
VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

Ege Orman Vakfı Ađaçlandırma ve Ađaç
Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi

Solar for Forest

in

TURKEY

MONITORING PERIOD:

From 01/10/2017 to 30/09/2020 (Both days included)

Abbreviations

CAR	: Corrective Action Request
CDM	: Clean Development Mechanism
CEF	: Carbon Emission Factor
CER	: Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL	: Clarification request
CO₂	: Carbon dioxide
CO₂e	: 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 CO ₂ 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	8
3.1. Verification Team and ITR Selection.....	9
3.2. Desk Review of Documents.....	10
3.3. On-Site Visits.....	11
3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol.....	12
3.5. Follow-Up Interviews.....	12
3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues	13
3.7. Internal Quality Control	13
4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS.....	15
4.1. Remaining Issues From Previous Validation or Verifications	15
4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD.....	15
4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology	15
4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan.....	15
4.5. Completeness of Monitoring.....	16
4.6. Sustainability Monitoring	16
4.7. Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments... 	18

4.8.	Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions	18
4.9.	Quality of Evidence.....	19
4.10.	Management System and Quality Assurance	20
4.11.	Materiality	20
4.12.	Verification of Sampling Plan.....	20
4.13.	Post Registration Changes	20
4.13.1.	Temporary deviations	20
4.13.2.	Corrections	20
4.13.3.	Changes to the start date of the crediting period.....	21
4.13.4.	Inclusion of monitoring plan	21
4.13.5.	Permanent changes	21
4.13.6.	Changes to the project design	21
5.	LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	22
6.	LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	23
7.	VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE.....	25
7.1.	Appointment Certificates.....	26
8.	VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION	28
	ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL	29

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY– VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. Has performed the second verification of the “Solar for Forest” which is a Gold Standard project with the registry reference number “GS 3305” for the period between 01/10/2017-30/09/2020. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 06 dated 10/04/2022 of “Solar for Forest”.

Re Carbon Ltd. Hereby confirms that the project activity “Solar for Forest” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 03 dated 25/05/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is AMS I.D. version 17.0.

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 1,308 Tco_{2e} during the monitoring period 01/10/2017-30/09/2020.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. Has been appointed by “Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi” to perform the second verification of the “Solar for Forest” with the service agreement dated 22/10/2020. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report dated “10/04/2022” 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 03 dated 25/05/2015.

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, “AMS I.D. version 17.0”, 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 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 3.0 and CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 3.0 and GS Toolkit version 2.2.

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

Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi has installed and commissioned a 500 Kw solar power plant (totally 2000 solar panels) with Yingli solar photovoltaic (PV) modules each having a capacity of 250 W. The project is located on Pancar-Menderes town in İzmir city of Turkey.

The first crediting period start date of the project is 01/08/2014 with choice of renewable crediting period as verified through the GS registry and initial verification report.

2.4. Parties Involved

Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi is the project participant and host country is Turkey.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

This is the second verification period from 01/10/2017 to 30/09/2020 (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 validated and registered PDD, version 03 dated 25/05/2015.
- An online site visit was conducted on 29/12/2020 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 AMS I.D. version 17.0.
- 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 elaborate 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 elaborate 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 23/07/2020 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 : Online 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 25/11/2020 which was submitted to the verification team on the same day. This monitoring report was revised due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 06 dated 10/04/2022 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the validated and registered PDD, version 03 dated 25/05/2015, the methodology AMS I.D. version 17.0, the relevant CDM rules and regulations, CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, Gold Standard Toolkit version 2.2, the final validation report dated 19/01/2015 and the initial verification report dated as 14/01/2016.

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 an online site visit¹ was performed to the project activity site through remote access due to COVID-19 outbreak, the details of which can be seen in the below Table 3-5:

Table 3-5: Online site visit details

Date	29/12/2020	
Location	Online through remote access by Zoom program	
Participant	Company Name	Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit
Yasemen Bilgili	Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi	Deputy General Manager
Aygün Pakyürek	Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi	Board Member
Dursun İlter	Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi	Site Staff (Local)
Engin Koç	GTE Carbon Ltd.	Consultant
Anıl Söyler	Re Carbon Ltd.	Team Leader
Bahtiyar Zeybek	Bulgurca Village	Mukhtar (Village Head)
Ebru Sivas	Bulgurca Village	Villager
Necibe Erol	Bulgurca Village	Villager
Points Verified		Source of Information
Implementation and operation of the proposed GS project activity as per the registered PDD		Document review, online site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Bulgurlu Village
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters		Document review, online site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Bulgurlu Village
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 with the local stakeholders from Bulgurlu Village
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such		Document review and online site visit

¹ The physical site visit hadn't been handled due to COVID-19 outbreak. Instead of that, alternative approaches like getting project site equipment details, project site and waste storage areas' pictures, interviewing some available local stakeholders through online means, checking signed documents by the local stakeholders if there are any feedbacks about the project and announcements by PP about PP's contact details in case of any complaints/ comments in the close surrounding locations had been implemented through online means.

as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Document review, online site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Bulgurlu Village
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 with the local stakeholders from Bulgurlu Village

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 15 CARs and 09 CLs 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 online site assessment 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	22/12/2020
Online site assessment	29/12/2020
1 st Protocol submission to client	12/02/2021
Responses received	01/06/2021
2 nd Protocol submission to client	04/06/2021
Responses received	13/09/2021
3 rd Protocol submission to client	26/09/2021
Responses received	14/12/2021
Closure of all CARs and CLs	06/12/2021
Submission for Technical Review	29/12/2021
Submission for final approval	03/01/2022
Final documents submitted to client	04/01/2022
Revision of the report based on initial GS comments	18/04/2022

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 reduction calculations, provisional acceptance documents, generation licence 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 haven't been any FARs from the initial verification and its issuance GS review stage.

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. The verification team 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 during the online site visit. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed through online site visit.

The project was operational on 01/08/2014 as confirmed through the provided provisional acceptance document.

According to the registered PDD, the estimated annual emission reduction is 548 tCO₂e and corresponding total estimated amount for the monitoring period is 1,644 tCO₂e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is 1,308 tCO₂e. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period is 20.4% less than estimated emission reduction amount. However, considering the yearly fluctuations in solar radiation and the high uncertainty for solar radiation estimation, the average decrease throughout the monitoring period as 20.4% is deemed acceptable.

The difference in the values does not lead to a substantial increment of the emission reduction in this period in relation to the estimates in the registered PDD, either.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, AMS I.D. version 17.0, 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 one main electricity meter at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There is also one backup electricity meter.

The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters and they have been controlled and maintained by the grid company (TEIAS). The serial number of the main meter (Köhler model and accuracy class is 0.5s) is 21000204 and that of back up meter (Köhler model and accuracy class is 0.5s) is 13000816, respectively and these have been verified through the provided meter photos and meter test protocols. All these meters are bi-directional (meter the energy in two directions – generation and consumption). The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPIAŞ (the financial

settlement centre of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by Gediz Elektrik Dağıtım A.Ş. All readings and billings are done via issued invoices by Gediz Elektrik Dağıtım A.Ş.

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 registered PDD relevant for the second periodic verification are:

- Air quality
- Biodiversity
- Livelihood of the poor
- Quantitative employment and income generation
- Water quality and quantity

As there are no missing parameters, monitoring is complete.

4.6. Sustainability Monitoring

Sustainability measures are in line with the registered PDD of the project. For verification of sustainability parameters in the current monitoring period, document review, online site visit observations and interviews with the local stakeholders were used.

Compliance check of the parameters indicated in the sustainability monitoring plan of the registered 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	Amount of SO ₂ and NO _x emissions	Annually based on net electricity generation during the monitoring period and ex-ante fixed respective emission factors	The net electricity generation has been checked from the provided invoices and the emission intensities of SO ₂ and NO _x emissions due to electricity generation are taken as: 0.70 kg/MWh and 1.35 kg/MWh, respectively, as fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD and in the initial monitoring period. Therefore, total of 1.55 tons of SO ₂ and 2.99 tons of NO _x emission reduction (avoidance) has been achieved

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
				during this monitoring period in line with the provided and checked calculation.
2	Biodiversity	Number of affected mammals and birds	Checking project site fences and repairing if there is any gap or broken sections (Annually)	There hasn't any adverse observation regarding this issue during the verification and the same has been confirmed through the photographic evidences. Besides that, there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online verification site visit.
3	Quality of employment	Number of certificates issued/trainings provided	Reviewing of training certificates or training logs (Annually)	As per the training records and certificates checked, the health and safety trainings were on basic HSE, occupational diseases, basic first aid, hygiene and manual lifting dated as 25-26/12/2017, 29/03/2018, 18/10/2018, 08/01/2020 and firefighting dated as 08/01/2018, 14/01/2019 and 08/01/2020 and all 2 staff directly working on behalf of PP had been given the trainings.
4	Livelihood of the poor	Number of people receiving social security system payment	Reviewing of social security documents (Annually)	As per the social security records checked and the interviews through the online site visit, 2 employees directly on behalf of PP including the plant electrical engineer have been employed and 1 of them is local employee.
5	Quantitative employment and income generation	Created employment opportunities	Reviewing of employment list (Annually)	As per the social security records checked and the interviews through the online site visit, 2 employees directly on behalf of PP including the

No.	Indicator	Chosen Parameter	Way of Monitoring (When)	Compliance Check
				plant electrical engineer have been employed and 1 of them is local employee.
6	Water quality and quantity	Appropriate disposal of waste water	Assessing disposal methods during site visits and checking waste water disposal records (Annually)	During the online site visit, a septic tank for collection of the wastewater has been checked. There hasn't been any waste water transfer and disposal during the monitoring period in line with the information by PP due to very low amount of waste water in the septic tank.

There hasn't been any detailed maintenance activities during the monitoring period except for cleaning of solar PV panels in line with the online site visit observations and the information by PP.

Therefore, based on the online site visit observations, handled interviews and provided documents, it can be confirmed that sustainability parameters are monitored in line with the registered 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 01/11/2013 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. The test for the meters was also performed on 15/11/2021.

The serial number of the main meter (Köhler model and accuracy class is 0.5s) is 21000204 and that of back up meter (Köhler model and accuracy class is 0.5s) is 13000816, respectively. 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

The invoices issued by Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış A.Ş. to which generated electricity sold have been presented to VVB for all months of the monitoring period. All data in emission reductions table are checked with the issued invoices. That means, such invoices are the main

data source in this project. The net electricity generated during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-2 below:

Table 4-2: Net electricity generation

Period	Amount	Compliance check
01/10/2017 – 31/12/2017	Net electricity supplied to grid: 147,352.850 kWh	Monthly issued invoices
01/01/2018 – 31/12/2018	Net electricity supplied to grid: 719,720.315 kWh	Monthly issued invoices
01/01/2019 – 31/12/2019	Net electricity supplied to grid: 734,156.053 kWh	Monthly issued invoices
01/01/2020 – 30/09/2020	Net electricity supplied to grid: 610,016.230 kWh	Monthly issued invoices

DOE confirms that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.592 tCO₂/MWh and the value is same as fixed ex-ante in the registered PDD.

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 VVB has checked the I-REC Registry (<https://v-1.evident.app/Public/ReportDevices/>), wherein in total 259 projects from Turkey are listed as of the verification report date and and this project isn't available within I-REC Registry database. 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 and the project does not appear on domestic REC scheme, I-REC and VCS registries, it could be confirmed that no RECs and other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project at the time of this verification.

4.9. Quality of Evidence

According to the registered PDD, the estimated emission reduction for this monitoring period would be 1,644 tCO₂e corresponding to the monitoring period. However, the project in operation totally reached 1,308 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 ₂ e)
01/10/2017 – 31/12/2017	87
01/01/2018 – 31/12/2018	426
01/01/2019 – 31/12/2019	434

01/01/2020 – 30/09/2020	361
-------------------------	-----

Calculations have been reproduced by the VVB and the source data (issued monthly invoices by Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış A.Ş.) have been presented by PP.

4.10. Management System and Quality Assurance

There are in total two electricity meters as one main and one back up meter attached to the power plant for measurement of the generated electricity which were installed to the plant. The meters used in the power house are in line with the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (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 VVB checked all data set (issued invoices from 01/10/2017 – 30/09/2020) and each day of production is included in these readings. These readings are exact and are the basis for billing. They are recorded and saved automatically by the relevant government authority and there is no base for any option of material information.

Level of materiality is ensured by application of “Guideline on the Application of Materiality in Verifications” version 02. To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

4.12. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.13. Post Registration Changes

4.13.1. Temporary deviations

Although allowed monitoring period is two years in line with the relevant GS interim measures through the online remote site visit, the monitoring period for this project is from 01/10/2017 to 30/09/2020 in line with the approved deviation (deviation reference number is COVID_DEV 176) by Gold Standard and dated as 27/01/2021.

4.13.2. Corrections

N/A.

4.13.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

N/A.

4.13.4. Inclusion of monitoring plan

N/A.

4.13.5. Permanent changes

Monthly meter readings (PMUM records) had been identified as the main source in the registered PDD but the net electricity generated by the project activity has been monitored through the monthly invoices issued by Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış Anonim Şirketi and the main source of the data is such invoices.

4.13.6. Changes to the project design

N/A.

5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

The list of people who were interviewed through the online site visit 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	Yasemen Bilgili	Deputy General Manager	Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi
I02	SV	Aygün Pakyürek	Board Member	Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi
I03	SV	Dursun İler	Site Staff (Local)	Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi
I04	SV	Engin Koç	Consultant	GTE Carbon Ltd.
I05	SV	Bahtiyar Zeybek	Mukhtar (Village Head)	Bulgurca Village
I06	SV	Ebru Sivas	Villager	Bulgurca Village
I07	SV	Necibe Erol	Villager	Bulgurca 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 online site visit:

- Sufficiency of local employment
- Waste management practices implemented by PP

It was also concluded that the grievance mechanism is in place and this was also confirmed by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online site visit through the handled interviews and document review. The document showing the contact details of the relevant person within PP with the signature of Bulgurlu Village Mukhtar (Village Head) and dated as 25/10/2021 were also provided to VVB.

² SV: Online site visit; T: Telephone; EM: E-mail

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

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

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	Registered PDD	03	25/05/2015
D02	AMS I.D.	17.0	-
D03	Verification Service Agreement	-	22/10/2020
D04	Monitoring Report	01	25/11/2020
D05	Monitoring Report	02	31/05/2021
D06	Monitoring Report	03	13/09/2021
D07	Monitoring Report	04	14/12/2021
D08	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	25/11/2020
D09	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	13/09/2021
D10	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	14/12/2021
D11	CDM Validation and Verification Standard For Project Activities	3.0	07/10/2021
D12	CDM Project Standard For Project Activities	3.0	07/10/2021
D13	CDM Project Cycle Procedure For Project Activities	3.0	07/10/2021
D14	Gold Standard Toolkit	2.2	-
D15	GS Transition Requirements	2.0	16/08/2021
D16	Final Initial Verification Report	-	14/01/2016
D17	Final Validation Report	-	19/01/2015
D18	Design Change Review Document	-	03/01/2013
D19	Monthly Invoices by Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış Anonim Şirketi (About Net Electricity Generation)	-	10/2017 –09/2020
D20	Meter Initial Calibration Record	-	01/11/2013
D21	Meter Test Reports	-	15/11/2021
D22	Training Records and Certificates (As detailed in the Section 4.6)	-	25-26/12/2017 08/01/2018 29/03/2018 18/10/2018 14/01/2019 08/01/2020
D23	Social Security Records for PP Site Employees	-	-
D24	Waste Water Storage Tank Photographic	-	-


Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
	Evidence		
D25	Deviation Approval Document by GS	-	27/01/2021
D26	Signed Letter by the Mukhtar (About the Contact Details of PP Relevant Staff in case of Any Complaint by Bulgurlu Villagers)	-	25/10/2021
D27	Annual Activity Reports by PP	-	2019 2020 2021
D28	Electricity Meters Photographic Evidences	-	-
D29	Provisional Acceptance Protocol	-	01/08/2014
D30	Site Photos	-	29/12/2020
D31	Monitoring Report	05	31/12/2021
D32	Monitoring Report	06	10/04/2022

7. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Anıl SÖYLER, Bsc. in Environmental Engineering, has completed his Bachelor degree in Middle East Technical University, Turkey. He has more than 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, team and client relationship management and quality management systems and has been involved in the validation/verification services of more than 200 GHG emission reduction projects in total. He has also been involved in both national and international projects supported by IFC, World Bank and EBRD. He has been working as contracted voluntary market projects' team leader/validator/verifier, technical reviewer and CDM validator/verifier 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, technical reviewer and CDM validator/verifier in the context of Re Carbon.

7.1. Appointment Certificates

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. Prof. Dr. Aziz Sancar Cad. 27/6 TR : 06880 Çankaya-Ankara Tel : 0090-312-287 5122 Fax: 0090-312-287 3373	Certificate of Appointment	
	Carbon Division	

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mr. Anıl SÖYLER** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
08-02-2021	08-02-2021	N/A	N/A	08-02-2021

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	N/A	08-02-2021

Speciality	Regional (Country) expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area
N/A	Turkey	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 canceled 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	08-02-2021	
Name	Position	Date	Signature

Re Carbon Güzelini Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. Prof. Dr. Aziz Sancar Cad. 27/6 TR / 06690 Çankaya-Ankara Tel: 0312-312-287 4122 Fax: 0312-312-287 3373	Certificate of Appointment	
	Carbon Division	

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
08-02-2021	08-02-2021	N/A	N/A	08-02-2021

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021

Speciality	Regional (Country) expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area
N/A	Turkey	N/A	1.2, 2.1 and 3.1

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 canceled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Anil SÖYLER	Certification Manager	08-02-2021	
Name	Position	Date	



8. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the second verification of of Gold Standard “Solar for Forest” which is a project with the registry reference number “GS 3305” for the period between 01/10/2017 and 30/09/2020. The scope of the activities covers the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in Monitoring Report version 06 dated 10/04/2022 of “Solar for Forest” project.

Ege Orman Vakfı Ağaçlandırma ve Ağaç Ürünleri İktisadi İşletmesi 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 06.

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 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities, version 3.0, and CDM Project Cycle Procedure for project activities, version 3.0, and GS Toolkit version 2.2.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Solar for Forest” in Turkey, is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD, version 03 dated 25/05/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is AMS I.D. version 17.0.

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

Project Title	Solar for Forest
Applicable Period	2nd Monitoring Period (01/10/2017 and 30/09/2020 both days included)
Baseline Emissions	1,308 tCO ₂ e (01/10/2017-31/12/2017: 87 tCO ₂ e; 2018: 426 tCO ₂ e; 2019: 434 tCO ₂ e; 01/01/2020 – 30/09/2020: 361 tCO ₂ e)
Project Emissions	0 tCO ₂ e
Leakage Emissions	0 tCO ₂ e
Emission Reductions (GS Product: GS VERs)	1,308 tCO ₂ e (01/10/2017-31/12/2017: 87 tCO ₂ e; 2018: 426 tCO ₂ e; 2019: 434 tCO ₂ e; 01/01/2020 – 30/09/2020: 361 tCO ₂ e)



Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader
18/04/2022



Fikriye Seda ATABEK
ITR
18/04/2022



Esin TUNALI
Certification Manager
18/04/2022

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, title of the project (Solar for Forest) has been provided.	OK	OK
1.2. Reference number of the project activity;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the reference number (GS 3305) has been provided.	OK	OK
1.3. Version number of the PDD applicable to this monitoring report	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the version number of the registered PDD is available as version 03.	OK	OK
1.4. Version number of the monitoring report;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the version number is available.	OK	OK
1.5. Completion date of the monitoring report (DD/MM/YYYY);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the completion date is available.	OK	OK
1.6. Monitoring period number and duration of this monitoring period (first and last days included (DD/MM/YYYY– DD/MM/YYYY));	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please clarify the duration of this monitoring period in the MR including the cover page considering current 2 year monitoring requirement. b) Please clarify the gap between the initial and current monitoring period since the initial one ends at 30/11/2015 and considering site visit requirement.	CAR-1	OK
1.7. Monitoring report number for this monitoring period;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The monitoring report number for this monitoring period has been provided.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.8. Project participant(s);	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please provide the Turkish version of the project owner in the cover page of the MR as in the registered PDD and initial verification report.	CAR-2	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, the methodology including the version number is available.	OK	OK
1.11. Sectoral scope(s)	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The sectoral scope number is available in the cover page of the MR.	OK	OK
1.12. Estimated amount of GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks for this monitoring period in the registered PDD;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, information on estimated amount of GHG emission reductions for this monitoring period in the registered PDD is available but please correct the number of days calculation in G57 cell of "Detail" Excel spreadsheet and please provide the number of days as an integer value.	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
1.13. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved in this monitoring period;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please provide the monthly TEIAS meter readings and EPIAS screenshots. b) Please indicate all baseline, project, leakage emissions and ER values as an integer value in Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR including the cover page. c) Please consider the number of days in the calculation of estimated and actual ER values considering current 2 year monitoring requirement in the Excel spreadsheet. d) Please use round down function for vintage base total and monitoring period total ER values. e) Please correct the difference calculation for the estimated and actual ER values in the Excel spreadsheet considering current 2 year monitoring requirement. f) Please correct the unit of EF value in the Excel spreadsheet. g) Please consider the number of days in the calculation of estimated and actual ER values for each vintage in the Excel spreadsheet. h) Please correct the ER value in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections.	CAR-4	OK
1.14. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period up to 31 December 2012;	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.15. Actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved during the period from 1 January 2013 onwards.	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this information is available but please see CAR-4.	CAR-4	OK
General Requirements					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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	a) Please check and correct the MR in line with the relevant applicable version of MR template. (e.g. Section A.6 of the MR isn't available in the template). b) Please check and correct/include the section headings in line with the relevant applicable version of MR template.	CAR-5	OK
1.3. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM without any other alteration	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
1.4. Completing the CDM-MR-FORM by deleting the Attachment of "Instructions for filling out the monitoring report form"	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
1.5. Not modifying or deleting tables and their columns in the CDM-MR-FORM	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, this has been followed.	OK	OK
A. Description of the Project Activity					
A.1. Purpose and general description of the project activity					
A.1.1. Has a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section B.1 provided under section A.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please provide the construction start date, GS registration date and initial and current monitoring period details in the section A.1 of the MR along with the relevant evidences. b) Please provide the provisional acceptance protocol of the project. c) Please provide the total net electricity generation and achieved GHG emission reduction amount for this monitoring period in the	CAR-6	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			Section A.1 of the MR. d) Please correct the sentences throughout the MR like including “expected” term or future tense since the project is already operational. e) Please remove unnecessary details in the section A.1 of the MR.		

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A.1.2. 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	Please provide the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under section A.1 of the MR.	CAR-7	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please include host country information regarding the location in the Section A.2 of the MR. b) Please provide the relevant evidence for the coordinates in the Section A.2 of the MR. c) Please provide the reference document for the approved planning permission and land usage permit documents including kmz format. 	CAR-8	OK
A.3. Parties and project participant(s)					
A.3.1. Has the list of the Parties and PPs been provided under section A.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	These are available in the Section A.3 of the MR.	OK	OK
A.4. References to applied methodologies and standardized baselines					
A.4.1. Has a complete reference of the methodology or standardized baseline(s), tools and other methodologies to which the applied methodology(ies) applied been provided under section A.4 including the version numbers and titles?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, the methodology and referred tools along with the relevant versions are provided in the Section A.4 of the MR.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
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	The crediting period including the crediting period start date, choice and length of the crediting period have been provided under Section A.5 of the MR.	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	Please provide the brief technical details for the used PV modules within the context of the project activity along with the reference document.	CL-1	OK
B.1.2. Has the information on the implementation and actual operation of the project activity (including relevant dates, construction, commissioning, continued operation periods etc.) been provided under section B.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	Please see the option a of CAR-6.	CAR-6	OK
B.1.3. If the project activity consists of more than one site, has the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site been clearly described under section B.1 of the MR?	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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
project activity achieved in each phase been indicated under section B.1 of the MR?					
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 period?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 EB93 Report Annex 5 §282 CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	a) Please clarify whether the provided deviation is valid only for this monitoring period. b) Please clarify the reason of this deviation along with the relevant evidence since there is reference to PMUM and TEAIS meter readings during the initial verification.	CL-2	OK
B.2.1.2. If there are temporary 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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232 CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
alternative monitoring of the project activity in the MR?					
B.2.1.3. If there are temporary 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	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	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	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	OK
B.2.1.3.2. The duration for which the deviation(s) is(are) applicable	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	OK
B.2.1.3.3. Justification on the conservativeness of the approach.	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	OK
B.2.1.4. If there are temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan or applied methodology or standardized baseline, have PPs applied conservative assumptions or discount factors to the calculations to the extent required to ensure that GHG emission reductions will not be over-estimated as a result of the deviation?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §232a EB93 Report Annex 5 §284	DR	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	OK
B.2.1.5. If there are temporary deviations from the registered monitoring plan and/or monitoring methodology or standardized	EB93 Report Annex 5 §284	DR	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
baseline, is the deviation likely to lead to a reduction in the accuracy of the calculation of emission reductions?					
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	Please see CL-2.	CL-2	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	Please clarify in the Section B.2.2 of the MR if there are any corrections applied during this monitoring period.	CL-3	OK
B.2.2.2. If the correction(s) and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CL-3.	CL-3	OK
B.2.2.3. If the correction(s) and the revised PDD aren't approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the version number and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CL-3.	CL-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.2.2.4. Is the corrected information an accurate reflection of actual project information?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §288a	DR	Please see CL-3.	CL-3	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	Please see CL-3.	CL-3	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	Please clarify in the Section B.2.3 of the MR if there are any changes to start date of crediting period.	CL-4	OK
B.2.3.2. Have the changes been notified to the Secretariat by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §235	DR	Please see CL-4.	CL-4	OK
B.2.3.3. If where the changes and the revised PDD are approved prior to the submission of this monitoring report for request for issuance, are the approval date and reference number provided?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see CL-4.	CL-4	OK
B.2.4. Inclusion of monitoring plan					
B.2.4.1. Is it indicated whether the inclusion of a monitoring plan into	CDM-MR-FORM	DR	Please clarify in the Section B.2.4 of the MR if there is any inclusion of the monitoring plan.	CL-5	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 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?	version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §238 EB93 Report Annex 5 §292 §293				
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	Please see CL-5.	CL-5	OK
B.2.5. Permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan, or permanent deviation of monitoring from the applied methodologies, standardized baselines, or other methodological regulatory documents					
B.2.5.1 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 clarify in the Section B.2.5 of the MR if there are any permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan.	CL-6	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.2.5.2 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 see CL-6.	CL-6	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 see CL-6.	CL-6	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 see CL-6.	CL-6	OK
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 see CL-6.	CL-6	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	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0		Please see CL-6.	CL-6	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
and the completion date of the revised PDD provided?					
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 clarify in the Section B.2.6 of the MR if there are any changes to the project design.	CL-7	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 CL-7.	CL-7	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 CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.4. Does the revised PDD comply with the applied monitoring methodology and tools and/or standardized baseline or any later version of the methodology and/or 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 CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.5. Does the changes to project	EB93 Report Annex 4	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-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
activity include the following?	§240				
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 CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.5.2. Addition of component or extension of technology has been occurred?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240b	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.5.4. Removal of a project activity from a bundle of small-scale CDM project activities?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240d	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	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	EB93 Report Annex 4 §240f	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-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
that is more appropriate as a result of the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?					
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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.6.1 The applicability and application of the applied methodology and, where applicable, the applied standardized baseline under which the project activity has been registered;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243a EB93 Report Annex 5 §303c	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.6.3 The level of accuracy and completeness in the	EB93 Report Annex 4	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-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
monitoring of the project activity;	§243c				
B.2.6.6.4 The additionality of the project activity;	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243d EB93 Report Annex 5 §303a	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.6.5 The scale of the project activity.	EB93 Report Annex 4 §243e EB93 Report Annex 5 §303b	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.7.6 In the case of investment analysis, have PPs modified the key parameters in the original spreadsheet calculations affected by the proposed or actual modifications to the project activity?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §244a EB93 Report Annex 5 §304a	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
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	Please see CL-7.	CL-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
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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	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 selected methodology and/or the selected standardized baseline?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §246a(ii)	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.6.10. If the changes and the revised PDD	CDM-MR-	DR	Please see CL-7.	CL-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
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.2.6.11.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	Please see CL-7.	CL-7	OK
B.2.7. Changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activity					
B.2.5.1. Are any changes specific to afforestation or reforestation project activity have been applied during this monitoring period?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A (The project activity isn't a afforestation or reforestation project activity).	OK	OK
C. Description of the Monitoring System					
C.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please correct the monitoring practices in line with the registered PDD in the Section C of the MR. b) Please provide the photographic evidences of all electricity meters including their serial numbers. c) Please provide the meter test protocols for all electricity meters along with the meter change protocols, if any. d) Please clarify the monitoring data collection and storage period in the Section C of the MR. e) Please correct the sentences in the Section C of the MR with future tense since the project is already operational. 	CAR-9	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			f) Please clarify the function of third electricity meter in the Section C of the MR.		

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Please see CAR-9.	CAR-9	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 but please clarify in the Section C of the MR if there is any change with the registered monitoring plan in terms of data aggregation.	CL-8	
C.2.3. Data recording	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Yes, the data recording details are available.	OK	OK
C.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	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
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	Please provide the emergency procedures for the monitoring system (e.g. failure of electricity meters) are available in the Section C of the MR.	CAR-10	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	The roles and responsibilities have been provided.	OK	OK
C.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364e	DR	Please see CAR-9.	CAR-9	OK
C.6. Has line diagram(s) showing all relevant monitoring points been provided under section C of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259	DR	Please provide the single line diagram of the project.	CAR-11	OK
C.7. Have the monitoring plan been properly implemented and followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364a	DR	Yes, but please see CAR-9 and CAR-10.	CAR-9 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
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	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK
D.1.2. If all the data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, does the listed data include all the parameters used to calculate baseline, project and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
monitoring plan?					
D.1.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK
D.1.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK
D.1.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the description of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK
D.1.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.1.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has the values applied of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK
D.1.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.1 of the MR, for each data has it been indicated what the data/parameters are used for (baseline/project/leakage emission calculations)?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The only parameter (EF _{CO2,2012}) 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.	OK	OK
D.2. Data and parameters monitored					
D.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under section D.2 of the MR using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	<p>Yes, EGfacility,y (Annual net electricity generation) is the data monitoring parameter. However, the following findings have been determined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please provide the same table format for all sustainability parameters as in EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR. b) Regarding the sustainability monitoring, please clarify the monitored sustainability parameters along with its reference source. c) The details about the hazardous waste including waste oil transfer and discharge amount regarding the monitoring period are missing. d) Please provide the wastewater transfer and discharge records associated with the monitoring period. e) The domestic waste transfer and discharge records regarding the 	CAR-12	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			<p>monitoring period are missing.</p> <p>f) Please provide the photographic evidences of hazardous waste storage area and wastewater storage tank.</p> <p>g) Please provide the training records of the employees considering the monitoring period.</p> <p>h) Please provide the recent social security records of all employees.</p> <p>i) The document regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint from Bulgurca Village and if there is any complaint during the monitoring period is missing.</p>		

*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	Yes, EGfacility,y (Annual net electricity generation) is the data monitoring parameter.	OK	OK
D.2.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered PDD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The unit has been provided.	OK	OK
D.2.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section D.2 of the MR, for each data has it been described how the data is monitored?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	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	The source of the data has been provided.	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, but the vintage wise data is available but please see CAR-4.	CAR-4	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	Please see CAR-4.	CAR-4	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	The accuracy class details are available in the Section D.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
D.2.8.2. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please provide the calibration frequency in the Section D.2 of the MR.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.8.3. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	The serial numbers of the electricity meters are available.	OK	OK
D.2.8.4. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please see the option b and c of CAR-9.	CAR-9	OK
D.2.8.5. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Please provide the information about the validity of the calibration in the Section D.2 of the MR.	CAR-14	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	OK
D.2.16.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370b	DR	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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	Please see CAR-13.	CAR-13	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 option a of CAR-12.	CAR-12	OK
D.2.21. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376	DR	Yes, all are available but please see option a of CAR-12.	CAR-12	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? (<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 	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-4.	CAR-4	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-4.	CAR-4	OK
E.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.1.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the baseline emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2. Calculation of project emissions or actual net removals					
E.2.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the project emissions been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A (The project emissions are taken as zero in line with the applied methodology.)	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.2.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of project emissions or or actual net GHG removals by sinks, applying actual values been provided under section E.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.2.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the project emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3. Calculation of leakage emissions					
E.3.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the leakage emissions been provided under section E.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A (The leakage is taken as zero in line with the applied methodology.)	OK	OK
E.3.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage emissions, applying actual values been provided under section E.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to	CDM-MR-	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	FORM version 7.0				
E.3.4. Have any assumptions used in leakage emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.3.5. If applicable, are the appropriate emission factors used for the leakage emission calculations in line with the good guidance practices? (e.g. IPCC default values and other reference values)	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4. Calculation of emission reductions or net anthropogenic removals					
E.4.1. Have the total baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	Yes, total baseline emissions have been provided but please see CAR-4.	CAR-4	OK
E.4.2. Has the total project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.3. Has the total leakage emissions during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.4. Have the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks	CDM-MR-FORM	DR	Yes, total emission reductions have been provided but please see CAR-4.	CAR-4	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
during the monitoring period been given under section E.4 of the MR?	version 7.0				
E.4.5. If the monitoring period starts before 31 December 2012 and ends anytime thereafter, has actual GHG emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks achieved for the following two periods been provided under section E.7 of MR?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.1. Up to 31 December 2012 (1 st commitment period); and	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E.4.5.2. From 1 January 2013 onwards	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §266a	DR	Yes, total emission reductions have been provided.	OK	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 see options c and d of CAR-4.	CAR-4	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 clarify in the Section E.6 of the MR if there is decrease or increase in achieved emission reductions comparing with the estimated emission reductions.	CL-9	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.7. Remarks on scale of small-scale project activity					
E.7.1. Has it been demonstrated that the combined scale of the activities belonging to the same small-scale project type (Type I, II or III) remained under the limit of that type every year during the crediting period, or if, during any year of its crediting period for small scale project activities?	CDM-MR-FORM version 7.0	DR	N/A (The project isn't small scale project activity).	OK	OK
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. Forward action requests (FARs) identified during validation and/or previous verification					
F.1.1. Is there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	There haven't been any issued FARs from the initial verification.	OK	OK
F.1.2. If there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities, have the PPs addressed these FARs in the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	There haven't been any issued FARs from the initial verification.	OK	OK
F.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349 §347d	DR	There haven't been any issued FARs from the initial verification.	OK	OK

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

PROJECT NUMBER: 652



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

R-C-18 / 12.03.2021- 03

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 during the online verification site visit.	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
<p>CAR-1</p> <p>a) Please clarify the duration of this monitoring period in the MR including the cover page considering current 2 year monitoring requirement.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the gap between the initial and current monitoring period since the initial one ends at 30/11/2015 and considering site visit requirement.</p>	<p>Table-1 1.6</p>	<p>a) Monitoring for three years are agreed with GS. Related document is to be shared with this document. Hence, 3 years monitoring is not changed on cover page and other related parts of the monitoring report. In the decision it was said that "The deviation request is approved whereby the VVB is allowed to carry out remote verification for a monitoring period having duration of three years".</p> <p>b) Remote site visit for three year monitoring period is approved by GS (deviation request) as also mentioned above.</p> <p>Response for Review-1: Deviation request is to be provided with this document.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) b) Please provide the mentioned approved deviation request document and relevant email evidence.</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) b) Ok Closed (The approved deviation request document by GS dated as 27/01/2021 has been provided).</p>
<p>CAR-2</p> <p>Please provide the Turkish version of the project owner in the cover page of the MR as in the registered PDD and initial verification report.</p>	<p>Table 1 1.8</p>	<p>Name of the project owner is revised as "Ege Orman Vakfi İktisadi İşletmesi (The Aegean Forest Foundation, EGEVAK)".</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>Ok Closed (The name of the project owner has been revised in the MR).</p>
<p>CAR-3</p> <p>Please correct the number of days calculation in G57 cell of "Detail" Excel spreadsheet and please provide the number of days as an integer value.</p>	<p>Table 1 1.12</p>	<p>Number of days calculation in G57 revised as "92" instead "91". Number of days revised as integer value representation. Moreover estimated emission reduction value of 2020 was wrong and it is revised also in MR (cover page).</p> <p>Response for Review-1:</p> <p>a) Excel spreadsheet is to be provided with this document. Sorry for the missing upload in previous round. Related corrections were done comply with other CARs.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Please provide the revised Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>b) Please correct the monitoring period vintage in the Excel spreadsheet (e.g. C42, C49, C52 cells).</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) b) Ok Closed (Excel spreadsheet has been revised accordingly).</p>

*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
<p>CAR-4</p> <p>a) Please provide the monthly TEIAS meter readings and EPIAS screenshots.</p> <p>b) Please indicate all baseline, project, leakage emissions and ER values as an integer value in Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR including the cover page.</p> <p>c) Please consider the number of days in the calculation of estimated and actual ER values considering current 2 year monitoring requirement in the Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>d) Please use round down function for vintage base total and monitoring period total ER values.</p> <p>e) Please correct the difference calculation for the estimated and actual ER values in the Excel spreadsheet considering current 2 year monitoring requirement.</p> <p>f) Please correct the unit of EF value in the Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>g) Please consider the number of days in the calculation of estimated and actual ER values for each vintage in the Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>h) Please correct the ER value in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections.</p>	<p>Table 1 1.13</p>	<p>b) Monitoring period vintages are revised.</p> <p>a) Since the project microscale, EPIAS screenshots and monthly TEIAS readings such as macro-scale could not be handled. Hence, invoices prepared between the project owner and local/regional electricity distribution company which is Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış Anonim Şirketi. That is why, the invoices between the project and distribution company were provided before to show monthly electricity sold of the project. During the verification and issuance of the first monitoring period, the same approach was used.</p> <p>b) There is no project or leakage emission of the project. Project is a small scale solar energy generation farm. There are no fossil fuels or wastes related with energy generation within that project boundary. Hence there no project or leakage possibility.</p> <p>c) Monitoring period kept as 3 years and related deviation document consisting decision of GS is to be provided with this document.</p> <p>d) Values are round downed</p> <p>e) Difference calculation is kept since monitoring period of 3 years is kept.</p> <p>f) Corrected.</p> <p>g) Each vintage is shown in excel</p> <p>h) Corrected</p> <p>Response for Review-1:</p> <p>a) Invoices and relevant months were revised. If the</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Please clarify the invoices and the relevant months (e.g. how the invoice dated as 14/11/2017 belongs to November 2017 which is almost half of the month).</p> <p>b) Please provide all ER values as an integer value including estimated values (e.g. cover page of the MR).</p> <p>c) Please correct the number of days in the calculation of estimated and actual ER values in the Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>d) e) Please provide the revised Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>f) Please correct the unit of EF value in the Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>g) Please consider the number of days in the calculation of estimated and actual ER values for each vintage in the Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>h) Please correct the ER value in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections.</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (The relevant invoices issued to Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış Anonim Şirketi (distribution company) covering the monitoring period have been provided).</p>

* 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
		<p>invoice has the date in September, the related electricity generation is belonged to August (previous month) as an example. Accordingly invoice of September 2021 (dated as November 2021) is to be shared with this document since this invoices was not shared in previous rounds.</p> <p>b) Values are revised as integer value in MR cover page. Details are provided in excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>c) corrected</p> <p>d-e) provided, sorry for the missing upload in previous round.</p> <p>f) It has been already correct as ton CO2/MWh</p> <p>g) Provided in detain via revised excel spreadsheet</p> <p>h) Corrected.</p>	<p>b) Ok Closed (ER values have been provided as an integer value).</p> <p>c) Ok Closed (Number of days calculation has been corrected).</p> <p>d) e) Ok Closed (Revised ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet has been provided).</p> <p>f) Ok Closed (ER Calculation spreadsheet has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>g) Ok Closed (Number of days calculation has been corrected and the revised ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet has been provided).</p> <p>h) Ok Closed (ER Calculation spreadsheet has been revised accordingly).</p>
<p>CAR-5</p> <p>a) Please check and correct the MR in line with the relevant applicable version of MR template. (e.g. Section A.6 of the MR isn't available in the template).</p> <p>b) Please check and correct/include the section headings in line with the relevant applicable version of MR template.</p>	<p>Table 1 General Requirements 1.2</p>	<p>Template is checked and related revisions were done according to template ver08.0.</p> <p>Response for Review-1:</p> <p>a-b) Template is revised. There is no additional remarks of project activity apart from estimated and actual emission reduction calculations which is explained in E.6 in detail. Hence this part is blanked.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) b) Please check and correct the MR in line with the relevant applicable version of MR template (e.g. why Section E.7 is not applicable, document information table at the end of MR).</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>Ok Closed (MR template has been revised accordingly).</p>
<p>CAR-6</p> <p>a) Please provide the construction start date, GS registration date and initial and current monitoring period details in the section A.1 of the MR along with the relevant evidences.</p> <p>b) Please provide the provisional acceptance protocol of</p>	<p>Table 1 A.1.1</p>	<p>a) GS registration date is present in cover page. In addition there is no need for any evidence of construction agreement. This is an issue of registration process which was already accomplished and approved by GS.,</p> <p>b) Please see the explanation in "a".</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Please provide the construction start date, GS registration date and initial and current monitoring period details in the section A.1 of the MR along with the relevant evidences.</p>

* 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
<p>the project.</p> <p>c) Please provide the total net electricity generation and achieved GHG emission reduction amount for this monitoring period in the Section A.1 of the MR.</p> <p>d) Please correct the sentences throughout the MR like including "expected" term or future tense since the project is already operational.</p> <p>e) Please remove unnecessary details in the section A.1 of the MR.</p>		<p>c) Total electricity generated in this monitoring period is added to Section A.1 both in total and annual values.</p> <p>d) Language was checked accordingly.</p> <p>e) Some parts of A.1 which are not so necessary are deleted.</p> <p>Response for Review-1: a-b) Relevant evidences are not the issue of verification process. Mentioned documents have already been validated by DOE and GS during the GS registration period before. Hence there is no need to share these documents such as construction agreement. These kinds of documents are related to registration/certification design process not to verification.</p> <p>b) MR has been revised.</p>	<p>b) Please provide the provisional acceptance protocol of the project.</p> <p>c) Please provide the total net electricity generation (in decimal places) and achieved GHG emission reduction amount for this monitoring period in the Section A.1 of the MR.</p> <p>d) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>e) Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>Review-2: a) Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>b) Ok Closed (The provisional acceptance protocol dated as 31/07/2014 has been provided).</p> <p>c) Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p>
<p>CAR-7</p> <p>Please provide the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under section A.1 of the MR.</p>	<p>Table 1 A.1.2</p>	<p>Yearly and total emission reduction accomplished in this monitoring period is added to Section A.1</p> <p>Response for Review-1: Provided in section A.1</p>	<p>Review-1: Please provide the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under section A.1 of the MR.</p> <p>Review-2: Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p>
<p>CAR-8</p> <p>a) Please include host country information regarding the</p>	<p>Table 1 A.2.1</p>	<p>a) What is the meaning of host country information? In all of other project country name is sufficient to</p>	<p>Review-1: a) Ok Closed (Host country information</p>

* 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
<p>location in the Section A.2 of the MR.</p> <p>b) Please provide the relevant evidence for the coordinates in the Section A.2 of the MR.</p> <p>c) Please provide the reference document for the approved planning permission and land usage permit documents including kmz format.</p>		<p>proceed. Please give a specific request. Province and district information is also present in MR.</p> <p>b) This project has been already registered and their coordinates are taken from registered PDD while preparing monitoring report which means these coordinates were checked and clarified during registration already. Hence there is no need for reference document on that issue.</p> <p>c) The same is valid for planning and land usage permissions (please see the explanation in “b”). These steps are belonged to registration and passed away already with successfully.</p>	<p>(Turkey) is available in the Section A.2 of the MR.</p> <p>b) Please include the relevant evidence document for the coordinates in the Section A.2 of the MR.</p> <p>c) Please provide the reference document for the approved planning permission and land usage permit documents.</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>b) Ok Closed (The provided coordinates are taken from the registered PDD).</p> <p>c) Ok Closed (Land usage documents have been provided).</p>
<p>CAR-9</p> <p>a) Please correct the monitoring practices in line with the registered PDD in the Section C of the MR.</p> <p>b) Please provide the photographic evidences of all electricity meters including their serial numbers.</p> <p>c) Please provide the meter test protocols for all electricity meters along with the meter change protocols, if any.</p> <p>d) Please clarify the monitoring data collection and storage period in the Section C of the MR.</p> <p>e) Please correct the sentences in the Section C of the MR with future tense since the project is already operational.</p> <p>f) Please clarify the function of third electricity meter in the Section C of the MR.</p>	<p>Table 1 C.1</p>	<p>a)</p> <p>b) Photographic evidences were provided already with DOE. Photos are to be provided again with this document.</p> <p>c) There is no change in electricity meters and so there are no change protocols.</p> <p>d) Data is kept at least two years as indicated in section C. In addition, information about invoices between electricity distribution company and project owner is added to explanations in section C.</p> <p>e) Corrected</p> <p>f) Information about third electricity meter is deleted. It was a mistake.</p> <p>Response for Review-1: The monitoring practices are now in-line with</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Please correct the monitoring practices in line with the registered PDD in the Section C of the MR.</p> <p>b) Ok Closed (The photographic evidences of electricity meters have been provided).</p> <p>c) Please provide the meter test protocols for all electricity meters including initial meter test protocol.</p> <p>d) Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>e) Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>f) Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has</p>

* 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
		<p>registered PDD. Number of the electricity meters are corrected as two. In addition the statement “Electricity generated by the Project activity is transferred to the Gediz Elektrik Perakende Satış Anonim Şirketi and this company shared invoices with The Aegean Forest Foundation contained information on net electricity generation. Hence, for the emission reduction calculations, the data belonged to these invoices are used. Details are present in emission reduction calculation excel document.” is added to this part since the electricity generation data is belonged to these invoices as the same monitoring way was used in first verification which was issued.</p>	<p>been revised accordingly). c) Ok Closed (The meter test protocols for 01/11/2013 and 15/11/2021 have been provided).</p>
<p>CAR-10 Please provide the emergency procedures for the monitoring system (e.g. failure of electricity meters) are available in the Section C of the MR.</p>	<p>Table 1 C.3</p>	<p>There are three different electricity meter within the boundary of the project and each of them is the back-up of another one. Hence, this is the emergency procedure in case any failure of any one. Response for Review-1: a) Project has back-up meter in case of any failure in main meter such as all other projects. Both the meters operate simultaneously. b) There are two electricity meters on site. The related information was given in MR and photos are to be shared again with this document.</p>	<p>Review-1: a) Please provide the emergency procedures for the monitoring system (e.g. failure of electricity meters) are available in the Section C of the MR. b) Please clarify the number of electricity meters in the project whether it is 2 or 3. Review-2: a) Ok Closed (Section C of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			b) Ok Closed (The photographic evidences of electricity meters have been provided).
CAR-11 Please provide the single line diagram of the project.	Table 1 C.6	Provided in Section A.2	Review-1: Ok Closed (The simple diagram of the project has been provided).
CAR-12 EGfacility,y (Annual net electricity generation) is the data monitoring parameter. However, the following findings have been determined: a) Please provide the same table format for all sustainability parameters as in EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR. b) Regarding the sustainability monitoring, please clarify the monitored sustainability parameters along with its reference source. c) The details about the hazardous waste including waste oil transfer and discharge amount regarding the monitoring period are missing. d) Please provide the wastewater transfer and discharge records associated with the monitoring period. e) The domestic waste transfer and disposal records regarding the monitoring period are missing. f) Please provide the photographic evidences of hazardous waste storage area and wastewater storage tank. g) Please provide the training records of the employees considering the monitoring period. h) Please provide the recent social security records of all	Table 1 D.2.1	a) Table format is revised b) Reference of air quality based sustainability monitoring belonged to national greenhouse gas emission inventory. In the inventory (table 1s1) SO2 and NOX emissions due to electricity generation in Turkey is shared. c) There is no waste oil generation during the monitoring period. Moreover, there is no additional hazardous waste related with the project. d) There was no wastewater discharge on project site during the monitoring period. e) Only one person is working on project site. This person packages his solid wastes and dumps it to the municipal containers. So there is no discharge and waste transfer happened during the monitoring period. f) There is no hazardous waste generation in project site. Wastewater collection drainage photo is to be shared again with this document. g) Training certificates of Dursun İlter and Birol Dizdar was shared before. Documents are to be shared again with this document. Training documents cover the years 2017-2018 and 2020 which are	Review-1: a) Please provide the same table format for all sustainability parameters as in EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR. b) Ok Closed (The same sustainable development parameters as in the initial monitoring period have been provided in the revised MR). c) f) Ok Closed (There hasn't been any hazardous waste during this monitoring period in line with the information by PP). d) Please clarify the status and management process waste water in the MR. e) Ok Closed (Since there is only one staff at the project site, domestic waste amount is negligible and handled properly in line with the information by PP). f) Ok Closed (The waste water storage tank photographic evidence has been provided). g) Please provide 2019 and 2020 training

* 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
<p>employees.</p> <p>i) Please provide the document regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint from Bulgurca Village and if there is any complaint during the monitoring period is missing.</p>		<p>belonged to this monitoring period.</p> <p>h) During the remote site visit (DOE representative was joined to remote site visit also), there were interviews with local stakeholders on web-cam. Local stakeholders did not mention about any negative issue within project. Related explanations are also added to MR (at the end of section D.2).</p> <p>Response for Review-1:</p> <p>a) Table in "Data and parameters fixed ex ante" part of the MR is revised as per the format as in EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR.</p> <p>e) Since project has just one employee on project site (in years 2019 and 2020) there was negligible amount of domestic wastewater generated and disposed to collected in chesspool and transmitted to authorized municipal vehicles. This statement is added to related indicator in revised MR.</p> <p>h) 2018-2020 term covered training records are to be provided within this document.</p> <p>i) 2019 and 2020 social security lists are to be provided within this document.</p> <p>k)" Indicator Balance of payment" was deleted from MR.</p> <p>l) There is no gap on fences which may cause risk for animals. In addition there was no any harm on birds due to panels. In addition, mukhtar of the nearest village did not propose any negative comment in terms of risk on biodiversity due to his observations during the remote site interview.</p>	<p>records for Mr. Birol Dizdar.</p> <p>h) Please provide the recent social security records of all employees since the provided records are for 2018.</p> <p>i) Please provide the document regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint from Bulgurca Village and if there is any complaint during the monitoring period is missing.</p> <p>j) Please clarify the balance of payments parameter in the Excel spreadsheet since this parameter hasn't been found among the parameters indicated in the initial monitoring period.</p> <p>k) Please clarify and explain the status of biodiversity parameter along with the relevant evidence as indicated in the initial monitoring period.</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (All sustainability parameters have been included as in EGfacility,y parameter in the Section D.2 of the MR).</p> <p>d) Ok Closed (The photographic evidence of the waste water storage tank has been provided).</p> <p>g) Ok Closed (The training records dated as 10/01/2017, 26-27/12/2017, 18/10/2018, 14/01/2019, 08/01/2020 and 02/06/2020 have been provided).</p>

* 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
		<p>Related clarification was added to revise MR. Related site photos are to be shared with this document again.</p>	<p>h) Ok Closed (The social security records have been provided). i) Ok Closed (The signed letter by Bulgurca Village and dated as 25/10/2021 regarding the contact details of responsible staff within the context of PP in case of any complaint from Bulgurca Village and if there is any complaint during the monitoring period has been provided). j) Ok Closed (ER Excel spreadsheet and MR have been revised accordingly). k) Ok Closed (The photographic evidences of the fences have been provided. Besides that, there hasn't been any complaint regarding this issue by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online verification site visit).</p>
<p>CAR-13 Please provide the calibration frequency in the Section D.2 of the MR.</p>	<p>Table 1 D.2.8.2</p>	<p>Provided with reference link.</p>	<p>Review-1: Ok Closed (The calibration frequency has been included in the Section D.2 of the MR).</p>
<p>CAR-14 Please provide the information about the validity of the calibration in the Section D.2 of the MR.</p>	<p>Table 1 D.2.8.5</p>	<p>Provided with reference link.</p>	<p>Review-1: Ok Closed (The validity of the calibration of the meters has been included in the Section D.2 of the MR).</p>
<p>CAR-15 (Issued during ITR stage) a) Please correct the values in the sentence of "Corresponding actual electricity generation is 2,141,949 kWh in total and 713,983 kWh annually." in the Section A.1 of the MR.</p>	<p>Table 1 A.1.1</p>	<p>a) b) MR revised.</p>	<p>Review-1: a) Ok Closed (Section A.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly). b) Ok Closed (The cover page and Section E.5 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
b) Estimated ER value for 2017 (01/10/2017-31/12/2017) is 137 in Excel spreadsheet and 138 in the cover page and Section E.5 of the MR.			
<p>CL-1</p> <p>Please provide the brief technical details for the used PV modules within the context of the project activity along with the reference document.</p>	Table 1 B.1.1	<p>Brief technical details were already present in section B.1. under the title “description of implemented project activity”. Since project is small scale and basic technology there is other details. This information is also present in registered PDD as reference document.</p> <p>Response for Review-1:</p> <p>This project did not have any design change after GS registration. As similar in responses of CAR 8 these kinds of documents are not the issue of monitoring periods and so there is no need to share again and again.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>Please provide the reference document for the used PV modules including the number of modules within the context of the project activity.</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>Ok Closed (The details about the used PV modules as in the registered PDD and initial monitoring period have been provided).</p>
<p>CL-2</p> <p>a) Please clarify whether the provided deviation is valid only for this monitoring period.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the reason of this deviation along with the relevant evidence since there is reference to PMUM and TEAIS meter readings during the initial verification.</p>	Table 1 B.2.1.1	<p>a) Previous issuance, issuance of first monitoring period, of the project was made by proceeding this way again. Hence this is not only for this monitoring period.</p> <p>b) Yes, during the registration period TEIAS and PMUM pages were shown as references; however, project owner could only share the invoices between Gediz Elektrik Dağıtım. A.Ş. The first issuance of the project was accomplished by using the similar invoices also.</p> <p>Response for Review-1:</p> <p>Provided deviation specifically stated the time period which is monitoring period of the project. Hence, of course valid only for this monitoring period.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Please clarify whether the provided deviation is valid only for this monitoring period since this has been included in the Section B.2.1 of the MR.</p> <p>b) Ok Closed (The relevant invoices and the email by PP about confirmation regarding the monitoring practice have been provided).</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (Sections B.2.1 and B.2.5 of the MR have been revised accordingly).</p>
CL-3	Table 1 B.2.2.1	There are no corrections applied. Term “N/A” is added.	Review-1:

* 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
Please clarify in the Section B.2.2 of the MR if there are any corrections applied during this monitoring period.			Ok Closed (Section B.2.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CL-4 Please clarify in the Section B.2.3 of the MR if there are any changes to start date of crediting period.	Table 1 B.2.3.1	There is no change in start date of CP. Term "N/A" is added.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section B.2.3 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CL-5 Please clarify in the Section B.2.4 of the MR if there is any inclusion of the monitoring plan.	Table 1 B.2.4.1	There is no inclusion. Term "N/A" is added.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section B.2.4 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CL-6 Please clarify in the Section B.2.5 of the MR if there are any permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan.	Table 1 B.2.5.1	There are no permanent changes. Term "N/A" is added. Response for Review-1: There is no change in monitoring plan. Related sentences were added to section B.2.5 and B.2.7	Review-1: a) Please clarify in the Section B.2.5 of the MR if there are any permanent changes to the registered monitoring plan. b) Please clarify the relevance of Section B.2.7 with the project in the MR. Review-2: a) b) Ok Closed (Sections B.2.5 and B.2.7 of the MR have been revised accordingly).
CL-7 Please clarify in the Section B.2.6 of the MR if there are any changes to the project design.	Table 1 B.2.6.1	There is no change in design. Term "N/A" is added.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section B.2.6 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CL-8 Please clarify in the Section C of the MR if there is any change with the registered monitoring plan in terms of data aggregation.	Table 1 C.2.2	There is no change in data aggregation. Term "N/A" is added. Response for Review-1: Related clarification is added to Section C.	Review-1: Please clarify in the Section C of the MR if there is any change with the registered monitoring plan in terms of data aggregation. Review-2:

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 and Table-2	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			Ok Closed (Sections B.2.5 and C of the MR has been revised accordingly).
<p>CL-9 Please clarify in the Section E.6 of the MR if there is decrease or increase in achieved emission reductions comparing with the estimated emission reductions.</p>	<p>Table 1 E.6.1</p>	<p>Section E.6 is revised accordingly. Response for Review-1: The numbers in E.6 were revised comply with revisions done for CAR4.</p>	<p>Review-1: Section E.6 of the MR has been revised but please see option g and h of CAR-4. Review-2: Ok Closed (Number of days calculation has been corrected and the revised MR and ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet have been provided).</p>

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