



**Verified Carbon
Standard**

URLA WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY 1ST VERIFICATION REPORT



Report Prepared By: Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.

Project Title	Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey
Version	01.1
Report ID	690

Report Title	Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey 1st Verification Report
Client	Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.
Pages	65
Date of Issue	16-11-2021
Prepared By	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.
Contact	Address: Prof. Dr. Aziz Sancar Cad. No: 27/6 06690 Çankaya/Ankara/TURKEY Tel.: 0090-312-287 51 22 Fax: 0090-312-287 33 73 email: info@re-carbon.net Website: www.re-carbon.net

Approved By	Mr. Sandeep KANDA Technical Reviewer	Mr. Anıl SÖYLER Certification Manager
		
Work Carried Out By	Verification Team Leader	Verification Team Members
	Mr. Anıl SÖYLER	N/A

Summary:

The installed capacity of the project is 15 MWm / 13 MWe and the project has 5 turbines four of which with unit capacity of 3MWm / 3MWe and one turbine with unit capacity of 3MWm / 1 MWe. The turbine model is Enercon E82 E4 with the rotor diameter of 82 meter and has three blades. The purpose of the project activity is to generate electricity and supply it into the public grid. The project activity reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would have otherwise occurred in the absence of the project activity by avoiding electricity generation from fossil fuel sources.

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 PD version 01 and dated 24/02/2015.

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, approved consolidated baseline and monitoring Methodology “ACM0002: Grid connected renewable electricity generation” version 16.0, 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 version 03.0, CDM Project Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 03.0 and VCS version 4.1.

The only purpose of the verification and certification is its usage during the issuance process as part of the VCS project cycle.

During this verification 26 Corrective Action Requests (CARs) and 01 Clarification Request (CL) were raised all of which were resolved by either revising the Monitoring Report or by sending objective evidence to the verification team.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the level of assurance of this verification report is reasonable, with respect to material errors, omissions and misrepresentations. To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

Re Carbon Ltd. also confirms the following based on the results of document review for the period between 27 May 2016 and 28 February 2021:

Year	Baseline emissions or	Project emissions or removals	Leakage emissions	Net GHG emission reductions or
------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------

	removals (tCO ₂ e)	(tCO ₂ e)	(tCO ₂ e)	removals (tCO ₂ e)
2016	15,805	0	0	15,805
2017	25,070	0	0	25,070
2018	24,997	0	0	24,997
2019	24,464	0	0	24,464
2020	26,922	0	0	26,922
2021	5,593	0	0	5,593
Total	122,851	0	0	122,851

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	6
1.1	Objective	6
1.2	Scope and Criteria	6
1.3	Level of Assurance	6
1.4	Summary Description of the Project	6
2	Verification Process	7
2.1	Method and Criteria	7
2.2	Document Review.....	8
2.3	Interviews	11
2.4	Site Inspections	11
2.5	Resolution of Findings.....	12
2.5.1	Forward Action Requests.....	17
2.6	Eligibility for Validation Activities	17
3	Validation Findings.....	18
3.1	Participation under Other GHG Programs	18
3.2	Methodology Deviations	18
3.3	Project Description Deviations.....	18
3.4	Grouped Project.....	18
4	Verification Findings.....	19
4.1	Project Implementation Status	19
4.2	Safeguards	21

4.2.1	No Net Harm.....	21
4.2.2	Local Stakeholder Consultation	21
4.3	AFOLU-Specific Safeguards	21
4.4	Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations.....	22
4.5	Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals	24
4.6	Non-Permanence Risk Analysis.....	24
5	Verification Conclusion	25
	Annex 1: Verification Protocol	27
	Annex 2: Verification Team and Its Competence.....	63
	Annex 2-1: Appointment Certificates.....	64

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by “Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.” to perform the initial verification of the “Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey” with the service agreement dated 01/02/2021. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report version 04 dated 15/11/2021 conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan of the registered Project Description (PD) and the approved methodology
- if the project activity conforms with the monitoring report and the registered PD, and
- if the data reported in the monitoring report are complete and transparent.

1.2 Scope and Criteria

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 PD version 01 and dated 24/02/2015.

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, ACM0002:“Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” version 16.0, subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other related rules, according to the guidance given in the according to the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 03.0 and VCS version 4.1.

The only purpose of the verification and certification is its usage during the issuance process as part of the VCS 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.

1.3 Level of Assurance

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the level of assurance of this verification report is reasonable, with respect to material errors, omissions and misrepresentations. To guarantee this level of assurance all data that is used in the GHG emission reduction calculations have been reviewed without any sampling.

1.4 Summary Description of the Project

Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey has been located on Urla town in İzmir city of Turkey and developed by Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş. The installed capacity of the project is 15 MWm / 13 MWe and the project has 5 turbines four of which with unit capacity of 3MWm / 3MWe and one turbine with unit capacity of 3MWm / 1 MWe in line with the electricity

generation licence and provisional acceptance protocol and the project also supports the sustainable economic development in the region.

The key parameters about the technical design of the project are listed below in Table-1:

Table 1: Technical specifications of the project

Component	Property
Turbine type	Enercon E82 E4
Rated Power (MWe)	3
Rotor Diameter (m)	82
Number of Blades	3
Cut in wind speed (m/s)	2.5
Cut out wind speed (m/s)	28-34

The start date of the project activity is 27/05/2016 which the date when the project is commissioned and the electricity was first supplied to the grid as verified through the provisional acceptance protocol and the first crediting period is from 27th May 2016 until 26th May 2026 with two times renewable crediting period of 10 years.

2 VERIFICATION PROCESS

The relevant details with regards to the verification process are available in the following sub sections.

2.1 Method and Criteria

Re Carbon Ltd. has been appointed by “Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.” to perform the initial verification of the “Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey” with the service agreement dated 01/02/2021. The objective of this verification activity is to assess, with objective evidence:

- if the monitoring report version 04 dated 15/11/2021 conforms with the requirements of the monitoring plan of the registered PD and the approved methodology
- if the project activity conforms with the monitoring report and the registered PD, and
- if the data reported in the monitoring report are complete and transparent.

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 PD version 01 and dated 24/02/2015.

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, ACM0002:”Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” version 16.0, subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other related rules, according to the guidance given in the according to the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 03.0 and VCS version 4.1.

There hasn’t been any sampling approach applied during the verification and all monitored data/parameters have been checked by the verification team.

The only purpose of the verification and certification is its usage during the issuance process as part of the VCS 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.

2.2 Document Review

The basis for the verification activity is the monitoring report version 01 dated 03/03/2021 which was submitted to the verification team on the same date. This monitoring report was revised due to the issued CARs and CLs, version 04 dated 15/11/2021 being the final version. The monitoring report and the monitoring activities were assessed against the registered PD version 01 and dated 24/02/2015, ACM0002:”Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” version 16.0, the relevant CDM and VCS rules and regulations including CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 03.0, VCS version 4.1 and the final validation report version 01 dated 26/02/2015.

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

The list of the documents which were reviewed during the validation period is given in the Table 2-1 below:

Table 2-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	Registered PD	01	24/02/2015
D02	Final Validation Report	01	26/02/2015

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D03	ACM0002: Grid-connected Electricity Generation from Renewable Sources	16.0	-
D04	Verification Service Agreement	-	01/02/2021
D05	Monitoring Report	01	03/03/2021
D06	Monitoring Report	02	03/05/2021
D07	Monitoring Report	03	27/10/2021
D08	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	03/03/2021
D09	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	03/05/2021
D10	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	27/10/2021
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	VCS Standard	4.1	19/09/2019
D15	VCS Program Guide	4.0	19/09/2019
D16	EIA Not Necessary Decision	-	30/03/2009
D17	Single Line Diagram	-	02/06/2015
D18	Electricity Generation Licence (Last Amendment)	-	20/05/2019
D19	TEIAS Monthly Reading Protocols	-	05/2016-02/2021
D20	EPIAS Screenshots	-	05/2016-02/2021
D21	Meters Test Reports	-	03/05/2016 08/12/2017 13/08/2018 19/09/2020
D22	Electricity Meters Photos	-	-
D23	Waste Water Transfer and Disposal Receipts	-	05/03/2018 27/02/2019 23/10/2019 09/03/2020
D24	Waste Water Storage Tank Photo	-	-

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D25	Domestic Waste Container Photo	-	-
D26	Hazardous Waste Storage Area Photos	-	-
D27	Signed Letter by PP (About Proper Disposal of Domestic Waste)	-	27/05/2021
D28	Hazardous Waste Declaration Forms to the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization	-	20/03/2018 20/02/2019 27/02/2020
D29	Land Usage Approval Documents (Forest Permit)	-	13/04/2015 29/12/2015
D30	Construction Agreement	-	27/10/2015
D31	Turbine Specification Document	-	-
D32	Turbine Photos	-	-
D33	Photographic Evidences of Announcement to Local Stakeholders (About Having Contact Details of Relevant Staff in PP in Case of Any Complaint by Barbaros Village Local Stakeholders)	-	02/03/2021
D34	Signed Letters by the PP (About Double Counting and Renewable Energy Certification (REC))	-	16/04/2021
D35	Provisional Acceptance Protocol	-	27/05/2016
D36	Social Security Rords for PP Site Employees	-	-
D37	Training Records	-	24/02/2016 25/02/2016 06/04/2018 13/07/2018 28/09/2020
D38	Environmental Noise Assessment Report	-	06/12/2017
D39	Site Photos	-	10/03/2021
D40	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	04	15/11/2021
D41	Monitoring Report	04	15/11/2021

2.3 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.

The list of people who were interviewed during the online (remote) verification site visit handled on 10/03/2021 and through Zoom program is given in the Table 2-2 below:

Table 2-2: List of persons interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview ¹	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Taylan Kabaş	Plant Manager	Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.
I02	SV	İsmail Kaya	Plant Chief	Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.
I03	SV	Fatih Çandır	Electricity Trading Manager	Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.
I04	SV	İsmail Arkan	Operator	Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.
I05	SV	Oğuz Çalışkan	Operator	Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş.
I06	SV	Sıla Duran	Consultant	Sekans Danışmanlık Ltd.
I07	SV	Erhan Aksan	Villager	Barbaros Village
I08	SV	Levent Ersan	Villager	Barbaros Village

2.4 Site Inspections

As a part of the verification activities, the physical site visit hadn't been performed due to COVID-19 outbreak but the following had been implemented and online site visit was handled on 10/03/2021 and through Zoom program, details of which can be seen in the Table 2-3 below:

Table 2-3: Online (remote) site visit details

Points Verified	Source of Information
Implementation and operation of the proposed VCS project activity as per the	Document review, online site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from

¹ SV: Online Site visit; T: Telephone; E: E-mail

Points Verified	Source of Information
registered PD	Barbaros Village
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Document review, online site visit and interviews with the PP representatives and local stakeholders from Barbaros Village
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PD	Interviews with the PP representatives and local stakeholders from Barbaros Village
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	Document review and online site visit
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PD and the selected methodology	Document review, online site visit and interviews with the the PP representatives and local stakeholders from Barbaros 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 PP representatives and local stakeholders from Barbaros Village

The project owner representatives and local stakeholders had been interviewed as in above during the online (remote) site visit using Zoom program and some photographic evidences like electricity meters, waste storage areas etc. have been taken along with the document review process to achieve the reasonable level of assurance during the verification as detailed in other sections of the report.

2.5 Resolution of Findings

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

- Assessment of the conformity of the actual project activity and its operation with the registered PD version 01 and dated 24/02/2015
- Assessment of the compliance of the monitoring plan with the relevant methodology “ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” version 16.0
- 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 two tables:

- Table 1 (Monitoring Report and VCS verification requirements) and
- Table 2 (Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests)

The usage description of Table-1 in Verification Protocol is explained in Table 2-4 below:

Table 2-4: 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 2-5 below:

Table 2-5: Explanation about Table-2 in Verification Protocol

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Verification Team	Ref. to Questions in Table-1	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.

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 Re Carbon Ltd. internal terminology and VCS Version 4.1, 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 and/or VCS 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 26 CARs and 01 CL were issued all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol. There haven't been any FARs issued during the initial verification.

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 VCS 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 18/01/2021 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 2-6 below:

Table 2-6: Verification team and ITR details

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Involvement*
Anil Söyler	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	A, DR, SV, R
Sandeep Kanda	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

As a final step of verification, the final documentation including the verification report and its annexes have to undergo an internal quality control by Re Carbon Ltd. This quality control is also referred to as Independent Technical Review process.

The Independent Technical Review is performed by another Team Leader who hasn't involved in the verification activities of this project activity. When the Team Leader finalizes the Verification Report, the report is sent to Independent Technical Reviewer, at this stage not only the report but all the supporting documents like emission factor calculations and relevant excel sheets etc. are reviewed.

Further CLs and CARs can be issued by the Independent Technical Reviewer during this review, to cover all the points that may need further clarification.

After all the CLs and CARs are closed, the verification report is reviewed and approved by the Team Leader, ITR and the Certification Manager/General Manager, and the request of issuance is submitted to the VCS Organization in line with the positive verification opinion and along with the all relevant documents.

2.5.1 Forward Action Requests

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 as explained in Section 2.5.

According to these principles, no FARs was issued during this verification.

2.6 Eligibility for Validation Activities

Re Carbon Ltd. holds accreditation for the validation and verification activities in scope 1: “Energy Industry – Renewable/Non-renewable Sources” in which the project activity falls into.

3 VALIDATION FINDINGS

The validation related findings have been detailed as in below.

3.1 Participation under Other GHG Programs

The project does not participate under any emission trading program and other GHG Programs including renewable energy certificates (RECs) and this is also confirmed by the PP through the signed and sealed letters by PP dated as 16/04/2021.

3.2 Methodology Deviations

N/A (There haven't been any methodology deviations applied).

3.3 Project Description Deviations

Although there haven't been any change on project's capacity, design, characteristics and project owner comparing with the registered project activity, the other entity involved in the project as carbon consultant was Life Enerji Ltd. Şti. in the project description. However, it's been changed as Sekans Danışmanlık Ltd. at the time of this verification process as indicated in the monitoring report. Besides that, the project's start date was planned to be 01/06/2016 but the project was commissioned on 27/05/2016.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the change in the other entity involved in the project as carbon consultant and the change in the start date of the project has no impact on the project to be in compliance with the VCS rules and requirements.

3.4 Grouped Project

The project is not a grouped project.

4 VERIFICATION FINDINGS

The verification findings have been detailed as in below.

4.1 Project Implementation Status

Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PD:

As a result of the reviewed documents, Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project is fully implemented according to the description given in the registered PD.

It can also be confirmed through the reviewed documents that all physical features of the project activity including data collecting systems and storage have been implemented in accordance with the registered PD. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed through the provided evidences including EPIAS records, TEIAS meter reading protocols, electricity meter test protocols and the photos of electricity meters.

According to the registered PD, the estimated annual emission reduction is 26,680 tCO₂e and corresponding total estimated amount for the monitoring period is 127,114 tCO₂e. The actual values achieved for the current monitoring period is 122,851 tCO₂e. The actual amount of emission reduction for the current monitoring period is about 3% less than the estimated emission reduction amount. However, considering the project's long life time, yearly fluctuations in wind and the high uncertainty for wind speed estimation, the average decrease throughout the monitoring period as 3% is deemed acceptable. Besides that, the difference in the values does not lead to a substantial increment of the emission reduction (ER) in this period in relation to the estimates in the registered PD, either.

The project also contributes to SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy with 210,621.11 MWh net electricity generation), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth with total 10 employed staff during the recent year of operation period) and SDG-13 (Climate Action with achieved emission reduction of 122,851 tCO₂e) during the monitoring period.

The project was commissioned on 27/05/2016 which was verified by the provisional acceptance protocol. The project activity does not consist of more than one site and does not have any phased implementation.

The GHG emission reductions generated by the project are not included in an emission trading program or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading, because of the position of the host country.

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

The only other eligible GHG program in the host country is Gold Standard and the certification program is Renewable Energy Certification (REC), and the project hasn't been listed in any of them, hence Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the project has not participated or been rejected under any other GHG programs since the validation.

Remaining Issues from Validation or Previous Verifications

There has been one Forward Action Request (FAR) as in below from the validation stage in line with the provided validation report version 01 dated as 26/02/2015.

FAR-1: “The project capacity is defined as 13 MW in the generation license dd. 29/05/2008. During the validation the project capacity is confirmed as 15 MW regarding to Equipment contract with Enercon. The DOE should check the project capacity through the revised generation license and turbines plates during the first verification period of the project activity.”

There hasn't been any change in the capacity and it is 15 MWm /13 MWe as confirmed through the generation licence with last amendment date as 20/05/2019 and provisional acceptance protocol dated as 27/05/2016).

Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology, ACM0002 version 16.0, applied by the project activity.

In line with the methodology and the registered PD, only monitored parameter is the quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant to the grid (Egfacility,y) as in below:

- Egfacility,y parameter: The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPIAS (the financial settlement centre of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by TEIAS. The net electricity is measured continuously by one main electricity meter at the grid interface and recorded monthly. There is also one back up electricity meter. That means, the electricity generation and consumption values have been determined through one main meter and checked through one back up meter. All readings and billings are done via EPIAS system which is the legal database of the Ministry. During this verification, all EPIAS and TEIAS meter reading records have been reviewed by the verification team. The project mainly uses its own electricity however during the times when there is no generation, the project imports electricity from the grid. There are also internal reviews of the metered data which is checked by different parties. SCADA system is also available from which daily reports are taken and the data collected daily is saved in plant manager computer and backed up.

CAR-23 was issued regarding the monitoring and this had been closed out as detailed in Annex-1.

Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments:

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

The calibrated electricity meters were installed as per the regulations. Although, re-calibration is required after ten years, nevertheless, in case of irregular difference between main and cross-check spare meters, TEIAS (grid company) responsible are informed for the intervention. That means, TEIAS is responsible for the calibration and maintenance of the meters. The tests for the meters were performed on 03/05/2016, 08/12/2017, 13/08/2018 and 19/09/2020, respectively and those test reports were provided to VVB.

The serial number of the currently available main meter (EMH model and accuracy class is 0.2s) is 3936679 and that of back up meter (EMH model and accuracy class is 0.2s) is 3936680, respectively and these have been verified through the meter test protocols. All these meters are bi-directional (meter the energy in two directions – generation and consumption).

CAR-22 was issued regarding the calibration and meter testing and this CAR had been closed as detailed in Annex-1.

4.2 Safeguards

4.2.1 No Net Harm

There hadn't been any observed significant environmental impact of the project activity as indicated in the registered PD and this was also confirmed through the reviewed documents. The EIA not necessary decision dated as 30/03/2009 by the Provincial Directorate of Environment and Urbanization was also provided by the PP.

Besides that, the photos of waste storage areas and the hazardous waste declaration forms to Ministry of Environment and Urbanization dated as 20/03/2018, 20/02/2019 and 27/02/2020, the waste water storage tank photo and the waste water transfer and discharge records dated as 05/03/2018, 27/02/2019, 23/10/2019 and 09/03/2020 have been provided by the PP. The signed letter by PP about proper disposal of domestic waste and dated as 27/05/2021 has also been provided to VVB.

4.2.2 Local Stakeholder Consultation

There hadn't been any complaint raised by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online verification site visit as detailed in Section 2.3.

The local stakeholders as stated in the Table 2-2 above were interviewed about the following issues and there hadn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online site visit:

- Noise due to the project activity
- Impact on the flora and fauna including bird life
- Sufficiency of local employment (The interviewed local stakeholders were pleased in general about the provided local employment opportunities by the PP)
- 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. The announcement photographic evidences about contact details of relevant staff in PP in case of any complaint by Barbaros Village local stakeholders and dated as 02/03/2021 were also provided to VVB.

4.3 AFOLU-Specific Safeguards

N/A (The project is not an AFOLU project).

4.4 Accuracy of GHG Emission Reduction or Removal Calculations

EPIAS records are presented for all months of the monitoring period. All data in emission reductions table are checked with EPIAS records as the main source and crosschecked with TEAIS meter reading protocol records. The net electricity generated during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-1 below:

Table 4-1: Net electricity generation

Period	Amount	Compliance Check
27/05/2016-31/12/2016	Export to Grid: 27,105.99 MWh Import from Grid: 9.10 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 27,096.90 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS
01/01/2017-31/12/2017	Export to Grid: 42,995.19 MWh Import from Grid: 13.96 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 42,981.23 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS
01/01/2018-31/12/2018	Export to Grid: 42,868.64 MWh Import from Grid: 12.64 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 42,856.01 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS
01/01/2019-31/12/2019	Export to Grid: 41,956.51 MWh Import from Grid: 14.33 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 41,942.18 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS
01/01/2020-31/12/2020	Export to Grid: 46,167.98 MWh Import from Grid: 13.23 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 46,154.75 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS
01/01/2021-28/02/2021	Export to Grid: 9,591.21 MWh Import from Grid: 1.15 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 9,590.06 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS
Total	Export to Grid: 210,685.52 MWh Import from Grid: 64.40 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: 210,621.11 MWh	Monthly records EPIAS

Emission factor and data and parameters available before validation are also applied in line with the registered PD and baseline excel sheet for validation.

According to the applied methodology ACM0002 version 16.0 and the registered PD, the GHG emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$$

Where:

ER_y = Emission reductions in year y (tCO₂e/yr)

BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO₂e/yr)

PE_y = Project emissions in year y (tCO₂e/yr)

The project emissions of the project are equal to zero in line with the applied methodology. Therefore, the emission reductions generated during the monitoring period are equal to baseline emissions.

The baseline emissions in the monitoring period are calculated using the following formula:

$$BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} * EF_{grid,CM,y}$$

Where;

BE_y = Baseline emissions in year y (t CO₂/y)

$EG_{PJ,y}$ = Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the project activity in year y (MWh/y)

$EF_{grid,CM,y}$ = Combined margin CO₂ emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y calculated using the latest version of the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (tCO₂ / MWh)

Since the project is a greenfield renewable power plant:

$EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{facility,y}$ = The amount of net electricity produced and fed into the grid by the project in year y .

Combined margin CO₂ emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) is calculated once during the validation of the project activity and is valid throughout the first crediting period of 10 years.

It has been confirmed that the data used for emission reductions are correct. The grid emission factor taken is 0.5833 tCO₂ / MWh and the value is same as fixed ex-ante in the registered PD.

It is also confirmed that the methods and formulae used for calculating baseline emissions are in line with the relevant methodology and the registered PD. The net electricity generation is multiplied with the grid emission factor to arrive at the emission reductions value.

According to the registered PD, the estimated emission reduction for this monitoring period would be 127,114 tCO₂e corresponding to the monitoring period. However, the project in operation totally reached 122,851 tCO₂e in this period.

The vintage break-up of the emission reductions during the current monitoring period was as follows in Table 4-2 below:

Table 4-2: Emission reductions

Period	Emission reductions (tCO ₂ e)
27/05/2016 – 31/12/2016	15,805
01/01/2017– 31/12/2017	25,070

Period	Emission reductions (tCO ₂ e)
01/01/2018 – 31/12/2018	24,997
01/01/2019– 31/12/2019	24,464
01/01/2020 – 31/12/2020	26,922
01/01/2021 – 28/02/2021	5,593

Calculations have been reproduced by VVB and the source data (EPIAS records) are presented by PP as explained above.

CAR-24 and CAR-25 were issued regarding the emission reduction calculations and the data used for these calculations and it had been closed as detailed in Annex-1. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the above mentioned electricity generation figures and GHG emission reduction calculations are presented and quantified correctly and are in accordance with the monitoring methodology ACM0002 version 16.0 and the monitoring plan given in the registered PD.

4.5 Quality of Evidence to Determine GHG Emission Reductions or Removals

The GHG emission reductions are a function of the net electricity generated and fed into the grid by the project activity and the combined margin emission factor which is determined during validation for the whole crediting period. According to the validation report version 01 dated 26/02/2015, the combined margin emission factor had been validated and will remain the same for the first crediting period of 10 years as 0.5833 tCO₂/MWh.

The only parameter that needs to be closely verified is the net electricity generation and this value is taken from the EPIAS records. EPIAS records are the basis for billing and these records for each month has been submitted to and reviewed. 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.

As a cross check means, TEIAS meter reading protocol records which include the monthly generation and consumption figures of the plant for every month have been reviewed by the verification team.

Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the evidence used to determine the GHG emission reductions are sufficient in quantity and appropriate in quality.

4.6 Non-Permanence Risk Analysis

N/A. (The project isn't an AFOLU project).

5 VERIFICATION CONCLUSION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the initial verification of “Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey” which is a project with the VCS registry reference number “1439” for the period between 27 May 2016 and 28 February 2021. The scope of the activities cover the verification and certification of GHG emissions reductions reported in monitoring report version 03 dated 27/10/2021.

Sekans Danışmanlık Ltd. 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 registered PD. The development and maintenance of the 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 both Sekans Danışmanlık Ltd. and 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 03.

The verification has been performed by a verification team consisting of “Anıl Söyler as team leader and Sandeep Kanda 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 VCS Organization, CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Standard version 03.0, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 03.0 and VCS version 4.1.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the project activity “Urla Wind Power Project, Turkey” in Turkey is implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PD version 01 and dated 24/02/2015. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology, which is ACM0002 version 16.0. It is also confirmed that the level of assurance of this verification report is reasonable.

Re Carbon Ltd. confirms the following based on the results of document review for the period between 27 May 2016 and 28 February 2021:

Year	Baseline emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Project emissions or removals (tCO ₂ e)	Leakage emissions (tCO ₂ e)	Net GHG emission reductions or removals (tCO ₂ e)
2016	15,805	0	0	15,805
2017	25,070	0	0	25,070
2018	24,997	0	0	24,997
2019	24,464	0	0	24,464
2020	26,922	0	0	26,922
2021	5,593	0	0	5,593
Total	122,851	0	0	122,851



Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader
16/11/2021



Sandeep Kanda
ITR
16/11/2021



Anıl SÖYLER
Certification Manager
16/11/2021

ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – VCS Monitoring Report (MR) Form Requirements

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Cover Page and General Requirements					
1. Are all items in the box at the bottom of the cover page completed using Arial 10.5 pt, black, regular (non-italic) font?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please clarify whether all items in the box at the bottom of the cover page and all Sections text part using Arial 10.5 pt, black, regular (non-italic) font since the provided MR is pdf document.	CAR-1	OK
2. Are the followings provided at the cover page in a tabular format?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
2.1. Name of the project?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please correct the project name in line with VCS registry and registered PD.	CAR-2	OK
2.2. Version number of the VCS MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as version 01.	OK	OK
2.3. Report ID of the document	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as URLA1.	OK	OK
2.4. The issuance date of the document in DD-Month-YYYY format?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as 03/03/2021 in the first version.	OK	OK
2.5. VCS project database ID, if registered	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as 1439.	OK	OK
2.6. Monitoring period in DD-Month-YYYY to DD-Month-YYYY format	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as from 27-05-2016 to 31-12-2020.	OK	OK
2.7. Individual or entity that prepared the document?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as Sekans Danışmanlık.	OK	OK
2.8. Physical address, telephone, email, website?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	These details are available.	OK	OK
3. Is this box available on the title page of the final document?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the version 01 of the MR.	OK	OK
4. Is there "Table of Contents" in the VCS MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
5. Is the VCS MR used as a basis for verification prepared in accordance with the latest template and guidance from the VCS?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-1.	CAR-1	OK
6. Are the VCS MR and other documents required under the VCS Program in English?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	MR and all other required documents are in English except for some legal permit documents since they are in Turkish.	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. PROJECT DETAILS					
1.1. Summary Description of the Implementation Status of Project					
1.1.1. Has a brief summary of the project description provided under Section 1.1 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0 CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	The brief summary is available but please provide the latest generation licence about 15 MWe capacity.	CAR-3	OK
1.1.2. Has the purpose of the project activity and the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions been provided under section 1.1 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0 CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	Please include the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the project activity in the Section 1.1 of the MR.	CAR-4	OK
1.1.3. Has a brief description of the installed technology and equipment been provided under Section 1.1 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0 CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	Please include the reference document for the used turbines in the Section 1.1 of the MR.	CAR-5	OK
1.1.4. Has the relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.) been provided under Section 1.1 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0 CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	Please provide the timeline of the project activity including the construction date, commissioning date and continued operation periods etc. in the Section 1.1 of the MR.	CAR-6	OK
1.1.5. Has the total emissions reductions achieved in this monitoring period been provided under Section 1.1 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0 CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	The total emissions reductions achieved in this monitoring period has been provided under Section 1.1 of the MR.	OK	OK
1.2. Sectoral Scope and Project Type					
1.2.1. Is it indicated whether this a grouped project under Section 1.2 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This has been indicated and the project is not a grouped project.	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
1.2.2. Is the sectoral scope(s) applicable to the project indicated?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The sectoral scope of the project has been indicated in the Section 1.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
1.2.3. Is the category of the project activity specified?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (Since this isn't an AFOLU project, the category is not applicable).	OK	OK
1.3. Project Proponent					
1.3.1. Are the contact information for the project proponent(s) provided in the tabular format?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The contact information for the project proponent has been provided in the tabular format in the Section 1.3 of the MR but please correct the PP name.	CAR-7	OK
1.4. Other Entities Involved in the Project					
1.4.1. Are the contact information and roles/responsibilities for any other entities involved in the development of the project provided?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the Section 1.4 of the MR.	OK	OK
1.5. Project Start Date					
1.5.1. Is the project start date (the date on which the project began reducing or removing GHG emissions) indicated in day, month and year format?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as 27/05/2016 but please provide the relevant justification for the mentioned project start date in the Section 1.5 of the MR.	CAR-8	OK
1.6. Project Crediting Period					
1.6.1. Is the total crediting period including the day, month and year for the start and end dates and the total number of years indicated?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The start and end dates of crediting period has been provided in the Section 1.6 of the MR but please explain the change in the start date of the crediting period along with the relevant evidence and cause of change compared with the start date of the crediting period available in the registered PD.	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
1.7. Project Location					
1.7.1. Has complete information on the location of the project activity, including town, city, country and GPS coordinates been provided under Section 1.7 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	a) Please include and provide the reference document information for all provided coordinates in Section 1.7 of the MR. b) Please include the town and country information in Section 1.7 of the MR. c) Please revise the sentences like “expected” or “will be” throughout the MR since the project is operational.	CAR-10	OK
1.8. Title and Reference of Methodology					
1.8.1. Is the following information provided regarding the methodology(s) applied to the project?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
1.8.1.1. The title of the methodology(ies)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
1.8.1.2. The reference of the methodology(ies)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
1.8.1.3. The version number of the methodology(ies)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
1.8.2. Is the following information provided regarding the tool(s) applied to the project?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
1.8.2.1. The title of the tool(s)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The title of the referred tools is available.	OK	OK
1.8.2.2. The version number of the tool(s)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The version number of the referred tools has been provided.	OK	OK
1.9. Participation under Other Programs					
1.9.1. Has it been indicated whether the project has been registered or seeking registration under any other GHG programs?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	It has been stated that the project hasn't been registered or seeking registration under other GHG programs but please provide a signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that the project hasn't been registered, or hasn't been seeking registration under any other GHG programs.	CAR-11	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.9.2. If the project has been registered under any other GHG programs, have the PPs provided the registration number and details?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (It has been stated that the project hasn't been registered or seeking registration under other GHG programs).	OK	OK
1.9.3. If the project has been registered under any other GHG programs, have the details of any GHG credits claimed under such programs been provided in the Section 1.9 of the MR?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (It has been stated that the project hasn't been registered or seeking registration under other GHG programs).	OK	OK
1.10. Other Forms of Credit					
1.10.1. Does the project reduce GHG emissions from activities that are included in an emissions trading program; or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please provide a signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that project hasn't been created other forms of credit (e.g. renewable energy certificates).	CAR-12	OK
1.10.2. If the project reduces GHG emissions from activities that are included in an emissions trading program; or any other mechanism that includes GHG allowance trading, have the PPs provided evidence on the following?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-12.	CAR-12	OK
1.10.2.1. the reductions or removals generated by the project have or will not be used for compliance under such program(s) or mechanism(s)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-12.	CAR-12	OK
1.10.3. Have the project(s) created other forms of environmental credit (for example renewable energy certificates)?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-12.	CAR-12	OK
1.10.4. If the project(s) created other forms of environmental credit (for example renewable energy certificates), has the PPs provided all	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-12.	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
relevant information about the GHG-related environmental credits and the related program?					
1.10.5. Have all other programs under which the project is eligible to participate (to create another form of GHG-related environmental credit) been listed?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-12.	CAR-12	OK
1.11. Sustainable Development					
1.11.1. Has it been described how the project contributes to achieving any nationally stated sustainable development priorities, including any provisions for monitoring and reporting same?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	a) Please include the achieved results of relevant SDGs during the monitoring period. b) Please revise the sentences like “expected” or “will be” throughout the MR since the project is operational.	CAR-13	OK
2. SAFEGUARDS					
2.1. No Net Harm					
2.1.1. Has it been summarized by PPs any potential negative environmental and socio-economic impacts of the project activity and the steps taken to mitigate them?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	a) Please include the justification details about having no environmental and socio-economic impacts of the project activity in the Section 2.1 of the MR. b) Please provide the following records: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social security records of PP site staff - Waste water storage tank photographic evidences - Hazardous and domestic waste storage area photographic evidences - Domestic waste transfer and disposal records - Wastewater transfer and disposal records - Land usage details of the project and relevant legal permits 	CAR-14	OK
2.2. Local Stakeholder Consultation					
2.2.1. Has the process regarding the local stakeholder consultation been described by	VCS Std.	DR	Please see in below.	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
PPs including the following?	Version 4.0				
2.2.1.1. The procedures or methods used for engaging local stakeholders (e.g. dates of announcements or meetings, periods during which input was sought)	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please include the procedures or methods used for engaging local stakeholders (e.g. dates of announcements or meetings, periods during which input was sought) in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	CAR-15	OK
2.2.1.2. The procedures or methods used for documenting the outcomes of the local stakeholder communication	VCS Std. Version 4.0		Please include the procedures or methods used for documenting the outcomes of the local stakeholder communication in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	CAR-16	OK
2.2.1.3. The mechanism for on-going communication with local stakeholders conducted prior to verification	VCS Std. Version 4.0		a) Please provide the signed document about the contact details of the PP relevant staff in case of any complaint by close surroundings and whether there is any complaint received by the Muhktars from the local stakeholders. b) Please clarify the communication methods (announcements and meetings) with the local stakeholders during the monitoring period and please provide such relevant details in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	CAR-17	OK
2.2.1.4. How due account of all and any input received during ongoing communication has been taken	VCS Std. Version 4.0		Please clarify if there are any complaint by the local stakeholders during the monitoring period and how all and any input received during ongoing communication has been taken due account by the PP in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	CAR-18	OK
2.2.1.5. The details on any updates to the project design or justifying why updates are not appropriate.	VCS Std. Version 4.0		Please clarify if there has been any updates to the project design in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	CAR-19	OK
3. IMPLEMENTATION STATUS					
3.1. Implementation Status of The Project Activity					
3.1.1. Has a description of the implementation and operational status of the project as of this monitoring period been provided under section 3.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	These are available in the Section 1.1 of the MR and please see CAR-4 and CAR-5.	CAR-4 CAR-5	OK
3.1.2. Has the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment, including the diagrams, where appropriate, been included in	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	These are available in the Section 1.1 of the MR and please see CAR-4 and CAR-5.	CAR-4 CAR-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
section 3.1 of the MR?					
3.1.3. Has the starting date of operation of the project activity been provided under Section 3.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	Please see CAR-6.	CAR-6	OK
3.1.4. 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 3.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3.1.5. If the implementation of the project activity planned to be realized in different phases, has the progress of the proposed VCS project activity achieved in each phase been indicated under Section 3.1 of the MR?	EB93 Report Annex 4 §257b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3.1.6. Do the actual project activity and its operation comply with the registered PD and/or an approved revised PD??	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR	The actual project activity and its operation complies with the registered PD.	OK	OK
3.1.7. Have the PPs implemented and operated the VCS project activity as per the descriptions contained in the registered PD?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §357a	DR	The actual project activity and its operation complies with the registered PD.	OK	OK
3.1.8. Has the installed technology(ies), technical process and equipment, including the diagrams, where appropriate, been included in Section 3.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	Please see CAR-4 and CAR-5.	CAR-4 CAR-5	OK
3.1.9. Are there any other changes (e.g. to project proponent or other entities) with respect to the registered project?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The changes with respect to other entities involved in the project comparing with the registered project has been provided but please indicate and correct when the mentioned change has occurred in the Section 3.1 of the MR.	CAR-20	OK
3.2. Deviations					
3.2.1. Methodology Deviations					
3.2.1.1. Are there any deviations from the methodology?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (There haven't been any deviations from the 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
• 3.2.1.2. If there are any deviations from the methodology, are these deviations described properly?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (There haven't been any deviations from the methodology).	OK	OK
3.2.1.3. If there are any deviations from the methodology, are these deviations justified properly and clearly?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (There haven't been any deviations from the methodology).	OK	OK
3.2.2. Project Description Deviations					
3.2.2.1. Are there any deviations from the registered project description?		DR	a) Please also indicate the changes in other entities involved in the project with respect to the registered project in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR. b) Please correct the sub section numbers in the Section 3.2 of the MR. c) Please include the capacity change in MWe in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR.	CAR-21	OK
3.2.2.2. If there are any deviations from the project description, are these deviations described properly?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-21.	CAR-21	OK
3.2.2.3. If there are any deviations from the project description, are these deviations justified properly and clearly?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-21.	CAR-21	OK
3.2.2.4. Is the outcome of the deviation from the project description provided?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-21.	CAR-21	OK
3.3. Grouped Projects					
3.3.1. Is this a grouped project?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The project isn't a grouped project).	OK	OK
3.3.2. If it is a grouped project, is the relevant information about new instances of the project activity(ies) provided?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The project isn't a grouped project).	OK	OK
3.3.3. If it is a grouped project, is it demonstrated	VCS Std.	DR	N/A (The project isn't a grouped project).	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
clearly and transparently that each new instance of the project activity(s) meets the eligibility criteria set out in the project description?	Version 4.0				
4. DATA AND PARAMETERS					
4.1. Data and Parameters Available at Validation					
4.1.1. 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 4.1 using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	All data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, has been listed under Section 4.1 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.1.2. 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 monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	All data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project, has been listed under Section 4.1 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.1.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	All data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project are in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.1.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	All data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project are in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.1.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 of the MR, for each data has the description of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD.	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
4.1.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 of the MR, for each data has the source of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.1.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 of the MR, for each data has the values applied of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.1.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 of the MR, for each data has the justification of choice of data or description of measurement methods and procedures applied been provided?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.1.9. In the data/parameter tables provided under Section 4.1 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD.	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
4.2. Data and Parameters Monitored					
4.2.1. Has all the data that are monitored been listed under Section 4.2 using the tabular format?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	EG _{facility,y} is the monitored parameter in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.2.2. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has the name of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	EG _{facility,y} is the monitored parameter in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.2.3. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has the unit of the data/parameters given in accordance with the registered VCS PD and the applied approved methodology?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The unit (MWh/yr) is available in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.2.4. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has it been described how the data is monitored?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Version 4.0	DR	This is stated in the Section 4.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.2.5. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.2.6. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has the monitored values of the monitoring parameter been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This has been provided.	OK	OK
4.2.7. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has the QA/QC procedures being applied been given?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	a) Please include the meter test and calibration dates of the electricity meters. b) Please provide the electricity meter change details, if any, in the Section 4.2 of the MR. c) Please provide electricity meter change protocols, if any. d) Please provide the photographic evidences of electricity meters.	CAR-22	

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4.2.8. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has the purpose of data been given?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the MR.	OK	OK
4.2.9. If applicable, has the calculation method, including any equations, used to establish the data/parameter been given?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the Excel spreadsheet.	OK	OK
4.2.10. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
4.2.10.1. Details on accuracy class	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR, SV	The accuracy class information of electricity meters has been provided in the Section 4.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.2.10.2. The person/entity responsible for the measurement	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.2.10.3. Any standards or protocols to be followed	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The reference to the relevant regulation is available in the Section 4.2 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.2.10.4. Calibration frequency	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as ten years.	OK	OK
4.2.10.5. Serial number	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR, SV	These are available as 3936679 and 3936680 for the main and back up meter, respectively.	OK	OK
4.2.10.6. Calibration date	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-22.	CAR-22	

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4.2.10.7. Validity of the calibration	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available as ten years.	OK	OK
4.2.11. In the data/parameter tables provided under section 4.2 of the MR, for each data has the measurement and recording frequency been indicated?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
4.2.12. Is the calibration frequency for measuring equipment specified in the monitoring methodology, in the applied standardized baselines or in the monitoring plan??	EB93 Report Annex 5 §368 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD and relevant legal regulation.	OK	OK
4.2.13. If the calibration frequency for measuring equipment isn't specified in the monitoring methodology, guidance provided by the Board or the monitoring plan, are the equipment calibrated either in accordance with the specifications of the local/national standards, or as per the manufacturer's specification?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD and relevant legal regulation.	OK	OK
4.2.14. If neither local/national standards nor the manufacturer's specification are available, have the international standards been used?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §373 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD and relevant legal regulation.	OK	OK
4.2.15. Is the calibration of the measuring equipment 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is in line with the registered PD and relevant legal regulation.	OK	OK
4.2.16. 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	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369 VCS Std.	DR	This is in line with the registered PD and relevant legal regulation.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the certain monitoring period?	Version 4.0				
4.2.17. 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 approaches adopted by the PPs for the calculation of emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §369 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.17.1. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.17.2. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.18. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.18.1. The adjusted measured values of the delayed calibration result in fewer claimed emission reductions?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §370a VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.18.2. For all measured values taken during the period between the	EB93 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
scheduled date of calibration and the actual date of calibration?	§370b VCS Std. Version 4.0				
4.2.19. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have Pss calculated the emission reductions conservatively?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §371	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.20. If the results of the delayed calibration aren't available, have post registration requirements been followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §372	DR	N/A (The calibration of the meters is valid ten years).	OK	OK
4.2.21. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.22. If the data that are monitored been listed under section 4.2 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 the monitoring plan?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §260	DR	EG _{facility,y} is the monitored parameter in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.2.23. Is a complete set of data available for the specified monitoring period?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	EG _{facility,y} is the monitored parameter in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3. Monitoring Plan					

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4.3.1. Has a description of the monitoring system been provided under Section 4.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The details of the monitoring system is available and in line with the registered PD but please check the number of employees both in the organizational structure diagram and text part of the Section 4.3 of the MR along with the relevant evidence.	CAR-23	
4.3.2. Has information about the data collection procedures, including following been provided under Section 4.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see in below.	OK	OK
4.3.2.1. Information flow including data generation	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The details of the data generation is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.2.2. Data aggregation	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The details of the data aggregation is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.2.3. Data recording	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report	DR	The details of the data recording is available and in line with the registered PD.	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
	Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0				

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

Question	Reference	Means of verification*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4.3.2.4. Data calculation	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The details of the data calculation (net electricity generation) is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.2.5. Data reporting	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The details of the data reporting is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.3. Has organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system been provided under section 4.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 EB93 Report Annex 4 §259 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The brief information about the roles and responsibilities of each personnel (like project manager and control operator etc.) has been provided in the Section 4.3 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.3.4. 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) VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The brief information about the roles and responsibilities of each personnel (like project manager and control operator etc.) has been provided in the Section 4.3 of the MR.	OK	OK
4.3.5. Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364e VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	These are in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.6. Are the procedures for handling internal	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The procedures for handling internal auditing and non-conformities	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
auditing and non-conformities described?			have been described in the Section 4.3 of the MR.		
4.3.7. Where appropriate, are the line diagrams to display the GHG data collection and management system included?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (This is explained without any diagram).	OK	OK
4.3.8. If the sampling approaches used in the monitoring plan, has the following been included?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.1. target precision levels	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.2. sample sizes	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.3. sample site locations	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.4. stratification	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.5. frequency of measurement and	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.6. QA/QC procedures	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.8.7. Demonstration on whether the required confidence/precision has been met.	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	N/A (The sampling approach hasn't been used).	OK	OK
4.3.9. Have the monitoring plan and the applied methodology been properly implemented and followed by the PPs?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364a VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The monitoring system is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.10. 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 PD or any accepted revised monitoring plan?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364b-(i)-(ii)-(iii) VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The monitoring system is available and in line with the registered PD.	OK	OK
4.3.11. Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and	EB93 Report Annex 5	DR	The monitoring system is available and in line with the registered PD.	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
relevant VCS requirements been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable?	§364b VCS Std. Version 4.0				
4.3.12. Are monitoring results consistently recorded and stored as per the approved frequency?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §364d VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The monitoring system is available and in line with the registered PD.	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
5. QUANTIFICATION of GHG EMISSION REDUCTIONS and REMOVALS					
5.1. Baseline Emissions					
5.1.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the baseline emissions been provided under section 5.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	a) Please take into consideration the monitoring period start date in the ER calculation spreadsheet. b) Please include December 2020 electricity generation and consumption values in the ER calculation spreadsheet along with the relevant EPIAS screenshot and TEIAS meter reading. c) Please correct 2019 total electricity generation value in the ER calculation spreadsheet. d) Please utilize round down function in total of each vintage and final total ER value. e) Please correct the ER value and net electricity generation in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections. f) Please correct the comparison calculation in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR. g) Please clarify the gap between the initial verification and validation of the project activity since the validation is completed in 2015 including the ongoing financial need of the project activity in terms of additionality.	CAR-24	OK
5.1.2. 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 5.1 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the Excel spreadsheet calculation but please see CAR-24.	CAR-24	OK
5.1.3. Has all electronic spread sheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	This is available in the Excel spreadsheet calculation.	OK	OK
5.1.4. Have any assumptions used in baseline emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (There haven't been any assumptions used).	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
5.1.5. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The grid emission factor has been calculated and determined during the validation process).	OK	OK
5.2. Project Emissions					
5.2.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the project emissions been provided under section 5.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The project emissions are zero and this has been explained in the MR.	OK	OK
5.2.2. 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 5.2 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the Excel spreadsheet calculation.	OK	OK
5.2.3. Has all electronic spreadsheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	This is available in the Excel spreadsheet calculation.	OK	OK
5.2.4. Have any assumptions used in project emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (There haven't been any assumptions used).	OK	OK
5.2.5. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The grid emission factor has been calculated and determined during the validation process).	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
5.3. Leakage					
5.3.1. Has all the formulae used to calculate the leakage emissions been provided under section 5.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The leakage emissions are zero and this has been explained in the MR but please correct the methodology name and please include the methodology version in the Section 5.3 of the MR.	CAR-25	OK
5.3.2. Has sample calculations for all formulae used and calculation of leakage emissions, applying actual values been provided under section 5.3 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	The leakage emissions are zero and this has been explained in the MR.	OK	OK
5.3.3. Has all electronic spread sheets to present full calculations in the monitoring report been attached?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0	DR	The leakage emissions are zero and this has been explained in the MR.	OK	OK
5.3.4. Have any assumptions used in leakage emission calculations been justified?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §376d VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (There haven't been any assumptions used).	OK	OK
5.3.5. 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 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	N/A (The grid emission factor has been calculated and determined during the validation process).	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
5.4. Net GHG Emission Reductions and Removals					
5.4.1. Have the total baseline emissions or baseline net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section 5.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-24.	CAR-24	OK
5.4.2. Has the total project emissions or actual net GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section 5.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the Section 5.4 of the MR.	OK	OK
5.4.3. Has the total leakage emissions during the monitoring period been given under section 5.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	This is available in the Section 5.4 of the MR.	OK	OK
5.4.4. Have the total emission reductions or net anthropogenic GHG removals by sinks during the monitoring period been given under section 5.4 of the MR?	CDM-MR-FORM Version 7.0 VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	Please see CAR-24.	CAR-24	OK
5.4.5. If there is material information that can cause overestimation of emission reductions or removals of the project activity, is this equal to higher than one of the following?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329	DR	There hasn't been any material information detected.	OK	OK
5.4.5.1. 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	There hasn't been any material information detected.	OK	OK
5.4.5.2. 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	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
5.4.5.3. 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	There hasn't been any material information detected.	OK	OK
5.4.5.4. 10 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for the microscale project activities?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329d	DR	There hasn't been any material information detected.	OK	OK
5.4.5.5. 5 per cent of the emission reductions or removals for small-scale project activities other than project activities covered under 5.4.5.4 above?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §329e	DR	There hasn't been any material information detected.	OK	OK
6. APPENDICES					
6.1. If any further background information regarding any raw data from monitoring is provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	There hasn't been any appendices provided in the MR.	OK	OK
6.2. If any further background information regarding additional information used in the monitoring plan is provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	There hasn't been any appendices provided in the MR.	OK	OK
6.3. If any further background information regarding documentation of activities conducted from the monitoring plan and diagrams are provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	VCS Std. Version 4.0	DR	There hasn't been any appendices provided in 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
7. OTHER REQUIREMENTS					
7.1. Forward Action Requests (FARs) Identified During Validation and/or Previous Verification					
7.1.1. Is there any remaining FARs from the validation and/or previous verification activities?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349	DR	There has been one FAR in line with the provided validation report as in below and please provide the relevant explanations and evidence documents: FAR-1: "The project capacity is defined as 13 MW in the generation license dd. 29/05/2008. During the validation the project capacity is confirmed as 15 MW regarding to Equipment contract with Enercon. The DOE should check the project capacity through the revised generation license and turbines plates during the first verification period of the project activity."	CL-1	OK
7.1.2. 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	Please see CL-1.	CL-1	OK
7.1.3. Has the FARs been resolved?	EB93 Report Annex 5 §38 §349 §347d	DR	Please see CL-1.	CL-1	OK

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

Table 2 – 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	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-1 Please clarify whether all items in the box at the bottom of the cover page and all Sections text part using Arial 10.5 pt, black, regular (non-italic) font since the provided MR is pdf document.	1	All sections have been revised.	Review-1: Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-2 Please correct the project name in line with VCS registry and registered PD.	2.1	The project name has been revised accordingly. Review-1: It's been corrected throughout the MR.	Review-1: Please correct the project name throughout the MR. (e.g. Section 1.1 of the MR). Review-2: Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-3 The brief summary is available but please provide the latest generation licence about 15 MWe capacity.	1.1.1	The latest generation license has been provided to the DOE.	Review-1: Ok Closed (The generation licence and provisional acceptance protocol indicating 15 MWm / 13 MWe have been provided).
CAR-4 Please include the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the project activity in the Section 1.1 of the MR.	1.1.2	Section 1.1. has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section 1.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-5 Please include the reference document for the used turbines in the Section 1.1 of the MR.	1.1.3	Reference documents for the used turbines are available to the DOE. Review-1: It's been included; Ministry Acceptance Protocols are the reference document for the used turbines.	Review-1: Please include the reference document for the used turbines in the Section 1.1 of the MR. Review-2: Ok Closed (Section 1.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-6 Please provide the timeline of the project activity including the construction date, commissioning date and continued operation periods etc. in the Section 1.1 of the MR.	1.1.4	Table 2 has been revised accordingly. Review-1: a) Section 1.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly. b) It's been corrected.	Review-1: a) Please provide the timeline of the project activity including the construction date and other important dates (EIA decision, land permit dates etc.) in the Section 1.1 of the MR. b) Please correct the monitoring period end date in the Table-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	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			Review-2: a) Ok Closed (Section 1.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly). b) Ok Closed (The monitoring period end date has been corrected in the Table-2).
CAR-7 The contact information for the project proponent has been provided in the tabular format in the Section 1.3 of the MR but please correct the PP name.	1.3.1	The PP name has been corrected.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section 1.3 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-8 This is available as 27/05/2016 but please provide the relevant justification for the mentioned project start date in the Section 1.5 of the MR.	1.5.1	Ministry Acceptance Protocols are provided to the DOE. Review-1: Section 1.5 of the MR has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: The provisional acceptance protocol dated as 27/05/2016 has been provided but please provide the relevant justification for the mentioned project start date in the Section 1.5 of the MR. Review-2: Ok Closed ((Section 1.5 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-9 The start and end dates of crediting period has been provided in the Section 1.6 of the MR but please explain the change in the start date of the crediting period along with the relevant evidence and cause of delay compared with the start date of the crediting period available in the registered PD.	1.6.1	The project's commissioning was realized in 27/05/2016 as it may be seen through the Ministry Acceptance Protocol. Thus first verifiable emission reductions were realized in May 2016 and the start date of the project is 27/05/2016. Review-1: The crediting period type has been included.	Review-1: Section 1.6 of the MR has been revised accordingly and the provisional acceptance protocol has been provided but please include the crediting period type clearly in the Section 1.6 of the MR. Review-2: Ok Closed ((Section 1.6 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-10 a) Please include and provide the reference document information for all provided coordinates in Section 1.7 of the MR. b) Please include the town, city and country information coordinates in Section 1.7 of the MR. c) Please revise the sentences like "expected" or "will be" throughout the MR since the project is	1.7.1	a) Document information for all provided coordinates has been included and provided. b) Related information has been included. c) Whole MR has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: a) b) Ok Closed (Section 1.7 of the MR has been revised accordingly and the generation licence has been provided as a reference document). c) Ok Closed (MR has been revised accordingly and such sentences have been revised).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
operational.			
CAR-11 It has been stated that the project hasn't been registered or seeking registration under other GHG programs but please provide a signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that the project hasn't been registered, or hasn't been seeking registration under any other GHG programs.	1.9.1	Signed and sealed letter has been provided to the DOE. Review-1: Signed and sealed letter is available to the VVB.	Review-1: It has been stated that the project hasn't been registered or seeking registration under other GHG programs but please provide a signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that the project hasn't been registered, or hasn't been seeking registration under any other GHG programs. Review-2: Ok Closed (The signed and sealed letter by PP dated as 16/04/2021 has been provided).
CAR-12 Please provide a signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that project hasn't been created other forms of credit (e.g. renewable energy certificates).	1.10.1	Signed and sealed letter has been provided to the DOE. Review-1: Signed and sealed letter is available to the VVB.	Review-1: Please provide a signed and sealed letter on company letterhead that project hasn't been created other forms of credit (e.g. renewable energy certificates). Review-2: Ok Closed (The signed and sealed letter by PP dated as 16/04/2021 has been provided).
CAR-13 a) Please include the achieved results of relevant SDGs during the monitoring period. b) Please revise the sentences like "expected" or "will be" throughout the MR since the project is operational.	1.11.1	a) Section has been revised accordingly. b) It's been revised accordingly. Review-1: a) The contribution to SDG-8 has been included. b) It's been corrected.	Review-1: a) Please include the contribution to SDG-8 during the monitoring period in the Section 1.11 of the MR. b) Please correct the third sentence in the Section 1.11 of the MR. Review-2: a) Ok Closed (Section 1.11 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-14 a) Please include the justification details about having no environmental and socio-economic impacts of the project activity in the Section 2.1 of the MR. b) Please provide the following records: - Social security records of PP site staff	2.1.1	a) As it may be seen through the comments of the local people during online meeting and the approved environmental permission, there isn't any negative environmental or socio-economic impact. b) - Social security records of PP site staff have been provided to the DOE.	Review-1: a) Please include the relevant justification details about having no environmental and socio-economic impacts of the project activity and the waste management practices in the Section 2.1

* 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	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waste water storage tank photographic evidences - Hazardous and domestic waste storage area photographic evidences - Domestic waste transfer and disposal records - Wastewater transfer and disposal records - Land usage details of the project and relevant legal permits 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waste water storage tank photographic evidences have been provided to the DOE. - Hazardous and domestic waste storage area photographic evidences have been provided to the DOE. - Domestic waste transfer and disposal records have been available to the DOE. - Wastewater transfer and disposal records have been provided to the DOE. - Land usage details of the project and relevant legal permits have been provided to the DOE. <p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Section 2.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>b) – Ten employees are working for the project activity. Social security records for all ten employees are available to the VVB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Domestic waste storage area photographic evidence is available to the VVB. - The signed letter for domestic waste transfer and disposal is available to the VVB. Please also see the photo of the domestic waste bin. - Land usage details have been included. 	<p>of the MR.</p> <p>b) - Please provide the social security records of all seven PP site staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please provide the domestic waste storage area photographic evidences. - Please provide the domestic waste transfer and disposal records. - Ok Closed (The hazardous waste storage area and waste water storage tank photographic evidences have been provided). - Ok Closed (The waste water transfer and disposal records dated as 05/03/2018, 03/07/2019 and 09/03/2020 have been provided). - Please include the land usage details in the MR. <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (Section 2.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>b) - Ok Closed (The social security records have been provided).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ok Closed (The signed letter about the domestic waste management process and dated as 27/05/2021 has been provided). - Ok Closed (The land usage details have been included in the Section 2.1 of the MR and the forest permit dated as 13/04/2015 has been provided).
<p>CAR-15</p> <p>Please include the procedures or methods used for engaging local stakeholders (e.g. dates of announcements or meetings, periods during which input was sought) in the Section 2.2 of the MR.</p>	<p>2.2.1.1</p>	<p>The methods used for engaging local stakeholders have been included.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>Ok Closed (Section 2.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly and the methods for engaging the local stakeholders during the monitoring period have been included).</p>
<p>CAR-16</p>	<p>2.2.1.2</p>	<p>The methods used for engaging local stakeholders have</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>Ok Closed (It has been confirmed in the</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	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
Please include the procedures or methods used for documenting the outcomes of the local stakeholder communication in the Section 2.2 of the MR.		been included.	Section 2.2 of the MR that there hasn't been any complaint during the monitoring period and there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online verification site visit).
CAR-17 a) Please provide the signed document about the contact details of the PP relevant staff in case of any complaint by close surroundings and whether there is any complaint received by the Muhktars from the local stakeholders. b) Please clarify the communication methods (announcements and meetings) with the local stakeholders during the monitoring period and please provide such relevant details in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	2.2.1.3	a)b) Any complaint or need from the local community could directly be received by the project owner and appropriate contributions or improvements are made to the local community. An announcement stating the contact details of the Project relevant staff in case of any complaint by close surroundings has been put up on the Mosque of the village to be seen by the villagers. Review-1: b) The date of monitored announcement and relevant village name have been included.	Review-1: a) b) Ok Closed (An announcement's photographic evidence dated as 02/03/2021 about the contact details of PP relevant staff in case of any complaint has been provided and there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders from Barbaros Village during the online verification site visit).
CAR-18 Please clarify if there are any complaint by the local stakeholders during the monitoring period and how all and any input received during ongoing communication has been taken due account by the PP in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	2.2.1.4	Regarding the monitoring period, no complaint has been received from the villagers. Section 2.2. has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Ok Closed (It has been confirmed in the Section 2.2 of the MR that there hasn't been any complaint during the monitoring period and there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the online verification site visit).
CAR-19 Please clarify if there has been any updates to the project design in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	2.2.1.5	It's been clarified in the Section 2.2 of the MR.	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section 2.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CAR-20 The changes with respect to other entities involved in the project comparing with the registered project has been provided but please indicate and correct when the mentioned change has occurred in the Section 3.1 of the MR.	3.1.9	The Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş. is the owner of the Project. Shareholder structure has been changed a few times. The latest structure change was on 20/05/2019 as the main shareholder Enda Enerji Holding A.S. Review-1: Section 3.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: The changes with respect to other entities involved in the project comparing with the registered project has been provided but please indicate when the mentioned change has occurred in the Section 3.1 of the MR. Review-2: Ok Closed (Section 3.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
<p>CAR-21</p> <p>a) Please also indicate the changes in other entities involved in the project with respect to the registered project in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR.</p> <p>b) Please correct the sub section numbers in the Section 3.2 of the MR.</p> <p>c) Please include the capacity change in MWe in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR.</p>	<p>3.2.2.1</p>	<p>a) The Egenda Ege Enerji Üretim A.Ş. is the owner of the Project. Shareholder structure has been changed a few times. The latest structure change was on 20/05/2019 as the main shareholder Enda Enerji Holding A.S. Please see the Generation License.</p> <p>b) Sub section numbers in the Section 3.2 of the MR have been corrected.</p> <p>c) Capacity change in MWe has been included in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR.</p> <p>Review-1: a) Section 3.2.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's been corrected. 	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) - The details about PP have been provided but please also indicate the changes in other entities involved in the project with respect to the registered project in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please correct the first sentence in the Section 3.2.2 of the MR in line with the current situation. <p>b) Ok Closed (The sub section numbers have been corrected in the Section 3.2 of the MR).</p> <p>c) Ok Closed (There hasn't been any change in the capacity and it is 15 MWm /13 MWe as confirmed through the generation licence and provisional acceptance protocol).</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (Section 3.2.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p>
<p>CAR-22</p> <p>a) Please include the meter test and calibration dates of the electricity meters.</p> <p>b) Please provide the electricity meter change details, if any, in the Section 4.2 of the MR.</p> <p>c) Please provide electricity meter change protocols, if any.</p> <p>d) Please provide the photographic evidences of electricity meters.</p>	<p>4.2.7</p>	<p>a) The meter test and calibration dates of the electricity meters have been included.</p> <p>b) Since power meters didn't change, there is no further information.</p> <p>c) Since power meters didn't change, there is no meter change protocol.</p> <p>d) The photographic evidences of electricity meters have been provided to the DOE.</p> <p>Review-1: The initial meter test protocol for 2016 is available to the VVB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They have been included. 	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) - Please also provide the initial meter test protocol for 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please include the last two meter test details in the Section 4.2 of the MR. <p>b) c) Ok Closed (The meter test protocols and the photographic evidences of electricity meters have been provided).</p> <p>d) Ok Closed (The photographic evidences of electricity meters have been provided).</p> <p>Review-2:</p> <p>a) - Ok Closed (The initial meter test protocol dated as 03/05/2016 has been provided).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ok Closed (Section 4.2 of the MR has been revised accordingly).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
<p>CAR-23</p> <p>The details of the monitoring system is available and in line with the registered PD but please check the number of employees both in the organizational structure diagram and text part of the Section 4.3 of the MR along with the relevant evidence.</p>	4.3.1	<p>One Plant Manager and one chief technician are responsible for all five projects of the project owner. Besides this, five control operators are working in shifts for the Project Activity.</p> <p>Review-1: Section 4.3 of the MR has been revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Review-1: Please include the brief roles and responsibilities regarding the monitoring the Section 4.3 of the MR along with the relevant evidences.</p> <p>Review-2: Ok Closed (Section 4.3 of the MR has been revised accordingly).</p>
<p>CAR-24</p> <p>a) Please take into consideration the monitoring period start date in the ER calculation spreadsheet.</p> <p>b) Please include December 2020 electricity generation and consumption values in the ER calculation spreadsheet along with the relevant EPIAS screenshot and TEIAS meter reading.</p> <p>c) Please correct 2019 total electricity generation value in the ER calculation spreadsheet.</p> <p>d) Please utilize round down function in total of each vintage and final total ER value.</p> <p>e) Please correct the ER value and net electricity generation in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR considering above corrections.</p> <p>f) Please correct the comparison calculation in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR.</p> <p>g) Please clarify the gap between the initial verification and validation of the project activity since the validation is completed in 2015 including the ongoing financial need of the project activity in terms of additionality.</p>	5.1.1	<p>a) ER calculation spreadsheet has been revised.</p> <p>b) It's been included.</p> <p>c) It's been corrected.</p> <p>d) Round down function has been utilized.</p> <p>e) They have been corrected.</p> <p>f) It's been corrected.</p> <p>g) The Project has started its operation in 2016. Both low demand for VERs and a sharp decrease in prices caused Project Owner to wait and seek issuance cumulatively for benefitting from VER revenue at the highest level.</p> <p>Review-1: e) The final total ER value has been corrected throughout the MR.</p> <p>f) The comparison calculation in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR has been corrected.</p>	<p>Review-1:</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (ER calculation spreadsheet has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>b) Ok Closed (December 2020, January and February 2021 values have been included).</p> <p>c) Ok Closed (ER calculation spreadsheet has been revised accordingly).</p> <p>d) Ok Closed (The round down function has been applied in total of each vintage and final total ER value).</p> <p>e) Please correct the final total ER value in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR.</p> <p>f) Please correct the comparison calculation in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR.</p> <p>g) Ok Closed (The provided explanation is deemed as acceptable).</p> <p>a) Ok Closed (The final total ER value has been corrected in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR).</p> <p>b) Ok Closed (The comparison calculation has been corrected in the Excel spreadsheet and throughout the MR).</p>
<p>CAR-25</p> <p>The leakage emissions are zero and this has been explained in the MR but please include the methodology</p>	5.3.1	Section 5.3 has been revised accordingly.	<p>Review-1: Ok Closed (Section 5.3 of the MR has been</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	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
version in the Section 5.3 of the MR.			revised accordingly).
CAR-26 (Issued during ITR stage) a) Please correct the combined margin grid emission factor value to be fully in line with the registered PD and validation report. b) Please correct the number of days for 2020 in Table 1 of the MR.	5.1.1	a) MR and Excel spreadsheet has been revised. b) MR has been revised.	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (ER calculation spreadsheet and MR have been revised accordingly). b) Ok Closed (Section 1.1 of the MR has been revised accordingly).
CL-1 There has been one FAR in line with the provided validation report as in below and please provide the relevant explanations and evidence documents: FAR-1: "The project capacity is defined as 13 MW in the generation license dd. 29/05/2008. During the validation the project capacity is confirmed as 15 MW regarding to Equipment contract with Enercon. The DOE should check the project capacity through the revised generation license and turbines plates during the first verification period of the project activity."	7.1.1	FAR- 1: The project includes 5 units of Enercon E82 E4 type turbines, as four of them have a capacity of 3MWm/3MWe and one of them has a capacity of 3 MWm/1MWe. Both the latest generation license and the Ministry Acceptance Protocol have been provided to the DOE.	Review-1: FAR-1: Ok Closed (There hasn't been any change in the capacity and it is 15 MWm /13 MWe as confirmed through the generation licence with last amendment date as 20/05/2019 and provisional acceptance protocol dated as 27/05/2016).


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

ANNEX 2: VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Anıl SÖYLER, Bsc. in Environmental Engineering, has completed his Bachelor degree in Middle East Technical University, Turkey. His Master study in the same field is at thesis stage and has 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, and quality management systems. He has been involved in both national and international projects supported by IFC and World Bank. He has been working as Certification Manager in the context of Re Carbon.

Sandeep KANDA holds a degree in Mechanical Engineering, Masters in Energy systems engineering from Indian Institute of Technology – Bombay and Post Graduate Diploma in Industrial Safety & Environmental Management from National Institute of Industrial Engineering in India. He has more than ten years of work experience with auditing and consultancy firms, seven years thereof with Designated Operational Entities under the CDM. He is experienced working on diversified areas of energy and environmental management, including policies, Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Corporate Sustainability Reporting (CSR) Audits, energy audits, utility audits and product development. As CDM auditor and technical reviewer for TÜV Süd, he has audited more than 30 CDM projects as technical reviewer; 40 projects as lead auditor and 7 PoAs in various capacities; covering a broad range of sectoral scopes, such as Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources), Energy distribution, Energy demand, Manufacturing industries, Chemical industries, Transport, Metal production, Waste handling & disposal and Agriculture. He has been working as a contracted team leader, technical reviewer, TA 1.1 and renewable energy expert in the context of Re Carbon.

Annex 2-1: Appointment Certificates

Re Carbon G3zetim Denetim ve Belgeleendirme Ltd. Şti. Prof. Dr. Aziz Sancar Cad. 27/E TR : 06850 Çankaya-Ankara Tel.: 0090-312-287 5122 Fax: 0090-312-287 3373	Certificate of Appointment	 www.re-carbon.com
	Carbon Division	Page: 1/1

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

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
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 the 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			
Name	Position	Date	Signature
Mr. Christian JOHANNES	General Manager	08-02-2021	



Re Carbon Bèzetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. Prof. Dr. Aziz Sancar Cad. 27/3 TR / 06690 Çankaya Ankara Tel: 0380-312-287 5122 Fax: 0380-312-287 3373	Certificate of Appointment	 Page: 1/1
	Carbon Division	

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Mr. Sandeep KANDA** 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	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	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	India, Vietnam, Nepal and Turkey	N/A	1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 8.1, 8.2, 13.1, 13.2 & 15.1

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

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

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated and there is no defined validity period for this Certificate.

However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of the performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

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

RC-19 / 21.01.2020 - 02

