International Carbon Registry

Ovid Wind Farm Project

Validation Report

Summary

"Ovid Wind Farm Project" is operated by "Ovid Wind LLC". The project activity is located in Ovidiopol district, approximately 30 km southwest of the city of Odesa, in Ukraine. The purpose of the project is to provide renewable electricity to the Ukraine grid through wind energy. According to the "commissioning acceptance" document, the start date of the operation of the project is 01/05/2019. 9 wind turbines are available at the project site with the installed capacity of 3.63 MWe each. Therefore, the total installed capacity of the project activity is 32.67 MWe. Based on real electricity generation data, the average value of the electricity generation is calculated as 115,428.17 MWh/year. Also, the estimated emission reduction of the project is calculated as 74,239 tCO_2e/year.

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.

Title of Project	Ovid Wind Farm Project
ID of Project	112
Date of Project Design Document	26/07/2023
Version of Project Design Document	1.3
Statement by the Project Proponent	The Project Proponent states that he is responsible for preparing and fair presentation of the Project Design Description and all accompanying documentation provided for under the validation.

Title of Report	Ovid Wind Farm Project Validation Report
ID of Report	1100
Client	Ovid Wind LLC
Date of Validation	06/09/2023
Version Number of the Report	03
Date of Version	06/09/2023
Prepared by	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti.
Contact	Mr. Christian JOHANNES - General Manager, physical address: Prof. Dr. Aziz Sancar Caddesi 27/6 - TR / 06690, Çankaya-/ Ankara, Tel.: +90-312-287 51 22, email: info@re-carbon.net, website: www.re-carbon.net
Independent review	Mr. Rohit BADAYA
Validation Team Leader	Ms. Öykü YAKUPOĞLU
Validation Statement	Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. states that Re Carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. is responsible for the opinion based on the validation of the project. It is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Ovid Wind Farm Project" in Ukraine, as described in the PDD, version 1.3 dated 26/07/2023, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM, ICR and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodologies "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 21.0. Hence, Re Carbon Ltd. requests the registration of the proposed project activity as an ICR project activity.
Signature	Esin TUNALI (CM)  Rohit Badaya (ITR) 

Contents

1. Summary

"Ovid Wind Farm Project" is operated by "Ovid Wind LLC". The project activity is located in Ovidiopol district, approximately 30 km southwest of the city of Odesa, in Ukraine. The purpose of the project is to provide renewable electricity to the Ukraine grid through wind energy. According to the "commissioning acceptance" document, the start date of the operation of the project is 01/05/2019. 9 wind turbines are available at the project site with the installed capacity of 3.63 MWe each. Therefore, the total installed capacity of the project activity is 32.67 MWe. The commissioning dates of the wind turbines are as follows:

Turbine	Commissioning Completion Date	Reliability Completion Date
WTG 1 -36170270	25/01/2019	31/01/2019
WTG 2 -36170272	30/01/2019	07/02/2019
WTG 3 - 36170274	04/02/2019	11/02/2019
WTG 4 36170276	02/03/2019	11/03/2019
WTG 5 36170271	28/01/2019	04/02/2019
WTG 6 36170273	30/01/2019	07/02/2019
WTG 8 36170275	07/02/2019	18/02/2019
WTG 9 36170277	20/02/2019	26/02/2019
WTG 10 36170278	11/03/2019	01/04/2019

The commissioning dates of the wind turbines have been confirmed via the provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines.

The technical features of the wind turbines are as follows:

Brand	General Electric
Type	GE 3.6-137
Number of Blades	3
Swept Area	14,741 m^2
Rotor Diameter	137 m
Electric Output of Each Turbine	3.63 MWe
Maximum Speed of the Blade Tips	82.0 m/s

The technical features of the wind turbines have been confirmed via the technical document of General Electric (GE).

The coordinates of the wind turbines are as follows:

Turbine	Latitude	Longitude
WTG 1 -36170270	46.229719°	30.469704°
WTG 2 -36170272	46.227898°	30.487732°
WTG 3 - 36170274	46.227564°	30.494686°
WTG 4 36170276	46.226220°	30.508451°
WTG 5 36170271	46.223332°	30.474743°
WTG 6 36170273	46.222520°	30.483135°
WTG 8 36170275	46.221036°	30.499335°
WTG 9 36170277	46.220521°	30.505735°
WTG 10 36170278	46.219988°	30.512614°

The wind turbines' coordinates have been confirmed via the reference link https://kadastr.live/#12.61/46.2206/30.48321.

Based on real electricity generation data, the average value of the electricity generation is calculated as 115,428.17 MWh/year. Also, the estimated emission reduction of the project is calculated as 74,239 tCO_2e/year.

The chosen crediting period is from 01/05/2019 to 30/04/2029. The total estimated emission reduction value for the crediting period is 742,390 tCO_2e.

The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant/unit and all power plants/units connected physically to the Ukraine grid system that the project power plant is connected to as per the applied methodology ACM0002, version 21.0. As per this statement the project boundary includes:

- The project activity (Ovid Wind Farm Project)
- Substation that connects the Ovid WFP to the Ukraine grid system
- Ukraine grid system

In the absence of the project activity, the same amount of electricity generated by the Ovid Wind Farm Project would have otherwise been generated by the operation of Ukraine grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources into the grid (Ukraine grid system is dominated by nuclear and thermal power plants).

2. General

2.1 Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. was appointed by "Ovid Wind LLC" to perform the validation of the "Ovid Wind Farm Project" in "Ukraine" through a service agreement, dated 04/05/2023. The objective of this validation activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the project design, and to ensure a thorough assessment of the proposed project activity against the applicable ICR and CDM requirements. In particular;

- the project's baseline was assessed against "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 21.0.
- the project's monitoring plan was assessed against "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", version 21.0.
- the project's additionality justification was assessed against "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 07.0.0.
- the project's compliance with the requirements of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures, as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes to this decision, subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other relevant rules, including the Host Country's legislation and sustainability criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0
- CDM Project Standard for Project Activities version 3.0
- ICR Standard Version 4.0

Validation is a requirement for all ICR projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of GHG emission mitigation.

2.2 Criteria

The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see section 2.1).

2.3 Scope

The scope of the validation is the independent and objective review of the ICR Project Design Description (PDD). The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see section 2.1) and decisions by the ICR Organization, including the approved baseline and monitoring methodology. The validation was based on the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0, and ICR Standard Version 4.0.

The validation team has employed a risk-based approach to assess the completeness and accuracy of the claims and conservativeness of the assumptions in the PDD. The focus of the validation team is to identify significant risks for the project implementation and the generation of GHG emission mitigation. The validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may have provided input for improvement of the project design.

The only purpose of the validation is its usage during the registration process as part of the ICR project cycle. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion that go beyond that purpose.

2.4 Materiality Thresholds

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

2.5 Validation Team

Full Name	Role or Responsibility	Technical Expertise (TA 1.2)	Type of activity performed
Öykü Yakupoğlu	Team Leader	Yes	A, DR, RA, R
Selen Cilasun	Validator	Yes	A, DR, RA, R
Zoia Pavlenko	Regional Expert	X	DR, RA, R
Rohit Badaya	ITR	Yes	ITR

* Explanations for the abbreviations used for involvement types are as follows:

A: Administrative

DR: Desk Review

SV: Site Visit

RA: Remote Assessment

R: Reporting

ITR: Independent Technical Review

2.5.1 Validation Team and ITR Competence

Mr. Rohit BADAYA holds a Master's degree in "Nanotechnology" and a Bachelor's degree in "Pulp and Paper Engineering" from the Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee (IIT Roorkee). He is also an Energy Auditor, certified by the Bureau of Energy Efficiency, Ministry of Power, Govt. of India. Rohit has more than 14 years of work experience in the area of Climate Change (CDM, GS, VCS, GCC) and has worked for various DOEs/VVBs in the capacity of Team Leader, Validator/Verifier, Technical Expert, ITR, Manager (Technical & Certification) and Quality Manager. During his previous work experience, Rohit has worked as a Technical Expert for Technical Areas TA 1.1 (Thermal energy generation from fossil fuels and biomass including thermal electricity from solar), TA 1.2 (Energy generation from renewable energy sources), TA 2.1 (Energy Distribution), TA 3.1 (Energy Demand), TA 13.1 (Waste Handling and Disposal) and TA 13.2 (Manure). Within the context of CDM/GS/VCS/GCC, Rohit has a record of accomplishment of more than 200 projects as Team Leader, Validator, Verifier, Technical Expert and Technical Reviewer. He is well versed with various local regulations related to CDM/GS/VCS/ GCC projects, located in countries in Asia, Africa, Middle East, Asia Pasific as well as in Turkey. With re-carbon, Rohit is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and a TA 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 13.1, 13.2 expert. Rohit is also a Regional Expert for Bhutan, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, The Gambia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Republic of Madagascar, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Vietnam and Zambia.

Ms. Selen CİLASUN holds a B.Sc. and a M.Sc. Degree in "Bioengineering". With re-carbon, Selen is an internal Validator/Verifier, a TA 1.2 expert and a Regional Expert for Türkiye.

Ms. Zoia PAVLENKO holds a M. Sc. Degree in Environmental Engineering with Nottingham University. She has over 10-year experience in mainstreaming environmental issues into economic activities. This includes environmental impact assessment projects in the metallurgy, energy, and agricultural sectors. Within the international technical assistance

projects, Zoia has been integrating environmental considerations into the operations of small and medium enterprises, facilitated the spread of resource efficiency measures in industry and organic farming practices. Zoia was engaged in the EU environmental policy analysis and public dialogues on its transposition into the Ukrainian sectoral legislation. With re-carbon, Zoia is a free-lance Regional Expert for the Ukraine.

Ms. Öykü YAKUPOĞLU holds a B.Sc. degree in "Environmental Engineering" from Middle East Technical University/Ankara and currently undergoes a M.Sc. program in "Chemistry". She is experienced in ISO 14001: 2015 - Environment Management System, ISO 50001: 2018- Energy Management System, ISO 45001: 2018 - Occupational Health and Safety, Management System, ISO 9001: 2015 - Quality Management System Internal Auditor, ISO 14001: 2015 - Environment Management System Internal Auditor and an ISO 50001: 2018-Energy Management System Internal Auditor. With re-carbon, Öykü is an internal Team Leader (TA 1.2, 13.1 and 13.2), a Regional Expert for Türkiye (TA 1.2, 13.1 and 13.2) and a trainee validator/verifier for TA 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 15.1.

2.5.2 Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **08.03.2023** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Rohit Badaya

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
	TA 1.2: Renewables	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
	TA 13.2: Manure	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
	TA 1.2: Renewables	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02/02/2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
	TA 13.2: Manure	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Bhutan, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, The Gambia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Republic of Madagascar, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Türkiye, Uganda, Vietnam and Zambia

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **27.02.2023** by:

RE CARBON GÖZETİM ve DENETİM HİZMETLERİ GENERAL LİMİTED ŞİRKETİ

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. Selen Cilasun

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

Gold Standard
Climate Security & Sustainable Development

Verified Carbon Standard
A VERRA STANDARD

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables					15.10.2022	10.01.2023	10.01.2023			15.10.2022	27.02.2023	27.02.2023			15.10.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

GCC

ICR International Carbon Registry

BioCarbon Registry

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables	27.02.2023	27.02.2023			15.10.2022	27.02.2023	27.02.2023			15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye (14.10.2022)

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **01.09.2022** by:

RE CARBON GESELLSCHAFT MIT BESCHRÄNKTER HAFTUNG

_____
Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. Zoia Pavlenko

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

Gold Standard
Climate Security & Sustainable Development

Verified Carbon Standard
A VERRA STANDARD

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables															
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

GCC

ICR International Carbon Registry

BioCarbon Registry

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables															
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Ukraine (for all schemes listed above in this certificate)

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

Within the scope and in strict accordance to the appointments indicated below, the bearer may:

- Participate in assessments conducted by re-carbon Ltd.
- Take the appointed positions within and outside of an assessment team
- Bring specific expertise to assessments

This Certificate of Appointment is valid unless there are changes in the related requirements for the qualification and appointment and/or the personnel's work agreement is terminated. There is no defined validity period for this Certificate. However, The Certificate may be updated, suspended or cancelled at any time, as a result of performance assessments and/or other reasons as defined above.

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **20.02.2023** by:

RE CARBON GÖZETİM DENETİM LİMİTED ŞİRKETİ

_____
Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. Öykü Yakupoğlu

as a confirmation of compliance with re-carbon's internal qualification requirements for the following positions:

Gold Standard
Climate Security & Sustainable Development

Verified Carbon Standard
A VERRA STANDARD

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables					30.05.2022	30.05.2022	30.05.2022	21.12.2022		30.05.2022	30.05.2022	30.05.2022	21.12.2022		30.05.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater					20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023
	TA 13.2: Manure					20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

GCC

ICR International Carbon Registry

BioCarbon Registry

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables	30.05.2022	30.05.2022	21.12.2022		30.05.2022	30.05.2022	30.05.2022	21.12.2022		30.05.2022	30.05.2022	30.05.2022	21.12.2022		30.05.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023
	TA 13.2: Manure	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023	20.02.2023		20.02.2023
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye (27.05.2022)

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

2.6 Validation Activities and Techniques

Provide information on evidence-gathering activities and techniques in the validation

Observation	☒
Inquiry	☐
Analytical testing	☐
Confirmation	☒
Recalculation	☒
Examination	☒
Retracing	☐
Tracing	☐
Control testing	☐
Sampling	☐
Estimate testing	☒
Cross-checking	☒
Reconciliation	☐

2.7 Documented Information

Confirm what documented information/records are maintained by the VVB considering 5.4.4 in ISO 14064-3, justify if some are missing

Engagement terms	☒
Validation plan	☒
Evidence-gathering plan	☒
Who performed the evidence-gathering activities and when they were performed	☒
Collected evidence	☒
Requests for clarification, material misstatements, and nonconformities arising from the validation and the conclusions reached	☒
Communication with the responsible party on material misstatements	☒
The conclusions reached and opinions by the validator	☒
The name of the independent reviewer, the date of review and comments of the reviewer	☒

3. Project

3.1 Description of the Project

"Ovid Wind Farm Project" is operated by "Ovid Wind LLC". The project activity is located in Ovidiopol district, approximately 30 km southwest of the city of Odesa, in Ukraine. The purpose of the project is to provide renewable electricity to the Ukraine grid through wind energy. According to the "commissioning acceptance" document, the start date of the operation of the project is 01/05/2019. 9 wind turbines are available at the project site with the installed capacity of 3.63 MWe each. Therefore, the total installed capacity of the project activity is 32.67 MWe. The commissioning dates of the wind turbines are as follows:

Turbine	Commissioning Completion Date	Reliability Completion Date
WTG 1 -36170270	25/01/2019	31/01/2019
WTG 2 -36170272	30/01/2019	07/02/2019
WTG 3 - 36170274	04/02/2019	11/02/2019
WTG 4 36170276	02/03/2019	11/03/2019
WTG 5 36170271	28/01/2019	04/02/2019
WTG 6 36170273	30/01/2019	07/02/2019
WTG 8 36170275	07/02/2019	18/02/2019
WTG 9 36170277	20/02/2019	26/02/2019
WTG 10 36170278	11/03/2019	01/04/2019

The commissioning dates of the wind turbines have been confirmed via the provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines.

The technical features of the wind turbines are as follows:

Brand	General Electric
Type	GE 3.6-137
Number of Blades	3
Swept Area	14,741 m^2
Rotor Diameter	137 m
Electric Output of Each Turbine	3.63 MWe
Maximum Speed of the Blade Tips	82.0 m/s

The technical features of the wind turbines have been confirmed via the technical document of General Electric (GE).

The coordinates of the wind turbines are as follows:

Turbine	Latitude	Longitude
WTG 1 -36170270	46.229719°	30.469704°
WTG 2 -36170272	46.227898°	30.487732°
WTG 3 - 36170274	46.227564°	30.494686°
WTG 4 36170276	46.226220°	30.508451°
WTG 5 36170271	46.223332°	30.474743°
WTG 6 36170273	46.222520°	30.483135°
WTG 8 36170275	46.221036°	30.499335°
WTG 9 36170277	46.220521°	30.505735°
WTG 10 36170278	46.219988°	30.512614°

The wind turbines' coordinates have been confirmed via the reference link https://kadastr.live/#12.61/46.2206/30.48321.

Based on real electricity generation data (the electricity data sheet has been provided to the VVB), the average value of the electricity generation is calculated as 115,428.17 MWh/year. Also, the estimated emission reduction of the project is calculated as 74,239 tCO_2e/year.

The chosen crediting period is from 01/05/2019 to 30/04/2029. The total estimated emission reduction value for the crediting period is 742,390 tCO_2e.

The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant/unit and all power plants/units connected physically to the Ukraine grid system that the project power plant is connected to as per the applied methodology ACM0002, version 21.0. As per this statement the project boundary includes:

- The project activity (Ovid Wind Farm Project)
- Substation that connects the Ovid WFP to the Ukraine grid system
- Ukraine grid system

In the absence of the project activity, the same amount of electricity generated by the Ovid Wind Farm Project would have otherwise been generated by the operation of Ukraine grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources into the grid (Ukraine grid system is dominated by nuclear and thermal power plants).

3.2 Description of the Baseline Scenario

In line with ACM0002, version 21.0, if the project activity is the installation of a greenfield power plant, the baseline scenario is electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM) calculations described in the "Tool 07: Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system".

As the methodology directly states the baseline scenario, there is no need to carry out other analyses.

The project supplies electricity generated from wind turbines to the national grid. Thus, the PDD correctly identifies baseline scenario comprised of electricity generation from grid-connected power plants in Turkey. The Combined Margin Emission Factor has been taken from the UNFCCC CDM IFI grid factors excel sheet[1] as "0.643167971743973 tCO_2/MWh".

Based on the validation team's local and sectoral knowledge, remote audit observations and by cross-checking the information with similar relevant projects, it is confirmed that the selected baseline scenario is the prevailing practice in the host country and in line with the host country regulations.

All the assumptions and data used by the PPs are listed in the PDD, including references and sources, all the references and documents used are relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted in the PDD, all relevant national and sectoral policies/regulations considered are listed in the PDD and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represented what would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity.

3.3 Projected Emissions Mitigations

Year	Baseline scenario (tCO_2e)	Estimated project mitigations (tCO_2e)	Estimated leakage (tCO_2e)	Estimated net GHG emission mitigations (tCO_2e)
2019 (01/05/2019 – 31/12/2019)	49,832	0	0	49,832
2020	74,239	0	0	74,239
2021	74,239	0	0	74,239
2022	74,239	0	0	74,239
2023	74,239	0	0	74,239
2024	74,239	0	0	74,239
2025	74,239	0	0	74,239
2026	74,239	0	0	74,239
2027	74,239	0	0	74,239

[1] IFI Default Grid Factors April 2022 v3.2., Harmonized IFI Default Grid Factors 2021 v3.2 | UNFCCC

2028	74,239	0	0	74,239
2029 (01/01/2029 – 30/04/2029)	24,407	0	0	24,407
Annual average	**74,239**	**0**	**0**	**74,239**

4. Validation Activities

4.1 Validation planning

Task	Performed (Y/N)
Strategic analysis	☒
Materiality thresholds	☒
Test estimates	☐
Assessment of GHG-related activity characteristics	☒
Validation plan	☒
Evidence-gathering plan	☒

4.2 Validation plan

Desk Review	08/05/2023 – 28/07/2023
Remote Site Visit	09/05/2023
The issuance of the 1st Draft Validation Protocol	09/07/2023
The issuance of the 2nd Draft Validation Protocol	14/07/2023
Closing all CARs and CLs	20/07/2023
The issuance of the 1st Validation Report	21/07/2023
ITR Process	21/07/2023 – 25/07/2023
The issuance of the 2nd Validation Protocol	28/07/2023
ITR Approval	31/07/2023

4.3 Evidence Gathering Plan

The list of the documents which were reviewed during the validation period is given in Appendix I. It is stated in this validation report (in the relevant sections) which documents are used to confirm for which information.

4.4 Activities and Techniques

The processes of the validation activity are desk review, remote site visit, follow-up interviews, resolution of outstanding issues, technical review and issuance of final opinion on the project activity.

4.5 Review of Documented Information

The list of the documents which were reviewed during the validation period is given in Appendix I. It is stated in this validation report (in the relevant sections) which documents are used to confirm for which information.

4.6 Interviews

ID	Last name	First name	Role	Date	Subject	Team member
1	Marlynink	Yevhem	Electrical Engineer – Ovid LLC	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)
2	Kuznetso	Aratolay	Electrical Engineer – Ovid LLC	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader)

						Selen Cilasun (Validator)
3	Kolyhozokleh	Sezhin	Technician – Ovid LLC	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)
4	Dağeri	Ergin	Civil Engineer – Güriş	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)
5	Yamatürk	Egemen	Manager of Ovid Wind – Ovid LLC	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)
6	Yılmaz	İlhan	Director – Güriş	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)
7	İncigül	Erdoğan	Consultant – Kilittaşı Mühendislik	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)
8	Ersöz	Erdoğan	Consultant – Kilittaşı Mühendislik	09/05/2023		Öykü Yakupoğlu (Team Leader) Selen Cilasun (Validator)

4.7 Inspection

The project is fully implemented according to the description presented in the PDD and 9 wind turbines were operational during the remote visit. The validation team confirms through the remote site visit inspection and provided evidences that all physical features of the project activity including data collecting systems and storage have been implemented in accordance with the PDD. Electricity meters were also seen during the remote visit. The project activity is completely operational and the same has been confirmed through remote site visit.
Each wind turbine has an installed capacity of 3.63 MWe (32.67 MWe in total). This information has been confirmed via the provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines. The technical specifications of the wind turbines are confirmed by looking at the technical document of the wind turbines.

4.8 Conformity

Criteria	Assessed	No. non-conformities	Resolved
1. Project Description			
1.1 Purpose, Objectives and General Description of the Project	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-1, CAR-2, CAR-3, CAR-4, CAR-20	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.2 Project Type and Sectoral Scope	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-5, CAR-6	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.3 Location	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-7	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A

1.4 Conditions Prior to Initiation	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.5 Technology Applied	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-8	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.6 Aggregated GHG Emission Mitigations	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.7 Roles and Responsibilities	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.7.1 Project Proponent(s)	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.7.2 Others Involved in the Project	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.8 Chronological Plan / Implementation	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-9	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.9 Eligibility	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-10	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.10 Funding	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.11 Ownership	☒ Y ☐ N	CL-1	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.12 Other Certifications	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.13 Participation under Other GHG Programs	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.14 Other Benefits	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	CAR-11	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.15 Host Country Attestation	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.16 Eligibility criteria for Grouped Project	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
1.17 Additional Information	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
2. Crediting			
2.1 Project Start Date	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-12	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
2.2 Expected Operational Lifetime or Termination Date	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-13	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
2.3 Crediting Period	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
3. Safeguards			
3.1 Statutory Requirements	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
3.2 Potential Negative Environmental and Socio-Economic Impacts	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-14	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
3.3 Consultation with Interested Parties and Communications	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
3.4 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
3.5 Risk assessment	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
3.6 Additional Information on Risk Management	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
4. Methodology			
4.1 Reference to the Applied Methodology	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	CL-2	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
4.2 Applicability of Methodology	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
4.3 Deviation from Methodology	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
4.4 Other Information Relating to Methodology Application	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5. Additionality	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.1 Level 1 - ISO 14064-2 GHG Emissions Additionality	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.2 Level 2a – Statutory Additionality	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.3 Level 2b – Non-enforcement additionality	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.4 Level 3 – Technology, Institutional, Common Practice Additionality	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.5 Level 4a – Financial Additionality I	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.6 Level 4b – Financial Additionality II	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
5.7 Level 5 – Policy Additionality	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
6. Baseline Scenario	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
7. Project Boundary	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-15	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A

8. Quantification of GHG emission mitigations	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
8.1 Criteria and Procedures for Quantification	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
8.1.1 Baseline emissions	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-16	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
8.1.2 Project emissions	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
8.1.3 Leakage	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
8.2 Quantification of Net-GHG Emissions and/or Removals	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-17	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
8.3 Risk Assessment for Permanence	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
9. Management of data quality	☒ Y ☐ N	None	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
10. Monitoring			
10.1 Monitoring Plan	☒ Y ☐ N	CL-3, CL-4	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
10.2 Data and Parameters Remaining Constant	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-18	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A
10.3 Data and Parameters Monitored	☒ Y ☐ N	CAR-19	☒ Y ☐ N ☐ N/A

5. Validation Findings

5.1 Project Description

5.1.1 Purpose, Objectives and General Description of the Project

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	CAR-1, CAR-2, CAR-3, CAR-4 and CAR-20 were raised during the validation process, which were successfully closed.
Conclusion	The purpose of the project is to provide renewable electricity to the Ukraine grid through wind energy. The project activity is operated by "Ovid Wind LLC Company" as per the provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines. Also, again, as per the provisional acceptance protocols and remote site observations, there are 9 wind turbines with the installed capacity of 3.63 MWe each. The location of the project has been confirmed via "Construction Complete" Document of the project activity. Moreover, the KMZ file of the project has been provided to the VVB. To calculate the average electricity generation of the project, the real data have been provided for the years 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023. The IFI Default Grid Factor has been used for the combined margin emission factor. The commissioning date of the project activity is 08/04/2019 as per ASCOE commissioning protocol. However project officially started to supply the Ukraine grid system on 01/05/2019, and received payment. This date has been confirmed via the "Operating on the basis of a License for the Right to carry out business activities in the wholesale supply of Electric Energy" evidence document. Moreover, the necessary documents for the project activity (e.g. generation license, permission letters and so on) have been provided to the VVB. The details of these documents are available in Appendix I of this report. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the general description of the project activity has been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.2 Project Type and Sectoral Scope

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-5 and CAR-6 were raised during the validation process, which were successfully closed.
Conclusion	As per the provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines, the total installed capacity of the project activity is 32.67 MWe. Therefore, the project activity is a large-scale project activity. The KMZ file has been reviewed for before 2019 and there was no construction in the project area before the implementation. Therefore, the project activity is a greenfield. Since wind energy is utilized to generate clean electricity, the project type is "Type-1 Renewable Energy Projects". Also, the project is under "Sectoral Scope 1: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)". In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the project type and sectoral scope of the project activity have been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.3 Location

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews

Findings	CAR-7 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The location of the project has been confirmed via "Construction Complete" Document of the project activity. Moreover, the KMZ file of the project has been provided to the VVB. The coordinates of the wind turbines has been confirmed via https://kadastr.live/#12.61/46.2206/30.48321. Moreover, during the remote site visit, the wind turbines have been showed by the employees. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the location of the project activity has been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.4 Conditions Prior to Initiation

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The KMZ file has been reviewed for before 2019 and there was no construction in the project area before the implementation. Therefore, the project activity is a greenfield. Also, during the remote site visit, it was showed that the project area is an agricultural area and before the implementation of the project, the area was used for agricultural purposes. Even after the implementation, the area can still be used for agricultural purposes. It was learned by the mukhtar and the employees during the remote site visit. Before the implementation of the project activity, the amount of renewable electricity generated by the project activity was utilized from the carbon intensive Ukraine national grid system, which is dominated by nuclear and fossil fuel based power plants. These energy sources have been confirmed via the relevant evidence document[2]. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the conditions prior to initiation of the project activity have been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.5 Technology Applied

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	CAR-8 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The number of the wind turbines, their brands and the installed capacities of them have been confirmed via the generation license of the project activity. The brand of the turbines is GE (General Electric). GE with the type of "GE 3.6-137" technical document has been provided to the VVB. There are two electricity meters at the project site and there are also two electricity meters at the substation. The substation where the project electricity is supplied to the national grid is operated by the Oblenergo company. Oblenergo is a private entity, acting as the electricity distribution system operator. The records of the electricity meters in the substation will be used as an official source for the electricity generation of the project activity. The records of the electricity meters at the project site will be used as a cross-checked method of the electricity generation. The technical details of the electricity meters have been confirmed via ASCOE document, signed by the Ovid Wind LLC and LG Smart Energy. Moreover, according to Tool 10, the technical lifetime of this wind power plant is 25 years. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the technology applied of the project activity has been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

[2] https://www.ukrenergoexport.com/en/node/49

5.1.6 Aggregated GHG Emission Mitigations

Means of Project Validation	Desk Review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Based on real electricity generation data, the average value of the electricity generation is calculated as 115,428.17 MWh/year. Also, the estimated emission reduction of the project is calculated as 74,239 tCO_2e/year with using IFI Default Grid Factor (April 2022, v3.2) as 0.64316797174397 tCO_2/MWh: $BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid,CM,y}$ BE_y= (115,428.17 MWh/year) x (0.64316797174397 tCO_2/MWh)= 74,239 tCO_2e/year The calculations in the ER Calculation Excel sheet have been reproduced by the VVB and the source data (monthly electricity meter readings) are presented by the project owner. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the calculations related to the GHG emission mitigations of the project activity have been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.7 Roles and Responsibilities

Means of Project Validation	Desk Review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The official project owner ("Ovid Wind LLC") has been confirmed via the official documents (e.g. provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines, generation license and so on). Also, the employees of Ovid Wind LLC have been interviewed during the remote site visit. The carbon consultant is "Kilittaşı Mühendislik Müşavirlik İnşaat Tic. Ltd. Şti.". This information has been confirmed by the project owner. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the roles and responsibilities have been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.7.1 Project Proponent(s)

Means of Project Validation	Desk Review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The official project owner ("Ovid Wind LLC") has been confirmed via the official documents (e.g. provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines, generation license and so on). Also, the employees of Ovid Wind LLC have been interviewed during the remote site visit. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the project proponent has been stated correctly and supported by the related evidence documents.

5.1.7.2 Others Involved in the Project

Means of Project Validation	Desk Review, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The carbon consultant is "Kilittaşı Mühendislik Müşavirlik İnşaat Tic. Ltd. Şti.". This information has been confirmed by the project owner. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the other company involved in the project has been stated correctly.

5.1.8 Chronological Plan / Implementation

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	CAR-9 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The commissioning date of the project activity is 08/04/2019 as per ASCOE commissioning protocol. However project officially started to supply the Ukraine grid system on 01/05/2019, and received payment. This date has been confirmed via the "Operating on the basis of a License for the Right to carry out business activities in the wholesale supply of Electric Energy" evidence document. The crediting period start date is therefore taken as 01/05/2019. The crediting period of the project activity is 10 years with no renewal. Therefore, the crediting period is from 01/05/2019 to 30/04/2029. Monitoring frequency is planned as 4 years, 3 years and 3 years. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the chronological plan for the project activity has been stated correctly and supported by the relevant evidence documents.

5.1.9 Eligibility

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-10 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	Project is eligible as per the ACM0002 methodology which is in compliance with the ISO 14064-2. Ovid Wind Farm Project operation start date is before 2020 (i.e. 01/05/2019). Project shall complete its registration before 31 December 2023. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the eligibility criteria of ICR Standard Version 4.0 has been stated correctly and supported by the relevant evidence documents.

5.1.10 Funding

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Project was implemented and has been operated by the project owner, Ovid Wind LLC, with its own financial resources. No public funding has been used. This information has been confirmed by the project owner as well. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the information related to public funding has been stated correctly.

5.1.11 Ownership

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, interviews
Findings	CL-1 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The official project owner ("Ovid Wind LLC") has been confirmed via the official documents (e.g. provisional acceptance protocols of the wind turbines, generation license and so on). Also, the employees of Ovid Wind LLC have been interviewed. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the ownership of the project activity has been stated correctly and supported by the relevant evidence documents.

5.1.12 Other Certifications

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Double counting issue has been assessed and the validation team has checked the VCS project database (http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home), GS project database (https://www.goldstandard.org/resources/impact-registry) and GCC project database

	(https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects) were checked and this project is not available within VCS, GS and GCC projects' databases, either. The project does not appear on VCS, GS and GCC registries, it could be confirmed that no other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project. Also, the signed and sealed letter dated 08/05/2023 was provided by the project owner about double counting. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the project did not receive and/or did not apply for any other GHG-related environmental crediting certifications.

5.1.13 Participation under Other GHG Programs

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Double counting issue has been assessed and the validation team has checked the VCS project database (http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home), GS project database (https://www.goldstandard.org/resources/impact-registry) and GCC project database (https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects) were checked and this project is not available within VCS, GS and GCC projects' databases, either. The project does not appear on VCS, GS and GCC registries, it could be confirmed that no other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project. Also, the signed and sealed letter dated 08/05/2023 was provided by the project owner about double counting. In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the project has not been registered or is not seeking registration under any other GHG programs.

5.1.14 Other Benefits

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-11 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	Project activity contributes to the diversification of energy mix of Ukraine from fossil fuel to renewables; and avoids GHG emissions from Ukraine grid system. The project activity contributes to SDG 7, SDG 8 and SDG 13 as follows: • SDG 7: 115,428.17 MWh/year • SDG 8: 13 employees (6 of them are local) • SDG 13: 74,239 tCO_2e/year In summary, Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the other benefits of the project activity have been stated correctly and supported by the relevant evidence documents.

5.1.15 Host Country Attestation

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Host country attestation for the project activity has not obtained yet. As of May 2023, Ukraine is still in war with Russia. It is not clear when the war will end, and when Ukraine will normalize. Until that time, host country attestation will not be able to be obtained from the Ukraine government.

5.1.16 Eligibility Criteria for Grouped Project

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Project is not a grouped project.

5.1.17 Additional Information

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	All information provided in this document is publicly available.

5.2 Crediting

5.2.1 Project Start Date

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-12 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The commissioning date of the project activity is 08/04/2019 as per ASCOE commissioning protocol. However project officially started to supply the Ukraine grid system on 01/05/2019, and received payment. This date has been confirmed via the "Operating on the basis of a License for the Right to carry out business activities in the wholesale supply of Electric Energy" evidence document. Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the reason of choosing crediting period is suitable.

5.2.2 Expected Operational Lifetime or Termination Date

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-13 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The technical lifetime of the project activity is indicated as 25 years as per Tool 10. Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the reason of choosing the expected operational lifetime of the project is suitable.

5.2.3 Crediting Period

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The commissioning date of the project activity is 08/04/2019 as per ASCOE commissioning protocol. However project officially started to supply the Ukraine grid system on 01/05/2019, and received payment. This date has been confirmed via the "Operating on the basis of a License for the Right to carry out business activities in the wholesale supply of Electric Energy" evidence document. As per ICR Standard Version 4.0, fixed 10-year crediting period may be selected. Therefore, the crediting period is taken from 01/05/2019 to 30/04/2029. Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the reason of choosing the crediting period is suitable.

5.3 Safeguards

5.3.1 Statutory Requirements

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The laws and regulations mentioned below have been reviewed by the validation team and no situation has been encountered that contradicts the project activity: • Law on the Electricity Market of Ukraine[3] • Market Rules[4]

[3] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2019-19?lang=en#Text
[4] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v0307874-18?lang=en#Text

	• Transmission System Code[5] • Distribution Systems Code[6] • Commercial Metering Code[7] • Law on Environmental Protection of Ukraine[8] • Law on Alternative Energy Sources[9] • Law on Labor Protection[10]

5.3.2 Potential Negative Environmental and Socio-Economic Impacts

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-14 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	Regarding the Law on Environmental Protection of Ukraine, project received the following environmental approvals: • As per the law of Ukraine "On Environmental Expertise", Ecological Expertise Conclusion Report which is the final official environmental assessment of the project activity by the official experts of Ukraine government stated the project has no negative environmental effects and its potential environmental impacts were found to be environmentally and ecologically acceptable. The report (dated 27/11/2013 with the number of 000237) has been provided to the VVB. • Environmental permit with the number of 5123755100-53 on 13/07/2020 from the Odesa administration ecology department permission from the Odesa Regional Administration Department of Environment and Natural Resources. The relevant permit has been provided to the VVB. Also, in the PDD, the possible environmental and socio-economic effects of project activity has been discussed with respect to air quality, aquatic environment, soil environment, waste management, vegetation and animal life, noise effect and general socio-economic aspects. The impacts, as presented in the PDD have been validated by the validation team and found appropriately described.

5.3.3 Consultation with Interested Parties and Communications

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	The consultation for the project activity was performed on 15-16/05/2023. The employees and the mukhtar of Ovidiopol district have confirmed that the consultation has happened on those dates. 10 villagers from Ovidiopol district have joined to the meeting. The opinions of the local stakeholders have been provided in the PDD. There were no negative comments from the local stakeholders. Moreover, on 09/05/2023, a remote site visit has been conducted. However, because of the current war, no local stakeholders could join to the site visit. Therefore, on 18/07/2023, the mukhtar of Ovidiopol district has been called and taken her opinions about the project activity. No negative comments have been received. Furthermore, project owner shared with the participants its phone number and the grievance book located at the village head office. The photographic evidences of the grievance book was provided to the VVB.

[5] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v0309874-18?lang=en#Text
[6] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v0310874-18?lang=en#Text
[7] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v0311874-18?lang=en#Text
[8] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1264-12?lang=en#Text
[9] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/555-15?lang=en#Text
[10] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2694-12?lang=en#Text

5.3.4 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	"Ecological Expertise Conclusion Report" (dated 27/11/2013 with the number of 000237) has been provided to the VVB. This report is the final official environmental assessment of the project activity by the official experts of Ukraine government. As per this report, the project activity has no negative environmental effects and its potential environmental impacts were found to be environmentally.

5.3.5 Risk assessment

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Since Ukraine has been in war since February 2022, a missile attack to the project site may happen. This situation is such a great risk for the project activity. Also, the Ukraine grid system may be affected by some missile attacks as well. Project owner received order from the military to stop the operation of the project. Hence, the project activity did not generate electricity from 26/03/2022 to 30/07/2022. The real data of electricity generation also show that electricity was not generated between these dates. During the remote site visit, all of these situations were discussed as well. The other risks may include operational and technical risks. With routine maintenance activities (e.g. monitoring of operation of the project activity through SCADA system, visual inspections and so on), these risks can be minimized.

5.3.6 Additional Information on Risk Management

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	With routine maintenance activities (e.g. monitoring of operation of the project activity through SCADA system, visual inspections and so on), operational and technical risks can be minimized. During the remote site visit, SCADA system has been checked by the validation team.

5.4 Methodology

5.4.1 Reference to the Applied Methodology

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CL-2 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The applied methodology for the project activity is "ACM0002: Large-scale consolidated methodology: Grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 21.0 which is the most recent version of the methodology. The project activity applies approved consolidated methodology ACM0002: Large-scale consolidated methodology: Grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources and the associated tools: • Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, Version 7.0.0 • Tool 07: Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, Version 07.0 • Tool 10: : Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment, Version 01

	According to ACM0002, version 21.0, the latest approved tools shall be referenced in the PDD like, "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (Version 07.0), "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 07.0.0) which are the latest versions of the mentioned tools valid at the starting time and the above tools are applied to the ICR-PDD. Therefore, it could be concluded that the title, version and reference of the methodology including the associated tools are correct and valid.

5.4.2 Applicability of Methodology

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Re Carbon Ltd. has assessed the relevant information contained in the PDD, remote audit and evidence obtained against the application criteria listed in the methodology. The applicability of this methodology is justified as below: • The proposed project activity (Ovid Wind Farm Project) is a greenfield, renewable (wind power) electricity generation project, connected to the Ukraine national grid • The project activity is the installation of 32.67 MWe wind power plant • The project does not involve capacity addition, a retrofit of (an) existing plant(s) or a replacement of (an) existing plant(s) • Project activity does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of project activity • The project does not involve combined heat and power generation activity • The geographic and system boundaries for the Ukraine national electricity grid can be clearly identified and information on the characteristics of the grid is available. According to ACM0002 version 21.0, the latest approved tools shall be referenced in PDD like, "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (Version 07.0) and "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (Version 07.0.0), which are the latest versions of the tools valid at the starting time and the above tools are applied to the PDD. Re Carbon Ltd. confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity and applies the latest version valid at the time of submitting the project activity for registration.

5.4.3 Deviation from Methodology

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	There are no deviations from the ACM0002 methodology applied to the project activity.

5.4.4 Other Information Relating to Methodology Application

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	ACM0002 methodology is fully applied.

5.5 Additionality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interview
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.

Conclusion	For additionality analysis, as per the ACM0002, Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, Version 7.0.0. is applied. This selection has been found appropriate by the validation team.

5.5.1 Level 1 - ISO 14064-2 GHG Emissions Additionality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interview
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	For additionality analysis, as per the ACM0002, Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, Version 7.0.0. is applied. This selection has been found appropriate by the validation team.

5.5.2 Level 2a – Statutory Additionality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	In laws of Ukraine, there are no laws, regulations or any other regulatory framework, agreement, settlements or any legally binding matters that enforces the similar measures of that would result in the same levels of GHG emission mitigations. This situation has been confirmed by the regional expert and project owner during the remote site visit as well.

5.5.3 Level 2b – Non-enforcement additionality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Project activity is not subject to statuary requirements in Ukraine. This situation has been confirmed by the regional expert and project owner during the remote site visit as well.

5.5.4 Level 3 – Technology, Institutional, Common Practice Additionality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	As per Tool 01, Step 0: Demonstration whether the proposed project activity is the first-of-its-kind is to be followed. The geographical area is defined as follows in Tool 01: “Applicable geographical area should be the entire host country. If the project participants opt to limit the applicable geographical area to a specific geographical area (such as province, region, etc.) within the host country, then they shall provide justification on the essential distinction between the identified specific geographical area and the rest of the host country”. For the project activity, the applicable geographical area is chosen as the region, which is Odesa Oblast and proper justifications are included in the ICR-PDD. The validation team confirms that the justifications and the relevant evidences to decide the project activity as the first-of-its-kind in the selected geographical area are stated correctly and properly. In summary, the proposed project activity is the first-of-its-kind in the selected geographical area (Odesa Oblast). Therefore, the other steps in Tool 1 (such as investment analysis, common practice analysis and so on) are not applied and it is demonstrated that the project activity is additional to the baseline scenario.

5.5.5 Level 4a – Financial Additionality I

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.

Conclusion	For additionality analysis, as per the ACM0002 Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, Version 7.0.0. is applied. According to "Step 0" of Tool 01, project is the first-of-its-kind in the selected geographical area which is Odesa Oblast.

5.5.6 Level 4b – Financial Additionality II

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	For additionality analysis, as per the ACM0002 Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, Version 7.0.0. is applied. According to "Step 0" of Tool 01, project is the first-of-its-kind in the selected geographical area which is Odesa Oblast.

5.5.7 Level 5 – Policy Additionality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Project activity is not subject to statuary requirements in Ukraine. This situation has been confirmed by the regional expert and project owner during the remote site visit as well.

5.6 Baseline Scenario

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	In line with ACM0002, version 21.0, if the project activity is the installation of a greenfield power plant, the baseline scenario is electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM) calculations described in the "Tool 07: Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system". As the methodology directly states the baseline scenario, there is no need to carry out other analyses. The project supplies electricity generated from wind turbines to the national grid. Thus, the PDD correctly identifies baseline scenario comprised of electricity generation from grid-connected power plants in Ukraine. The Combined Margin is taken from IFI Default Grid Factors (April 2022, v3.2). Based on the validation team's local and sectoral knowledge, remote audit observations and by cross-checking the information with similar relevant projects, it is confirmed that the selected baseline scenario is the prevailing practice in the host country and in line with the host country regulations. All the assumptions and data used by the PPs are listed in the PDD, including references and sources, all the references and documents used are relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted in the PDD, all relevant national and sectoral policies/regulations considered are listed in the PDD and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represented what would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity.

5.7 Project Boundary

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-15 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The project supplies electricity to the Ukraine grid, which has been validated based on remote audit observation and the provisional acceptance protocols. All the units of the

	project activity as well as the power plants connected to the grid are included in the project boundary in line with the requirements of the baseline methodology applied, ACM0002: -Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources- version 21.0. This includes the project site and all power plants connected physically to the Ukraine national grid. There are no off-grid power plants in Ukraine grid. Moreover, GHG sources (inclusions and exclusions) related to the project activity are stated correctly in the ICR-PDD. Furthermore, there are no emission sources that are not addressed by the applied methodology which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the annual emission reduction.

5.8 Quantification of GHG emission mitigations

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised during this section.
Conclusion	ACM0002, version 21.0 is followed to estimate the emission reductions of the project activity.

5.8.1 Criteria and Procedures for Quantification

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised during this section.
Conclusion	ACM0002, version 21.0 is followed to estimate the emission reductions of the project activity.

5.8.1.1 Baseline emissions

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-16 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The emission reduction calculation estimations have been done in the PDD as per the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002 version 21.0. The baseline emissions are calculated based on the emission coefficient multiplied by the expected net electricity generation, which amounts to 115,428.17 MWh per annum. The IFI Default Grid Factor has been used for the combined margin emission factor (April 2022, v3.2). As per this document, the emission factor is taken as ”0.643167971743973 tCO_2/MWh”. Therefore, $BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid,CM,y}$ BE_y= (115,428.17 MWh/year) x (0.64316797174397 tCO_2/MWh)= 74,239 tCO_2e/year The calculations in the ER Calculation Excel sheet have been reproduced by the VVB and the source data (monthly electricity meter readings) are presented by the project owner.

5.8.1.2 Project emissions

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	There are no project or leakage emissions associated with wind power projects.

5.8.1.3 Leakage

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.

Conclusion	There are no project or leakage emissions associated with wind power projects.

5.8.2 Quantification of Net-GHG Emissions and/or Removals

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-17 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	Quantification of net emission reductions of the project activity as per the ACM0002 is provided as follows: $ER_y = BE_y - PE_y$ $ER_y = 74,239 - 0$ $ER_y = 74,239\ tCO_2e/year$ During a 10-year crediting period, the total estimated emission reduction is 742,390 tCO2e.

5.8.3 Risk Assessment for Permanence

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	Since Ukraine has been in war since February 2022, a missile attack to the project site may happen. This situation is such a great risk for the project activity. Also, the Ukraine grid system may be affected by some missile attacks as well. Project owner received order from the military to stop the operation of the project. Hence, the project activity did not generate electricity from 26/03/2022 to 30/07/2022. The real data of electricity generation also show that electricity was not generated between these dates. During the remote site visit, all of these situations were discussed as well. The other risks may include operational and technical risks. With routine maintenance activities (e.g. monitoring of operation of the project activity through SCADA system, visual inspections and so on), these risks can be minimized.

5.9 Management of data quality

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	No findings were raised in this section.
Conclusion	At the Oblenergo substation, there are two electricity meters, one is main and the other one is back-up. These meters continuously measure the electricity supplied to the grid. Project owner has no control on these electricity meters; they are sealed and protected from possible interventions. Oblenergo applies remote reading to these power meters. The technical details of the meters are as follows:

	Main Meter	Back-up Meter
Brand	ITRON	ITRON
Model	SL7000	SL7000
Serial Number	83898670	83898673
Accuracy Class	0.2S	0.2S
Date of Installation	07/03/2019	07/03/2019

The calibration documents of the meters dated 07/03/2019 has been provided to the VVB. These meters are the main source for the electricity generation of the project activity.

For cross checking of the electricity generation, the internal meters of the project activity are used. There are 2 electricity meters (one is main and other one is back-up) at the project site. The technical details of the electricity meters are as follows:

	Main Meter	Back-up Meter
Brand	ITRON	ITRON
Model	SL7000	SL7000
Serial Number	83883594	83898710
Accuracy Class	0.2S	0.2S
Date of Installation	01/05/2019	01/05/2019

5.10 Monitoring

5.10.1 Monitoring Plan

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	CL-3 and CL-4 were raised during the validation process, which were successfully closed.
Conclusion	Monitoring plan will be implemented as per the ACM0002 Methodology. At the Oblenergo substation, there are two electricity meters, one is main and the other one is back-up. These meters continuously measure the electricity supplied to the grid. Project owner has no control on these electricity meters; they are sealed and protected from possible interventions. Oblenergo applies remote reading to these power meters. The technical details of the meters are as follows:

	Main Meter	Back-up Meter
Brand	ITRON	ITRON
Model	SL7000	SL7000
Serial Number	83898670	83898673
Accuracy Class	0.2S	0.2S
Date of Installation	07/03/2019	07/03/2019

The calibration documents of the meters dated 07/03/2019 has been provided to the VVB. These meters are the main source for the electricity generation of the project activity. The main source of the electricity generation by the project activity is the invoices both in hardcopy and softcopy format which are sent by the electricity purchasing company (State Enterprise SE Guaranteed Buyer). During the remote site visit, it was learned that every month, Ovid WFP receives an email from the SE Guaranteed Buyer company for the net amount of electricity generated of the project activity. All data for each monitoring parameters will be archived during the project and will be kept for 5 more years following the end of the crediting period.

For cross checking of the electricity generation, the internal meters of the project activity are used. There are 2 electricity meters (one is main and other one is back-up) at the project site. The technical details of the electricity meters are as follows:

	Main Meter	Back-up Meter
Brand	ITRON	ITRON

Model	SL7000	SL7000
Serial Number	83883594	83898710
Accuracy Class	0.2S	0.2S
Date of Installation	01/05/2019	01/05/2019

Electricity meters are tested every 6 years[11]. In Ovid Wind Farm Project, after 6 years, testing will be applied to the electricity meters. There is no testing process applied so far. There are 13 employees at the project site. The social security records of the employees have been provided to the VVB.

5.10.2 Data and Parameters Remaining Constant

Means of Project Validation	Desk review
Findings	CAR-18 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	There is just one ex-ante parameter which will be remained constant during the crediting period: • $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ (Combined margin CO2 emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y): The value is taken as 0.643167971743973 tCO_2/MWh as per UNFCCC IFI Default Grid Factors, April 2022, v.3.2. Re Carbon confirms that the ex-ante parameter of the project activity has been chosen correctly.

5.10.3 Data and Parameters Monitored

Means of Project Validation	Desk review, remote site visit, interviews
Findings	CAR-19 was raised during the validation process, which was successfully closed.
Conclusion	The monitoring parameter is in line with the applied methodology and include the following: • $EG_{PJ,y}$: Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the project activity in year y (MWh/year) At the Oblenergo substation, there are two electricity meters, one is main and the other one is back-up. These meters continuously measure the electricity supplied to the grid. Project owner has no control on these electricity meters; they are sealed and protected from possible interventions. Oblenergo applies remote reading to these power meters. The calibration documents of the meters dated 07/03/2019 has been provided to the VVB. These meters are the main source for the electricity generation of the project activity. The main source of the electricity generation by the project activity is the invoices both in hardcopy and softcopy format which are sent by the electricity purchasing company (State Enterprise SE Guaranteed Buyer). During the remote site visit, it was learned that every month, Ovid WFP receives an email from the SE Guaranteed Buyer company for the net amount of electricity generated of the project activity. All data for each monitoring parameters will be archived during the project and will be kept for 5 more years following the end of the crediting period. For cross checking of the electricity generation, the internal meters of the project activity are used. There are 2 electricity meters (one is main and other one is back-up) at the project site.

[11] https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z1417-16#Text

	Electricity meters are tested every 6 years . In Ovid Wind Farm Project, after 6 years, testing will be applied to the electricity meters. There is no testing process applied so far.

6. Independent Review

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

The Independent Technical Review is performed by another Team Leader of Re Carbon Ltd. who was not involved in the validation activities of this specific project activity. When the appointed Team Leader finalizes the Validation Report, the report is sent to the (for this project specifically appointed) Independent Technical Reviewer who reviews not only the validation report itself, but also all supporting documents such as the emission factor calculations, additionality justifications, relevant excel sheets and so on.

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

After all CLs and CARs are closed, the validation report is again reviewed and finally approved by the Team Leader, ITR and the Certification Manager, and the request for registration is submitted to the Project Developer along with the relevant documents.

7. Validation Opinion

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the validation of the "Ovid Wind Farm Project" in "Ukraine" between 08/05/2023 and 21/07/2023. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, ICR and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation was performed by a validation team consisting of "Öykü Yakupoğlu as the Team Leader, Selen Cilasun as the Validator, Zoia Pavlenko as the Regional Expert and Rohit Badaya as the ITR" and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0 and ICR Standard Version 4.0.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirm that the proposed project activity "Ovid Wind Farm Project" in Ukraine, applied all relevant EB-guidance as the selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and the associated methodological tools have been applied correctly. The total emission reductions from the project are estimated to be on the average of 74,239 tCO_2e per annum over the selected 10-year crediting period (i.e. 742,390 tCO_2e in total). The emission reduction forecast was checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount will be achieved, given that the underlying assumptions do not change.

As a result, the validation team assigned by Re Carbon Ltd., concludes that the proposed Project Activity "Ovid Wind Farm Project" in Ukraine, as described in the PDD version 1.3 dated 26/07/2023:

- meets all relevant Host Party criteria
- meets all relevant requirements of the ICR Standard, UNFCCC for CDM project activities [including Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the Modalities and Procedures for CDM (Marrakesh Accords) and the subsequent decisions and guidance by the COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board]
- applies correctly the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 version 21.0
- its additionality is sufficiently justified in the PDD
- is likely to achieve estimated emission reductions

Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. requests the registration of the proposed project activity as an ICR project activity.

Öykü YAKUPOĞLU	Rohit BADAYA	Esin TUNALI
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
28/07/2023	06/09/2023	06/09/2023

Appendix

If required due to confidentiality, the appendix may be disclosed to ICR as a separate document.

I. Documents reviewed or referenced in the report

Provide a list of documents reviewed or are referenced in the report.

No.	Title	Version	Provider
1	Project Design Description (PDD)	1.0	Project Owner
2	Project Design Description (PDD)	1.1	Project Owner
3	Project Design Description (PDD)	1.2	Project Owner
4	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	1.0	Project Owner
5	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	1.1	Project Owner
6	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	1.2	Project Owner
7	Articles of Association Limited Liability Company "Ovid Wind"	2021	Project Owner
8	Extract from the Unified State Register of Legal Entities, Individual Entrepreneurs and Public Organizations	13/01/ 2023	Project Owner
9	Extract from the Register of Value Added Tax Payers	23/12/ 2022	Project Owner
10	Resolution on the Issuance of a License for the Production of Electricity to Ovid Wind LLC	18/10/ 2018	Project Owner
11	Resolution on Establishing the "Green Tariff" of "Ovid Wind LLC"	12/04/ 2019	
12	Qualification Certificate of the Responsible Executor of Certain Types of Work (services), related to the Creation of an Architectural Object	30/05/ 2012	Project Owner
13	System Usage Agreement	2018	Project Owner
14	Conclusion on the Environmental Impact Assessment	-	Project Owner
15	Expert Opinion on the Assessment of Natural Complexes of the Environment on the Territory of the Site of the Pilot Ovidiopol Wind Power Plant and Adjacent Territories within the Ovidiopol district, Odesa region	2013	Project Owner
16	Expert Report on the Review of Project Documentation for the Project "Construction of a 30 MW wind power plant in the Ovidiopol district of the Odesa region"	20/10/ 2017	Project Owner
17	Environmental Impact Assessment of the Feasibility Study for the Construction of a Wind Power Plant	2017	Project Owner
18	Shadow Flicker Report	20/05/ 2019	Project Owner
19	Report on the Results of the Environmental Assessment and Environmental Monitoring of the Operating Conditions of the Constructed Wind Power	21/02/ 2020	Project Owner

	Plant of “Ovid Wind LLC” in the Ovidiopol district of the Odesa Region		
20	Monitoring Report based on the Results of the Assessment of the Impacts of the Operation of Ovid Wind LLC on the Natural Complexes of the Environment	2021	Project Owner
21	Odesa Administration Ecology Department Permission	30/06/ 2020	Project Owner
22	Operating on the basis of a License for the Right to carry out business activities in the wholesale supply of Electric Energy	01/05/ 2019	Project Owner
23	Certificate of Construction of 30 MW WPP in Ovidiopols’kiy rayon of Odesa oblast	25/02/ 2019	Project Owner
24	General Explanatory Note of “Construction of a 30 MW Wind Power Plant in the Ovidiopol district, Odesa region” (Project State)	2017	Project Owner
25	Technical Documents of the Wind Turbines		Project Owner
26	Real Data of Annual Electricity Generation	2019 2020 2021 2022 2023	Project Owner
27	ASCOE Document	08/04/ 2019	Project Owner
28	Training Records of the Employees	02/01/ 2019 08/10/ 2019 23/03/ 2021 22/07/ 2021 26/01/ 2023 02/04/ 2021 07/12/ 2021	Project Owner
29	Social Security Records of the Employees	-	Project Owner
30	Evaluation Forms of the Local Stakeholders	15-16/05/ 2023	Project Owner
31	KMZ file of the Project Activity	-	Project Owner
32	Signed ODA Declaration	08/05/ 2023	Project Owner
33	Signed Letter about Double Counting	08/05/ 2023	Project Owner

34	Harmonized IFI Default Grid Factors	04/2022	Project Owner
35	Provisional Acceptance Protocols of the Wind Turbines	25/01/2019 28/01/2019 30/01/2019 04/02/2019 07/02/2019 20/02/2019 02/03/2019 11/03/2019	Project Owner
36	ACM0002	v21.0	CDM
37	Tool 01	v07.0.0	CDM
38	Tool 07	v07.0	CDM
39	Tool 10	v01	CDM
40	Project Design Description (PDD)	1.3	Project Owner

II. Non-Conformities

Provide non-conformities and their status. Amend as required.

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-1	**Reference to criteria:**	1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please provide an abstract and the project proponent on the cover page (i.e. in the first page).				
Response from project proponent:	Abstract is provided on the cover page, project proponent name is indicated on the cover page.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The PDD was revised accordingly.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-2	Reference to criteria:	1.4	Date:	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please provide the contact information of the Representative (i.e. the relevant company, the email and the telephone number) on the cover page.				
Response from project proponent:	Contact information of the Representative is provided on the cover page. **Response 1:** Cover page is revised and project proponent is indicated.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Please provide the contact information of the Representative (i.e. the relevant company, the email and the telephone number) on the cover page. Review-2: Ok Closed (The contact information has been included.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-3	Reference to criteria:	1.8	Date:	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please correct the “date of version” on the cover page.				
Response from project proponent:	Date of version is indicated.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The relevant date was corrected.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-4	**Reference to criteria:**	1.1.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	a) Please provide "OvidWind_MonthlyElectricityGeneration" Excel sheet again (The document cannot open). b) Please include the detailed calculation approach of "115.43 GWh electricity generation/year" in Section 1.1 (i.e. in Footnote 5). c) Please indicate the commissioning dates of each wind turbine as well in Section 1.1. d) The estimated electricity generation value is indicated as "115.43 GWh" and "115,428.2 MWh" at the same time in Section 1.1. Please correct the contradiction. e) Please correct the statement "The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant/unit and all power plants/units connected physically to the electricity system that the CDM project power plant is connected to" in Section 1.1. f) Please include the project owner of the project activity in Section 1.1 with indicating the relevant evidence document.				
Response from project proponent:	a) Electricity generation data is prpvided in the ER excel sheet. ICR_Ukraine_Ovid_ERCalculations_Rev1.0. b) Detailed calculation is provided in Footnote 5. Calculation is provided in the ICR_Ukraine_Ovid_ERCalculations_Rev1.0 excel sheet too. c) Will be provided in the second round of comments. d) 115.43 GWh is corrected as 115,428.2 MWh. All 115.43 GWh in the PDD is converted to 115,428.2 MWh. e) "The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant/unit and all power plants/units connected physically to the Ukraine grid system that the CDM project power plant is connected to." f) Project owner and relevant reference is provided in Section 1.1. **Response 1:** a.PDD and excel sheet is revised to indicate 115,428.17 MWh. 115,428.2 MWh information is removed from excel and PDD. c. Commissioning dates are indicated. Comissioning was accomplished bu the manufacturer. Government agency in Ukraine does not apply commissioning to wind turbines, instead just power meters are commissioned. Wind turbine commissioning dates are added to the Section 1.1 as a table. As it can be seen in the table, wind turbine numbers are Wtg1, wtg2, wtg3, wtg4, wtg5 wtg6, wtg8, wtg9 and wtg10. Wtg7 is missing instead wtg10 is indicated. Footnote 7 in the PDD provides an explanation why numbering is in this way. In addition to that, to reflect the correct wind turbine numbering based on the project's noise and shadow flickering reports (provided to the DoE in the 2nd round), KMZ file is revised, and Section 1.3 is revised too. d.PDD and excel sheet is revised to indicate 115,428.17 MWh. 115,428.2 MWh information is removed from excel and PDD. e. CDM term is removed from the project boundary description in the PDD.				
Referenced documentation:					

Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: a) The average value is indicated as “115,428.17 MWh” in “Cell I9” in “Electricity Production” Excel sheet. Please provide consistent information throughout the Excel sheet and PDD. b) Ok Closed (The relevant footnote was revised accordingly.) c) Please indicate the commissioning dates of each wind turbine as well in Section 1.1. d) The average value is indicated as “115,428.17 MWh” in “Cell I9” in “Electricity Production” Excel sheet. Please provide consistent information throughout the Excel sheet and PDD. e) The project activity is not a CDM project. Please correct the relevant statement accordingly. f) Ok Closed (The relevant information was included in Section 1.1.) Review-2: a) Ok Closed (The electricity generation value is consistent throughout the PDD.) c) Ok Closed (The commissioning dates were included.) d) Ok Closed (The electricity generation value is consistent throughout the PDD.) e) Ok Closed (The relevant statement was revised accordingly.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-5	**Reference to criteria:**	1.2.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please indicate whether the project activity is a grouped project or not in Section 1.2.				
Response from project proponent:	“Project activity is not a grouped project.” added to the section 1.2.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The relevant information was included in Section 1.2.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-6	**Reference to criteria:**	1.2.2	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				

Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information
Non-conformity:	Please correct the type of the project activity in Section 1.2.
Response from project proponent:	The first sentence is changed as "Ovid WFP is large scale renewable type of Greenfield project activity". **Response 1:** The term is added to the Section 1.2.
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Please include "Type I – Renewable Energy Projects" in Section 1.2. Review-2: Ok Closed (The type was revised accordingly.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-7	**Reference to criteria:**	1.3.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	The turbine coordinates in Section 1.3 do not match with the coordinates provided in the KMZ file. Please correct the contradiction.				
Response from project proponent:	KMZ file is revised and accordingly Section 1.3, wind turbine coordinates are revised.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The KMZ file and the coordinates in Section 1.3 were revised accordingly.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-8	**Reference to criteria:**	1.5.1.3	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				

Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information
Non-conformity:	Please include a flow diagram of the project activity with indicating the installed technology and electricity meters in Section 1.5.
Response from project proponent:	Flowdiagram is added to the Section 1.5.
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The flow diagram was included in Section 1.5.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-9	**Reference to criteria:**	1.8.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	The term of operation is indicated as 20 years in Section 1.8. However, in Section 1.5, the project lifetime is indicated as 25 years. Please clarify this issue.				
Response from project proponent:	Section 1.5 and Section 2.2 are indicated as follows: “The term of operation of Ovid WFP is 25 years. Average lifetime of the equipment is determined by the wind turbines. According the Tool 10, average lifetime of the wind turbines is 25 years.”				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The inconsistent information was corrected in the PDD.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-10	**Reference to criteria:**	1.9.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please include the eligibility criteria of the project activity for the ICR Program as well in Section 1.9.				

Response from project proponent:	Section 1.9 is revised as per the comment.
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section 1.9 was revised accordingly.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-11	**Reference to criteria:**	1.14.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please include the achievement related to SDG 8 as well in Section 1.14.				
Response from project proponent:	Section 1.14 is revised as per the comment.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The contribution of SDG 8 was included in Section 1.14.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-12	**Reference to criteria:**	2.1.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please include the reason of choosing the project start date in Section 2.1.				
Response from project proponent:	Section 2.1 is revised as per the comment.				
Referenced documentation:					

Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The relevant information was included in Section 2.1.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-13	**Reference to criteria:**	2.2.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	The project lifetime is indicated as 25 years in Section 1.5. However, in Section 2.2, it is indicated as 20 years. Please correct the contradiction.				
Response from project proponent:	Contradiction is corrected. Section 2.2. is revised.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The inconsistent information was corrected in the PDD.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-14	**Reference to criteria:**	3.2.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	a) Please revise the notation of the date “08/29/2013” in Section 3.2 since all other dates are indicated as “DD/MM/YYYY” format in the ICR-PDD. b) Please clarify how the intention for implementation of the project activity was announced in 2013, while the consultation was happened in 2012.				
Response from project proponent:	a) Date is corrected as 29/08/2023 in Section 3.2. b) “In addition to that, on 22/08/2012, project was introduced to the Ovidiopol Settlement Council as per the environmental impact assessment procedures of Ukraine.” This statement is inedicated in Section 3.2. In 2012 project was introduced to the Ovidiopol Settlement Council. In 2013 public consultation was done.				
Referenced documentation:					

Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The notation of the relevant date was revised accordingly.) b) Ok Closed (Section 3.2 was revised accordingly.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-15	**Reference to criteria:**	7.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please indicate “Included/excluded” of “CO2” GHG in Section 7.				
Response from project proponent:	Table in Section 7 is corrected. CO2 Is indicated as included.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (Section 7 was revised accordingly.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-16	**Reference to criteria:**	8.1.1.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	a) Please correct the notation of “EFgrid,CM,y” in Section 8.1 (on page 38). It is indicated as “EFgrid,,”. b) The emission factor is indicated as “0.643167971743973” in “ERCalculation” Excel sheet. However, the relevant value is indicated differently in Section 8.1. Please correct the contradiction. c) Please indicate the units of the values in the ER Calculation Excel sheet. d) Please indicate the unit of the emission factor in Section 8.1. e) Please provide a sample calculation for the baseline emission in Section 8.1. f) Please include the total estimated baseline emission of the project activity in Section 8.1. g) Both EFgrid,CM and EFgrid,CM,y notations are used in Section 8.1. Please provide consistent notations of the parameters throughout the ICR-PDD.				
Response from project proponent:	a) EF_{grid} is corrected as $EF_{grid,CM,y}$.				

	b) In Section 8.1, emission factor is indicated as 0.643167971743973. Correction applied. c) Units of values in ER excel sheet is corrected and unit of emission factor is indicated too in excel sheet. d) Unit of emission factor is indicated in Section 8.1. e) A sample calculation of the baseline emission is provided in Section 8.1. f) Total emission reduction is indicated in Section 8.1. g) In the whole PDD, $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ is indicated. Correction applied.
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The notation was corrected.) b) Ok Closed (The emission factor was corrected in Section 8.1.) c) Ok Closed (The units were included in the ER Calculation Excel sheet.) d) Ok Closed (The unit of the emission factor was included in Section 8.1.) e) Ok Closed (Section 8.1 was revised accordingly.) f) Ok Closed (The estimated annual emission reduction was included in Section 8.1.) g) Ok Closed (The relevant notation was corrected throughout the PDD.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-17	**Reference to criteria:**	8.2.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please correct the total estimated emission reduction in Section 8.2.				
Response from project proponent:	Total emission reduction is corrected in the table in Section 8.2				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The estimated total emission reduction value was corrected in Section 8.2.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-18	**Reference to criteria:**	10.2.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				

Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information
Non-conformity:	The emission factor is indicated as "0.643167971743973" in "ERCalculation" Excel sheet. However, the relevant value is indicated differently in Section 10.2. Please correct the contradiction.
Response from project proponent:	Corrected as 0.643167971743973 in Section 10.2.1.
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The value was corrected in Section 10.2.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-19	**Reference to criteria:**	10.3.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	In ERCalculation Excel sheet, the estimated electricity generation is indicated as 115,428.2 MWh/year. However, the relevant value is indicated differently in Section 10.3 Please correct the contradiction.				
Response from project proponent:	The value is indicated as 115,428.2 in Section 10.3. **Response 1:** PDD and excel sheet are revised, only 115,428.17 MWh is indicated.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: The average value is indicated as "115,428.17 MWh" in "Cell I9" in "Electricity Production" Excel sheet. Please provide consistent information throughout the Excel sheet and PDD. Review-2: Ok Closed (The electricity generation value is consistent throughout the PDD.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CAR-20	**Reference to criteria:**	ITR	**Date:**	26/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				

Non-conformity:	The value (115.428.2 MWh/year) in the statement "Ovid WFP is a large scale project activity with an installed capacity of 32.67 MW, providing 115.428.2 MWh/year clean electricity to the Ukraine grid system" on the cover page does not look logical. Please check.
Response from project proponent:	Corrected as 115,428.17 MWh/year on the cover page .
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The value was corrected.)
Status:	

Non-conformity ID:	CL-1	**Reference to criteria:**	1.11.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please include the reference documents as well for the project ownership in Section 1.11.				
Response from project proponent:	Reference is provided as footnote.				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The reference document was included in Section 1.11.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CL-2	**Reference to criteria:**	4.1.1.2	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	Please clarify why Tool 01 and Tool 02 are applied at the same time.				
Response from project proponent:	Tool 02 is removed due to that it is not used in the additionality analysis since investment analysis is not applied.				
Referenced documentation:					

Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (Tool 02 was removed from the PDD.)
Status:	Closed

Non-conformity ID:	CL-3	**Reference to criteria:**	10.1.1	**Date:**	09/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Inconsistent and inaccurate information				
Non-conformity:	a) Please indicate the reason why there is a gap between the commissioning and generating electricity (i.e. between 08/04/2019 – 01/05/2019). b) Please provide "2019.04.08_Act_ASCOE commissioning_UA.pdf". It cannot be found among the supporting documents. c) Please include the main source of the electricity generation (e.g. invoices or any other official source) in Section 10.1.				
Response from project proponent:	a) 01/05/2019 is the date when the Ovid WFP started to provide electricity to the Ukraine grid. Technically project started operation on 08/04/2019, which can be accepted as testing period, Ovid plant operated smoothly, and on 1st of May 2019, officially started to supply to the Ukraine grid. b) It was provided in the 09_powermeters folder. Just in case, it is provided again. c) Section 10.1 is revised as per the comment. The following sentence added to the Section 10.1: "The main source of the electricity generation by the project activity is the invoices both in hardcopy and softcopy format which are sent by the electricity purchasing company. "				
Referenced documentation:					
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: a) Ok Closed (The clarification was made.) b) Ok Closed (The evidence document was provided.) c) Ok Closed (The relevant information was included in Section 10.1.)				
Status:	Closed				

Non-conformity ID:	CL-4	**Reference to criteria:**	ITR	**Date:**	26/07/2023
Requirement:	Revisions in the PDD				
Observation:	Missing information				
Non-conformity:	The discussions about the testing frequency is provided, however no discussions on the Calibration frequency is provided in the PDD. Please check.				

Response from project proponent:	Section 10.1 and 10.3 are revised. "As per Ukraine regulations, calibrations are not applied. If the test results show that the metering device is not working properly, it is replaced with the new one."
Referenced documentation:	
Validators assessment of corrective actions:	Review-1: Ok Closed (The PDD was revised accordingly.)
Status:	

III. Validation Protocol

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Cover Page and General Requirements					
1. Are the following provided at the cover page in a tabular format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please provide an abstract and the project proponent on the cover page (i.e. in the first page).	CAR-1	OK
1.1. ID of the project?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as “112”.	OK	OK
1.2. Name of the project?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as “Ovid Wind Farm Project”.	OK	OK
1.3. Project Proponent that prepared the document?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as “Ovid Wind LLC”.	OK	OK
1.4. Name, title, email and telephone number of the Representative?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please provide the contact information of the Representative (i.e. the relevant company, the email and the telephone number) on the cover page.	CAR-2	OK
1.5. First date of submission in DD-Month-YYYY format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as “05/05/2023” for the first submission.	OK	OK
1.6. Date of validation in DD-Month-YYYY format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project is under validation currently.	OK	OK
1.7. Version number of the ICR PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as “1.0” for the first submission.	OK	OK
1.8. Date of version DD-Month-YYYY?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please correct the “date of version” on the cover page.	CAR-3	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION					
1.1. Purpose, Objectives, and General Description of the Project					
1.1.1. Does section 1.1 of the ICR PDD include a summary and a general description of the project in order to provide an understanding of the nature of the project, including:	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	a) Please provide "OvidWind_MonthlyElectricityGeneration" Excel sheet again (The document cannot open). b) Please include the detailed calculation approach of "115.43 GWh electricity generation/year" in Section 1.1 (i.e. in Footnote 5). c) Please indicate the commissioning dates of each wind turbine as well in Section 1.1. d) The estimated electricity generation value is indicated as "115.43 GWh" and "115,428.2 MWh" at the same time in Section 1.1. Please correct the contradiction. e) Please correct the statement "The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant/unit and all power plants/units connected physically to the electricity system that the CDM project power plant is connected to" in Section 1.1. f) Please include the project owner of the project activity in Section 1.1 with indicating the relevant evidence document.	CAR-4	OK
1.1.1.1. Project title	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as "Ovid Wind Farm Project".	OK	OK
1.1.1.2. Conditions prior to initiation of the project	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The conditions prior to initiation of the project are available in Section 1.1.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.1.1.3. Technologies/measures to be utilized and/or implemented	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	A brief description of the installed technology is available in Section 1.1.	OK	OK
1.1.1.4. Project boundary	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 1.1.1.	CAR-4	OK
1.1.1.5. Baseline scenario	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated in Section 1.1.	OK	OK
1.1.1.6. Estimate of annual average and total GHG emission mitigation	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The estimated annual and total emission reduction values are indicated in Section 1.1.	OK	OK
1.2. Project Type and Sectoral Scope					
1.2.1. Is this a grouped project?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please indicate whether the project activity is a grouped project or not in Section 1.2.	CAR-5	OK
1.2.2. Is the information on the type of project provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please correct the type of the project activity in Section 1.2.	CAR-6	OK
1.2.3. Is the sectoral scope of the project provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as “Sectoral Scope 1: Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)”.	OK	OK
1.3. Location					
1.3.1. Is the project location, including organizational, geographic, and physical location information, allowing for the unique identification and delineation of the specific extent of the project, including physical address (host country, region/state/province, city/town/community, street name and number, and geographic coordinates,	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The turbine coordinates in Section 1.3 do not match with the coordinates provided in the KMZ file. Please correct the contradiction.	CAR-7	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
link to an aerial photo of the location) provided in the PDD?					
1.3.2. If it is a grouped project, are each identified specifically. (KML or CSV files may be submitted separately.)	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.4. Conditions Prior to Initiation					
1.4.1. Is the information on conditions at the project site prior to the implementation of project activities provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The conditions prior to initiation of the project activity are available in Section 1.4.	OK	OK
1.5. Technology Applied					
1.5.1. Is the following information provided on Technologies/measures to be utilized and/or implemented:	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please see below.		
1.5.1.1. List the facilities, systems, and equipment installed and/or modified.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The installed equipment is explained in Section 1.5.	OK	OK
1.5.1.2. The types and levels of services provided by the facilities, if any, to other facilities, outside the project boundary.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The types of services are included in Section 1.5.	OK	OK
1.5.1.3. Arrangement of facilities, systems, and equipment.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please include a flow diagram of the project activity with indicating the installed technology and electricity meters in Section 1.5.	CAR-8	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.5.1.4. Age and the average lifetime of equipment utilized based on the manufacturer's specifications and industry standards.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The lifetime of the project activity is included.	OK	OK
1.5.1.5. Installed capacities, load factors, and efficiencies.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The installed capacities of the wind turbines are included.	OK	OK
1.5.1.6. Energy and mass flows and balances of the facilities, systems, and equipment, if necessary.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 1.5.1.3.	CAR-8	OK
1.5.1.7. Monitoring equipment and their location in the systems.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 1.5.1.3.	CAR-8	OK
1.5.2. Is the information on Technologies/measures existing prior to implementing the project at the same site, as applicable, provided including the equivalent information listed above from 1.5.1.1 to 1.5.1.7 on the facilities, systems, and equipment?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
1.6. Aggregated GHG Emission Mitigations					
1.6.1. Is the information on aggregated impacts of the project activities provided in the tabular format for the following?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please see below.		
1.6.1.1. Baseline scenario (tCO_2e)	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The baseline emissions are included.	OK	OK
1.6.1.2. Estimated project mitigations (tCO_2e)	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project emissions are included.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.6.1.3. Estimated leakage (tCO_2e)	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The leakage emissions are included.	OK	OK
1.6.1.4. Estimated net GHG emission mitigations (tCO_2e)	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The emission reductions are included.	OK	OK
1.7. Roles and Responsibilities					
1.7.1. Project Proponent(s)					
1.7.1.1. Are the Roles and responsibilities, including contact information of the project proponent provided in the tabular format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The contact information of the project proponent is available in Section 1.7.1.	OK	OK
1.7.2. Project Proponent(s)					
1.7.2.1. Are the Roles and responsibilities, including contact information of the other project participants, (amended as needed) provided in the tabular format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The contact information of the other entity is available in Section 1.7.2.	OK	OK
1.8. Chronological Plan/Implementation					
1.8.1. Are the Chronological Plan or actual dates for the following provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The term of operation is indicated as 20 years in Section 1.8. However, in Section 1.5, the project lifetime is indicated as 25 years. Please clarify this issue.	CAR-9	OK
1.8.1.1. Start date	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The start date is available.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.8.1.2. Baseline period	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The baseline period is available.	OK	OK
1.8.1.3. Termination of the project	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 1.8.1.	CAR-9	OK
1.8.1.4. Frequency of monitoring, reporting, crediting period	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
1.8.1.5. Validation and verification activities.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
1.9. Eligibility					
1.9.1. Is how the project meets eligibility criteria and the ICR program in general described?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please include the eligibility criteria of the project activity for the ICR Program as well in Section 1.9.	CAR-10	OK
1.10. Funding					
1.10.1. Is the information on public funding received, if any, and information on the sources of the public financing provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	No public funding.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.11. Ownership					
1.11.1. Has the evidence of project ownership and any IP utilization/ownership in relation to the project activities been provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please include the reference documents as well for the project ownership in Section 1.11.	CL-1	OK
1.12. Other Certifications					
1.12.1. Is the information if another form of GHG-related environmental credit has been received or applied for provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Project did not receive and/or did not apply for any other GHG-related environmental crediting certifications.	OK	OK
1.12.2. If received or applied for, is all relevant information about the GHG-related environmental credit and the related program included in the PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Project did not receive and/or did not apply for any other GHG-related environmental crediting certifications.	OK	OK
1.13. Participation Under Other GHG Programs					
1.13.1. Has it been indicated whether the project has been registered, or is seeking registration under any other GHG programs in the Section 1.13 of the PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Project has not been registered or is not seeking registration under any other GHG program.	OK	OK
1.13.2. If the project has been registered under any other GHG program, has the registration number and the relevant details been provided in the Section 1.13 of the PD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.13.3. If the project has been rejected by any other GHG programs, has the relevant information, including the reason(s) for the rejection and justification of eligibility under the ICR Program been provided in the Section 1.13 of the PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.14. Other Benefits					
1.14.1. If the project contributes to achieving any other benefits, such as sustainable development goals, is information on how provided and any provisions for monitoring and reporting included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please include the achievement related to SDG 8 as well in Section 1.14.	CAR-11	OK
1.15. Host Country Attestation					
1.15.1. Is information provided, whether the project has obtained a letter of assurance and authorization from the host country or countries where the emission mitigations occur?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The clarification is included in Section 1.15.	OK	OK
1.16. Eligibility criteria for Grouped Project					
1.16.1. If it is a grouped project, is eligibility criteria for inclusion of new project activities under grouped project provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.17. Additional Information					
1.17.1. Are additional relevant • legislative, • technical, • economic, • sectoral, • social, • environmental, • geographic, • site-specific, and • other information relevant to the project's eligibility, net GHG emission mitigations, or quantification of the project's net GHG emission mitigations provided?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	All information provided in this document is publicly available.	OK	OK
1.17.2. Is any information that may be excluded from public disclosure due to confidentiality indicated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	All information provided in this document is publicly available.	OK	OK
2. CREDITING					
2.1. Project Start Date					
2.1.1. Is the start date of the project activity stated in the format of dd/mm/yyyy?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please include the reason of choosing the project start date in Section 2.1.	CAR-12	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
2.2. Expected Operational Lifetime or Termination Date					
2.2.1. Is the expected operational lifetime or termination date of the project in years and months indicated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project lifetime is indicated as 25 years in Section 1.5. However, in Section 2.2, it is indicated as 20 years. Please correct the contradiction.	CAR-13	OK
2.3. Project Crediting Period					
2.3.1. Is the total crediting period including the day, month and year for the start and end dates and the total number of years indicated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available as "01/05/2019 – 30/04/2029".	OK	OK
3. SAFEGUARDS					
3.1. Statutory Requirements					
3.1.1. Has relevant local, regional, and national laws, statutes, and regulatory frameworks identified, and demonstration of compliance indicated in the ICR PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	All statutory requirements are included in Section 3.1.	OK	OK
3.2. Potential Negative Environmental and Socio-Economic Impacts					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3.2.1. Has any potential negative environmental and socio-economic impacts due to the implementation of the project and the steps taken to mitigate them been summarized in the ICR PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	a) Please revise the notation of the date "08/29/2013" in Section 3.2 since all other dates are indicated as "DD/MM/YYYY" format in the ICR-PDD. b) Please clarify how the intention for implementation of the project activity was announced in 2013, while the consultation was happened in 2012.	CAR-14	OK
3.3. Consultation with Interested Parties and Communications					
3.3.1. Are interested parties to the project identified and consultation conducted with them prior to validation described including the following?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please correct the statement "Consultation was done face-to-face to instead of a meeting." in Section 3.3.		
3.3.1.1. details on actions taken to appropriately engage interested parties and solicit comments (e.g., dates of announcements or meetings, periods during which input was sought) and	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
3.3.1.2. documentation of outcomes,	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
3.3.1.3. action taken due to comments,	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
3.3.1.4. the process of continuous communication,	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3.3.1.5. relevant statutory requirements	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
3.4. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)					
3.4.1. Have the PPs summarized any environmental impact assessments concerning the project activity?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Ecological Expertise Conclusion Report (dated as 27/11/2013 with the number of 000237) has been provided.	OK	OK
3.4.2. Are any measures and steps taken to meet the outcome of the assessment described?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Ecological Expertise Conclusion Report (dated as 27/11/2013 with the number of 000237) has been provided.	OK	OK
3.5. Risk assessment					
3.5.1. Are risks that could substantially affect the project's GHG emissions mitigations identified?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The risks that could substantially affect the project's GHG emissions mitigations are identified in Section 3.5.	OK	OK
3.5.2. Are any measures and steps taken due to risk assessment to mitigate risk described?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Routine maintenance activates	OK	OK
3.6. Additional Information on Risk Management					
3.6.1. Are additional information on measures, adverse effects on ecosystems or local communities, risk management processes, and methods indicated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Additional information on Risk Management is included in Section 3.6.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4. METHODOLOGY					
4.1. Reference to the Applied Methodology					
4.1.1. Is the Title, version, and reference number of the following indicated:	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please see below.		
4.1.1.1. Selected methodology.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	ACM0002, v21.0.	OK	OK
4.1.1.2. Any other methodologies or methodological tools to which the selected methodology refers to	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please clarify why Tool 01 and Tool 02 are applied at the same time.	CL-2	OK
4.1.1.3. Link to the applicable website to referenced methodologies and methodological tools	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The reference links are included.	OK	OK
4.2. Applicability of Methodology					
4.2.1. Is the choice of the methodology justified by showing that the proposed project activity meets all the applicability conditions of the methodology?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM-PDD-FORM Version 12.0 CDM project standard for project activities §54	DR	All applicability conditions of the methodology and the relevant tools are included in Section 4.2.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67				
4.2.2. Does the project activity meet each of the applicability conditions of the tools or other methodology components referred to in the applied methodology?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67	DR	The project activity meets all applicable conditions.	OK	OK
ACM 0002					
4.2.3. Is the type of proposed project activity defined?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The type of the project activity is defined.	OK	OK
4.2.4. If the proposed project activity is a hydro power plant project, does one of the following conditions conform to the proposed project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
4.2.4.1. Is the proposed project activity implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, with no change in the volume of any of the reservoirs?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.4.2. Is the project activity implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of the reservoir(s) is increased and the	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m^2?					
4.2.4.3. Is the project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m^2?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.5. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PPs demonstrated that water flow from upstream power plants/units spill directly to the downstream reservoir and that collectively constitute to the generation capacity of the integrated hydro power project?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
4.2.6. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PPs provided an analysis of the water balance covering the water fed to power units, with all possible combinations of reservoirs and without the construction of reservoirs?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
4.2.7. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project involving multiple reservoirs, where the power density for any of the reservoirs calculated using equation (3) is lower than or equal to 4	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is a wind power plant.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
W/m^2, do all the following conditions conform the project activity?					
4.2.7.1. The power density calculated using the total installed capacity of the integrated project, as per equation (4), is greater than 4 W/m^2;	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.7.2. Water flow between reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity;	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.7.3. Installed capacity of the power plant(s) with power density lower than or equal to 4 W/m^2 shall be:	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.7.3.1. Lower than or equal to 15 MW; and	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.2.7.3.2. Less than 10 per cent of the total installed capacity of integrated hydro power project.	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.3. Deviation from Methodology					
4.3.1. If there are deviations from the methodology, has the PP(s) described and justified the methodology deviations?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.3.2. If there are deviations from the methodology, has the evidence been provided on the following?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4.3.2.1. The deviation will not negatively impact the conservativeness of the quantification of GHG emission mitigations and	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.3.2.2. conformity to ISO 14064-2	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.4. Other Information Relating to Methodology Application					
4.4.1. Is other relevant information regarding the application of a methodology, e.g., any revisions or ongoing development of a methodology provided by the PP(s)?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	ACM0002 methodology is fully applied.	OK	OK
5. Additionality					
1. Have the PP(s) performed demonstration of project additionality according to ICRs additionality requirements, applied methodology, other applied documents, and applicable provisions for demonstration of additionality.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
1.1. -If the demonstration involves steps, have the PP(s) described how each step is applied and documented the outcome of each step in a transparent manner.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.2. In applying investment analysis, have the PP(s) listed all relevant assumptions and parameters used in the analysis and applied benchmark analysis, clearly indicating the benchmark?					
1.3. For each step, have the PP(s) provided a demonstration at the appropriate benchmark level?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5.1. Level 1 - ISO 14064-2 GHG Emissions Additionality					
5.1.1. Is how the project scenario is additional to the baseline scenario according to ICRs additionality requirements summarized?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5.2. Level 1 - ISO 14064-2 GHG Emissions Additionality					
5.2.1. Is how the project scenario is additional to relevant statutory requirements in the host country according to ICRs additionality requirements demonstrated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5.3. Level 2b – Non-enforcement additionality					
5.3.1. Is how the project scenario is additional subject to non-enforcement of statutory requirements in the host country	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Project activity is not subject to statuary requirements in Ukraine.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
according to ICRs additionality requirements demonstrated?	ICR requirement document v.4.0				
5.4. Level 3 – Technology, Institutional, Common Practice Additionality					
5.4.1. Is how the project scenario is subject to implementation barriers or its implementation can accelerate the deployment of technology or activities according to ICRs' additionality requirements demonstrated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5.5. Level 4a – Financial Additionality I					
5.5.1. Is how the project scenario faces financial limitations that revenues from the sale of carbon credits could mitigate according to ICRs additionality requirements demonstrated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5.6. Level 4b additionality – Financial additionality II					
5.6.1. Is how the project scenario faces significant financial limitations or lack of revenues, where the sale of carbon credits is the only source of revenues according to ICRs additionality requirements demonstrated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5.7. Level 5 additionality – Policy additionality					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
5.7.1. Is how the project scenario goes beyond its host country's climate objectives and lies outside the scope of the host country's climate action strategy towards its NDC, according to ICRs additionality requirements demonstrated?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is not a mandatory activity enforced by any law in Ukraine.	OK	OK
Additionality Test					
1. Have the PP(s) followed additionality testing guidelines?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 ICR requirement document v.4.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
2. Has it been clearly stated in the PD which analysis method(s) has been chosen for additionality assessment?	ICR requirement document v.4.0 CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality ACM 0002 version 20.0 ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM-PDD-FORM Version 12.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-Step 1a: Definition of alternatives	CDM TOOL01				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
Sub-Step 1b: Consistency with mandatory laws and regulations	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
3. Has the analysis of compliance of the defined alternatives with the mandatory laws and regulations carried out appropriately?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Step 2: Investment analysis	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4. Are the input values used in all investment analysis valid, consistent and applicable at the time of the investment decision taken by the PP?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §96	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
5. Are all the listed input values been consistently applied in all calculations?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
6. Do the PPs rely on values from Feasibility Study Report (FSR) that are approved by national authorities for proposed project activities?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §101	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
7. If PPs rely on FSR,		DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
7.1. Is it possible to conclude that in the period of time between the finalization of the FSR and the investment decision input values would not have materially changed?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §101a	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
7.2. Are the values used in the PD and associated annexes fully consistent with the FSR?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §101b §101c	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
8. Is the plant load factor defined ex-ante in the PD appropriately?	Guidelines for the reporting and validation of plant load factors	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 2a: Determine appropriate analysis method	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
9. Has the PD described the selection process of investment analysis method (simple cost, investment comparison and benchmark analysis) for the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10. Is the choice of the investment analysis method appropriate to the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 2b: Option I-Simple cost analysis	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
11. Have all costs associated with the project activity and the alternatives identified in Step 1 been documented?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
12. Has it been demonstrated and supported by valid evidence that at least one of the alternatives defined in Step 1 is less costly than the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	and assessment of additionality				
Sub-step 2b: Option II-Apply investment comparison analysis	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
13. Has the PPs identified a financial indicator (such as IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or unit cost of service (e.g., levelized cost of electricity production in $/kWh or levelized cost of delivered heat in $/G)) which is most suitable for the project type and decision-making context regarding the investment comparison analysis?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 2b: Option III. Apply benchmark analysis	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
14. Has the PPs identified a financial indicator (such as IRR) which is most suitable for the project type and decision-making context including the alternatives for the benchmark analysis?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §99a				
15. Has a pre-tax benchmark been applied?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
16. If post tax benchmark is applied, has actual interest payable been taken into account in the calculation of income tax?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
If the project participant has applied investment comparison or benchmark analysis	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
17. If the benchmark is based on parameters that are standard in the market, is the cost of equity determined appropriately? Guideline either by:	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
17.1. selecting the values provided in the latest applicable version of Appendix of Investment Analysis Tool? or	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
17.2. by calculating the cost of equity using Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM)?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
18. If the benchmark based on parameters that are standard in the market, has the cost of debt been calculated as the cost of financing in the capital markets (e.g. commercial lending rates and guarantees required for the country and the type of project activity concerned), based on documented evidence from financial institutions with regard to the cost of debt financing of comparable projects?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
19. Has the discount rates and benchmarks been derived and supported appropriately?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
If the company's internal benchmark has been used for the expected return on equity: (Only applicable to benchmark analysis)	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis				
20. Has it been demonstrated that there is only one possible project developer?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
21. Has it been demonstrated that same benchmark values are used for similar projects with similar risks, developed by the same company or, if the company is brand new, would have been used for similar projects in the same sector in the country/region?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
22. If the company's expected return on equity is used as a benchmark, does the percentage of debt financing and equity financing reflect the long-term debt/equity finance structure of the legal entity owning the assets of the project activity?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
23. If the company's expected return on equity is used as a benchmark, has the cost of debt been based on the weighted average cost of debt financing of the legal entity owning the project activity?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
24. In case of loans, is the weighted average cost of outstanding long-term debt used as a benchmark?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
25. In case of bonds, is the weighted average yield of the bonds used as a benchmark?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
26. In case of bonds, are the key parameters of the bond including the time of maturity, yield, registration issuance in the financial system and set-up in the market documented?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
27. In case of debt financing from a parent company, is the transfer of capital to the legal entity documented?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
28. In case of loans from a financial institution, is the contract of lending between the financial institution and the legal entity owning the assets of the project activity, or, in absence of the contract, a letter from the bank stating its intention to award the loan and the key terms for the loan documented and supported by the appropriate evidence?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 2c: Calculation and comparison of financial indicators (Only applicable to investment comparison and benchmark analysis)	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
29. Has the period of assessment including IRR and equity IRR calculations been chosen appropriately?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
30. Have the PPs justified the period of assessment in the context of the underlying project activity?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
31. In case IRR assessment period doesn't cover the technical lifetime of the project, does the cash flow in the final year include a fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
32. Has the fair value of the project activity assets been calculated in accordance with local	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
accounting regulations where available, or international best practice?					
33. Do the fair value calculations include both the book value of the asset and the reasonable expectation of the potential profit or loss on the realization of the assets?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
34. Have all relevant costs been included for the calculation of IRR or other relevant financial indicator?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
35. In case of project IRR, has the cost of financing expenditures (i.e. loan repayments and interest) been included?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
36. Has the depreciation, and other non-cash items related to the project activity, (those deducted in estimating gross profits on which tax is calculated) been added back to net profits in the calculation of the financial indicator (e.g. IRR, NPV)?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
37. In case of using post-tax bencmark, has taxes been included as an expense in the IRR/NPV calculation?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
38. In case any risk premiums are applied in determination of the benchmark, are the same risks associated with the project type or activity, too?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §100b CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
39. In the equity IRR, has the cost of debt (loan, bond etc.) been considered as the net cash outflow?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
40. In cases where an investment analysis is carried out in nominal terms and the available IRR benchmarks are in real terms, have PPs converted the real term values of benchmarks to nominal values by adding the inflation rate?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
41. Has it been demonstrated that proposed project activity isn't economically or financially feasible without the revenue from CDM?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §96b	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
ACM0002					
42. If the proposed project is integrated hydro power project, has the following been considered for the purpose of investment analysis?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
42.1. Investment associated with the CDM project activity, i.e. construction of a new reservoir and new power plants/units and	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
42.2. Revenue due to net electricity generation ($EG_{PJ,y}$) as determined using equation (10) in ACM 0002	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 2d: Sensitivity analysis (Only applicable to investment comparison and benchmark analysis)	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
43. Has a sensitivity analysis showing whether the conclusion regarding the financial/economic attractiveness is robust to reasonable variations in the critical assumptions, been included in the PD?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
44. Has the range of variations selected been justified in the context of the project?	CDM TOOL27: Investment analysis	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Step-3: Barrier analysis	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
45. Have the PPs used and referred the "Guidelines for Objective Demonstration and Assessment of Barriers"?	Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 3a: Identify barriers that would prevent the implementation of the proposed project activity					
46. Has the PPs established realistic and credible barriers that would prevent the implementation of the proposed project activity? •	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 3b: Show that the identified barriers would not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives (except the proposed project activity)	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	and assessment of additionality				
47. Has the identified barriers that would prevent the implementation of the proposed project activity, but not the implementation of at least one of the alternatives in particular the identified baseline scenario, been supported by the clear and valid evidence?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §103 Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
48. Is it demonstrated and supported by proper evidence how the VCS alleviates each of the identified barriers to a level that the project is not prevented anymore from occurring by any of the barriers?	Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Investment, technological and other barriers					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
49. In case of investment barriers, is it demonstrated in the PD that the financing of the project was assured only due to the benefit of the VCS?	Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
50. Can any of the indicated barriers be eliminated by additional financial investments into the proposed project activity?	Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
51. While demonstrating barriers related to the lack of access to capital, technologies and skilled labour, do the PPs provide information on the nature of the companies and entities involved in the financing and implementation of the project?	Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Barriers due to prevailing practice					
52. In case PPs claim that project activity is "first-of-its-kind" have those claims been substantiated and supported by proper evidence?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM TOOL23 Additionality of first-of-its-kind project Activities §12	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Step-4: Common practice analysis					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
53. If the project is not "first-of-its-kind", have PPs applied the common practice analysis appropriately?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §108 CDM TOOL24 Common practice	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
54. Is the selection of the assessment region explained and justified completely and correctly?	CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §108a CDM TOOL24 Common practice §9	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 4a: The proposed CDM project activity(ies) applies measure(s) that are listed below **(Questions from 63 to 69 are applicable)** •	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM TOOL24 Common practice §10				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
55. Have all projects within an applicable output range (+/-50%) been included into the common practice analysis?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §13	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
56. Have the similar projects (both CDM and non-CDM) been identified?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
57. If the similar projects have been identified, are the following conditions fullfilled?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
57.1. Are the projects located in the applicable geographical area?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
57.2. Are the projects applied the same measure as the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
57.3. Do the projects use the same energy source/fuel and feedstock as the proposed project activity, if a technology switch measure is implemented by the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
57.4. Do the plants in which the projects have been implemented produce goods or services with comparable quality, properties and applications areas (e.g. clinker) as the proposed project plant?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
57.5. Are the capacity or output of the projects within the applicable capacity or output range calculated in Question 3.5.68?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
57.6. Do the projects start commercial operation before the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation or before the start date of proposed project activity, whichever is earlier for the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §14	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
58. Within the projects identified in Question 3.5.68, have the following project activities been identified?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §15	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
58.1. Non registered CDM project activities	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §15	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
58.2. Project activities not submitted for registration	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §15	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
58.3. Project activities not undergoing validation	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §15	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
59. Within similar projects identified in Question 3.5.68, have the projects applying technologies that are different to the technology applied in the proposed project activity been identified?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §16 CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	and assessment of additionality CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §108c				
60. Has the factor (F=1-Ndiff / Nall) been calculated correctly?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §17	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
61. Based on an analysis provided in the PD, is it possible to conclude that the proposed project activity is not common practice?	CDM TOOL24 Common practice §18	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
Sub-step 4b: The proposed CDM project activity(ies) doesn't apply any of the measures that are listed in Sub-step 4a above **(Questions 70 and 71 are applicable):**					
62. Has the PPs provided an analysis of any other activities that are operational and that are	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
similar to the proposed project activity in the PD?	and assessment of additionality CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §109b				
63. If similar activities have been identified, has it been demonstrated that there are essential distinctions between them and proposed project activity, which demonstrate the necessity of the VCS benefits?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §109c	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind.	OK	OK
In all cases to check additionality at the final stage					
64. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to additionality?	CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §63d	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind. Therefore, it is additional.	OK	OK
65. As a result, has the PPs demonstrated that the project activity is additional in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and tool(s)?	CDM-PDD-FORM Version 12.0 CDM Validation and Verification Standard for	DR	The project activity is first-of-its-kind. Therefore, it is additional.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Project activities §88				
6. Baseline Scenario					
6.1. Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed project activity prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required? •	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §94 CDM project standard for project activities §59	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.2. Does the PD identify the baseline for the proposed project activity, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §75 CDM project standard for project activities §61	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
6.3. If the methodology requires use of the tools to identify the baseline scenario, have all those been applied?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §77	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.4. Are there relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §81 CDM project standard for project activities §64	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.5. If there are relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario, have those been considered correctly in the PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §83d	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.6. Are there relevant circumstances to identify the baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §81	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.7. Does the methodology require several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most reasonable baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §78	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
6.8. If the methodology requires several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most reasonable baseline scenario, are all credible scenarios that are in the PP and are supplementary to those required by the methodology reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §78	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.9. If the proposed project activity includes several different facilities, technologies, outputs or services, do the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.10. If the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately, are the realistic combinations of these be considered as possible alternative scenarios to the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.11. Does the list of alternative scenarios given in the PP include the following?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.11.1. The project activity is undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.11.2. All plausible alternatives	CDM validation and verification	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	standard for project activities §93b				
6.11.3. Comply with all applicable and enforced legislation	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.12. Has the PP explained how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §59	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.13. Where the procedure in the selected methodology(ies) involves several steps, has the PPs described how each step is applied and transparently documented the outcome of each step?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM-PDD-FORM Version 12.0 CDM project standard for project activities §59	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.14. Has the PP provided and explained all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources, etc.)?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.15. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonably supported by correct and verifiable references, assumptions, calculations and ratinonales?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	CDM-PDD-FORM Version 12.0				
6.16. Has a transparent description of the baseline scenario been provided including the technology(ies) that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM Validation and Verification Standard for Project activities §80	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.17. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to baseline identification?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63b	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
ACM 0002					
6.18. If the project activity involves the installation of a greenfield power plant, is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM 0002?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly with including the reference documents.	OK	OK
6.19. If the project activity involves capacity addition to existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM0002?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
6.20. If the proposed project activity is a capacity addition, retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement, have the existing plant/unit started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion, retrofit or rehabilitation of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.21. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the point of time at which the generation facility would likely be replaced or retrofitted ($DATE_{Baseline\ Retrofit}$) defined?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.22. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified following the step-wise procedure in accordance with the ACM0002?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.23. Are the realistic and credible alternative baseline scenarios for power generation appropriately identified following the Step 1 of the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality"?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.24. Is "the proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity" listed as one of the alternatives?	CDM TOOL01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a ACM 0002 Version 20.0				
6.25. Has "other realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) to the proposed CDM project activity scenario that deliver outputs services or services with comparable quality, properties and application areas" been listed as an alternative?	CDM TOOL01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93b ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.26. Has "continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken" been listed as an alternative?	CDM TOOL01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.27. If the barrier analysis is used, is the Step 2 of the latest applicable version of "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" applied appropriately?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
6.28. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2 and if the remaining alternatives include scenarios P1 and P3, is the Investment Comparison as per step 3 of the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" applied appropriately?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6.29. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2 and if the remaining alternatives include scenarios P1 and P2, is the Benchmark Analysis as per step 2b of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" applied appropriately?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
7. Project Boundary					
7.1. Is the diagram or map of the project boundary, showing clearly the physical locations of the various installations or management activities taking place as part of the project activity given?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please indicate "Included/excluded" of "CO_2" GHG in Section 7.	CAR-15	OK
7.2. Has the PP described the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project emissions and baseline emissions, in the tabular format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project boundary is described correctly in Section 7.	OK	OK
7.3. Has the PP presented a flow diagram of the project boundary, physically delineating the project activity, based on the description provided in section 7 of the ICR PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	A flow diagram is included in Section 7.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
7.4. Has the PP included in the flow diagram the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described in ICR PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	A flow diagram is included in Section 7.	OK	OK
7.5. Has it been indicated in the diagram the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	A flow diagram is included in Section 7.	OK	OK
7.6. Does the selected methodology allow the PPs to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM project standard for project activities §58	DR	N/A	OK	OK
7.7. If the selected methodology allows the project participants to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary, do the project participants explain and justify their choices?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM project standard for project activities §58	DR	N/A	OK	OK
7.8. Have all sources and GHGs necessary for the calculation of emissions been included within the project boundary?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §69	DR	All GHG sources are included.	OK	OK
7.9. Does the PP correctly describe the project boundary and the physical delineation of the proposed project activity?	CDM project standard for project activities §57	DR	The project boundary is described correctly in Section 7.	OK	OK
7.10. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to project boundary?	CDM validation and verification	DR	The selected methodology is applied correctly with respect to project boundary.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	standard for project activities §63a				
ACM 0002					
7.11. Is the spatial extent of the project boundary identified correctly? (The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system that the CDM project power plant is connected to.)	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The spatial extent of the project activity is identified correctly.	OK	OK
7.12. Are the greenhouse gases and emission sources included in or excluded from the project boundary given in the tabular form as per the guidance given in Table-2 of ACM 0002?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	All GHG sources are considered in Section 7.	OK	OK
8. QUANTIFICATION OF GHG EMISSION MITIGATIONS					
8.1. Criteria and Procedures for Quantification					
8.1.1. Baseline emissions					
8.1.1.1. Do the steps taken, and equations applied to calculate baseline emissions comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	a) Please correct the notation of "$EF_{grid,CM,y}$" in Section 8.1 (on page 38). It is indicated as "$EF_{grid,,}$". b) The emission factor is indicated as "0.643167971743973" in "ERCalculation" Excel sheet. However, the relevant value is indicated differently in Section 8.1. Please correct the contradiction.	CAR-16	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			c) Please indicate the units of the values in the ER Calculation Excel sheet. d) Please indicate the unit of the emission factor in Section 8.1. e) Please provide a sample calculation for the baseline emission in Section 8.1. f) Please include the total estimated baseline emission of the project activity in Section 8.1. g) Both $EF_{grid,CM}$ and $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ notations are used in Section 8.1. Please provide consistent notations of the parameters throughout the ICR-PDD.		
8.1.1.2. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology to calculate baseline emissions are applied by the PPs?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 8.1.1.1.	CAR-16	OK
8.1.2. Project Emissions					
8.1.2.1. Do the steps taken, and equations applied to calculate project emissions comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.1.2.2. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
approved methodology to calculate project emissions are applied by the PPs?					
8.1.2.3. Has the PPs explained and justified all relevant methodological choices including the following?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.1.2.3.1. Where the methodology(ies) or standardized baseline(s) include different scenarios or cases, indicate and justify which scenario or case applies to the project activity	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.1.2.3.2. Where the methodology(ies) or standardized baseline(s) provide different options to choose from , indicate and justify which option is chosen for the project activity	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.1.2.3.3. Where the methodology(ies) or standardized baseline(s) allow different default values, indicate, and justify which of the default values have been chosen for the project activity.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
8.1.3. Leakage					
8.1.3.1. Do the steps taken, and equations applied to calculate leakage comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The leakage emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.1.3.2. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology to calculate leakages are applied by the PPs?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The leakage emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.2. Quantification of Net-GHG Emissions and/or Removals					
8.2.1. Have the project proponents included the description of the procedure for quantification of the net GHG emission reductions and removals including all relevant equations?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please correct the total estimated emission reduction in Section 8.2.	CAR-17	OK
8.2.2. Are the ex-ante calculation (estimate) of baseline emissions/removals, project emissions/removals, leakage emissions and net emission reductions and removals provided in a tabular format?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The ER values are included in Section 8.2.	OK	OK
8.2.3. Has it been documented how each equation is applied in a manner that	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The ER values are included in Section 8.2.	OK	OK

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

	Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	enables the reader to reproduce the calculation?					
8.2.4.	Are the example calculations for all key equations provided to allow the reader to reproduce the calculation of estimated net GHG emission reductions or removals?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The ER values are included in Section 8.2.	OK	OK
	ACM 0002					
8.2.5.	Are baseline emissions calculated using equation (11) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Equation (11) is used for the baseline emissions.	OK	OK
8.2.6.	Is the quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y ($EG_{PJ,y}$) calculated using equations (12), (13), (14), (15) or (16) given in the methodology depending on the project type and relevant requirements?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	$EGPJ,y = EGfacility,y$	OK	OK
8.2.7.	When the methodology offers options for approaches in calculations, is "which option applied" documented in the PP?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
8.2.8.	In the case of retrofits or replacements, has the point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced/retrofitted in the absence of the project chosen in a conservative manner?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
8.2.9. In the case of capacity additions, retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects)	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
8.2.9.1. Is it ensured that the existing plant started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
8.2.9.2. Is it defined in the baseline emission section that no capacity addition, retrofit or rehabilitation of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
8.2.10. Are the project emissions calculated properly using equations (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) or (10) given in the methodology depending on the project type and the power density value?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	The project emissions are taken as zero.	OK	OK
8.2.11. Where project emissions are taken as "0", has the PP made proper justification?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	As per ACM0002 (a wind power plant).	OK	OK
8.2.12. Are the emission reductions calculated using equation (17) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Equation (17) is used to calculate the emission reductions.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
8.3. Risk Assessment for Permanence					
8.3.1. If there is a risk for reversal of CO_2 reductions or removals for the project, have the PP(s) provided the risk analysis and buffer determination.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	With routine maintenance activities, the risks are minimized.	OK	OK
8.3.2. Are established and applied criteria, procedures, and/or methodologies for assessing the risk of reversal of GHG emission reduction or removals described in the ICR PDD?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	With routine maintenance activities, the risks are minimized.	OK	OK
8.3.3. Have the PP(s) included internal, external, and natural disturbance risks, such as political, project management, financial, market, and other relevant risks?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	With routine maintenance activities, the risks are minimized.	OK	OK
9. MANAGEMENT OF DATA QUALITY					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
9.1. Are quality management procedures to manage data and information relevant to the project and baseline scenario, accompanied by the uncertainty assessment described by the PP(s)?.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Section 9 is completed.	OK	OK
9.2. Do the management procedures include a description of how data is maintained and recorded.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Section 9 is completed.	OK	OK
9.3. Is the information management system used in the project described?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Section 9 is completed.	OK	OK
9.4. Are location and retention of stored data and data management that includes a procedure for data transfers between different systems or documentation forms included in the procedures?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Section 9 is completed.	OK	OK
10. MONITORING					
10.1. Monitoring Plan					
10.1.1. Is a detailed description of the monitoring plan for the project activity that includes the following provided in the ICR PDD:	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	a) Please indicate the reason why there is a gap between the commissioning and generating electricity (i.e. between 08/04/2019 – 01/05/2019). b) Please provide "2019.04.08_Act_ASCOE commissioning_UA.pdf". It cannot be found among the supporting documents.	CL-3	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			c) Please include the main source of the electricity generation (e.g. invoices or any other official source) in Section 10.1.		
10.1.1.1. procedures for measuring or otherwise obtaining, recording, compiling, and analyzing data and information important for quantifying and reporting GHG emissions and/or removals relevant to the project and baseline scenario,	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.2. calibration of equipment and	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.3. documentation of data collected.	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4. Does the monitoring plan and, as applicable, information on parameters in section 10.2 include:	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please see below.		
10.1.1.4.1. purpose of monitoring;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.2. list of parameters being measured and monitored;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.3. types of data and information to be reported, including units of measurement;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.4. origin of the data;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.1.1.4.5. monitoring methodologies, including estimation, modeling, measurement, calculation	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.6. approaches, and uncertainty;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.7. monitoring frequency, considering the needs of intended users;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.8. monitoring roles and responsibilities, including procedures for authorizing, approving, and documenting changes to recorded data;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.1.4.9. controls that include internal data checks for input, transformation, and output, and procedures for corrective actions;	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.2. Have the PPs developed and described the monitoring plan for the proposed project activity in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and all other applicable rules and requirements?	CDM project standard for project activities §78 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §117	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.3. Does the monitoring plan include all data, parameters and related information	CDM project standard for	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
required by the selected methodology(ies)?	project activities §81 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118a-ii ACM 0002 Version 20.0				
10.1.4. Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118b	DR	The monitoring arrangements are feasible within the project design.	OK	OK
10.1.5. Is the operational and management structure for the monitoring of emission reductions or any leakage emissions described in the monitoring plan?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.1.6. Does the monitoring plan clearly indicate the responsibilities and internal arrangements for data collection and archiving?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 CDM project standard for project activities §82c	DR	The monitoring plan is clearly indicated.	OK	OK
10.1.7. Does the monitoring plan reflect good monitoring practices appropriate to the type of project activity?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The monitoring plan reflects good monitoring practices.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.1.8. Are measurements conducted with according to relevant industry or national/international standards?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The relevant national rules are included.	OK	OK
10.1.9. Where appropriate, have the line diagrams to display the GHG data collection and management system been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.2. Data and Parameters Remaining Constant					
10.2.1. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each data/parameter which are determined to remain fixed throughout the project crediting period been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The emission factor is indicated as "0.643167971743973" in "ERCalculation" Excel sheet. However, the relevant value is indicated differently in Section 10.2. Please correct the contradiction.	CAR-18	OK
10.2.2. Has the unit of the each data/parameter been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The unit is correct.	OK	OK
10.2.3. Has the description of the each data/parameter been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The description is available.	OK	OK
10.2.4. Has the source of the each data/parameter been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	IFI Default Grid Factors	OK	OK
10.2.5. Where several sources of data/parameters are used, is the choice of data sources explained and justified?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.2.6. Are the applied actual values provided correctly?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 10.2.1.	CAR-18	OK
10.2.7. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The value is taken from IFI Default Grid Factors.	OK	OK
10.2.8. Has the PPs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.2.9. Has the PPs included how the measurement is undertaken?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.2.10. Have the PPs included description of calibration procedures for the monitoring equipment?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.2.11. Has the accuracy level of the measurement method included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.2.12. Has the responsible person/entity and the interval for the measurements included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The value is taken from IFI Default Grid Factors.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.2.13. If applicable, has the calculation method been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	The value is taken from IFI Default Grid Factors.	OK	OK
10.3. Data and Parameters Monitored					
10.3.1. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each data/parameter been included?ICR PDD	ICR PDD Template V.3.0 AM0058 Version 5.0	DR	In ERCalculation Excel sheet, the estimated electricity generation is indicated as 115,428.2 MWh/year. However, the relevant value is indicated differently in Section 10.3 Please correct the contradiction.	CAR-19	OK
10.3.2. Has the unit of the each data/parameter been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.3. Has the description of the each data/parameter been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.4. Has the source of the each data/parameter been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.5. Where several sources of data/parameters are used, is the choice of data sources explained and justified?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.3.6. Has the frequency of monitoring/recording been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.7. Are the applied actual values provided correctly?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	Please refer to 10.3.1.	CAR-19	OK
10.3.8. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.9. Has the PPs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.3.10. Has the PPs included how the measurement is undertaken?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.11. Have the PPs included description of calibration procedures for the monitoring equipment?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.12. Has the accuracy level of the measurement method included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.13. Has the responsible person/entity and the interval for the measurements included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
10.3.14. If applicable, has the calculation method been included?	ICR PDD Template V.3.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
10.3.15. If the data and parameters monitored in Section 10.3 of the ICR PDD are to be determined by a sampling approach, has the PP provided a description of the sampling plan in accordance with the recommended outline for a sampling plan in the latest applicable version of "Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities"?	CDM-PDD-FORM Version 12.0 CDM Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §29 §30 §31 §32 §33	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.16. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, does the sampling plan present a reasonable approach for obtaining	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
unbiased, reliable estimates of the variables?	CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40a				
10.3.17. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the elements of objectives and reliability requirements complete?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40a-i	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.18. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, do the requirements specified agree with those stated in the appropriate standards?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40a-i	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.19. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the population in the sampling plan clearly defined?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40b	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.20. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the proposed sampling approach clear?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	programmes of activities §40c				
10.3.21. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, does the sampling approach comply with the description of the population?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40c-ii	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.22. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the proposed sample size adequate to achieve the minimum confidence/precision requirements?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40d	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.23. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the ex-ante estimate of the population variance needed for the calculation of the sample size adequately justified?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40d	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.24. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the sample representative of the population?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40e	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.3.25. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is it identified how the sampling frame would be kept?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40e-ii	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.26. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the methods of data collection clear and unambiguous?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40f-i	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.27. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the procedures for the data measurements defined appropriately and clearly?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.28. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, do the procedures for measurements adequately provide for minimizing non-sampling errors?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.3.29. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the quality control and assurance strategy adequate?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g-i	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
10.3.30. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the proposed skill sets, qualifications and experience of the personnel to be engaged to conduct sampling adequate?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40h-i	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK

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