checked). EPIAS records are crosschecked with the meter reading records.(OSOS).	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.5 Is the equipment used for monitoring is controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan, the applied methodology, the Board guidance, local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	VVS	234(c)	The last calibration records are provided to verification team. The last calibration date is 04/10/2017.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.6 Is the calibration of those measuring equipments that have an impact on the claimed emission reductions conducted by the project participants at a frequency specified in the applied monitoring methodology and/or the monitoring plan?	VVS	237	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.7 If, during verification of a certain monitoring period, the calibration has been delayed and the calibration has been implemented after the monitoring period in consideration (i.e. the results of delayed calibration are available), is the following conservative approach adopted in the calculation of emission reductions:	VVS	238	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.7.1 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?	VVS	238(a)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.7.2 Applying the error identified in the delayed calibration test, if the error is beyond the maximum permissible error of the measuring equipment?	VVS	238(b)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Please provide the training details under SDI.10 Quality of employment indicator.	**CAR03**	**OK**
			Please provide the employee details under SDI.11 Quantitative Employment and Income Generation.	**CAR04**	**OK**
D.2.8 Has the error has been applied:	VVS	239	-	**-**	**-**
D.2.8.1 In a conservative manner, such that the adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration shall result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	VVS	239(a)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.8.2 For all measured values taken during the period between the scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration.	VVS	239(b)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.9 In cases where the results of the delayed calibration are not available, or the calibration has not been conducted at the time of verification, prior to finalizing verification, were the project participants requested to conduct the required calibration have the project participants calculated the emission reductions conservatively using the approach mentioned in item “D.2.7” above?	VVS	240	N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.10 In cases where it is not possible for the project participants to conduct the calibration at a frequency specified by either the applied methodology, guidance provided by the Board, and/or the registered monitoring plan due to reasons beyond the control of PPs, are the requirements for post registration changes, in section 9.5 of the VVS, followed?	VVS	241	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.11 In cases where neither the monitoring methodology nor the monitoring plan specify any requirements for calibration frequency for measuring equipments, are the equipments calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification? If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, were international standards used?	VVS	242	Frequency and requirements were determined by the national standards and were given in the MR.	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.12 Is it described how the parameters are measured/calculated and the measurement and recording frequency?	PS	195(c)	The net electricity generation supplied to the grid has been measured continuously by TEAIS meters (both main and spare) and recorded monthly.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.13 Are monitoring results consistently recorded as per approved frequency?	VVS	234(d)	EPIAS records provides the exact electricity generation of the facility and the imports from the grid. The electricity meters have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner. The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been cross checked with the meter reading records (OSF forms) provided to the company by TEIAS .	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.14 Is the source of data (e.g. logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc.) provide and/or identified?	PS	195(d)	The net electricity export/supplied to a grid is the difference between the measured quantities of the grid electricity export and the import. EPIAS records are crosschecked with the meter reading records.(OSOS).	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.15 Where relevant is the calculation method of the parameter provided?	PS	195(e)	The net electricity of the facility is the difference of the electricity exported to the grid and imported from the grid.	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.16 Are the QA/QC procedures applied described (if applicable per monitoring plan)?	PS	195(f)	EPIAS records are crosschecked with the meter reading records.(OSOS).	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.2.17 Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan or the revised monitoring plan?	VVS	234(e)	Measurements are undertaken using energy meters. There are two measurement devices continuously measuring and recording electricity generation and consumption of the Project activity. The primary measurement (main)device is used for invoicing, and the spare measurement (back-up) device is used for quality control and back-up purposes	**OK**	**OK**
D.2.18 Is information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals provided?	PS	195(g)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.3 Implementation of sampling plan					
D.3.1 Is a description provided on how project participants implemented the sampling efforts and surveys for those data and parameters according to the sampling plan, Include:	MR		No sampling plan is applicable to the project activity and hence N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.3.1.1 Description of implemented sampling design?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.3.1.2 Collected data (electronic spreadsheets may be attached and referenced)?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
D.3.1.3 Analysis of the collected data?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
D.3.1.4 Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
E. Calculation of emission reductions or GHG removals by sinks					
E.1 Calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks					
E.1.1 Are the sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks provided, applying actual values?	MR PS	197(a)	Under section E.1 of the monitoring report baseline emission calculations are presented for the year 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018.	**OK**	**OK**
E.1.2 Are the electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report attached?	MR		Şah WPP-Baseline-Calculation has been presented.	**OK**	**OK**
E.2 Calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks					
E.2.1 Are the sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks provided, applying actual values?	MR PS	197(b)	Project emissions are 0 in line with the guidance of the applied methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
E.2.2 Are the electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report attached?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.3	**Calculation of leakage**					
E.3.1	Are the sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage provided, applying actual values?	MR PS	197(c)	Leakage is considered 0 in line with the guidance of the applied methodology.	**OK**	**OK**
E.3.2	Are the electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report attached?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**
E.4	**Summary of calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks**					
E.4.1	Are the results of above sections summarized and GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period presented, using the provided table?	MR PS	197(d)	The results of above sections are summarized and GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period presented using the provided table.	**OK**	**OK**
E.4.2	Is a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available?	VVS	245(a)	Complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available.	**OK**	**OK**
E.4.3	Has information provided in the monitoring report been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis?	VVS	245(b)	Cross-checking with other sources are applied.	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.4.4	Have calculations of baseline emissions, and project activity emissions and leakage, as appropriate, been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document?	VVS	245(c)	Yes.	**OK**	**OK**
E.4.5	Have any assumptions used in emission calculations been justified?	VVS	245(d)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
E.4.6	Have appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values been correctly applied?	VVS	245(e)	N/A	**OK**	**OK**
E.5	**Comparison of actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks with estimates in registered PDD**					
E.5.1	Is a comparison of actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removal of the project activity achieved during this monitoring period with the estimates in the registered PDD provided?	MR PS	198	Emission reduction is estimated in the registered PDD is 621,564 tCO2e and the achieved value in the monitoring period is 566,689 tCO2e.	**OK**	**OK**
E.6	**Remarks on difference from estimated value in registered PDD**					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.6.1 For any registered CDM project activity, except A/R project activities, have project participants explained the cause of any increase in the actual GHG emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water availability, higher plant load factor, etc.), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in the registered PDD?	MR PS	199	Estimated emission reduction in ex ante calculation of registered PDD is 207,188 tCO2e, which corresponds to 621,564 tCO2e during monitoring period. And actual emission reduction achieved during this monitoring period is 566,689 (for 01/06/2015-31/05/2018). When it is compared, actual emission reduction achieved during this monitoring period is approximately 8,83% lower than the estimated. This difference may occur due to the more wind than expected.	**OK**	**OK**
E.7 Actual emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the first commitment period and the period from 1 January 2013 onwards					
E.7.1 If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, are actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved for the following two periods provided respectively? (a) Up to 31 December 2012 (1st commitment period); (b) From 1 January 2013 onwards.	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
E.7.2 Is it ensured that the achieved GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks are calculated proportionally for each period? In cases where annual caps were applied in the calculations, is it ensured that the annual caps are pro-rated to each period?	MR		N/A	**OK**	**OK**

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

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
CAR01 Estimated amount of GHG emission reduction is not provided on cover page of monitoring report.		It has been revised accordingly.	**Response 1:** Estimated amount of GHG emission reduction is presented on cover page of MR. **The corrective action request has been closed.**
CAR02 Please provide the reference for May 2018 electricity production		The reference of May 2018 electricity production has been provided to the DOE.	**Response 1:** May 2018 reference has been provided. **The corrective action request has been closed.**
CAR03 Please provide the training details under SDI.10 Quality of employment indicator.		Health and Safety Trainings are provided to the 25 employees and some related trainings for technician personnel. Attendance record or certificate already provided to the DOE.	**Response 1:** Records are provided to DOE. **The corrective action request has been closed.**
CAR04		The employee details related with the SD12. Quantitative Employment and Income Generation has been provided to the DOE.	**Response 1:** Records are provided to DOE.

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1	Summary of project participant response	Verification team conclusion
Please provide the employee details under SDI.11 Quantitative Employment and Income Generation.			**The corrective action request has been closed.**