



VERIFICATION REPORT INNORES ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.S.

VERIFICATION OF THE GRID-CONNECTED ELECTRICITY GENERATION FROM RENEWABLE SOURCES: YUNTDAĞ 42,5 MW WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY

REPORT NO. TURKEY-
VER/CER.1937.10.C45/2010/2011
REVISION No. 02

BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Great Guildford House, 30 Great Guildford Street
SE1 0ES - London – United Kingdom



Date of first issue: 24/04/2011	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: Innores Elektrik Üretim A.S.	Client ref.: Mr. Emre Samsun

Summary:

Bureau Veritas Certification has made the 3rd periodic verification (01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010) of the Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdağ 42.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey, GS Registration Reference Number GS352, project of Innores Elektrik Üretim A.S. located in Yuntdag/Bergama/Izmir - Turkey, and applying the methodology ACM0002 version 06, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM methodology and Gold Standard Version 1 requirements, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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 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. The GHG emission reduction is calculated without material misstatements, and the CER issued totalize 68,737 tons of CO₂eq for the monitoring period between the dates 01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010.

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.

Report No.: TURKEY- ver/CER.1937.10.c45/2010/20 11	Subject Group: GS – Version 1
Project title: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdağ 42.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey	
Work carried out by: Burcu Mutman – Team Leader Yıldız Arıkan – Technical Specialist	
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Ashok Mammen – Internal Technical Reviewer Mustafa Işık – Sector Specialist	
Date of this revision: 06/05/2011	Rev. No.: 02
Number of pages: 25	

Indexing terms

Work approved by:

Flavio Gomes

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

☐ Limited distribution

☐ Unrestricted distribution



<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>Page</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Objective	3
1.2 Scope	3
1.3 GHG Project Description	4
1.4 Verification Team	4
2 METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 Review of Documents	5
2.2 Follow-up Interviews	5
2.3 Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	6
2.4 Internal Technical Review	7
3 VERIFICATION CONCLUSIONS	7
3.1 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document (198)	8
3.2 Compliance of the monitoring plan with the monitoring methodology (203)	8
3.3 Compliance of monitoring with the monitoring plan (206)	8
3.4 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions (209)	11
4 VERIFICATION OPINION	11
5 REFERENCES	12
6. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VERIFICATION TEAM MEMBERS	14
APPENDIX A: COMPANY CDM PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL.....	15



1 INTRODUCTION

Innores Elektrik Üretim A.S. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to verify the emissions reductions of its GS project Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdağ 42.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey (hereafter called “the project”) at Yuntdag, Bergama – Izmir/Turkey.

This report summarizes the findings of the verification of the project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC CDM Methodology and GS Version 1 criteria's, 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 CERs and verifiable and in accordance with applicable GS 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 Gold Standard Rules and Methodology requirements, and associated interpretations.

The verification is not meant to provide any consulting towards the Client. 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 project activity is a wind power plant located in Yuntdag – Bergama – Izmir /Turkey and registered as GS project on 31 July 2008. It is generating electricity and fed into the grid since 07.03.2008. The operation started with 6 turbines first and then on 04.06.2008 remaining 11 turbines commissioned.

1.4 Verification Team

The verification team consists of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	CODE HOLDER*	TASK PERFORMED
Lead Verifier	Burcu Mutman	☐ Yes ☒ No	☒ DR ☐ SV ☒ RI
Verifier	n.a.	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI
Technical Specialist	Yıldız Arıkan	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Ashok Mammen	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ DR ☐ SV ☒ RI
Specialist supporting ITR	Mustafa Işık	☒ 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 and the Gold Standard requirements. 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 Gold Standard 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) The registered PDD, including the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation report;
- (b) Previous verification reports;
- (c) The applied monitoring methodology;
- (d) Relevant decisions, clarifications and guidance from the CMP and the CDM Executive Board;
- (e) Any other information and references relevant to the project activity's resulting emission reductions (e.g. IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid or laboratory analysis and national regulations).
- (f) Gold Standard Requirements

2.2 Follow-up Interviews

Between December 2010 - April 2011 Bureau Veritas Certification performed interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Site visit is not performed for the project activity since it was the third verification of the project activity. This has been referred in the Gold Standard Manual as follows,

GSv2.1 Toolkit Pg.75 - 4.7 DOE site visit

Under the Gold Standard a site visit is mandatory one of the first two years after the start of project operation, and by default once every three years after that, unless you (the DOE) provide a convincing case for less frequent visits as part of the verification plan. During the site visit you (the DOE) have to visit the location of the project activity, which includes a visit to the installation and interviews with responsible personnel during



verification. You (the DOE) have to verify the monitoring of the sustainable development indicators, which must be submitted at each site visit. This is to better assess the impact of the project and the scoring of the Sustainable development indicators. If you are verifying a CDM or JI project the Gold Standard site visit can coincide with the CDM/JI site visit. Representatives of Innorec Elektrik Üretim A.S. were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Innorec Elektrik Üretim A.S.	➤ Management of the project activity ➤ Sustainable Development Indicators
Future Camp	➤ Emission Reduction Calculation ➤ Trainings ➤ Management of the Project Activity ➤ Sustainable Development Indicators

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 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 a Internal Technical Review (ITR) before requesting issuance of CERs for the project activity.

The ITR is an independent process performed to examine thoroughly that the process of verification has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the verification scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas 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 Gold Standard 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 such as uploading on the GS Registry..

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, 05 Clarification Requests, and 03 Forward 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 Project implementation in accordance with the registered project design document (198)

The implementation of the project is in line with the registered PDD which was verified during initial and first periodic verification. The starting date of operation is 07/03/2008 with 6 turbines and then 11 turbines has been commissioned. During this 3rd verification investment decision for the capacity addition has been decided.

The actual operation of the proposed project activity is generating electricity from the wind power and fed into the grid. Total emission reduction for the 3rd verification period which covers the dates between 01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010 is 68,737 tCO₂.

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.

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

The monitoring plan is in accordance with the approved methodology ACM0002 Version 6 applied by the proposed GS project activity.

3.3 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) Electricity Generation – The generated electricity has been verified through the monthly reading protocols which are signed by both TEIAS and the project owner. The generated electricity has been recorded by TEIAS people at the end of each month and signed by both parties. These values have been also crosschecked with the PMUM records which are the annexes of the invoices. All main documents and PMUM records have been provided for each month under the monitoring period.

(a) Local Job Creation – The project activity created jobs for the local people and this has been verified through the social insurance records and the settlement certificates. During the 3rd monitoring period local employees who were working for the project activity since the beginning did not change. Only one person quit from the job but also new employee is also local. The settlement certificate for new employee has been provided. The training records have been also provided for the locals.

Following list shows the local employees for the project activity.

Employment	Number of employee	Employment; Local or Not?
Technical Manager	1	Local
Plant Manager	1	Local
Electric Technicians:	4	3 of them is Local
Turbine Supplier Technicians (Nordex):	2	Not Local
Security Guards:	4	Local

(c) Bird Collisions – The signed letter from the head of the 3 villages (Balaban, Koyuneli, Ismaili (Yuntdag)) have been provided to DOE. It is clearly states that no bird death has been observed during the monitoring period.

There are 17 Nordex N90 turbines under project activity. However in August 2010 it is decided to upgrade the capacity of the project activity. This 3rd verification has been done for the dates 01 April to 31 December



2010. Since the capacity addition not realized under this monitoring period it shall be verified during next verification.

The calibrations of the monitoring equipments are under TEIAS responsibility. Installation of the equipments has been done on 07.03.2008 and no breakdown has been recorded since the installation.

Two FAR's were raised during the previous verification these were listed as follows,

***FAR1** - The PP should ensure that training is administered to staff as frequently as needed to ensure employee development. It is noted that a portion of staff was trained in 2008. Refresher training should be re-administered during future monitoring periods when and if needed.*

***FAR2** – In the next verification period, project activities' compliance with the new regulation on the "Assessment and Management of Environmental Noise" shall be verified by the verification DOE. As the subject regulation was published in June 2010, it does not effect the second verification period.*

Previous FAR Review Findings during 3rd Monitoring Period;

FAR1 – During third verification trainings has been provided for the plant manager only. Also these trainings were not the refresher trainings. So the forward action request is not closed and shall be reviewed during future monitoring periods.

FAR2 – Regarding to "Assessment and Management of Environmental Noise" Regulation noise measurement has been done for the project activity by Ugurlu IGM Is Guvenligi Mad. San. Tic. Ltd. Sti. dd. January 2011. Under the report it is clearly indicated that Morning and Night Measurement done in the near villages are under the regulation limits. Validation team closed FAR-2.

FAR Finding during 3rd Monitoring Period;

FAR 1 - There is no change in the project activity under this third verification period which is defined as 01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010. However the project capacity will be increased 15 MW during next verification. The extension shall be verified during next verification period of the project activity.

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)).



3.4 Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions (209)

All data's made available to DOE which were defined under monitoring plan. There were no assumptions used in the calculations. All electricity generation data's has been taken from the metering equipments and were signed by both TEIAS and Project Owner. Also emission factor has been used from the validated PDD which were 0,7086 tCO₂/Mwh.

The total emission reduction has been calculated as 68,737 tCO₂.

The reported data was cross-checked by the PMUM records which were the annexes of the invoices for the sold electricity. The values were in line with the monthly reading protocols.

Appropriate methods and formulae for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions and leakage have been followed. Additionally, the estimated annual emission reductions which were 113,964 tCO₂ 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 initial, 3rd periodic verification of the "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources: Yuntdağ 42.5 MW Wind Power Project, Turkey" Project in Turkey, which applies the methodology ACM0002 version 06. The verification was performed based on the requirements set by the GS and relevant guidance.

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 FutureCamp İklim ve Enerji Ltd. Sti 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 03 dd.28 July 2008. 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 03.1 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 ready to generate 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 01/04/2010 to 31/12/2010

Baseline emissions : 68,737 t CO₂ equivalents.

Project emissions : 0 t CO₂ equivalents.

Emission Reductions : 68,737 t CO₂ equivalents.

29/04/2011

24/04/2011

Ashok Mammen
Internal Technical Reviewer

Burcu Mutman
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/ GS-VER PDD Yuntdağ_28.07.2008
- /2/ Yuntdağ Initial and First Verification Report dd.26.11.2009
- /3/ Workbook Yuntdag 42,5MW WPP Version 1
- /4/ Workbook Yuntdag 42,5MW WPP Version 2
- /5/ Yuntdag Second Verification Report dd. 09.08.2010
- /6/ Third Monitoring Report – Yuntdağ Version 1
Third Monitoring Report – Yundağ Version 2
Third Monitoring Report – Yuntdağ Version 3

Category 2 Documents:

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /1/ Monthly Reading Protocols between the dates 01.04.2010 – 31.12.2010



- /2/ PMUM Records between the dates 01.04.2010 – 31.04.2010
- /3/ Calibration Records
- /4/ Signed Letters from Head of Koyuneli, Balaban and Ismailli (Yuntdag) Villages
- /5/ Training Records
- /6/ Loan Agreement for Capacity Extension
- /7/ Monitoring Manual
- /8/ Noise Measurement Report
- /9/ Settlement Documents
- /10/ Social Insurance List

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/ Mr. Emre Samsun – Innores Elektrik
- /2/ Mr. Fariz Tasdan – FutureCamp
- /3/ Ms. Melike Kus – FutureCamp
- /4/ Mr. Isa Alkan – Innores Elektrik
- /5/ Mr. Serif Kutsi Aygur – Head of Koyuneli Village



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

Dr. Ashok Mammen – PhD Oils and Lubricants

Bureau Veritas Certification Internal Technical Reviewer

Over 20 years of experience in chemical and petrochemical field. Dr. Mammen is a lead auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. He is also a lead verifier and tutor for GHG projects and has been involved in the validation and verification processes of more than 100 CDM/JI/VCS and other GHG projects.

Mr. Mustafa Isık

Bureau Veritas Certification Sector Specialist

Mustafa Isık is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. He has over 5 years experience in Health Safety and Environmental management system coordination in the wind farm construction projects.

Ms. Burcu Mutman

Bureau Veritas Certification, Verifier

Burcu Mutman is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. She is also lead verifier for GHG projects.

Baseline Specialist: Mrs. Yildiz Arikan - Assoc. Professor Dr

Technical Specialist

Yıldız Arikan is an Electrical engineer and is working at Bahcesehir University. She has supported thesis related with energy . Also she has been conducting research studies on energy including "CO2 Emission Research" Studies. Academically, Yıldız Arikan is working also on GHG project since 2005.

APPENDIX A: COMPANY GS PROJECT VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

APPENDIX A: COMPANY GS 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 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	Yes all the physical features of the proposed GS-VER project activity are in place.	OK	OK
b Have the project participants operated the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD?	VVM	196	Yes, the project participants operated the proposed CDM Project activity as per the registered PDD. Please provide the monitoring manual which is stated in section B.2.1.2 of the MR.	CL1	OK
c Was an on-site visit conducted?	VVM	196	No, the site visit did not conducted during this third verification which is in line with GS Requirements.	OK	OK
d If not, justify the rationale of the decision.	VVM	196	The rationale of this is as follows, GSv2.1 Toolkit Pg.75 - 4.7 DOE site visit <i>Under the Gold Standard a site visit is mandatory one of the first two years after the start of project operation, and by default once every three years after that, unless you (the DOE) provide a convincing case for less frequent visits as part of the verification plan. During the site visit you (the DOE) have to visit the location of the project activity, which includes a visit to the installation and interviews with responsible personnel during verification.</i>	OK	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<i>You (the DOE) have to verify the monitoring of the sustainable development indicators, which must be submitted at each site visit. This is to better assess the impact of the project and the scoring of the Sustainable development indicators. If you are verifying a CDM or JI project the Gold Standard site visit can coincide with the CDM/JI site visit.</i>		



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
e Does the implementation or operation of CDM project activity conform with the description contained in the registered PDD?	VVM	197	Yes, the implementation and operation of CDM project activity confirm with the registered documents.	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	n.a.	OK	OK
g Was a notification or a request for approval of changes from the project activity as described in the registered PDD submitted prior to the conclusion of the verification/certification for the corresponding?	VVM	197	There is no change in the project activity under this third verification period which is defined as 01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010. However the project capacity will be increased 15 MW during next verification. The extension shall be verified during forth verification of the project activity. Please provide the objective evidence for the second phase decision date as stated in section B.1.4 of the MR.	FAR1 CL3	FAR1 OK
2 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	Yes, the monitoring plan 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	VVM	202	N.A.	OK	OK


**BUREAU
VERITAS**

VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
methodologies (e.g. additional monitoring parameters, monitoring frequency and calibration frequency)?					
3 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 applied properly. However please provide the training follow-up sheet regarding to the FAR 1 raised during previous verification. Please provide the noise measurement report regarding to the FAR2 raised during previous verification. Please provide the employee list and the settlement document for local people. It is stated that 1 new person hired under third verification period. Please provide trainin records and SGK record for the new employee. Please clarify the table B.1.1.1.	CL2	OK
b 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			
i Project emission parameters?	VVM	205	Project does not have any project emissions.	OK	OK
ii Baseline emission parameters?	VVM	205	The baseline emissions has been calculated through the metering reading records and the values used for the emission reduction calculation is in line with the reference document. Emission factor is also in line with the registered PDD (0,7086 tco2/mwh).	CAR1	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			An only December record is missing for the baseline emission calculation. Please provide. For the cross check PMUM records has been used. PMUM values are in line for the supplied values however they are not in line for the consumption values. Please provide the PMUM records which only cover the Innorees – Yunttag WPP data's. Also Please provide the PMUM records for November and December 2010.		



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
iii Leakage parameters?	VVM	205	There is no leakage in the project activity.	OK	OK
iv 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	Roles and responsibilities defined in section B.2.1.1. of the MR and it is mentioned that Mr. Isa Alkan is responsible for the monitoring. Also in the metering reading protocols Mr. Isa Alkan signature is seen. However in June records the document signed by Nurullah Celik. Please also define deputy for the monitoring issues.	CAR2	OK
c 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 equipments are under TEIAS control as confirmed in the registered PDD. It is stated that no trouble has been occurred in this verification period.	OK	OK
i Are monitoring results consistently recorded as per approved frequency?	VVM	205	Yes, monitoring results recorded monthly as it is defined in the registered PDD.	OK	OK
ii Have quality assurance and quality control procedures been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan monitoring plan?	VVM	205	Yes, QA/QC has been applied in accordance with the monitoring plan.	OK	OK
4 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	December data is missing for meter reading protocols and November and December records are missing from the PMUM which will be used for cross check. Please refer to CAR1.	CAR1	OK



VERIFICATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
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	Yes, signed protocols are cross checked with the PMUM records which are the main documents for the invoice.	OK	OK
c Have calculations of baseline emissions, proposed 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?	VVM	208	Yes, the calculations are in line with the applied monitoring plan and the methodology.	OK	OK
d Have any assumptions used in emission calculations been justified?	VVM	208	No assumptions have been used.	OK	OK
e Have appropriate emission factors, IPCC default values and other reference values been correctly applied?	VVM	208	Emission factor used for the calculation was the same with the registered PDD.	OK	OK

VERIFICATION REPORT

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

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
CL1 Yes, the project participants operated the proposed CDM Project activity as per the registered PDD. Please provide the monitoring manual which is stated in section B.2.1.2 of the MR.	Table1 – 1.b	Monitoring manual is attached as annex 1.	The monitoring manual has been provided to DOE. It is used to guarantee maximum understanding for project owner. <u>The clarification request is closed.</u>
FAR1 There is no change in the project activity under this third verification period which is defined as 01/04/2010 – 31/12/2010. However the project capacity will be increased 15 MW during next verification. The extension shall be verified during forth verification of the project activity.	Table1 – 1.g		
CL3 Please provide the objective evidence for the second phase decision date as stated in section B.1.4 of the MR.	Table1 – 1.g	The document as supporting evidence for decision of capacity increase is attached as annex 2a and 2b.	Investment Decision for the capacity addition has been demonstrated through the loan agreement dd. 31 August 2010. The document has been provided to DOE. <u>The clarification request is closed.</u>
CL2 Yes, the monitoring plan applied properly. However please provide the training follow-up sheet regarding to the FAR 1 raised during	Table1 – 3.a	Regarding FAR 1, there were three more training during third verification period which is listed in monitoring report. The	Trainings have been provided during 3 rd verification period. FAR1 - <i>During third verification trainings has been provided for the</i>



VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
previous verification. Please provide the noise measurement report regarding to the FAR2 raised during previous verification. Please provide the employee list and the settlement document for local people. It is stated that 1 new person hired under third verification period. Please provide trainin records and SGK record for the new employee. Please clarify the table B.1.1.1.		document of training which could not be submitted to DOE before is presented in Annex 3. Regarding FAR3, please find noise measurement report attached as annex 4. Employee list is attached as annex 5. SGK record for new employee is attached as annex 6. There is not yet training for the employee. Table B 1.1.1 is revised accordingly.	<i>plant manager only. Also these trainings were not the refresher trainings. So the forward action request is <u>not closed</u> and shall be reviewed during future monitoring periods.</i> FAR2 - Noise: Noise measurements dd.29.01.2011 and 05.02.2011 has been demonstrated in the noise measurement report. Regarding to the report prepared by Ugurlu IGM (3rd Party) the noise level is not pass the regulatory levels. <u>FAR 2 has been closed.</u> Employee List: Employee List has been provided to the DOE. Settlement Document for new local Employees are provided. SGK Record for new employee (Alaaddin Kanat) has been provided. Table for the measurement equipments has been updated. <u>The clarification request is closed.</u>
CAR1 The baseline emissions have been calculated through the metering reading records and the	Table1 – 3.b.ii	December Monthly meter reading record and PMUM data is attached as Annex 7 and Annex 8	December 2010 monthly reading and PMUM protocol has been provided to DOE for the baseline calculation and



VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
values used for the emission reduction calculation is in line with the reference document. Emission factor is also in line with the registered PDD (0, 7086 tco2/mwh). Only December record is missing for the baseline emission calculation. Please provide. For the cross check PMUM records has been used. PMUM values are in line for the supplied values however they are not in line for the consumption values. Please provide the PMUM records which only cover the Innorees – Yunttag WPP data's. Also Please provide the PMUM records for November and December 2010.		PMUM data which gives only values of Innorees is attached as annex 9.	cross check. PMUM records for Yunttag have been provided and it is concluded that they are in line with the monthly protocols. Total emission reduction has been calculated as 68,737 tCO2/mwh. <u>The corrective action request is closed.</u>
CAR2 Roles and responsibilities defined in section B.2.1.1. of the MR and it is mentioned that Mr. Isa Alkan is responsible for the monitoring. Also in the metering reading protocols Mr. Isa Alkan signature is seen. However in June records the document signed by Nurullah Celik. Please also define deputy for the monitoring issues.	Table1- 3.b.iv	In the absence of Plant manager, there could be other responsible staff to sign the protocols. It is defined in monitoring manual accordingly. Monitoring report is also revised accordingly in page 7.	Deputy has been defined for the monitoring. <u>The corrective action request is closed.</u>
CL4 “(c)Bird Collisions – The signed letter from the		The statements of muhtars on bird collusion are provided as	The signed letters from Balaban, Koyuneli and Ismaili (Yunttag)



VERIFICATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by verification team	Reference to checklist question in Periodic Verification Checklist	Summary of project owner response	Verification team conclusion
head of the village has been provided to DOE. It is clearly states that no bird death has been observed during the monitoring period.” PDD page 29 states “As no continuous observation is practicable, the Muhtars (mayors) of the three nearby villages, Balaban, Yunttag and Koyuneli, shall be asked for a statement regarding bird kills at the end of a monitoring period.’ Reference section states only “Signed Letter from Head of Koyuneli Village” Please provide the statement 3 nearby village heads.		annex1a,1b,1c.	heads have been provided. <u>The clarification request is closed.</u>
CL5 Please clarify if the project owner does the maintenance of the road constructed in 2008.		The road constructed in 2008 is continuously used by villagers and project developer, and project developer provides maintenance when there is a need.	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 (Yunttag)).