VERIFICATION REPORT
INNORES ELEKTRIK URETIM A.S.

VERIFICATION OF THE GRID CONNECTED ELECTRICITY GENERATION FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES: YUNTDAG 57.5 MW WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY

REVISION NO. 03

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

62/71 Boulevard du Château
92571 Neuilly Sur Seine Cdx - France

Date of first issue:	Organizational unit:
19/01/2012	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client:	**Client ref.:**
Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S.	Emre Samsun

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the fourth periodic verification of the "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdag 57.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey", GS Registration Reference Number GS352, project of Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S. located in Bergama, Izmir, Turkey and applying the methodology ACM0002 version 6, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the GS-VER, Gold Standard criteria as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the GS-VER rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria.

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

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

In summary, Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented as planned and described in validated and registered project design document (v4 dd. 03 May 2011). Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is already generating GHG emission reductions. The GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements, and the emission reductions verified totalize 138,505 tons of CO2eq for the monitoring period.

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

Reporting period	:	01/01/2011 to 31/12/2011
Baseline emissions	:	138,505 t CO_2 eq.
Project emissions	:	0 t CO_2 eq.
Leakage emissions	:	0 t CO_2 eq.
Emission Reductions	:	138,505 t CO_2 eq.

Report No.:	Subject Group:
TURKEY/CER.1850.11.C45./2011	GS-VER

Project title:
Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdag 57.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey

Work carried out by:
Fikriye Seda Yücel-Lead Verifier
Mehmet Kumru - Verifier

Internal Technical Review carried out by:
Burcu Mutman

Date of this revision:	Rev. No.:	Number of pages:
27/02/2012	03	40

Indexing terms

Work approved by:
Burcu Mutman – Local Product Manager

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution

Table of Contents *Page*

1 INTRODUCTION

Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its GS-VER project "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdag 57.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey" (hereafter called "Yuntdag") at Bergama, Izmir, Turkey.

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

1.1 Objective

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 Scope

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

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

1.3 GHG Project Description

The Yuntdag project is a 57.5 MW WPP in Izmir in Turkey. The purpose of the project is to generate electricity and to feed it into the public grid. By project activity fossil fuel power generation is replaced, thus the greenhouse gas emission in Turkey is reduced.

Initial project capacity was 42.5 MW and consisted of 17 turbines with 2.5 MW each, which was planned to increase by 15 MW. Revised license for 57.5 MW was granted by EMRA to Innores on 09.06.2010.

After 2.5 years in operation, Innores Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. decided to increase capacity. The increased capacity was also registered under Gold Standard for consideration of emission

reduction and GS-VER revenue on 13 of June 2011. FAR-1 about stakeholder comments on capacity increase is closed as during site visit DOE approved that local stakeholders do not have complaints about capacity increase.

All turbines are producing electricity by the end of 2011 but the date of commissioning of the last 2 turbines is not in the 4th monitoring period (January 2012). In the next verification period DOE shall see the provisional acceptance papers of the last two turbines. FAR is raised in this verification for the checking of provisional acceptance papers.

Yuntdağ including additional capacity is consist of 23 wind turbines Nordex N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m in diameter and 80m hub height. The wind turbines will be connected to the wind farm substation through 34.5 kV underground cables. The voltage is raised to 154 kV and is transferred to the National Electricity System (Alosbi Transformer Station) via a 26 km long transmission line.

1.4 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	CODE HOLDER*	TASK PERFORMED
Lead Verifier	Fikriye Seda Yücel	**X Yes ☐ No**	**X DR X SV X RI**
Verifier	Mehmet Kumru	**X Yes ☐ No**	**X DR ☐SV ☐RI**
Technical Specialist	N/A	**☐Yes ☐ No**	**☐DR ☐SV ☐RI**
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Burcu Mutman	**X Yes ☐ No**	**☐DR ☐SV XRI**
Specialist supporting ITR	N/A	**☐Yes ☐ No**	**☐DR ☐SV ☐RI**

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

2 METHODOLOGY

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

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

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

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

2.1 Review of Documents

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

procedures for transfer of data, frequency of emissions reports, and review and internal audit of calculations.

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

(a) Previous verification report: 06/05/2011
(b) GS Review of the Request for Approval of Design Change due to Capacity Addition: 13/07/2011
(c) Monitoring report
(d) Emission reduction calculations
(e) PMUM records and monthly protocols
(f) Social security records of employees
(g) Training certificates
(h) Bills of local purchases
(i) Declarations of village heads related to bird deaths

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

As there is change in design in means of capacity addition, site visit is conducted. DOE interviewed stakeholders and did not receive any negative comments regarding capacity addition.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Innores	_ Implementation of the project _ Review of the data flow for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters _ Confirmation of the correct implementation of procedures of operations and data collection _ Information on the monitoring equipment _ The data for cross-checking the values on the Monitoring Report _ PMUM data, Invoices, SCADA records _ Training of the employees _ Monitoring of bird deaths _ Working conditions _ Health and safety measures
Local Stakeholders	_ Observation of bird deaths _ Project's impact on local economy
Futurecamp	_ Monitoring Report _ Emission reduction calculations _ The data for cross-checking the values on the Monitoring Report _ PMUM data, Invoices, SCADA records _ Training of the employees _ Meter reading protocols _ Calibration records

2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

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

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

Corrective Action Requests (CAR) is issued, where:

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.4 Internal Technical Review

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

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

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

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

The verification activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the GS-VER rules and requirements.

The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans and emission reduction calculations, internal quality assurance systems of the project participant as well as the project activity, review of the stakeholder comments and responses, closure of CARs, CLs and FARs during the verification exercise, review of sample documents.

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

After the agreement of the responses on the 'Clarification Request' from the Lead Verifier as well as the PP(s) the finalized verification report is accepted for further processing like signing and approval.

3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS

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

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

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Verification Protocol in Appendix A. The verification of the Project resulted in 02 Corrective Action Requests, 14 Clarification Requests and 02 Forwarded Action Requests.

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

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

3.1 Remaining issues from previous validation/verification

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

Open issues from previous verifications are listed below,

FAR-1: The local stakeholders have been interviewed and they did not provide any negative feedback on capacity increase. FAR is closed.

FAR-2: The Pre-EIA report recommended that the lighting facility has to be provided for night birds. Some literature study retrieved the results that extra lighting attracts night birds. References are provided to DOE but as the lighting requirement is not realized, FAR are not closed. Lighting should be checked in next verification.

FAR-3: There is a FAR from previous verifications about refresher trainings. In this monitoring period some trainings have been provided to employees and related records were presented to DOE as evidence. In this monitoring period 7 employees received trainings. A training plan for 2012 is also presented. FAR is closed.

FAR-4: In 3rd monitoring report, there is the FAR about "The maintenance of the road". The maintenance of the road is monitored through the written letter gained from the Head of Village where the road has been constructed, as planned in the monitoring plan. During 4th verification site visit it was observed by the verification team that roads are appropriate. Interviews with locals also indicate that. FAR is closed.

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

The project was implemented in accordance with the registered project design document (v4), which was verified during the first periodic verification.

Innores installed and commissioned a 42.5 MW wind power plant in 2008. Initial project capacity was 42.5 MW consists of 17 turbines with 2.5 MW each, which was planned to increase by 15 MW.

Yuntdağ including additional capacity is consist of 23 wind turbines Nordex N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m in diameter and 80m hub height. The wind turbines will be connected to the wind farm substation through 34.5 kV underground cables. The voltage is raised to 154 kV and is transferred to the National Electricity System (Alosbi Transformer Station) via a 26 km long transmission line.

The actual operation of the proposed project activity is generation of electricity from Wind Power and feeding it to the public grid.

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

There is no data and variables that are provided in the monitoring report which are different from the stated in the registered PDD that will cause an increase in estimates of the emission reductions in the current monitoring period or is highly likely to increase the estimates of emission reductions in the future monitoring periods.

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

The monitoring plan is in accordance with "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources (ACM0002) Version 6" applied by the proposed GS project activity.

3.4 Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan (206)

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

The parameters required by the monitoring plan and the way the Verification Team has verified the information flow (from data generation, aggregation, to recording, calculation and reporting for these parameters including the values in the monitoring reports are described below:

(a) EGy – Annual net electricity generated and delivered to the grid: According to the monitoring plan in the GS-VER PDD, the officials from TEIAŞ (the national grid operator) perform monthly the measurements for both main and back up meters, under the control of the plant personnel of Innores. The TEIAŞ personnel comes to the plant in the first days of the month for reading the recorded values obtained at 24:00 of the last day of the month before.

The data of meter reading protocols which form the basis of net electricity figures are filled on the first day of every month to record the generation of previous month. A reading protocol is then signed by both parties.

The protocol is then sent to PMUM which checks the correctness of the protocol and prepares the invoice amount until 18th of the following month. In reference to the checked data from the protocol and the PMUM data, Innores prepares the invoice for the energy produced. Since the meters are reading electricity supplied to the system and withdrawn from the system separately, the net electricity amount supplied to the grid is calculated by electricity supplied minus electricity withdrawn. Thus, based on this procedure, monitoring is sufficient and no extra monitoring methods have to be implemented. The above described measurement method follows Article 52 of the official regulation “Electricity Market Balancing and Settlement Regulation”.

For verification, data is checked with monthly protocols and cross-checked with PMUM records.

Quality of data handling and storage is assured by the business processes between Innores and TEIAS. The monthly meter reading documents are stored by Innores and TEIAS, the settlement notification, which is issued by TEIAS and includes the meter reading data, is stored on a PMUM/TEIAS file server and accessible by Innores via a secured website. The meters themselves can always be read as plausibility check for verification.

All turbines are producing electricity by the end of 2011 but the date of commissioning of the last 2 turbines is not in the 4th monitoring period (January 2012). In the next verification period Doe shall see the provisional acceptance papers of the last two turbines.

According to the registered GS-VER-PDD, regarding the sustainability monitoring, the following parameters are monitored:

Project activity’s contribution to sustainable development is based on indicators of;

- environmental sustainability,
- social sustainability & development
- economic & technological development

For the fourth verification period, three indicators were added to the monitoring report in line with PDD. “Use of the new road” was taken out from periodic verification according to the PDD as the indicator was verified during initial verification with interviews with local people. However since there were a FAR about the maintenance of road, the use and maintenance of new road has been confirmed by the verification team.

During fourth verification period, the remaining indicators as “local job creation” and “bird collusion” are presented in the report since there was capacity addition during the monitoring period. To show the continuation of job creation by the project, SGK records both during the new construction and operation phases has been presented to DOE and it is confirmed that the project is continued to created job opportunities. Regarding to the PDD, impact of the project on birds has to be monitored with the statement from village mayor and it is provided to DOE that there were no bird kills during the monitoring period.

Although the staffs working in the project was mainly trained for new technology during first verification period, there were two more trainings arranged for the plant manager during third verification period. There is a FAR from previous verification about refresher trainings. In this

monitoring period some trainings have been provided to employees and related records were presented to DOE as evidence. A training plan for 2012 is also presented. FAR is closed.

Regarding effects of turbines on biodiversity, mayors of villages have reported no bird strikes. Statement of Mayor is presented to Verifier. Besides, the Pre-EIA report recommended that the lighting facility has to be provided for night birds. Some literature study retrieved the results that extra lighting attracts night birds. References are provided to DOE but as the lighting requirement is not realized, FAR is not closed. Lighting should be checked in next verification.

The project contributes to above SD indicators positively.

3.5 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions

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

Baseline emissions

Baseline emissions include only CO2 emissions from electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants that are displaced due to the project activity.

Project Emissions

The proposed project activity involves the generation of electricity by a wind power plant therefore project activity does not result in greenhouse gas emissions.

Leakage Emissions

As a wind project, leakage emissions are assumed negligible.

Emission Reductions

Emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$ERy = BEy - PEy - LEy$

Where:
ERy = Emission reductions in year *y* (t CO2/yr).
BEy = Baseline emissions in year *y* (t CO2/yr).
PEy = Project emissions in year *y* (t CO2/yr).
LEy = Leakage emissions in year *y* (t CO2/yr).

The emission reduction calculation and the records are in line. The reported data was cross-checked by PMUM records and monthly meter protocols.

The calculation of net electricity delivered to the grid in this reporting period are as shown in the Table below.

Year	Month	Gross Energy Generation (MWh)	Self-Consumption (MWh)	Net-electricity Generation (MWh)	Emission Reduction (tCO_2)
2011	January	11.489,020	20,870	11.468,150	8.126,331
2011	February	13.496,990	14,140	13.482,850	9.553,948
2011	March	13.078,670	14,310	13.064,360	9.257,405
2011	April	15.789,690	9,910	15.779,780	11.181,552
2011	May	10.697,220	14,340	10.682,880	7.569,889

2011	June	10.970,070	16,640	10.953,430	7.761,600
2011	July	12.260,050	15,610	12.244,440	8.676,410
2011	August	24.307,680	1,080	24.306,600	17.223,657
2011	September	24.386,940	4,350	24.382,590	17.277,503
2011	October	20.894,910	23,690	20.871,220	14.789,346
2011	November	24.291,390	13,830	24.277,560	17.203,079
2011	December	13.973,810	23,910	13.949,900	9.884,899
TOTAL		**195.636,440**	**172,680**	**195.463,760**	**138.505,620**

Actual emission reduction amount is less then assumed amount in the PDD due to the delay of commissioning of two turbines.

Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed. Additionally, the estimated annual emission reductions in the PDD are deemed appropriate and the difference to the verified value is deemed reasonable.

The assumptions, emission factors and default values that were applied in the calculations have been justified.

4 VERIFICATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed the fourth verification of the "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdag 57.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey", which applies the methodology ACM0002 v6. The verification was performed based on the requirements set by the CDM and relevant guidance provided by CMP and the CDM Executive Board and Gold Standard Criteria.

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

The management of Innores Elektrik Uretim A.S. is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions of the project on the basis set out within the project Monitoring and Verification Plan indicated in the final PDD version 04. The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures in accordance with that plan, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project, is the responsibility of the management of the project.

Bureau Veritas Certification verified the Project Monitoring Report version 04.3 for the reporting period as indicated below. Bureau Veritas Certification confirms that the project is implemented and described in validated and registered project design documents. Installed equipment being essential for generating emission reduction runs reliably and is calibrated appropriately. The monitoring system is in place and the project is already generating GHG emission reductions

Bureau Veritas Certification can confirm that the GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements. Our opinion relates to the project's GHG emissions and resulting GHG emissions reductions reported and related to the valid and registered project baseline and monitoring, and its associated documents. Based on the information we have seen and evaluated, we confirm the following statement:

Reporting period: From 01/01/2011 to 31/12/2011

Baseline emissions	:	138,505	t CO2 equivalents.
Project emissions	:	0	t CO2 equivalents.
Emission Reductions	:	138,505	t CO2 equivalents.

19/01/2012	19/01/2012
Burcu Mutman	Fikriye Seda Yücel
Internal Technical Reviewer	Lead Verifier

5 REFERENCES

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

/1/ Previous verification report: 06/05/2011
GS Review of the Request for Approval of Design Change due to Capacity Addition: 13/07/2011
/2/ Calculation Worksheet:
Annex1_Workbook_Yuntdağ 57,5 MW WPP_2011xls
/3/ Monitoring Report v1, 12.01.2012
/4/ Monitoring Report v2, 15.01.2012
/5/ Monitoring Report v.4.3 13.02.2012

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

/1/ PMUM records for all months of the crediting period
/2/ Monthly protocols for all months of the crediting period
/3/ Social security records of employees
/4/ Training certificates
/5/ Bills of local purchases
Declarations of village heads related to bird deaths

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

/1/ Aydın Dinler-Local
/2/ Mehmet Altak-Village Head of Ismailli
Ali Tilki- Village Head of Koyuneli
Nurullah Çelik-Technical Manager
Isa Alkan-Operations Manager
Zafer Aslanlı-Logistics
Emre Samsun-Investments
Fariz Tasdan-Futurecamp
Ersun Gülcen-Local

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

Internal Technical Review:
Mrs. Burcu Mutman Environmental Engineer
Bureau Veritas Certification - Climate Change Verifier

Burcu Mutman is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. Has participated various online trainings, seminars and personal trainings on Gold Standard also participated in the Gold Standard Academy in 2009 and 2010.

Lead Verifier:
Ms. Seda Yücel – Chemical Engineer, M.Sc Energy
Bureau Veritas Certification – Auditor/Trainer

Seda Yucel has over 2 years of experience in management systems and 4 years of experience in energy management in industry. She is a verifier for GHG Emission Reduction Projects. Has participated various trainings on Gold Standard.
Verifier:
Mr. Mehmet Kumru- Environmental Engineer
Bureau Veritas Certification Climate Change Verifier
Mehmet Kumru is an has over 5 years experience in environmental and energy sectors. He is worked about renewable energy projects. He is a verifier for GHG Emission Reduction Projects. He is an auditor for ISO 14064 standard.

APPENDIX A: COMPANY GS-VER PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

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

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
1 Compliance of the monitoring report with the guidelines for completing the monitoring report form					
a ***Brief description of the project activity***					
a. Is the description of the project activity to be presented in this section a brief summary of the detailed description given in the section .B.1 Implementation status of the project activity?	EB 54	Ann 34	Initial project capacity was 42.5 MW consists of 17 turbines with 2.5 MW each. There was a design change by means of capacity addition and now Yuntdağ 57,5 MW WPP including additional capacity consists of 23 wind turbines Nordex N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m in diameter and 80m hub height. During fourth verification site visit, design change is observed and validated on site. Revised license is also provided to DOE. The wind turbines will be connected to the wind farm substation through 34.5 kV underground cables. The voltage is raised to 154 kV and is transferred to the National Electricity System (Alosbi Transformer Station) via a 26 km long transmission line.	OK	OK
b. Does this description include:	EB	Ann 34		OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		54				
i.	Purpose of the project activity and the measures taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions?	EB 54	Ann 34	The purpose of the project is to generate electricity and to feed it into the public grid.	OK	OK
ii.	Brief description of the installed technology and equipments;	EB 54	Ann 34	Initial project capacity was 42.5 MW consists of 17 turbines with 2.5 MW each. There was a design change by means of capacity addition and now Yuntdağ 57,5 MW WPP including additional capacity consists of 23 wind turbines Nordex N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m in diameter and 80m hub height. During fourth verification site visit, design change is observed and validated on site.	OK	OK
iii.	Relevant dates for the project activity (e.g. construction, commissioning, continued operation periods, etc.)?	EB 54	Ann 34	Milestones are provided in MR. "Start date of construction for capacity extension" is validated with contract with subcontractor for installation of the new turbines dated 07.03.2011. Construction began on 01.04.2011. All of the 6 new turbines began to produce energy but until provisional acceptance is realized, all production is "test production". This amount of production is recorded by meters and is determined by a protocol on day of	CL-1	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			provisional acceptance. 4 of the new turbines have started selling electricity to the grid on 27.09.2011. Evidence for validation is provisional acceptance documents of TEIAS. 2 of them will begin to sell electricity to the grid on 12.01.2011. The related provisional acceptance papers will be sent to DOE. Please provide documents		
iv. Total emission reductions achieved in this monitoring period?	EB 54	Ann 34	Emission reductions are presented in tabular format in MR. Data is checked with monthly protocols and cross-checked with PMUM records.	OK	OK
b ***Project participants***					
a. Are the project participants listed?	EB 54	Ann 34	Project owner is Innores Elektrik Üretim AŞ.	OK	OK
c ***Location of project activity***					
a. Is complete information of the location of the project activity: town, city, country and GPS coordinates.provided?	EB 54	Ann 34	Coordinates of new turbines are checked during site visit.	OK	OK
d ***Technical description of the project***					
a. Are a escription of the technology applied in the project activity and detailed technical process, including diagrams provided?	EB 54	Ann 34	Technology applied is described in MR.	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	e ***Title, reference and version of the baseline and monitoring methodology applied to the project activity***					
a	Are the complete reference of the methodology applied and tools whenever is applicable included?	EB 54	Ann 34	"Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources (ACM0002) Version 6" is used.	OK	OK
	f ***Registration date of the project activity***					
a	Is the registration date of the project activity provided?	EB 54	Ann 34	GS Registration date is 31 July 2008.	OK	OK
	g ***Crediting period of the project activity and related information (start date and choice of crediting period)***					
a	Does the description also include changes to the start date of the crediting period post-registration that have been accepted by the Board, when applicable?	EB 54	Ann 34	3rd monitoring period was between 01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010. 4th monitoring period is between 01/01/2011 – 31/12/2011. Start date is adequate.	OK	OK
	h ***Name of responsible person(s)/entity(ies)***					
a	Is the contact information of the person(s)/entity(ies) responsible for completing the monitoring report form (CDM-MR) provided?	EB 54	Ann 34	Fariz Tasdan from Futurecamp is responsible for monitoring.	OK	OK
	i ***Implementation status of the project activity***					
a	Does this section include a description of the implementation and operational status of the	EB	Ann 34	Important dates of the project are provided. The project installation is completed according to the	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	project as of this monitoring period in accordance with the latest version of the CDM Validation and Verification Manual (CDM-VVM)?	54		description in the PDD and completely operational.		
b	Does the description include inter alia:	EB54	Ann 34		OK	OK
i	The starting date of operation of the project activity? For project activities that consist of more than one site, the report shall clearly describe the status of implementation and starting date of operation for each site. For CDM project activities with phased implementation, the report shall indicate the progress of the proposed CDM project activity achieved in each phase.	EB54	Ann 34	Milestones are provided in MR. "Start date of construction for capacity extension" is validated with contract with subcontractor for installation of the new turbines dated 07.03.2011. Construction began on 01.04.2011. All of the 6 new turbines began to produce energy but until provisional acceptance is realized, all production is "test production". This amount of production is recorded by meters and is determined by a protocol on day of provisional acceptance. 4 of the new turbines have started selling electricity to the grid on 27.09.2011. Evidence for validation is provisional acceptance documents of TEIAS. 2 of them will begin to sell electricity to the grid on 12.01.2011. The related provisional acceptance papers will be sent to DOE. Please provide documents	CL-1	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
ii The information regarding the actual operation of the project activity during this monitoring period, including information on special events, for example overhaul times, downtimes of equipment, exchange of equipment, etc?	EB 54	Ann 34	Please explain in the MR if the project had any overhaul times, downtimes of equipment, exchange of equipment.	CL-2	OK
iii A brief description of: (i) events or situations that occurred during the monitoring period, which may impact the applicability of the methodology, and (ii) how the issues resulting from these events or situations are being addressed?	EB 54	Ann 34	Special event section sentence “Related steps with the extension will be taken in the fourth verification period, as the impact of the extension will be best evaluated during this period” seems to remain from previous monitoring report. Please revise.	CL-3	OK
j ***Revision of the monitoring plan***					
a Is it indicated if the monitoring plan has been revised?.	EB 54	Ann 34	MP is not revised.	OK	OK
b Is the date of approval, if revised, included?	EB 54	Ann 34	N/A	OK	OK
k ***Request for deviation applied to this monitoring period***					
a Is any deviation applied to this monitoring period indicated?	EB 54	Ann 34	No deviations to the monitoring procedure documented in the registered monitoring plan occurred.	OK	OK
b Is the reference number, if any deviation applied, included?	EB 55	Ann 34	N/A	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		4				
	l ***Notification or request of approval of changes***					
a	Is any notification or request of approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered CDM-PDD indicated?	EB 54	Ann 34	Please mention in this section the change in design.	CL-4	OK
b	Is the date of approval, if applicable, included?	EB 54	Ann 34	N/A	OK	OK
	m ***Description of the monitoring system***					
a	Is a description of the monitoring system provided?	EB 54	Ann 34	The monitoring procedure ((aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system) is provided in this section.	OK	OK
b	Does his section include data collection procedures (information flow including data generation, aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system?	EB 54	Ann 34	The monitoring procedure ((aggregation, recording, calculation and reporting), organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of personnel, and emergency procedures for the monitoring system) is provided in this section.	OK	OK
c	Does this include line diagrams showing all relevant monitoring points?	EB 54	Ann 34	Line diagram is provided.	OK	OK
	n ***Data and parameters***					

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
a Does this section include parameters used to calculate baseline, project, and leakage emissions as well as other relevant parameters required by the approved methodology and the monitoring plan; and specific information on how data and parameters have been monitored during the monitoring period?	EB 54	Ann 34	Parameters used are provided in this section. They are in line with the registered PDD. References are seen as "**Error! Reference source not found.**" In the MR. Please correct.	CL-5	OK
b Are data that is determined only once for the crediting period but are used after registration of the project activity included here under section D.1.?	EB 54	Ann 34	Data that is determined only once for the crediting period are provided in this section. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
c For each parameter the following information, using the tables provided, is provided:				OK	OK
i Value of monitored parameter in the period for the purpose of calculating emission reductions? To report multiple values, a table may be used and included in this monitoring report or include references to spreadsheet. For default value (such as an IPCC value), where it is ex-post confirmed, the most recent value shall be applied.	EB 54	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
ii Description of the equipment used to monitor each parameter, including details on accuracy class, and calibration information (frequency, date of calibration and validity), if applicable as per monitoring plan?	EB 54	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
iii Measuring and recording method: how the parameters are measured/calculated, specifying the measurement and recording frequency?	EB 5	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	4				
iv Source of data: logbooks, daily records, surveys, etc?	EB 54	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
v Where relevant, the calculation method of the parameter?	EB 54	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
vi The QA/QC procedures applied (if applicable per monitoring plan)?	EB 54	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
vii Include information about appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and any other reference values that have been used in the calculation of emission reductions?	EB 54	Ann 34	Required data are provided. They are in line with the registered PDD.	OK	OK
o ***Baseline emissions calculation***					
a Does this section include all formulae used and description to calculate the baseline emissions applying actual values?	EB 54	Ann 34	Formulas to calculate baseline emissions are provided correctly.	OK	OK
b Was a table used and included in this monitoring report or include references to spreadsheet?	EB 54	Ann 34	Baseline emissions and emission reductions are presented in a table which is also presented to DOE as worksheet. Data and calculations are checked with monthly protocols.	OK	OK
p ***Project emissions calculation***					

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
a	Does this section include all formulae used and description to calculate the project emissions applying actual values?	EB 54	Ann 34	There are no project emissions in this kind of project. There are no project emissions in this kind of project. There was a diesel generator in Yuntdağ 42.5 MW WPP project for emergency cases; however while this generator was not used so often, it was transferred from the plant on 14.10.2009. A battery system was installed in the plant to supply electricity when there is a need.	OK	OK
b	Was a table used and included in this monitoring report or include references to spreadsheet?	EB 54	Ann 34	N/A	OK	OK
	q ***Leakage calculation***					
a	Does this section include all formulae used and description to calculate the leakage applying actual values?	EB 54	Ann 34	Leakage emissions in this project are considered to be negligible.		
b	Was a table used and included in this monitoring report or include references to spreadsheet?	EB 54	Ann 34	N/A	OK	OK
	r ***Emission reductions calculation/table***					
a	Does this section include the formulae used to calculate the emission reductions and the total of the emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period?	EB 54	Ann 34	Formulas are provided and they are in line with the validated PDD and VR.	OK	OK
i	Total baseline emissions:	EB	Ann 34	Formulas are provided and they are in line with the validated PDD and VR.	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		54				
ii	Total project emissions:	EB 54	Ann 34	Formulas are provided and they are in line with the validated PDD and VR.	OK	OK
iii	Total leakage:	EB 54	Ann 34	Formulas are provided and they are in line with the validated PDD and VR.	OK	OK
iv	Total emission reductions:	EB 54	Ann 34	Formulas are provided and they are in line with the validated PDD and VR.	OK	OK
	s ***Comparison of actual emission reductions with estimates in the CDM-PDD***					
a	Does this section include a comparison of actual values of the emission reductions achieved during the monitoring period with the estimations in the registered CDM-PDD?	EB 54	Ann 34	Planned and actual emission reductions are compared.	OK	OK
	t ***Remarks on difference from estimated value in the PD***					
a	Is an explanation of the cause of any increase in the actual emission reductions achieved during the current monitoring period (e.g. higher water availability, higher load plant factor, etc), including all information (i.e. data and/or parameters) that is different from that stated in	EB 54	Ann 34	Please explain differences between planned and actual emission reductions.	CAR-1	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION		Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	the registered CDM-PDD provided?					
2 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document						
a	Are all physical features of the proposed CDM project activity proposed in the registered PDD in place?	VVM	196	Initial project capacity was 42.5 MW consists of 17 turbines with 2.5 MW each. There was a design change by means of capacity addition and now Yuntdağ 57,5 MW WPP including additional capacity consists of 23 wind turbines Nordex N90 of the 2.5 MW output, 90m in diameter and 80m hub height. During fourth verification site visit, design change is observed and validated on site. Revised license is also provided to DOE. The wind turbines will be connected to the wind farm substation through 34.5 kV underground cables. The voltage is raised to 154 kV and is transferred to the National Electricity System (Alosbi Transformer Station) via a 26 km long transmission line.	OK	OK
b	Have the project participants operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD?	VVM	196	Project is operated as per the PDD (GS has approved the design change due to capacity addition).	OK	OK
c	Was an on-site visit conducted?	VV	196	Site visit is conducted on 05.01.2012. Following stakeholders have been interviewed:	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
		M		Aydın Dinler-Local Mehmet Altak-Village Head of Ismailli Ali Tilki- Village Head of Koyuneli Nurullah Çelik-Technical Manager Isa Alkan-Operations Manager Zafer Aslanlı-Logistics Emre Samsun-Investments Fariz Tasdan-Futurecamp Ersun Gülcen-Local		
d	If not, justify the rationale of the decision.	VVM	196	N/A	OK	OK
e	Does the implementation or operation of CDM project activity conform with the description contained in the registered PDD?	VVM	197	Project is operated as per the PDD (GS has approved the design change due to capacity addition).	OK	OK
f	If not, which are the potential impacts due to these changes, according to the relevant guidelines established by the Executive Board (EB48-§73)?	VVM	197	Capacity addition will result in more emission reductions than planned. As the amount will be verified in each period, there is no concern about capacity increase.	OK	OK
g	Was any change identified close to the boundary of the project activity but outside it?	VVM	197	There is no change in project boundaries.	OK	OK
h	If yes, which are the potential impacts due to these changes?	VVM	197	N/A	OK	OK
i	Was a notification or a request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD submited prior to the	VVM	197	GS has approved the updated PDD where capacity increase is considered.	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	conclusion of the verification/certification for the corresponding?					
3 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology						
a	Is the validated monitoring plan in accordance with the approved methodology applied by the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	200	Monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved applied methodology ACM0002 Ver.6.	OK	OK
b	If no, was a request for revision of the monitoring plan was done? (The DOE may request for revision of the monitoring plan covering the monitoring period under verification, for approval by the CDM Executive Board)	VVM	201	N/A	OK	OK
c	Are there any monitoring aspects of the project activity that are not specified in the methodology, particularly in the case of small-scale methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency)?	VVM	202	N/A	OK	OK
4 Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan						
a	Have the monitoring plan and the applied methodology been properly implemented and followed by the project participants?	VVM	205	Yes, the monitoring plan is applied properly.	OK	OK
1.				Employees are locals. Addresses of employees and social security records for 2 new employees are provided to DOE.	OK	OK
2.				Please clarify if any new meters or transformers have been installed due to increase in capacity.	CL-6	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			Regarding FAR raised in previous verifications: In year 2011, only some employees have received various trainings (certificates have been provided to DOE). Please discuss if other personnel need refreshing trainings and provide a training plan for these people.		
			In 3rd monitoring report, there is the following FAR: "FAR 2 – The maintenance of the road will be done by the project owner if needed. The maintenance of the road shall be monitored during next verifications through the written letter gained from the Head of Village where the road has been constructed (Ismailli (Yuntdag)." Please also mention this FAR in the MR. During 4th verification site visit it was observed by the verification team that roads are appropriate. Interviews with locals also indicate that.		
			Please provide more evidences for the FAR about "lighting facilities for night birds".		
			Muhtars of nearby villages reported that there was no bird deaths observed during monitoring period. This was also questioned in the 4th verification site visit. Local people have been interviewed on capacity increase. They approved that they have no	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
				problems with the company and they have been informed about capacity increase earlier. Due to capacity increase, some local people now have roads reaching their gardens which is an additional contribution to sustainable development.		
b	Have the previous monitoring reports been reviewed?	VVM	205	3rd verification report has been reviewed. Monitoring plan is not revised.	OK	OK
c	Where applicable, has the impact of revision in the monitoirng plan on the current verification been reviewed ?	VVM	205	3rd verification report has been reviewed. Monitoring plan is not revised.	OK	OK
d	Does the registered/approved monitoring plan have any description of an illustration to calculate net electricity supplied to the grid by the project activity ?	VVM	205	At the end of each monitoring period, which is planned to generally last one year, the data from the monthly meter reading records will be added up to the yearly net electricity generation and multiplied with the combined margin emission factor with the help of an excel spreadsheet that also contains the combined margin calculation. There is no deviation from this procedure.	OK	OK
e	If yes to (d) above, has the verification team verified /confirmed the validity of such illustration with supporting documents ?	VVM	205	There is no deviation from the above procedure.	OK	OK
f	Have all parameters stated in the monitoring plan, the applied methodology and relevant CDM Executive Board decisions been sufficiently monitored and updated as applicable, including:	VVM	205	All parameters in the MP are included in monitoring.	OK	OK
	i Project emission parameters?	V	205	There are no project emissions in this kind of	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	VM		project.		
ii Baseline emission parameters?	VVM	205	Baseline emissions are same with emission reductions.	OK	OK
iii Leakage parameters?	VVM	205	Leakage emissions in this project are considered to be negligible.	OK	OK
iv Validation of entire procedure of apportioning, if applicable	VVM	205	There is no apportioning of emissions.	OK	OK
v Management and operational system: the responsibilities and authorities for monitoring and reporting are in accordance with the responsibilities and authorities stated in the monitoring plan?	VVM	205	In line with the PDD, plant manager is responsible for monitoring.	OK	OK
g Is the accuracy of equipment used for monitoring in accordance with the relevant guidance provided by the CDM Executive Board and are equipment controlled and calibrated in accordance with the monitoring plan?	VVM	205	The monitoring of the metering equipment are under TEIAS control as confirmed in the registered PDD. It is stated during verification site visit that no inconsistencies occurred during last monitoring period.	OK	OK
i Are monitoring results consistently reccorded as per approved frequency?	VVM	205	Records are kept at predefined intervals. SCADA systems continuously records data and monthly protocols are prepared every month.	OK	OK
ii Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan monitoring plan?	VVM	205	Procedure is “The fact that two reliable best practice meters are installed in a redundant manner keeps the uncertainty level of the only parameter for baseline calculation low. High data quality of this parameter is	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			not only in the interest of the emission reduction monitoring, but paramount for the business relation between the plant operator and the electricity buyer. " There is no deviation from the procedure and it is implemented (two meters are used).		
iii Has the verification team confirmed whether the applicability and correct implementation of any procedure that replaces direct calibration of meters, and any procedure that leads to calculation of parameters used in the ER determination ?	VVM	205	N/A.	OK	OK
5 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions					
a Is a complete set of data for the specified monitoring period is available? (If no, i.e., only partial data are available because activity levels or non-activity parameters have not been monitored in accordance with the registered monitoring plan, the DOE shall opt to either make the most conservative assumption theoretically possible in finalizing the verification report, or raise a request for deviation prior to submitting request for issuance, if appropriate).	VVM	208	For each month of the monitoring period, monthly protocols and PMUM records are available.	OK	OK
b Has information provided in the monitoring report been cross-checked with other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records, laboratory analysis?	VVM	208	Monitoring report data is checked with monthly protocols and PMUM data.	OK	OK
c Have calculations of baseline emissions, proposed	V	208	Project activity emissions and leakage are zero.	OK	OK

	CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
	CDM project activity emissions and leakage, as appropriate, been carried out in accordance with the formulae and methods described in the monitoring plan and the applied methodology document?	VM		Baseline emissions are same with emission reductions. Emission reductions are verified with monthly protocols and PMUM.		
d	Have any assumptions used in emission calculations been justified?	VVM	208	There are no assumptions used.	OK	OK
e	Have appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values been correctly applied?	VVM	208	Emission factor is 0.7086 tCO2/MWh as it is in the previously approved documents.	OK	OK

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

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
CAR-1 Please explain differences between planned and actual emission reductions.		Actual emission reduction amount is less then assumed amount in the PDD due to the delay of commissioning of two turbines. Respond1: Explanation is added to revised MR.	Review 1: Please explain the difference in the MR. The clarification request is still open. Review 2: Explanation is added to revised MR. The clarification request is closed.
CAR-2 For September 2011, please explain in the MR the difference between the monthly protocols and PMUM data.		During the month of September 2011, four turbines has started testing and transmitting electricity to the grid. While this amount is calculated by main meter, the produced electricity till time of commissioning cannot be sell to PMUM, that is why there is difference between main meter and PMUM data Respond1: There is no need to add the explanation	Review 1: Please explain the difference in the MR. The clarification request is still open. Review 2: Cross check data and difference will be explained in the VR. The clarification request is closed.

		to the monitoring report because the explanation is in regards of cross-check data which is not presented in MR.	
CL-1 Milestones are provided in MR. "Start date of construction for capacity extension" is validated with contract with subcontractor for installation of the new turbines dated 07.03.2011. Construction began on 01.04.2011. All of the 6 new turbines began to produce energy but until provisional acceptance is realized, all production is "test production". This amount of production is recorded by meters and is determined by a protocol on day of provisional acceptance. 4 of the new turbines have started selling electricity to the grid on 27.09.2011. Evidence for validation is provisional acceptance documents of TEIAS. 2 of them will begin to sell electricity to the grid on 12.01.2011. The related provisional acceptance papers will be sent to DOE. Please provide documents		The commissioning of the Turbine did not take place yet, and moreover the date is not in the monitoring period, so it can be checked during next verification	Review 1: All turbines are producing electricity by the end of 2011 but the date of commissioning of the last 2 turbines is not in the 4th monitoring period (January 2012). For the next verification period a FAR will be raised to see the provisional acceptance papers of the last two turbines. The clarification request is closed.
CL-2 Please explain in the MR if the project had any overhaul times, downtimes of equipment,		Related explanation is added under the section C.1.5 special event	Review 1: Apart from extension of the capacity

exchange of equipment.			there are no overhaul times, downtimes of equipment and exchange of equipment. The clarification request is closed.
CL-3 Special event section sentence "Related steps with the extension will be taken in the fourth verification period, as the impact of the extension will be best evaluated during this period" seems to remain from previous monitoring report. Please revise.		Explanation is revised	Review 1: Section provides correct information now. The clarification request is closed.
CL-4 Please mention in this section the change in design.		Capacity extension activity is added under section C.1.5	Review 1: Capacity increase is explained in section C.1.5. The clarification request is closed.
CL-5 Parameters used are provided in this section. They are in line with the registered PDD. References are seen as "**Error! Reference source not found.**" In the MR. Please correct.		The reference is deleted. The paper is attached as annex1. Respond 1: References are corrected.	Review 1: Problem not solved. PDF version of MR shows erroneous references. The clarification request is still open. Review 2: References are corrected in PDF version of MR. The clarification request is closed.
CL-6			

Please clarify if any new meters or transformers have been installed due to increase in capacity.		There is no new meter for installed capacity. The existing infrastructure is used to connect extended turbines to the system. Respond 1. The explanation is added to the MR under section C.1.5	Review 1: Please explain the issue in the MR. The clarification request is still open. Review 2: The explanation is added to the MR under section C.1.5 The clarification request is closed.
Regarding FAR raised in previous verifications: In year 2011, only some employees have received various trainings (certificates have been provided to DOE). Please discuss if other personnel need refreshing trainings and provide a training plan for these people.		The training that has been taken place as refreshing are added under section F.1.2 table 6. Training plan has been added to the under section F.1.2 as table 8.	Review 1: Refresher trainings are added to MR. Planned trainings for year 2012 are also provided in the MR now. The clarification request is closed.
In 3rd monitoring report, there is the following FAR: "FAR 2 – The maintenance of the road will be done by the project owner if needed. The maintenance of the road shall be monitored during next verifications through the written letter gained from the Head of Village where the road has been constructed (Ismailli (Yuntdag)." Please also mention this FAR in the MR. During 4th verification site visit it was observed by the verification team that roads are appropriate. Interviews with locals also indicate that.		The FAR is added to the Monitoring report	Review 1: FAR is included in the MR now. The clarification request is closed.

Please provide more evidences for the FAR about "lighting facilities for night birds".		One more article is provide in the MR. for more article please check the reference of the provided articles. Respond1: Please find articles as attachment of this documents.	Review 1: Please provide the reference documents instead of links. Please highlight where in the document the relevant information is. The clarification request is still open. Review 2: References regarding "negative effects of lighting facilities for night birds" are provided. The clarification request is closed.
CL-7 Please provide PMUM records for December 2011.		Please find monthly record as annex2. PMUM data is not published yet, whenever it is published we will provide to DOE . Respond1. PMUM data for December is attached	Review 1: Please provide PMUM data. The clarification request is still open. Review 2: PMUM data for December is provided. The clarification request is closed.
CL-8 In MR, please give the end date of the 4th monitoring period in the timeline.		It is added under timeline	The end date of the fourth monitoring period has been added. The clarification request is closed.

CL-9 In MR C.2.3, please state if calibration has been done during the monitoring period. It is stated that "Calibration and maintenance procedures will follow the requirements" Please state about the MP.		While the statement was quoted from PDD, there is no need to make changes in the statement. However Another statement was added mentioning that there was no calibration during fourth monitoring period under section C.1.3 of MR	No calibration has been done during the monitoring period. The statement has been added to the MR. The clarification request is closed.
CL-10 In MR- C.1.4., please state if trouble shooting occurred during the monitoring period.		Under section C.1.5 it is stated that there was no special events apart from capacity extension. It is also added under this section C.1.4 that there was no troubleshooting during fourth monitoring period.	It is stated that no trouble shooting has been occurred during the monitoring period. The clarification request is closed.
CL-11 In MR – E.5, please give the final version and date of the PDD.		It was added under section E.5	The final version of the PDD is stated as Version 4 dd. 03. May 2011 which covers the capacity addition. The clarification request is closed.
CL-12 In MR – F.1 It is stated that, Additionally, the table related with employment during construction will be taken out from the monitoring report, while it was also verified during initial verification and not subject to any changes during period verifications. However turbines have been added to the project activity and another construction has been occurred. How the parameter measured during additional construction.		The indicator related with employment during construction is added to the monitoring report, while there is construction of capacity extension. According to the monitoring of this indicator 44 people were employed during construction. 29 worker is employed by subcontractor (Pramit A.Ş) of Ersel Mühendislik for construction, 15 worker is employed by subcontractor of (Öztürk) Güngör Elektrik for electrical work	The employement during new construction and operation has been presented in the MR and the evidances has been presented to DOE. The clarification request is closed.

Also under number and type of jobs and completed trainings PDD Version 4 it is stated that The first monitoring report shall contain a section on employment by the project developer and plant operator during the construction phase and the first year of operation. With the help of the labour contracts and job descriptions, the number and types of new jobs will be presented.		(for evidence Please see; Annex 1a_Employement list from Ersel and Annext1b_e-mail confirmation, Annex2a_Emploment list from Güngör and Annex2b_e-mail confirmation).	
CL-13 In MR – Section G, FAR1- Response during MP is not defined. Please clarify.		More explanation is added to the FAR1	The response has been presented. The clarification request is closed.
CL-14 Please state MR version as 2 instead of 4.2.		Version number of Monitoring Report presents Monitoring period (fourth monitoring period) and revisions together that is why it stated as 4.2 or 4.3. On this based it was not changed.	The clarification has been presented. The clarification request is closed.
FAR-1 All turbines are producing electricity by the end of 2011 but the date of commissioning of the last 2 turbines is not in the 4th monitoring period (January 2012). In the next verification period Doe shall see the provisional acceptance papers of the last two turbines.			
FAR-2 The Pre-EIA report recommended that the lighting facility has to be provided for night birds. Some literature study retrieved the results that extra lighting attracts night birds. References are provided to DOE but as the lighting requirement is			

not realized FAR are not closed. Lighting should be checked in next verification.			