GS PROJECT RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD VALIDATION REPORT

VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.

ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY

IN

TURKEY

R-C-01 / 24.08.2022- 03

PROJECT NUMBER:1004

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd.		
Project Title:	ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current PDD Version:**
1004	VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.		076
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
19/05/2023	121/032/2024	054	83

Summary:

Host Country: Turkey

Project is Reviewed Against:

☒ Kyoto Protocol ☒ UNFCCC CDM Rules and Regulations and associated documents

☒ Gold Standard Rules and Regulations ☐ Other (Please Specify)

Methodology: ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources"

Version: 21.0

Project Developers: Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.

Average Annual Emission Reduction Estimate in the 2nd Crediting Period: 34, 757 tCO_2e

Project Size: ☒ Large Scale ☐ Small Scale ☐ Micro Scale

Registry Number:	**Crediting Period Renewal No:**	**Crediting Period Start Date:**
GS2542	☒1st ☐ 2nd	23/05/2022

Validation Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Validation Findings: During the validation 27 Corrective Action Requests and 02 Clarification Request were raised, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this validation report. ~~No~~ 01 Forward Action Requests were raised during the validation all of which shall be addressed during the initial verification of the proposed project activity.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey" in Turkey, as described in the PDD, version ~~06~~ 07 and dated ~~02/01/2024~~11/03/2024, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM, GS and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002, version 21.0. Hence, Re Carbon Ltd. requests the renewal of crediting period of this registered GS project activity.

Validation Team Leader:	Seda Atabek	**Indexing Terms:**
Validation Team Members:	Selen CİLASUN- Trainee Validator İrem TAŞKIRAN- Trainee Validator	☒No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit

Approved By (Technical Reviewer):	**Name:**	**Signature:**	☐ Limited Distribution ☐ Unrestricted Distribution
	Anıl Söyler		

Abbreviations

BM : Build Margin
CAR : Corrective Action Request
CDM : Clean Development Mechanism
CER : Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL : Clarification request
CM : Combined Margin
CO_2 : Carbon dioxide
CO_2e : Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA : Designated National Authority
DOE : Designated Operational Entity
DR : Document Review
EF : Emission Factor
EIA : Environmental Impact Assessment
ER : Emission Reductions
ERPA : Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
FAR : Forward Action Request
FSR : Feasibility Study Report
GHG : Greenhouse gas(es)
GS : Gold Standard
GS4GG: Gold Standard for Global Goals
GWP : Global Warming Potential
I : Interview
IPCC : Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRR : Internal Rate of Return
kWh : Kilo Watt Hour
LoA : Letter of approval
MoV : Means of Validation
MW : Mega Watt
MWh : Mega Watt Hour
NCV : Net Calorific Value
NGO : Non-governmental Organisation
ODA : Official Development Assistance
OM : Operating Margin
PDD : Project Design Document
PD : Project Developer(s)
tCO2e : Tonnes of CO2 equivalents
UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION 6

2. INTRODUCTION 7

2.1. Objective 7

2.2. Scope 7

2.3. GHG Project Description 8

2.4. Parties Involved ..... 10~~9~~

3. METHODOLOGY ..... 11~~10~~

3.1. Validation Team and ITR Selection ..... 13~~12~~

3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents ..... 14~~13~~

3.3. Site Visits ..... 15~~14~~

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Validation Protocol ..... 16~~15~~

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews ..... 17~~16~~

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues ..... 17~~16~~

3.7. Internal Quality Control ..... 18~~17~~

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS ..... 19~~18~~

4.1. Baseline Scenario ..... 19~~18~~

4.2. Application of the Selected Baseline and Monitoring Methodology or Standardized Baseline ..... 20~~19~~

4.3. Monitoring ..... 20~~19~~

4.4. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions ..... 23~~22~~

4.5. Sampling Plan ..... 24~~23~~

5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED ..... 25~~24~~

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED ..... 27~~26~~

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE ..... 30~~28~~

7.1. Appointment Certificates ..... 31~~29~~

8. VALIDATION OPINION 3533

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL 3735

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the 2nd crediting period validation of the "Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey" in "Turkey" between 27/03/2023 and 25/05/2023. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

As a result of validation, Re Carbon Ltd. concludes the following:

☒ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Re Carbon Ltd. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and Gold Standard for Global Goals. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. recommends the renewal of crediting period of the project by Gold Standard.

☐ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided Re Carbon Ltd. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. does not recommend the renewal of crediting period of the project by Gold Standard and will inform the project developer(s) and Gold Standard on this decision.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. was appointed by "Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş." to perform the crediting period renewal validation of the "Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey" in Turkey through a contract dated 07/12/2022. The objective of this validation activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the project and to ensure that the selected baseline, estimated emission reductions and monitoring plan is still in line with the applied methodologies and the applicable CDM and GS4GG requirements. In particular;

- the project's baseline is assessed against "ACM0002-Large-scale Consolidated Methodology: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 21.0
- the project's monitoring plan is assessed against "ACM0002-Large-scale Consolidated Methodology: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" Version 21.0
- Tool: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period version 03.0.1
- the projects 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 legislation and sustainability criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0
- CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0
- GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements

Validation is a requirement for all GS projects that are requesting a renewal of crediting period and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of certified emission reductions (CERs).

2.2. Scope

The scope of the validation is the independent and objective review of the Project Design Document (PDD) which is revised for the 2nd crediting period. The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see Section 2.1) and decisions by the CDM Executive Board, 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 GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

The validation team employed a risk-based approach to assess the completeness and accuracy of the claims and conservativeness of the assumptions in the PDD. The main focus of the validation team is to determine if the identified baseline is still applicable to the project activity,

if the estimated emission reductions for the 2nd crediting period are still conservative and if the monitoring plan is still feasible for the project activity.

The only purpose of the validation is its usage during the renewal of crediting period process as part of the GS 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 will go beyond that purpose.

2.3. GHG Project Description

The "ÇESME WIND POWER PROJECT, TURKEY" is operated by "VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.". The project activity is located in Çeşme District of İzmir Province, Turkey. The project activity has 6 turbines with 3 MWm/2.67 Mwe unit capacity. Total capacity is 18 MWm/16 MWe. Annual electricity generation is calculated as 53.572.000 kWh which is transmitted to the national grid at Çeşme RES transmission line.

- The construction start date of the project activity was 02/01/2014.
- The first crediting period is from 23/05/2015-22/05/2022 (both days included).
- The start date of commissioning is 23/05/2015 and is accepted as the CP start date.

The project is located in Çeşme district in İzmir province of Turkey. The project is estimated to supply electricity to grid as 53,572 MWh per annum. Expected annual emission reductions of the project is approximately 34,757 tCO2e/year and a total reduction of 243,299 tCO2e over the 5-year crediting period. The project supplies electric power to the Turkish National grid.

The coordinates given below are given in the PDD, version ~~06~~ 07 and dated ~~02/01/2024~~11/03/2024 of the Çeşme Wind Power Project:

	E	N
T1	44 09 16	42 40 120
T2	44 12 41	42 39 870
T3	44 15 15	42 39 705
T4	44 09 49	42 39 200
T5	44 07 61	42 38 827
T6	44 07 84	42 38 478

These coordinates have been confirmed by the validation team with examining the generation license of the project activity.

The project activity aligns with the eligibility criteria outlined in section 3.1.1 of the GS4GG Principles & Requirements document, as follows:

The project utilizes the ACM0002 methodology (Version 21.0), an approved approach under the Gold Standard, for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources.

It falls under the eligible project type of wind, as specified in the 1.1. Eligible Project Types & Scope under Renewable Energy Activity Requirements.

The project is required to generate and deliver energy services from non-fossil and renewable sources, including various renewable energy generation units such as photovoltaic, tidal/wave, wind, hydro, geothermal, waste to energy, and renewable biomass.

The project displaces electricity from thermal power stations, contributing to Turkey's sustainable development and aligning with the Gold Standard Vision and Mission.

Wind is an approved project type for this endeavor.

The project is not part of any other voluntary or compliance standards program, and the existing 18 MWm/16 MWe capacity is not included in IREC.

Meeting the general eligibility criteria, the project is classified as a wind project located in İzmir Province, Turkey, with a registered activity scale of 16 MWe at a large scale. The project adheres to the legal, environmental, ecological, and social regulations of the host country. Contact details of the project owner, VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş., are available in Appendix 2, and an Official Development Assistance (ODA) Declaration has been signed by the Project Developer.

The project also fulfills additional requirements:

It remains consistent with the General Eligibility Criteria and complies with Gold Standard Requirements.

The project aligns with the following principles:

Contribution to Climate Security & Sustainable Development, supporting SDG 7, 8, and 13.

Safeguarding Principles (Refer to Appendix 1).

Stakeholder Inclusivity, with completed Stakeholder Consultation Processes and an established grievance mechanism.

Demonstration of Real Outcomes, evidenced by the application of the tool "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period" (Version 03.0.1), resulting in a revised baseline.

Financial Additionality & Ongoing Financial Need (See section B.5.2), with an updated IRR analysis reflecting realized generation, resulting in a decreased IRR of 7.82%.

2.4. Parties Involved

The registered PDD indicates ‘’Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.” as the project developer and ‘’Sekans Enerji Ltd. Şti. ’’ as the project representative of the project activity and host country is Turkey.

3. METHODOLOGY

The renewal of crediting period validation of proposed GS project activity includes the following phases:

- Assessment whether the baseline of the project activity is revised in the PDD to reflect the most recent situation for the project activity, via a desk review of the revised PDD between 27/03/2023 and 19/05/2023.
- Assessment whether the applied methodology ACM0002 “Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 21.0, in the revised PDD was applied correctly, including the baseline selection and monitoring plan.
- The physical site visit was conducted on 13/02/2023 in order to assess the implementation process of the project activity and to confirm stakeholders’ comments.
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions.
- Issuance of the renewal of crediting period validation report
- Independent technical review (ITR)
- Approval of the validation report and request of renewal of crediting period

The Validation Protocol is used for the assessment of each requirement during the execution of validation activities and is given in Annex-1 of this validation report.

The Validation Protocol consists of two tables:

- Table 1 GS-PDD-FORM, GS4GG and CDM Renewal of Crediting Period validation requirements)
- Table 2 (Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests)

The usage description of Table-1 in Validation Protocol is explained in Table 3-1 below:

Table 3-1: Explanation about Table-1 in Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Protocol

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with the GS-PDD Form, GS4GG and CDM Renewal of Crediting Period validation Standards and/ or Procedures	Gives reference to the legislation or documents where the relevant requirement is found	Explains how conformance with question is investigated. Examples of means of validation are Document Review (DR), Interview (I) and Not Applicable (NA)	Is used to elebarote and discuss the question and/or conformance to the question by giving related references and document sources based on which the finding is issued or evidence is checked	Either acceptable based on the evidence provided (OK), non-compliance with the requirement (CAR), further clarification (CL) due to insufficient, unclear or not transparent information, forward action request (FAR) that needs to be solved during the verification

The usage description of Table-2 in Validation Protocol is explained in Table 3-2 below:

Table 3-2: Explanation about Table-2 in Validation Protocol

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
The all CL, FAR and CARs determined during the draft validation report should be listed here	Gives reference to the checklist questions in Table-1 of Validation Protocol	Is used to summarize the responses by project developers regarding the non-conformities	Is used to summarize the responses by validation team and their conclusions

The Validation Protocol is filled out by the validation team in line with the descriptions above and all the CARs, CLs and FARs are listed in a transparent and clear manner.

3.1. Validation Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the validation team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and the related host country experience required amongst team members for the accurate and thorough assessment of the project design. The relevant GS validation and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and the Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The validation team and ITR were assigned to this validation activity on 02/12/2022 taking all the above factors into consideration and as a result of the contract review process.

The validation team members and ITR are listed in Table 3-3 below:

Table 3-3: Validation team and ITR details

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Financial Expertise	Involvement*
Seda Atabek	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	☐	A, DR, R, SV
Selen Cilasun	Trainee Validator	☒	☒	☒	☐	A, DR, R, SV
İrem Taşkıran	Trainee Validator	☒	☒	☒	☐	A, DR, R, SV
Anıl Söyler	ITR	☒	☒	☒	☒	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

3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents

The basis for the crediting period renewal validation activity is the PDD version 01, dated 24/03/2023 which was submitted to the validation team on 27/03/2023. This PDD was revised several times due to the raised CARs and CLs, version ~~06~~ 07 dated ~~02/01/2024~~11/03/2024 being the final version. The PDD was assessed against;

- The methodology ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources Version 21.0''
- "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 7.0.0
- ''Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system'', Version 07.0
- "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period", Version 03.0.1
- the Host Country criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0,
- CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0
- GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements
- and other relevant documents, rules and regulations listed in section 2.1 of this report

A list of all the documents that were reviewed can be found in Section 6 of this renewal of crediting period validation report.

3.3. Site Visits

As a part of the validation activities site visit was performed to the project activity site, details of which can be seen in the Table 3-4 below:

Table 3-4: Site visit details

Date	13/02/2023	
Location	Ceşme, Turkey	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
İlhan Çeneli	Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	Plant Manager
Erman Kaya	Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	General Manager
Sıla Duran	Sekans Enerji Ltd. Şti	Consultant
Dilan Özalp	Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	Office Personnel-Female
Sibel Can Dinç	Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	Office Personnel-Female
Cengiz Yaman	İnönü Village	Muhtar
Önder Soman	Musalla Village	Muhtar
Rahmi Sezer	Ovacık Village	Coffee Shop Owner
Mehmet Koç	Ovacık Village	Muhtar
Selen Cilasun	Re Carbon Ltd.	Trainee Validator
İrem Taşkıran	Re Carbon Ltd.	Trainee Validator
Seda Atabek	Re Carbon Ltd.	Lead Verifier
Points Verified		**Source of Information**
Implementation and operation of the proposed GS project activity as per the registered PDD		Document review, site visit and interviews with PP (Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.) representatives and consultant
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters		Document review, site visit and interviews with PP representatives and consultant
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD including sustainable development goal (SDG) parameters		Interviews with PP representatives and local stakeholders during site visit

Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	Document review and site visit
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Document review site visit and interviews with the PP representatives, consultant and local stakeholders
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Document review
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Document review and interviews with PP representatives and consultant during site visit.

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Validation Protocol

During the validation period, a Validation Protocol which is attached in Annex 1 to this crediting period renewal validation report was used to submit the findings to the project developers.

As part of this validation report, please see "**Attachment to Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Report / GS4GG Audit Techniques Template for Validation**" for details of Audit Techniques used and risk assessment.

In line with the CDM Validation and Verification Standard, the team reports the non-conformities in the forms of Corrective Action Requests (CARs), Clarification Requests (CLs) and Forward Action Requests (FARs). When and for which type of non-conformities CARs, CLs and FARs are raised is explained below:

- The Validation team raises a **CAR** if one of the following occurs:
  - The project developers have made mistakes that influences the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions
  - The CDM and/or GS4GG requirements have not been met
  - There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.
- The Validation team raises a **CL** if information is insufficient or not clear or not transparent enough to determine whether the applicable CDM and/or GS4GG requirements have been met.
- The Validation team raises a **FAR** during validation to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the verification of the project activity.

According to these principles, a total of 27 CARs, 02 CLs and ~~00~~ 01 FARs were raised, all of which are listed in the Validation Protocol.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

During the validation period follow-up interviews were executed by the validation team in order to further analyze the correctness and accurateness of the information provided. A list of individuals interviewed is given in Section 5 of this Validation Report.

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

All issues raised as CLs and CARs during this validation activity, were resolved during the written and oral communications between the Project developer(s) and Re Carbon Ltd. Validation team members. For the resolution of these non-conformities, the project developers modified the project design, rectified the PDD or provided adequate additional explanations or evidence that satisfies the concerns of the validation team members.

Concerns were raised in the desk review, the site audit assessments and the follow up interviews and the responses provided for the raised concerns are documented in Annex 1 (Validation Protocol) to guarantee the transparency of the validation process.

The validation timeframe is given in detail in Table 3-5 below:

Table 3-5: Validation Timeframe

Activity	Timeline		Total Days
	From	To	
Desk Review	27.03.2023	22.05.2023	57
Review of the PDD version 01	13.02.2023	27.03.2023	43
Site Visit	13.02.2023	13.02.2023	1
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Protocol version 01	27.03.2023	7.04.2023	12
Review of PDs Initial Set of Responses	7.04.2023	1.05.2023	25
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Protocol version 02	10.05.2023	19.05.2023	10
Review of PDs Second Loop Responses	19.05.2023	22.05.2023	4
Closing of all the CARs and CLs	22.05.2023	22.05.2023	1
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Report version 01	22.05.2023	22.05.2023	1
ITR Process	22.05.2023	25.05.2023	4
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Report version 02	24.05.2023	25.05.2023	2
ITR Approval	25.05.2023	26.05.2023	2
Submission for Final Approval	26.05.2023	26.05.2023	1
Submission to the PD	26.05.2023	26.05.2023	1

Information or clarifications provided as a response to a CAR, CL or FAR could also lead to a new request. This can also be seen transparently in the Validation Protocol provided in Annex 1 of this Validation Report.

3.7. Internal Quality Control

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 like emission factor calculations, additionality justifications, relevant excel sheets etc.

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 GS Standard along with the necessary documents.

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS

4.1. Baseline Scenario

The project activity using the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002., Version 21.0. All the applicability conditions of the methodology have been justified appropriately in the revised PDD (version ~~06~~ 07 dated ~~02/01/2024~~11/03/2024).

The PP has also included "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period version 03.0.1" under the applicable tools list. The VVB has checked the application of the aforesaid tool and confirms that it has been correctly applied.

There has been no significant change in the relevant policies and circumstances, which would impact the baseline scenario. The earlier registered PDD takes into account all the relevant national and sectoral policies and circumstances that were applicable as on date. The discussion on the same has also been provided in the updated PDD.

The project activity is supplying power to the Turkish national grid. Thus, the baseline scenario continues to remain same as earlier, as follows: "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 to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system".

Further, the emission factor has been updated and fixed ex-ante for the 2nd renewable crediting period. The procedures as defined in the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", version 07.0 have been followed. OM and BM values in the updated PDD are 0.7424 tCO_2/MWh and 0.3680 tCO_2/MWh respectively, with 0.75 and 0.25 weightage factor given to 'operating margin' and 'build margin' respectively.

Therefore, the combined margin can be calculated as follows as per Tool 07, version 07.0:

(0.7424 x 0.75) + (0.3680 x 0.25) = **0.6488 tCO2/MWh**

OM and BM values and the grid emission factor value corresponds to the latest official emission factor of Turkey that can be used in the projects depending on the project type have been published by the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources. The same has been checked from the following link and the document available:

https://enerji.gov.tr//Media/Dizin/EVCED/tr/%C3%87evreVe%C4%B0klim/%C4%B0klimDe%C4%9Fi%C5%9Fikli%C4%9Fi/TUESEmisyonFktr/Belgeler/Bform2020.pdf

No updates in policy and regulatory framework have been found in Turkey. Hence, the baseline scenario has not changed during the 2nd crediting period and continues to be the same as during the first crediting period.

4.2. Application of the Selected Baseline and Monitoring Methodology or Standardized Baseline

The PDD has been using the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002, Version 21.0. All the applicability conditions of the methodology have been justified appropriately in the revised PDD (version ~~06~~ 07 dated ~~02/01/2024~~11/03/2024). Based on the site audit conducted and the reviewed documents including the generation license among others it is confirmed that the project has total capacity of 18 MWm/16 Mwe connected to the Turkish National Grid.

4.3. Monitoring

The monitoring plan has been revised in the updated PDD as per the applied methodology ACM0002 Version 21.0. The emission coefficient of the grid has been fixed ex-ante and will not be updated during the first renewable crediting period. As per the applied methodology, the only monitoring parameter is the amount of electricity fed into the grid by Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey.

Parameters to be monitored during the second crediting period are:

- Ery (SDGI 13.3.2)
  Baseline emissions, which are correspond to emission reductions, are calculated as the net electricity generated by the project activity, multiplied with combined margin emission factor for grid connected power generation in year y. Emission reductions will be calculated by considering the EPIAS records for the net electricity generated and the emission factor for the grid, 0.6488 tCO2/MWh, latest published by the Ministry of Energy. The annual emission reduction estimated by the project is 34,757 tCO2e. The relevant calculations were reproduced by the validation team leader and the results were found appropriate.

- $EG_{facility,y}$
  The project is expected to generate 53,572 MWh annually as per generation licence. The net generation value will be monitored continuously and recorded monthly by metering devices that belong to TEIAS, Turkish Electricity Transmission company. The main source of generation data is EPIAS records (Energy Markets Company of the government). The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid is cross checked with monthly generation from site records.

- Quality of Employment
  The positions at the power plant projects require skilled workers, which will be achieved by adequate trainings. Training records will be provided during the verification processes. The project provides workers with a safe and healthy work environment.

- Quantitative employment and income generation
  Number of employment is monitored through Social Security System (SGK) records. Considering the operational phase, 6 personnel are working. The target will be

monitored by the number of employees with the social security records during the verification process, available to VVB.

- Biodiversity
  During site visit no complaints were received about biodiversity (i.e. regional habitat) from the local stakeholders and project coordinator appointed by the Project Owner monitors and then inform bird/bat carcasses and nests in site. In case of any case, he reports to the management in his reports. The project activity have Ornithology report. An ornithology report dated in October 2012, bat monitoring reports dated in March 2017 and September 2017 also proves that there isn't any negative impact by the project activity.

Parameters not to be monitored during the second crediting period are:
Air Quality (Reduction in amount of CO and NMVOC emissions) and Water Quality and Quantity.

The net electricity is measured continuously by two power meters. The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters. Current meter is installed on 01/08/2017. The latest test of the meters was conducted on 19/09/2020. Calibration requirements are in line with legal regulations.

	Main Meter	Spare Meter
Brand	EMH	EMH
Serial Number	4213167	4213168
Accuracy Class	0.2 S	0.2 S

The electricity meters have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner. The quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid has been calculated with the EPIAS (the financial settlement center of TEIAS) records provided to the PP by TEIAS. All readings and billings are done via EPIAS system which is the legal database of the Ministry. EPİAS records are considered as the main source for the net electricity and the values are crosschecked with the data measured by meters. Meters have been validated on the physical site visit. Accuracy classes are defined in the Communiqué for Power Meters 0.2 S class. The calibration will be implemented in accordance with the related standard procedure by either Turkish Electricity Transmission Corporation (TEIAS) or the provider company in the name of TEIAS. The initial calibration of the electricity meters was done on 01/08/2017 as confirmed with the first index protocol document. Although, re-calibration is required after ten years, nevertheless, in case of irregular difference between main and cross-check spare meters, TEIAS responsible are informed for the intervention. That means TEIAS is responsible for the calibration and maintenance of the devices for every 10

years[1]. The electricity meters are tested every two years. The meter tests for the electricity meters were performed on 19/09/2020. These meter test protocols were provided to the VVB.

The assessment of Safeguarding Principles:

Principle 1 (Human Rights): The project owner respects internationally proclaimed human rights including dignity, cultural property and uniqueness of indigenous people. The project is not complicit in Human Rights abuses.

Principle 6.1 (Labour Rights): All employees will be trained and certified for the required positions. Training Records (including H&S, annually) & Other Certificates will be kept in case of any injury happened on-site. For positions that require specific skills (such as high voltage equipment) staff will be trained as well. Social security records and training records will be checked annually.

Principle 2. (Gender Equality): The project does not involve in any form discrimination in any kind of form. The project respects the employees' freedom of association and their right to collective bargaining and is not complicit in restrictions of these freedoms and rights.

Principle 3. (Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions): The Project avoids community exposure to increased health risks and does not adversely affect the health of the workers and the community. All employees will be trained and certified for the required

positions. Training Records (including H&S, annually) & Other Certificates will be kept.

Principle 7.2 (Energy Supply): The annual electricity production of the project is 53,572 MWh/year. The Çeşme Wind Farm Project, Turkey is connected to the Çeşme RES transmission line and the generated electricity will be supplied to Turkey's national electricity grid.

Ongoing Financial Need:

The estimated annual electricity generation value is taken as 53,572 MWh as per the generation license of the project activity. However, as per the official record data, a production lower than the estimated electricity generation in the first crediting period was obtained. Actual generation was almost 31.2% lower compared to the estimated generation and revenue during the first monitoring period of the first crediting period. For the second monitoring period actual generation was almost 20% lower than estimated generation. Even if the predicted electricity production had been made, it would still be below the equity IRR benchmark. Project activity's IRR analysis has been revised with the realized generation from the commissioning date of the project. As a result of an assessment with the realized generation, IRR has decreased to 7.82%. (data obtained from verified monitoring reports) and with these values, the difference between the equity IRR and benchmark increased even more.

During the 1st CP the below verifications have been realized:

Biçimlendirdi: Üst simge

1 https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/anasayfa/MevzuatFihristDetayIframe?MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatNo=6381&MevzuatTertip=5

No	Monitoring Period	Amount of Issued GS VERs
1st MP	23/05/2015 – 31/07/2017	48,088
2nd MP	01/08/2027 – 22/05/2022	149,953

Hence, significance of carbon revenues has become more critical due to reduced electricity revenue.

Since the payments are made for the investment cost and the agreements are signed, there will be no change in this manner. Operational and maintenance cost needs are the same as the first crediting period.

With considering these three main parameters (electricity income, investment cost and operational and maintenance cost), the project is still not financially attractive.

The income of the GS VER is very important for the financial performance of the project and GSVERs price has been increased. Project Owner could not benefit from carbon income as expected. The carbon income has been completed its first issuance. The project activity has unique situation which is Gold Standard allowed the Project Owner to continue the GS processes after completing the 2nd Stakeholder Consultation Process. The Project Owner was not able to sell all of their VER and benefit from carbon revenue as expected. Currently 1st MP is released and 2nd MP is in performance review.

Considering the certification related costs for the project activity, approximately 1% of the revenues were spent.

As per the GS4GG Requirements (Section 4.1.52), this would be considered a FAR for the next Issuance since no revenue is realized from Gold Standard certification.

So, the results of the financial analysis still same for the project. This therefore indicates that in comparison to alternative investments, the Project was still financially unattractive in the absence of VER financing. VVB approves that PP currently needs credits to financially support the project.

4.4. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions

The emission reduction from the project activity throughout the 2nd renewable crediting period of 7 years would continue to happen if the project operates without getting replaced during the whole crediting period. The lifetime has been taken as 25 years with reference. The site audit discussion and review of the records suggest that the key project equipment is maintained properly. Therefore, the project is expected to operate throughout the 2nd crediting period of 7 years and result in emission reductions.

The emission reduction calculation estimations have been revised in the updated PDD as per the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002, Version 21.0. The emission coefficient of the grid has been updated and the emission reduction estimates are revised. The baseline emissions are calculated based on the emission coefficient multiplied by the expected net electricity generation, which amounts to 53,572 MWh per annum.

For calculation of the emission factor of Turkish Grid, the latest official operating margin and build margin emission factors of Turkey published by the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources has been referred. The document refers to calculation of the grid emission factor based on the "Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System, version 7.0".

Option A: A combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) is calculated according to the procedures prescribed in the 'Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system'.

The OM is calculated as 0.7424 tCO2/MWh.

The BM is calculated as 0.3680 tCO2/MWh.

The combined margin emissions factor has been calculated using the default values of 0.75 and 0.25 for OM and BM respectively. The CM is calculated as 0.6488 tCO2/MWh.

There are no project or leakage emissions associated with solar power projects. Thus, the emission reductions correspond to the baseline emissions. The project is expected to result in an average emission reduction of 34,757 tCO_2/year during the second crediting period. The relevant emission reduction calculation is as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y \text{ where } PE_y=0 \text{ and } LE_y=0$$

$$ER_y = BE_y$$

$$ER_y = (53{,}572 \text{ MWh/year}) \times (0.6488 \text{ tCO2/MWh})$$

$$ER_y = 34{,}757 \text{ } tCO_2\text{/year}$$

No emission sources which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the annual emission reduction by the applied methodology have been excluded.

VVB has checked the I-REC Registry (https://v-1.evident.app/Public/ReportDevices/), wherein 385 projects from Turkey are listed as of the validation report date and this project isn't available within I-REC Registry database. Similarly, VCS project database (http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home) and GCC project database (https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects) were checked and this project isn't available within VCS and GCC projects' databases, either. Given that CDM projects are not applicable in Turkey and the project does not appear on domestic REC scheme, I-REC and VCS registries, it could be confirmed that no RECs and other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project at the time of this validation.

4.5. Sampling Plan

Not applicable (Since there has not been any sampling approach implemented within the context of the project activity and crediting period renewal validation service).

5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

The list of individuals who were interviewed during the validation period is given in the Table 5-1 below:

Table 5-1: List of individuals interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview[2]	Full Name	Organization	Title
01	SV	İlhan Çeneli	Vega Enerji	Plant Manager
02	SV	Erman Kaya	Vega Enerji	General Manager
03	SV	Sıla Duran	Sekans	Consultant
04	SV	Dilan Özalp	Vega Enerji	Office Personnel-Female
05	SV	Sibel Can Dinç	Vega Enerji	Office Personnel-Female
06	SV	Cengiz Yaman	İnönü Village	Muhtar
07	SV	Önder Soman	Musalla Village	Muhtar
08	SV	Rahmi Sezer	Ovacık Village	Coffee Shop Owner
09	SV	Mehmet Koç	Ovacık Village	Muhtar
10	SV	Selen Cilasun	Re Carbon Ltd.	Trainee Validator
11	SV	İrem Taşkıran	Re Carbon Ltd.	Trainee Validator
12	SV	Seda Atabek	Re Carbon Ltd.	Lead Verifier

The local stakeholders stated in the Table 5-1 above were interviewed about the following issues and there had not been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders during the site visit:

- Noise due to the project activity
- Sufficiency of local employment
- Waste management practices implemented by PP

[2] SV: Site visit; T: Telephone; EM: E-mail

- Impact of the project on flora and fauna including bird life
- Land acquisition process of the project activity

It was also concluded that the grievance mechanism is in place and this was also confirmed by the interviewed local stakeholders during the site visit.

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

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

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	PDD	01	24/03/2023
D02	PDD	02	01/05/2023
D03	PDD	03	22/05/2023
D04	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	24/03/2023
D05	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	01/05/2023
D06	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	22/05/2023
D07	SDG Impact Tool	01	22/05/2023
D08	Meter Readings	-	2017-2022
D09	Electricity Meters First Index	-	28/05/2015
D10	Training records	-	18/02/2019, 28/04/2018, 22/05/2020, 08/04/2015, 30/03/2022, 08/10/2019, 26/05/2021, 12/01/2021
D11	Logbook Evidence	-	17/02/2023
D12	CDM Validation and Verification Standard For Project Activities	3.0	09/09/2021
D13	CDM Project Standard For Project Activities	3.0	09/09/2021
D14	ACM0002, “Large-scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”	21.0	02/11/2022
D15	Contract Agreement	-	07/12/2022
D16	GS Passport	-	23/12/2015
D17	Registered PDD	5	29/09/2015
D18	Building permits	-	02/07/2018, 02/10/2018
D19	Protocol with technical high school	-	December 2021
D20	Waste disposal evidences	-	2017-2022
D21	Waste water disposal evidences	-	2017-2022

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D22	2016-969 decision Court 5	-	02/02/2018
D23	Grievance_GS2542_SCReport	-	31/10/2022
D24	Deviation Request	-	06/01/2023[3]
D25	Stakeholder Consultation Report	-	15/08/2022
D26	Validation Report	-	23/12/2015
D27	Independent Observer Report	-	May 2022
D28	Local Employment Evidence	-	17/02/2023
D29	Screenshot of project items	-	-
D30	Honey Bee Report	-	December 2016
D31	Electromagnetic resonance report	-	2008-2014
D32	Electromagnetic Report	-	November 2015
D33	Ornithology Report	-	October 2016
D34	Ornithology Report	-	October 2012
D35	Landscape Repair Report	-	October 2012
D36	Landscape Repair Report	-	May 2014
D37	Noise Report	-	October 2020
D38	Sociology Report	-	-
D39	Dust Emission Report	-	2014
D40	Dust Emission Report	-	2016
D41	Bat Report	-	March 2017
D42	Bat Report	-	September 2017
D43	Carcass monitoring form	-	2016-2022
D44	License	-	11/03/2010
D45	Acceptances	-	May and June 2015
D46	Meter Test	-	19/09/2020
D43	PDD	04	24/05/2023
D44	SDG Impact tool	02	24/05/2023
D45	ER Calculations Excel Sheet	04	24/05/2023
D46	SDG Impact tool	03	06/10/2023
D47	PDD	05	06/10/2023
D48	PDD	06	02/01/2024

[3] https://platform.sustain-cert.com/public-project/426

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D49	SDG Impact Tool	01	06/10/2023
D50	IRR assessment	-	02/01/2024
D51	PDD	07	11/03/2024

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK holds B.Sc. degree in "Chemical Engineering" and a M.Sc. degree in "Energy Science and Technology". She is a lead auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and since 2004 has been working in the fields of "Management systems", "ISO 14064" and "Energy Management in Industry". She has been involved in more than 100 GS and VCS projects as an ITR, Team Leader, Validator and Verifier. With re-carbon, Seda is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and a TA 1.2, 2.1 & 3.1. expert. Seda is also a Regional Expert for Türkiye and China.

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.

Mr. Anıl SÖYLER holds a B. Sc. In "Environmental Engineering" from Middle East Technical University/Ankara. He has more than 15 years of professional experience in environmental management, monitoring and auditing, environmental and social impact assessments, GHG emission reporting as well as projects' validation and verification. He has been involved in the validation/verification services of more than 200 GHG emission reduction projects. Anıl has also been involved in both national and international projects, supported by IFC, the World Bank and EBRD. With re-carbon, Anıl is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and TA 1.2 expert. Anıl is also a Regional Expert for China and Türkiye.

Ms. İrem TAŞKIRAN holds a B. Sc. In "Energy Systems Engineering" from Ankara Yıldırım Beyazit University. With re-carbon, İrem is an internal Validator/Verifier Trainee and a Technical Area 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 and 3.1 expert and a Regional Expert for Türkiye.

7.1. Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

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 **03.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Anıl Söyler

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

Gold Standard

Verified Carbon 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	08-02-2021	08-02-2021		03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021
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	08-02-2021	08-02-2021		03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

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 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Turkey, China

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

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 **15.10.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. İrem Taşkıran

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

Gold Standard
Verified Carbon Standard
IOR 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					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
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					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand					15.10.2022					15.10.2022					15.10.2022
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:

F-C-053 / 19.04.2022 - 03

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

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 **01.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mrs. Fikriye Seda Atabek

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
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation					
	TA 1.2: Renewables	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater					
	TA 13.2: Manure					
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture					

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation					
	TA 1.2: Renewables	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
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: Turkey, China

F-C-053 / 19.04.2022 - 03

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

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:

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:

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 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: 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															
	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 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye (14.10.2022)

F-C-053 / 15.04.2022 - 03

8. VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. Performed the 2nd crediting period validation of the "Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey" in "Turkey" between 27/03/2023 and 25/05/2023. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) 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 "Seda Atabek as the Team Leader, Selen Cilasun as the Trainee Validator, İrem Taşkıran as the Trainee Validator and Anıl Söyler 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 GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements.
Re Carbon Ltd. Hereby confirms that the proposed project activity "Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey'' in Turkey, has 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 around 34,757 tCO_2e per annum over the 2nd crediting period. Total amount of the estimated emission reductions for the second crediting period is 243,299 tCO_2e (VERs). 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.

The relevant SDGs that would be estimated for the second crediting period as follows:

- SDG 7 (Increasing the number and percentage of renewable energy power plants such as wind power plants will provide substantial increase in the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix and ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services): 53,572 MWh/year (estimation)
- SDG 8 (The project will generate employment and income): 6 employees (estimation, currently 6 employees)
- SDG 8 (All employees will be provided with the required trainings (First Aid, Occupational and health and safety) and certification depending on the duties of their own): H&S trainings will be provided annually to the employees.
- SDG 13 (Renewable energy power plants such as Cesme WPP, will contribute to "Emissions Reductions or Removals and/or Adaptation to Climate Change" by reducing CO2 emissions caused by fossil fuel-fired power plants that are displaced due to the project activity, in line with GS4GG principles): 34,757 tCO2/year (estimation)

SDG Impact tool assessed by the VVB and found in the line with appropriate based on the current status of the project activity.

As a result, the validation team assigned by the Re Carbon Ltd. Concludes that the proposed Project Activity "Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey" in Turkey, as described in the Final PDD (version 07~~6~~, dated ~~02/01/2024~~11/03/2024)

- meets all relevant Host Country criteria;
- meets all relevant requirements of the GS4GG, 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 “Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” Version: 21.0
- is likely to achieve estimated emission reductions;

Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. Requests the renewal of crediting period of the project activity.

Seda Atabek Team Leader 12~~1~~/~~02~~03/2024	Anıl Söyler ITR 11/03/2024~~21/02/2024~~	Esin TUNALI Certification Manager 11/03/2024~~21/02/2024~~

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – GS-PDD-FORM, GS4GG and CDM Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Requirements

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
Cover Page-Key Project Information					
1. Has the following information been indicated in the cover page of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please remove the blank space on the cover page.	CL-1	OK
1.1. GS ID of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as ‘‘GS2542’’.	OK	OK
1.2. Title of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as ‘‘Çeşme Wind Power Project, Turkey’’.	OK	OK
1.3. Time of first submission date	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as ‘‘07/01/2016’’ for the first submission.	OK	OK
1.4. Date of design certification	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide the design certification.	CAR-1	OK
1.5. Version number of the PDD	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This Is available as 1 for the first submusion.	OK	OK
1.6. Completion date of version	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	‘‘24/03/2023’’	OK	OK
1.7. Project developer	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	In GS Registry system project developer indicated as ‘‘ Abk Çesme Res Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S.’’ However it is indicated as ‘‘ VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.’’ in the some of the project documents. Please clarify,	CAR-2	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
			provide evidence document and please inform GS about this situation.		
1.8. Project representative	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as ‘‘SEKANS ENERJİ LTD. ŞTİ.’’.	OK	OK
1.9. Project developers and any communities involved	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please revise the row “Project Participants and any communities involved” on the cover page since the mentioned companies are indicated as the project developer and the project representative.	CAR-3	OK
1.10. Host country (ies)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Türkiye.	OK	OK
1.11. Activity requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	‘’ Renewable Energy Activities’’.	OK	OK
1.12. Scale of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available as Large scale .	OK	OK
1.13. Other requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.14. Methodology (ies) applied and version number	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please indicate the full name of the methodology.	CAR-4	OK
1.15. Product requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available as ‘’ GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration’’.	OK	OK
1.16. Project cycle	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Regular	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
2. Has the estimated sustainable development contributions of the project activity been provided in the relevant tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please correct the unit of "13 Climate Action (mandatory)" Target in Table 1 on the cover page.	CAR-5	OK
A. Description of Project					
A.1. Purpose and general description of project					
1. Is the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project activity including, where applicable, the type of facility where the project activity will take place or replace, described in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please provide evidence document for the construction date. b) Please revise the ER calculation and baseline scenario and estimated emission reduction. In ER Calculation Excel Sheet Cell C8 isn't seen correct. c) Please correct the Mwe values for each turbine in Section A.1. d) Please provide the reference document number 1 and indicate version and date for it on the page 3. e) Please indicate the milestone table in Section A.1. f) Please indicate the brand of turbines and their generators. g) Please indicate meter information in Section A.1. h) Please indicate the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity in Section A.1 (i.e. whether the project activity is a greenfield or not).	CAR-6	OK
2. Is the baseline scenario described as identified in section B4 of the PDD? (If baseline scenario is the same with the scenario existing prior to the start of the project activity, then no need to repeat the description, but it shall be stated in the PDD that both scenarios are the same.)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
3. Has the PDs provided an estimation of annual average and total GHG emission reductions for the chosen crediting period?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to CAR-5.	CAR-6	OK
4. Is the purpose of the project activity described including how it contributes to the sustainable development of the Host Party?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available in Section A.1.1.	OK	OK
A.1.1. Eligibility of the project under Gold Standard		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
A.1.2. Legal ownership of products generated by the project and legal rights to alter use of resources required to service the project					
A.1.2.1. Is it justified that the project owner has full and uncontested legal ownership of the products that are generated under Gold Standard Certification and has legal rights concerning changes in use of resources required to service the Project for e.g water rights, where applicable?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please revise the Section A.1.1. It is not completely match with the reference which is ''GENERAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 3.1.1 The following General Eligibility Criteria applies to all projects seeking'' b) Please also indicate related references in this section (i.e. methodology)	CAR-7	OK
A.2. Location of the project activity					
A.2.1. Is the location of the project activity clearly identified including:	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below.		

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
A.2.1.1. Host Country	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Türkiye	OK	OK
A.2.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	İzmir Province	OK	OK
A.2.1.3. City/Town/Community etc.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Çeşme district	OK	OK
A.2.1.4. Physical/Geographical Location	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide documents below: • The coordinates of the turbines in the ÇED • The coordinates of the turbines in reconstruction permit (imar izin) (1:1.000) • The parcels from expropriation, respectively (Orman / Hazine / Mera) permits with coordinates or at least parcel numbers	CAR-8	OK
A.2.1.5. A map	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The map is available.	OK	OK
A.3. Technologies and/or measures					
A.3.1. Does PDD include the accurate and complete description of the proposed project activity and provide an understanding of the proposed GS project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please correct the statement ''…., each having a capacity of 3.0 MWM/2.67 Mwe….'' b) Please indicate the start date of the operation in Section A.3. c) Please indicate the total installed capacity of the project activity in Section A.3. d) Please indicate the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity in Section	CAR-9	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
			A.3 (i.e. whether the project activity is a greenfield or not). e) Please indicate the average lifetime of the equipment in Section A.3. f) Please indicate the generator technical information and electricity information in Section A.3.		
A.3.2. Is the GS project activity in existing facilities or utilizing existing equipment?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
A.3.3. Does the GS project activity involve the alteration of an existing installation or process?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
A.3.4. If the GS project activity is the alteration of an existing installation or process, does the project description clearly state the differences resulting from the project activity compared to the pre-project situation?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
A.3.5. Have the technologies and measures to be employed and/or implemented by the project activity been described including a list of facilities, systems and equipment that will be installed and/or modified by the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The installed technology is described in the PDD.	OK	OK
A.3.6. Has the PD provided a list of facilities, systems and equipment in operation under the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to A.3.1.	CAR-9	OK
A.3.7. Has the PD provided a list of facilities, systems and equipment in the baseline scenario, as established in section B.4 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to A.3.1.	CAR-9	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
A.3.8. Does the description clearly explain how the same types and levels of services provided by the project activity would have been provided in the baseline scenario?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
A.3.9. Has the PDs included information about the age and average lifetime of the equipment based on manufacturer's specifications and industry standards, and existing and forecast installed capacities, load factors and efficiencies, under section A.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to A.3.1.	CAR-9	OK
A.3.10. Is the information provided as to how the project contributes positively to three SDGs?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
A.3.11. Has the energy and mass flows and balances of the systems and equipment included in the project activity, been given?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The single line diagram is available.	OK	OK
A.3.12. Has the types and levels of services (normally in terms of mass or energy flows) provided by the systems and equipment that are being modified and/or installed under the project activity and their relation, if any, to other manufacturing/production equipment and systems outside the project boundary, been given?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
A.4. Scale of the project					
A.4.1. Has the scale of the project defined (micro scale, small scale or others)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A (It is large scale project)	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
A.4.2. Is the justification for the scale of the project provided referring to relevant activity requirement?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It has been provided.	OK	OK
A.5. Funding source of project		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
		DR	Please provide ODA declaration.	CAR-10	OK
B. Application of Approved Gold Standard Methodology (ies) and/or Demonstration of SDG Contributions					
B.1. Reference of approved methodology(ies)					
B.1.1. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of the selected methodology(ies) given in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please clarify why using ''Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion", Version 03.0 Tool.	CAR-11	OK
B.1.2. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology(ies) refers to given in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §54	DR	Please refer to B.1.1.	CAR-11	OK
B.2. Applicability of methodology(ies)					
B.2.1. Has the PDs justified the choice of the selected methodology(ies), if applicable, by showing that the project activity meets each applicability condition of the methodology(ies)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §54 CDM validation and verification	DR	Please indicate all applicability conditions and the relevant justifications of the tools used in Section B.2. Please also refer to B.1.1.	CAR-12	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	standard for project activities §67				
B.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?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67	DR	Please refer to B.2.1.	CAR-12	OK
B.2.3. Has the PDs explained the documentation that has been used and provided the references to applicability of methodology?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to B.2.1.	CAR-12	OK
ACM 0002					
B.2.4. Is the type of proposed project activity defined?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
B.2.5. 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 21.0	DR	Please see below.		
B.2.5.1. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.2. Is the project activity implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of the reservoir(s) is increased and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m2?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.3. Is the project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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/m2?					
B.2.5.4. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PDs 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PDs 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6. 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 W/m2, do all the following conditions conform the project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.1. The power density calculated using the total installed capacity of the integrated project, as per equation (4), is greater than 4 W/m2;	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.2.6.2. Water flow between reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity;	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3. Installed capacity of the power plant(s) with power density lower than or equal to 4 W/m2 shall be:	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3.1. Lower than or equal to 15 MW; and	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3.2. Less than 10 per cent of the total installed capacity of integrated hydro power project.	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3. Project boundary					
B.3.1. Has the PD 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?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please use the original table format for project '' Project Scenario'' or remove "Project Scenario" from the table in Section B.3	CAR-13	OK
B.3.2. Has the PD presented a flow diagram of the project boundary, physically delineating the project activity, based on the description provided in section A.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Flow diagram is available.	OK	OK
B.3.3. Has the PD included in the flow diagram the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described in section A.3 of the PDD, and indicated in the diagram the emission sources and GHGs included in the project	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
boundary and the data and parameters to be monitored?					
B.3.4. Does the selected methodology allow the PDs to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary?	CDM project standard for project activities §58	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3.5. If the selected methodology allows the project developers to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary, do the project developers explain and justify their choices?	CDM project standard for project activities §58	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3.6. 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	Please refer to B.3.1.	CAR-13	OK
B.3.7. Does the PDD correctly describe the project boundary and the physical delineation of the proposed project activity?	CDM project standard for project activities §57	DR	It is correctly described.	OK	OK
B.3.8. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to project boundary?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63a	DR	The methodology is correctly applied.	OK	OK
ACM 0002					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.3.9. Is the spatial extent of the project boundary identified correctly?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	It is correctly described.	OK	OK
B.3.10. 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 21.0	DR	Please refer to B.3.1.	CAR-13	OK
B.4. Establishment and description of the baseline scenario					
B.4.1. Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed GS project prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required? •	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §94 CDM project standard for project activities §59	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly in Section B.4.	OK	OK
B.4.2. Does the PDD identify the baseline for the proposed GS project, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed GS project?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §75 CDM project standard for project activities §61	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.3. 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	Please include references for tool and methodology in Section B.4.	CAR-14	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.4. 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	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.5. 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	It is considered correctly in PDD.	OK	OK
B.4.6. Are there relevant circumstances to identify the baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §81	DR	Identification is available.	OK	OK
B.4.7. 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
B.4.8. 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 PDD and are supplementary to those required by the methodology reasonable in the context of the proposed GS project?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §78	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.9. 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
B.4.10. 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
B.4.11. Does the list of alternative scenarios given in the PDD include the following?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11.1. The project activity is undertaken without being registered as a GS project	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11.2. All plausible alternatives	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11.3. Comply with all applicable and enforced legislation	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.12. Has the PD explained how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §59				
B.4.13. Where the procedure in the selected methodology(ies) involves several steps, has the PDs described how each step is applied and transparently documented the outcome of each step?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.14. Has the PD provided and explained all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources, etc.)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.15. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonably supported by correct and verifiable references, assumptions, calculations and ratinonales?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.16. 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?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §80	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.17. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to baseline identification?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
ACM 0002					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.18. 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 21.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.19. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.20. If the proposed project activity is a capacity addtion, 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.21. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.22. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.23. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.24. 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 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.25. 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	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	ACM 0002 Version 21.0				
B.4.26. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.27. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.28. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.29. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5. Demonstration of additionality		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
B.5.1. Prior consideration of CDM					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
1. In case of projects undergoing design changes, has the request for design change approval is within one year design change start date?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide the Excel Sheet for calculations in Section B.5.	CAR-15	**OK**
B.5.2. Ongoing financial need					
B.5.2.1. Has a short narrative that demonstrates how the revenue from Gold Standard certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the project been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) outcomes					
B.5.1. Has the PDs specified the relevant SDG target for each of three SDGs addressed by the project?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	PDs have been identified for each of the three SDGs addressed by the project, with the corresponding SDG target.	OK	OK
B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG outcome					
B.6.1.1. Has the PDs explained how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology(ies), for calculating baseline and project outcomes are applied?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please include the version and date of the PDDD in '' Value(s) applied '' row of the Gross electricity generation parameter in Section B.6.1. b) Pleas indicate baseline, project emission, leakage, net benefit description, equation in Section B.6.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.1.1.1. Baseline	GS-PDD-FORM	DR	Please see B.6.1.1.	CAR-16	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Ver. 1.2				
B.6.1.1.2. Project	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see B.6.1.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.1.1.3. Leakage	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see B.6.1.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.1.1.4. Net benefit	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see B.6.1.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.1.2. Has the PDs clearly stated which equations will be used in calculating net benefit?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see B.6.1.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.1.3. Has the PDs explained and justified all relevant methodological choices including the following?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	Please see B.6.1.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.1.3.1. Where the methodology(ies) include different scenarios or cases, indicate and justify which scenario or case applies to the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.1.3.2. Where the methodology(ies) provide different options to choose from , indicate and justify which option is chosen for the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Project activities §72				
B.6.1.3.3. Where the methodology(ies) allow different default values, indicate and justify which of the default values have been chosen for the project activity.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2. Data and parameters fixed ex ante					
B.6.2.1. Have the PDs included a compilation of information on the data and parameters that are **not monitored** during the crediting period but are determined before the registration and remain fixed throughout the crediting period under section B.6.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please revise the link in source of data row for all parameters. b) In description it is indicaed as'' ..in year'' however unit tco2/MWh for ''EFCO2, Grid, y'' parameter. Please correct the contradiction. c) Please revise the '' Value(s) applied'' for ''EFCO2, Grid, y'' parameter. Please also correct the other rows based on the above corrections for ''EFCO2, Grid, y'' parameter.	CAR-17	OK
B.6.2.2. Are the data that are calculated with the equations provided in the selected methodology(ies) or default values specified in the methodology(ies) included in the compilation?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Calculations are line with the methodology.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3. Is the following information regarding the data and parameters specified correctly?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below.		
B.6.2.3.1. Relevant SDG indicator	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.2.3.2. Data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.3. Data/parameter unit	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.4. Description of the data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.5. Source of data	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.6. Values applied to data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4. Where applied values have been measured, are the following included in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below		
B.6.2.4.1. The equipment used	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.2. The standards used	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.3. Responsible person/entity having undertaken the measurement	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.4. The date of measurement(s)	GS-PDD-FORM	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Ver. 1.2				
B.6.2.4.5. The frequency of measurement(s)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.6. The measurement results	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.5. Has the purpose of data been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to B.6.2.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.2.5.1. Calculation of baseline;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to B.6.2.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.2.5.2. Calculation of project;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to B.6.2.1.	CAR-16	OK
B.6.2.5.3. Calculation of leakage.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to B.6.2.1.	CAR-16	OKO
B.6.3. Ex ante estimation of SDG impact					
B.6.3.1. Do the steps taken and equations applied to calculate following comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	project activities §110				
B.6.3.1.1. project outcome	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK
B.6.3.1.2. baseline outcome	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK
B.6.3.1.3. leakage	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK
B.6.3.1.4. Net outcomes	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.2. Where the methodology allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, has adequate justification been provided in the PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §111	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.3. Has the PDs used the values contained in the tables in section B.6.2 of the PDD for data and parameters available before registration?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Emission factor is used to calculate the baseline emissions.	OK	OK
B.6.3.4. Has the PDs used the estimates contained in the table in section B.6 of the PDD for the data/parameters not available before registration and monitored during the crediting period?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Electricity generation value is used to calculate the baseline emissions.	OK	OK
B.6.3.5. If any of these estimates has been determined by a sampling approach, has the PD provided a description of the sampling efforts undertaken in accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities"?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
B.6.3.6. Has the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK
B.6.3.7. Have the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used, substituting the values used in the equations?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK
B.6.3.8. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology or standardized baseline(s) to calculate emissions like	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §112	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
project emissions, baseline emissions and leakages are applied by the PDs?					
B.6.3.9. Has the selected methodology or standardized baseline(s) been correctly and transparently applied with respect to algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63c	DR	Please refer to CAR-6 option (b).	CAR-6	OK
ACM 0002					
B.6.3.10. Are baseline emissions calculated using equation (11) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	Equation (11) is used.	OK	OK
B.6.3.11. Is the 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 ($EG_{PJ,y}$) calculated using equations (12), (13), (14), (15) or (16) given in the methodology depending on the project type and relevant requirements? ➢	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.6.3.12. When the methodology offers options for approaches in calculations, is it documented in the PDD which option is applied?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.13. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.14. In the case of capacity additions, retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects)	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.14.1. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.14.2. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.15. 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 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.16. Where project emissions are taken as "0", has the PD made proper justification?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.17. Are the emission reductions calculated using equation (17) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimates of each SDG impact					
B.6.4.1. Have the PDs summarized the results of the ex-ante calculation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, using the tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7. Monitoring Plan					
B.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored					
B.7.1.1. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each relevant SDG indicator been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please explain the why adding '' Ery (SDGI 13.3.2)'' parameter. This is not available last registered MR and GS passaport. b) Please provide the Excel sheet for "Balance of payments and investment", "Air Quality" and '' Water Quality and Quantity'' monitoring parameters. c) Please provide the Transition Feedback of the project activity.	CAR-18	OK
B.7.1.2. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Data and parameters are available.	OK	OK"
B.7.1.3. Has the unit of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Descriptions are available	OK	OK
B.7.1.4. Has the description of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.5. Has the source of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Ver. 1.2				
B.7.1.6. Where several sources of data/parameters are used, is the choice of data/parameter sources explained and justified?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.7. Has the applied value of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.8. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included?)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.9. Has the PDs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10. Have the PDs included description of calibration procedures for the monitoring equipment including the following?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.1. Frequency of the calibration	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §81c ACM 0002 Version 20	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.2. Accuracy of the calibration	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.1.10.3. Uncertainty of the calibration	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.4. Calibrating agency/person	CDM project standard for project activities §81c	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.5. The relevant national/international standards	CDM project standard for project activities §81c	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.11. Has the accuracy level of the measurement method included?	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	It is available as ''0.2S''.	OK	OK
B.7.1.12. Has the responsible person/entity for the measurements included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.13. Has the interval for the measurements included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.14. Has the monitoring frequency for each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available in Section B.7.1.	OK	OK
B.7.1.15. Has the QA/QC procedures of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §81a	DR	It is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	ACM 0002 Version 21.0				
B.7.1.16. Has the purpose of data/parameter been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below.		
B.7.1.16.1. Calculation of baseline outcome;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.2. Calculation of project outcome;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.3. Calculation of leakage.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.17. Have the PDs 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 the line with methodology.	OK	OK
B.7.1.18. Does the monitoring plan include all data, parameters and related information required by the selected methodology(ies)?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118a-ii ACM 0002 Version 21.0	DR	This is the line with methodology.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.1.19. Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118b	DR	This is feasible.	OK	OK
B.7.2. Sampling plan					
B.7.2.1. Are the data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 of the PDD determined by a sampling approach?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §29e CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
B.7.2.2. If the data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 of the PDD are to be determined by a sampling approach, has the PD 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"?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 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

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.2.3. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, does the sampling plan present a reasonable approach for obtaining unbiased, reliable estimates of the variables?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40a	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK
B.7.2.4. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.5. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.6. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.7. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the proposed sampling approach clear?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40c	DR	N/A (Sampling approach is not used.)	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.2.8. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.9. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.10. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.11. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.12. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.2.13. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.14. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.15. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.16. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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
B.7.2.17. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, 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

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.3. Other elements of monitoring plan					
B.7.3.1. Has the operational and management structure been given in the monitoring plan to monitor emission reductions and any leakage generated by the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82a	DR	Please include the organizational chart and indicate information about that in Section B.7.3.	CAR-19	OK
B.7.3.2. Has the PD clearly indicated the responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82c	DR	Please see B.7.3.1.	CAR-19	OK
C. Duration and crediting period		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
C.1. Duration of project					
C.1.1. Start date of project					
C.1.2. Expected operational lifetime of project		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
C.2. Crediting period of project					
C.2.1. Start date of crediting period					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
C.2.1.1. Is the start date of the crediting period of the project activity given in DD/MM/YYYY format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as " 23/05/2015''	OK	OK
C.2.1.2. Have the PDs determined only one start date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation of the proposed project activity?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §89	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.1.3. Has the PDs used any qualifications to the start date, such as "expected"?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §90	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.2. Total length of crediting period					
C.2.2.1. Is the length of the crediting period of the proposed project activity stated in years and months under section C.2.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	7 years	OK	OK
D. Summary of Safeguarding Principles and Gender Sensitive Assessment					
D.1. Safeguarding principles that will be monitored					
D.1.1. Has the safeguarding principles that will be monitored been summarized including the mitigation measures added to the monitoring plan? Have the PDs carried out an analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts following the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please explain why the ''balance of payment'' table is exist in Section D.1., if there should be please use the same format with the other indicated principles. Please also see B.7.1.1.	CAR-20	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
D.1.2. Are all the safeguarding principles stated?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The principles stated.	OK	OK
D.1.3. Are all the relevant assessment questions included pertaining to the safeguarding principles?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.4. Is the relevance of the principle cited correctly (Yes/potentially/no)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.5. Is proper justification for the safeguarding principle indicated?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Justifications are indicated.	OK	OK
D.2. Assessment that project complies with 'gender sensitive' requirements					
D.2.1. Has the evidence been provided that the project concept and design cover the overall societal context from a gender perspective?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
D.2.2. Does the project reflect the key issues and requirements of Gender Sensitive design and implementation as outlined in the Gender Policy?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
D.2.3. Has it been explained how the project align with existing country policies, strategies and best practices?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
D.2.4. Has an expert been involved for the Gender Safeguarding Principles & Requirements, where required?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
D.2.5. Has it been explained how the project address the questions raised in the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
D.2.6. Does the project apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is available.	OK	OK
E. Summary of Local Stakeholder Consultation		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
E.1. Summary of stakeholder mitigation measures					
		DR	Please indicate the first LSC date and give more information about that in Section E.1.	CAR-21	OK
E.2. Final continuous input / grievance mechanism					
E.2.1. Has the relevant methods and all details of chosen methods been provided in the related tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Tabular format is available.	OK	OK
E.2.2. Has the following been provided as the mandatory methods as part of the final continuous input / grievance mechanism	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below.		
E.2.2.1. Continuous input / grievance expression process book	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
E.2.2.2. GS contact	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. Forward action requests (FARs) identified during previous verification and/or design change review					
F.1.1. Are there any FARs from the previous verification and/or design change review, if applicable, stages?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §36	DR	This is the CP renewal process.	OK	OK
Appendix-1 Safeguarding principles assessment					
1. Has the safeguarding principles assessment been completed for each principle using the relevant tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The tabular format has been used.	OK	OK
2. Has the justification of relevance for the related safeguarding principles assessment been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, the justifications are provided.	OK	OK
3. If the respond is yes for the justification of relevance, has all relevant requirements from the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements document been included in the tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The tabular format is available.	OK	OK
4. If the respond is no or potentially for the justification of relevance, has this been justified clearly and adequately?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Appendix-2 Contact information of project developers					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
1. Is the contact information of PDs provided in Appendix 2?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please fill the table in Appendix-2	CAR-22	OK
Appendix 3- LUF additional information					
1. In case of land use and forest projects, has the additional information been provided in Appendix-3?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please indicate the Appendix-3 according to GS template.	CAR-23	OK
Appendix-4 Summary of approved design changes					
1. If applicable, is the summary of the approved design changes been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please indicate Appendix 4 as N/A if it is not used.	CAR-24	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Table 2 – Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CAR-1 Please provide the design certification.	1.4.	The project was a suspended project, so previous documents are not available. But the latest LSC is an approved assessment.	Review-1: Ok, closed (The declaration has been made).
CAR-2 In GS Registry system project developer indicated as '' Abk Çesme Res Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.S.'' However it is indicated as '' VEGA RÜZGAR ENERJİSİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.'' in the some of the project documents. Please clarify, provide evidence document and please inform GS about this situation.	1.7.	The name of the project owner is "Vega Rüzgar Enerjisi Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.". Since the project was suspended, the change could not be implemented on the GS Portal. During the verification process, the change will be committed to the GS Portal.	Review-1: Ok, closed (The declaration has been made).
CAR-3 Please revise the row "Project Participants and any communities involved" on the cover page since the mentioned companies are indicated as the project developer and the project representative.	1.9	Cover page has been revised.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been revised).
CAR-4 Please indicate the full name of the methodology.	1.14	It's been indicated. Review-2: It's been indicated.	Review-1: Please indicate the full name of the methodology on the cover page. Review-2: Ok, closed.
CAR-5 Please correct the unit of "13 Climate Action (mandatory)" Target in Table 1 on the cover page.	2	It's been corrected.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been corrected).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CAR-6 a) Please provide evidence document for the construction date. b) Please revise the ER calculation and baseline scenario and estimated emission reduction. In ER Calculation Excel Sheet Cell C8 isn't seen correct. c) Please correct the Mwe values for each turbine in Section A.1. d) Please provide the reference document number 1 and indicate version and date for it on the page 3. e) Please indicate the milestone table in Section A.1. f) Please indicate the brand of turbines and their generators. g) Please indicate meter information in Section A.1. h) Please indicate the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity in Section A.1 (i.e. whether the project activity is a greenfield or not).	A.1 1	a) The evidence document for the construction date is the registered PDD, V05, dated 20/09/2015 and it has been provided to the VVB. b) The ER calculation sheet has been revised accordingly. c) The Mwe value for one unit turbine is 2.67 Mwe. d) The registered PDD (Version 05) has been provided to the VVB and the reference has been revised accordingly. e) It's been indicated. f) They have been indicated. g) It's been indicated. h) It's been indicated in Section A.1. Review-2: Meter information have been indicated in Section A.1 and Section A.3.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed (It has been provided) b) Ok, closed (corrected). c) Ok, closed (corrected). d) Ok, closed (It has been indicated). e) Ok, closed. f) Ok, closed (They have been indicated). g) Please indicate meter information in Section A.1. and Section A.3. h) Ok, closed. Review-2: g)Ok, closed.
CAR-7 a) Please revise the Section A.1.1. It is not completely match with the reference which is ''GENERAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA 3.1.1 The following General Eligibility Criteria applies to all projects seeking'' b) Please also indicate related references in this section (i.e. methodology)	A.1.2.1.	Review-1: a)b) Section A.1.1 has been revised.	Review-1: a-b) Ok, closed.
CAR-8 Please provide documents below: • The coordinates of the turbines in the ÇED	A.2.1.4.	Review-2: All relevant documents have been provided to the VVB.	Review-1: Please provide documents below:

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
• The coordinates of the turbines in reconstruction permit (imar izin) (1:1.000) • The parcels from expropriation, respectively (Orman / Hazine / Mera) permits with coordinates or at least parcel numbers		The coordinates of the turbines have been revised in PDD.	• The coordinates of the turbines in the ÇED • The coordinates of the turbines in reconstruction permit (imar izin) (1:1.000) • The parcels from expropriation, respectively (Orman / Hazine / Mera) permits with coordinates or at least parcel numbers Review-2: Ok, closed.
CAR-9 a) Please correct the statement ''…., each having a capacity of 3.0 MWM/2.67 Mwe….'' b) Please indicate the start date of the operation in Section A.3. c) Please indicate the total installed capacity of the project activity in Section A.3. d) Please indicate the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity in Section A.3 (i.e. whether the project activity is a greenfield or not). e) Please indicate the average lifetime of the equipment in Section A.3. f) Please indicate the generator technical information and electricity information in Section A.3.	A.3.1.	a) It's been corrected. b) It's been indicated. c) It's been indicated. d) It's already been indicated in Section A.1. e) It's been indicated. f) It's been indicated.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed (Indicated). b) Ok, closed (Indicated). c) Ok, closed (Indicated). d) Ok, closed. e) Ok, closed (It has been indicated). f) Ok, closed.
CAR-10 Please provide ODA declaration.	A.5	ODA declaration has been provided to the VVB.	Review-1: Please provide ODA declaration.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
		Review-2 The ODA declaration has been provided to the VVB.	Review-2: Ok, closed.
CAR-11 Please clarify why using ''Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion", Version 03.0 Tool.	B.1.1.	The relevant tool has been used in order to state as reference that there is not project or leakage emissions of the project.	Review-1: Ok, closed (The declaration has been made.
CAR-12 Please indicate all applicability conditions and the relevant justifications of the tools used in Section B.2. Please also refer to B.1.1.	B.2.1.	Section B.2 has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been revised).
CAR-13 Please use the original table format for project '' Project Scenario'' or remove "Project Scenario" from the table in Section B.3	B.3.1.	Section B.3 has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been revised).
CAR-14 Please include references for tool and methodology in Section B.4.	B.4.3.	The references for tools and methodology have been included in Section B.4.	Review-1: Ok, closed (References have been included).
CAR-15 Please provide the Excel Sheet for calculations in Section B.5.	B.5.1. 1	The Excel sheet has been provided to the VVB. Review-2: The Excel sheet has been revised.	Review-1: Please add to references in Excel Sheet. Review-2: OK, closed.
CAR-16	B.6.1.1	a) They have been included. b) Section B.6.1 has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed (It has been indicated). b) Ok, closed (It has been indicated).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
a) Please include the version and date of the PDD in '' Value(s) applied '' row of the Gross electricity generation parameter in Section B.6.1. b) Please indicate baseline, project emission, leakage, net benefit description, equation in Section B.6.			
CAR-17 a) Please revise the link in source of data row for all parameters. b) In description it is indicaed as'' ..in year'' however unit tco2/MWh for ''EFCO2, Grid, y'' parameter. Please correct the contradiction. c) Please revise the '' Value(s) applied'' for ''EFCO2, Grid, y'' parameter. Please also correct the other rows based on the above corrections for ''EFCO2, Grid, y'' parameter.	B.6.2.1.	a) Links of all parameters have been revised. b) The contradiction has been cleared. c) ''Value(s) applied" for ''EFCO2, Grid, y" parameter has been revised. Other rows have been revised accordingly.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed. b) Ok, closed. c) Ok, closed (It has been revised).
CAR-18 a) Please explain the why adding '' Ery (SDGI 13.3.2)'' parameter. This is not available last registered MR and GS passaport. b) Please provide the Excel sheet for "Balance of payments and investment", "Air Quality" and '' Water Quality and Quantity'' monitoring parameters. Please provide the Transition Feedback of the project activity.	B.7.1.1.	a) Since the the process is the revalidation of the project activity, ER_y parameter has been included in the parameter section. b) The Excel sheet for "Air Quality" and "Water Quality and Quantity" has been provided to the VVB. Since the "Balance of payments and investment" parameter has been removed, it has not been included in Excel sheet. Also, the Transition Feedback of the project activity has been provided to the VVB. Review-2: b) The Transition process is still ongoing.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed. b) Please provide the Transition Feedback of the project activity. Review-2: b)Ok, closed.
CAR-19	B.7.3.1.	It's been included and indicated.	Review-1: Ok, closed (Indicated).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Please include the organizational chart and indicate information about that in Section B.7.3.			
CAR-20 Please explain why the ''balance of payment'' table is exist in Section D.1., if there should be please use the same format with the other indicated principles. Please also see B.7.1.1.	D.1.1.	It's been deleted and Section B.7.1 has been revised.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been revised).
CAR-21 Please indicate the first LSC date and give more information about that in Section E.1.	E.1.	Section E.1 has been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Ok, closed (Relevant informations have been indicated).
CAR-22 Please fill the table in Appendix-2	Appendix-2	Appendix-2 has been filled.	Review-1: Ok, closed.
CAR-23 Please indicate the Appendix-3 according to GS template.	Appendix-3	Appendix-3 has been indicated.	Review-1: Ok, closed.
CAR-24 Please indicate the Appendix-3 according to GS template.	Appendix-4	Appendix-4 has been indicated.	Review-1: Ok, closed.
CAR-25 a) Please include the units in B11, B13, B24, D14, E14, F14 and G14 cells of Emission Reductions Excel Spreadsheet.	ITR	a) It's been added. b) It's been corrected.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed (Units have been indicated). b) Ok, closed (corrected).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
b) Please clarify and correct Rounddown function D9-D16 cells of Electricity Generation Excel Spreadsheet.			
CAR-26 a) Please include the training parameter under SDG-8 parameter throughout the PDD including Table-1, Section B.6.4 etc. b) Please include the reference of the calibration period of the meters within Egfacility,y parameter in the Section B.7.1 of the PDD.	ITR	a) It's been included. b) It's been added.	Review-1: a) Ok, closed (It has been indicated). b) Ok, closed (The relevant refences have been added).
CAR-27 a) Please clarify and correct 2012 year reference for air quality parameter in ER Excel and PDD. b) Please clarify and correct 2012 year reference for water quality and quantity parameter in ER Excel and PDD. c) Please include total number of jobs parameter baseline and project values for the whole crediting period in the SDG Impact Tool Excel d) Please include training parameter along with the relevant detailsin the SDG Impact Tool Excel.	ITR	a)b) Parameters have been revised accordingly. c) It's been added. d) It's been added.	Review-1: a)Ok, closed. b) Ok, closed (The relevant references have been revised). c) Ok, closed (It has been indicated). d) Ok, closed (It has been indicated).
CL-1 Please remove the blank space on the cover page.	1	It's been removed.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been removed).
CL-2 Please clarify the ongoing financial need of the project in line with GS4GG Principles and Requirements para 4.1.51 and 4.1.5	ITR	It's been revised accordingly.	Review-1: Ok, closed (It has been indicated).
FAR-1 Since no revenue is realized from Gold Standard certification, as per the GS4GG Requirements (Section 4.1.52), a FAR is raised for the next Issuance to check VER revenues.			

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

Biçimlendirdi: Yazı tipi: (Varsayılan) Arial, 9 nk, Türkçe (Türkiye)

Biçimlendirdi: Yazı tipi: (Varsayılan) Arial, 9 nk, Yazı tipi rengi: Otomatik, Türkçe (Türkiye)

Biçimlendirilmiş: Aralık Önce: 0 nk

Biçimlendirdi: Yazı tipi: (Varsayılan) Arial, 9 nk, Yazı tipi rengi: Otomatik, Türkçe (Türkiye)

Biçimlendirdi: Yazı tipi: (Varsayılan) Arial, 9 nk, Yazı tipi rengi: Otomatik, Türkçe (Türkiye)

Biçimlendirdi: Yazı tipi: (Varsayılan) Arial, 9 nk, Türkçe (Türkiye)

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