VALIDATION REPORT

BOYDAK ENERJİ ÜRETİM VE TİCARET ANONİM ŞİRKETİ

CANTA WPP

IN

TURKEY

Organizational Unit:	re-consult Ltd. Carbon Department		
Project Title:	Canta WPP		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current PDD Version:**
145	Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi		07
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
07/01/2014	06/07/2015	05	184

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 **Version:** 13

Average Annual Emission Reduction Estimate: 96,072 tCO_2e

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

Type of Crediting Period:	Crediting Period Start Date:
☒Renewable ☐ Fixed	01/10/2013
Project Participants:	Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi (Boydak) (Project Owner) Global Tan Energy Ltd (Project Developer)

Validation Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Global Stakeholder Consultation ☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Validation Findings: During the validation 17 Corrective Action Requests, 62 Clarification Requests were raised, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this validation report. 6 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-consult's opinion that the project activity "Canta WPP" in Turkey, as described in the PDD, version 7 dated 09/06/2014, 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 13. Hence, re-consult requests the registration of the proposed project activity as a GS project activity.

Validation Team Leader:	Seda YUCEL		Indexing Terms:
Validation Team Members:	Seza DANISOGLU-Financial Expert		☐No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit
Approved By (Technical Reviewer):	**Name:**	**Signature:**	☐ Limited Distribution
	Praveen PYATA		☐ Unrestricted Distribution

Abbreviations

BM : Build Margin
CAR : Corrective Action Request
CDM : Clean Development Mechanism
CL : Clarification request
CM : Combined Margin
CO_2 : Carbon dioxide
DNA : Designated National Authority
DOE : Designated Operational Entity
DR : Document Review
EF : Emission Factor
EIA : Environmental Impact Assessment
ER : Emission Reductions
FAR : Forward Action Request
GHG : Greenhouse gas(es)
GS : Gold Standard
I : Interview
IPCC : Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRR : Internal Rate of Return
kWh : Kilo Watt Hour
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
PP : Project Participant(s)
tCO2e : Tonnes of CO2 equivalents
UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION

re-consult Ltd. has performed the validation of the "Canta WPP" in "Turkey" between 27/06/2013 and 07/02/2014.
The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Gold Standard (GS) and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

As a result of validation, re-consult concludes the following:

☒ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided re-consult 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. Therefore, re-consult will recommend the project for registration by the Gold Standard.

☐ The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided re-consult with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. Therefore, re-consult will not recommend the project for registration by the Gold Standard and will inform the project participants and the Gold Standard on this decision.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

re-consult Ltd. has been appointed by “Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi” to perform the validation of the “Canta WPP” in Turkey with the contract dated 15/02/2013. The objective of this validation activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the project design, and to ensure a thorough assessment of the proposed project activity against the applicable CDM and GS requirements. In particular;

- the project's baseline is assessed against “ACM0002 v13” /D1/
- the project’s monitoring plan is assessed against “ACM0002 v13” /D1/
- the project’s additionality justification is assessed against “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”, Version 07.0.0 /D2/
- 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 version 5 /D3/
- CDM Project Standard version 5 /D4/
- CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 5 /D5/
- GS Toolkit version 2.2 and its relevant annexes /D6/

Validation is a requirement for all GS projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of voluntary emission reductions (VERs).

2.2. Scope

The scope of the validation is the independent and objective review of the Project Design Document (PDD). The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see 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 version 5, CDM Project Standard version 5, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 5 and GS Toolkit version 2.2. /D3, D4, D4, D5/.

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

The only purpose of the validation is its usage during the registration process as part of the GS project cycle. Therefore, re-consult can't be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

2.3. GHG Project Description

Large scale Canta WPP has 45 MW capacity (19 turbines each having 2.5 MW capacity with total capacity of 47.5 MWm and 45MWe). Project is located within the boundaries of Silivri District of Istanbul province. License was given to Bora A.S. previously. On 14/08/2012, the company was merged with the mother company and the name of the project owner was changed as Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi (Boydak).

2.5MW Nordex N100/2500kW R100 turbines have been selected for the project which results in 163.2 GWh annual generation. Estimated generation corresponds to 96,072 tCO2 avoided annually.

Investment decision date is "mechanical equipment purchase contract date (26/03/2012)" /D7/ and construction started on 01/03/2013. Land delivery protocol is provided to DOE /D8/. Project will use renewable crediting period, and it is the first crediting period that is expected to start on 01/10/2014.

2.4. Parties Involved

PP's are Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi (Boydak) as Project Owner and Global Tan Energy Ltd as Project Developer. Host party is Turkey.

3. METHODOLOGY

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

- Assessment whether the project design of the proposed GS project activity meets the relevant CDM and GS requirements, via a desk review of the PDD between 27/06/2013 and 01/07/2013.
- Public stakeholder consultation by publishing the PDD on the UNFCCC CDM website between 11/10/2013 and 11/12/2013.
- Assessment of the stakeholders' comments and how these comments are implemented in the PDD.
- Assessment whether the applied methodology ACM0002 v13 /D1/, has been applied correctly, including the baseline selection and monitoring plan.
- Assessment of the additionality argument of the project activity against the rules and guidance given in "tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 07.0.0. /D2/
- A site visit was conducted on 02/07/2013 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 validation report
- Independent technical review (ITR)
- Approval of the validation report and request of registration

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 five tables:

- Table 1 Gold Standard (GS) Toolkit requirements
- Table 2 GS Passport requirements
- Table 3 GS Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC) requirements
- Table 4 (Project Design Document (PDD) and CDM validation requirements) and
- Table 5 (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 Validation Protocol

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with GS Toolkit	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 first 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

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with GS Passport	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 first verification

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

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

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with GS Local Stakeholder Consultation (LSC)	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 first verification

The usage description of Table-4 in Validation Protocol is explained in Table 3-4 below:

Table 3-4: Explanation about Table-4 in Validation Protocol

Question	Reference	MoV*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft & Final Conclusion
The requirements related with the PDD and validation	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 first verification

The usage description of Table-5 in Validation Protocol is explained in Table 3-5 below:

Table 3-5: Explanation about Table-5 in Validation Protocol

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Questions in Table-1, Table-2, Table-3 and Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' 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 participants regarding the non-conformities	Is used to summarize the responses by validation team and their conclusions

The Validation Protocol is fulfilled 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 relevant 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 Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The validation team and ITR are assigned to this validation activity on 15/02/2013 taking all the above factors into consideration and as a result of the contract review process.

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

Table 3-6: Validation team and ITR details

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Financial Expertise	Involvement*
Seda YUCEL	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	☐	DR,SV,R
Seza DANISOGLU	Financial Expert	☒	☐	☐	☒	DR
Praveen PYATA	ITR	☒	☒	☒	☐	ITR

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

A : Administrative
DR : Desk Review
SV : Site Visit
R : Reporting
ITR : Independent Technical Review

3.2. Desk Review of PDD and Additional Documents

The basis for the validation activity is the PDD version 01, dated 30/04/2013 /D9/ which was submitted to the validation team on 30/04/2013. This PDD was revised several times due to the raised CARs and CLs, version 7 dated 09/06/2014 being the final version /D54/. The PDD was assessed against;

- ACM0002 v13 /D1/
- Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 07.0.0 /D2/
- Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system'', Version 3.0 /D15/
- the Host Country criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 5 /D3/
- CDM Project Standard version 5/D4/
- CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 5/D5/
- GS Toolkit version 2.2/D6/
- 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 validation report.

3.3. Site Visits

As a part of the validation activities a site visit was performed to the project activity site, details of which can be seen in the Table 3-5 below:

Table 3-7: Site visit details

<table>
<tr><td>Date</td><td colspan="2">02/07/2013</td></tr>
<tr><td>Location</td><td colspan="2">Silivri, Istanbul</td></tr>
<tr><th>Participant</th><th>Company Name</th><th>Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit</th></tr>
<tr><td>Miyeser Tezgez</td><td>Sancantepe&Balaban village</td><td>Local Employee</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ahmet Tezgez</td><td>Sancantepe&Balaban village</td><td>Local Employee</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sezgin Baktır</td><td>Boydak</td><td>Field Chief</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ömer Ercan</td><td>Sancantepe village</td><td>Head of Sancaktepe Village</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hasan Susulu</td><td>Balaban village</td><td>Head of Balaban Village</td></tr>
<tr><td>Gülün Öztürk</td><td>Sancantepe&Balaban village</td><td>Village resident</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ibrahim Sönmez</td><td>Sancantepe&Balaban village</td><td>Village resident</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mustafa Çalışkan</td><td>Sancantepe&Balaban village</td><td>Village resident</td></tr>
<tr><td>Zeren Erik</td><td>GTE</td><td>Consultant</td></tr>
<tr><td>Berk Gürçınar</td><td>Boydak</td><td>Project Manager</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">Points Verified</th><th>Source of Information</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Thanks to the project, this female employee has an opportunity to work</td><td>interview</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">IS very happy with the contributions of the PP to local economy</td><td>interview</td></tr>
</table>

HSE trainings and equipment are provided to all employees	interview
Expropriation fees are paid to all stakeholders	interview
PP has good relations with villages	interview
Villagers complained a bit about the fields being divided but PP compensated everyones loss	interview
Villagers complained a bit about the fields being divided but PP compensated everyones loss	interview
Villagers complained a bit about the fields being divided but PP compensated everyones loss	interview
Additionality, calculations, reference documents	interview
Local employment rate, PP contributions to local economy, Municipality helps the PP to dispose wastewater and solid waste	interview

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Validation Protocol

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

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 are explained below:

- The Validation team raises a **CAR** if one of the following occurs:
  - The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions
  - The CDM and/or GS 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 GS requirements have been met.

- The Validation team raises a **FAR** during validation to highlight issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity.

According to these principles total of 17 CARs, 62 CLs and 6 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 realized by the validation team to further analyze the correctness and accurateness of the information provided. A list of persons interviewed is given in Section 5 of this Validation Report.

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

All the issues raised as CLs and CARs during this validation activity, were resolved, during the written and oral communications between the Project Participant(s) and re-consult Ltd. validation team members. For the resolution of these non-conformities, the project participants modified the project design, rectified the PDD or provided adequate additional explanations or evidences that satisfy the concerns of the validation team members.

Concerns raised in the desk review, the on-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.

Proposal requested for validation	15/02/2013
Proposal issued	15/02/2013
Agreement signed for validation	05/04/2013
Desk review started	27/06/2013
Desk review finished	01/07/2013
On site assessment	02/07/2013
1st Protocol started, finished and sent to client	27/06/2013 - 10/07/2013
Responses received	23/07/2013
2nd Protocol started, finished and sent to client	31/07/2013
Responses received	10/09/2013
3rd Protocol started, finished and sent to client	30/09/2013
Responses received	13/11/2013
4th Protocol started, finished and sent to client	09/12/2013
Final Responses received-All CAR-CL closed	12/12/2013
Report writing	10/01/2014
Submission for Technical Review	10/01/2014

Technical Review started	10/01/2014
Technical Review finished	16/01/2014
Draft report submitted to TL	16/01/2014
Submission for 2nd Technical Review	21/01/2014
Technical Review started	21/01/2014
Technical Review finished	07/02/2014
Draft report submitted to TL	07/02/2014
Submission for Final Approval	07/02/2014
Date sent to client	07/02/2014

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 have to undergo an internal quality control by the re-consult. This quality control is also referred to as Independent Technical Review process.

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

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

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

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS

4.1. Participation Requirements

The project participants are Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A.Ş. as Project Proponent and Global Tan Energy Ltd as Consultant.

Turkey is the host country. Turkey ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 5th February of 2009 and put in effect on 13th May 2009. Turkish National Focal Point to the UNFCCC is the Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

Through document review and interview during site-visit, re-consult Ltd. confirmed that the project participants as listed in PDD are correct. It is also confirmed that no entities other than those authorized as project participant are included in the relevant sections of the PDD.

4.2. Project Design

After cross-check and comparison with the templates provided in UNFCCC website, re-consult Ltd. confirms that:

Project design document form for CDM project activities (F-CDM-PDD) version 04.1/D16/ is used and it is the latest available template provided in CDM website.

All relevant sections of the PDD are covered and PDD /D54/ is complete.

4.3. Project Description

"Canta WPP" will be constructed by "Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A.Ş." (hereinafter referred as Boydak) near Silivri, Istanbul, Turkey. Proof of title is the generation license /D17/.

The purpose of Canta WPP is to produce renewable electricity using wind as the power source and to contribute to Turkey's growing electricity demand through a sustainable and low carbon technology. The project will displace the same amount of electricity generated by the grid dominated with fossil fired power plants.

Large scale Canta WPP has 45 MW capacity (19 turbines each having 2.5 MW capacity with total capacity of 47.5 MWm and 45MWe). Generation license was given to Bora A.S. previously. On 14/08/2012, the company was merged with the mother company and the name of the project owner was changed as Boydak Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi (Boydak).

Although, in the Generation License /D17/and the Project Introduction File (PIF) /D18/ of the project the total output has been stated as 159.75 GWH, the final expected output has been augmented as a result of micro siting /D19/ and optimization studies where several layouts have been compiled using different turbines. Finally, 2.5MW Nordex N100/2500kW R100 turbines have been selected for the project which results in 163.2 GWh annual generation. Estimated generation corresponds to 96,072 tCO2 avoided annually. Excel file containing CM calculation and ER data is validated by the DOE /D20-D21/.

Average lifetime of turbines are assumed as 25 years. The accuracy and completeness of the project description is validated via on site visit conducted on 02/07/2013. Number of turbines and capacity of each turbine are observed in place by the validation team.

Electricity generated at project will be fed to the national grid via Silivri substation. Length of transmission line will be around 11.5 km /D22/.

Investment decision date is “mechanical equipment purchase contract date (26/03/2012)” /D7/ and construction started on 01/03/2013 /D8/. Project will use renewable crediting period, and it is the first crediting period that is expected to start on 01/10/2014.

Site visit was conducted on 02/07/2013.

4.4. Project Boundary

As clearly defined in the PDD, the project boundary encompasses the physical, geographical site of the renewable generation source. The windpower plant with all installation is the project boundary. This is validated during on site visit.

As the electricity generated by the project displaces the electricity generated by national grid, the baseline boundary is defined as the national grid. This includes the project site and all power plants connected physically to the national grid . There are no off-grid power plants in Turkish grid.

The defined project boundary is in line with the selected methodology.

The only GHG and emission source included in the project boundary are the CO_2 emissions from the electricity generation in fossil fuel fired power plants that are displaced due to the project activity.

In conclusion, re-consult Ltd. confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases as documented in PDD /D54/ are justified for the project activity. As result of the implementation of the proposed project activity, there are no greenhouse gas emissions occurring within the proposed project boundary which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emission reductions, which are not addressed by the selected approved methodology.

4.5. Determination of the Baseline Scenario

According to ACM0002 v13 /D1/, if the project activity is the installation of a new grid-connected renewable power plant, the baseline scenario is the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity that otherwise would have been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources.

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

As the project is a large scale electricity generation from renewable sources project, methodology and the related baseline scenario is applicable. PDD /D54/ clearly states the baseline scenario and that it is stated by the methodology.

Based on the site-visit and by cross-checking the information with similar relevant projects, also based on the validation team’s local and sectoral knowledge, it is confirmed that the selected baseline scenario is the prevailing practice in the host country and in line with the host country regulations.

4.6. Application of the Selected Baseline and Monitoring Methodology

The emission reductions of Canta WPP have been calculated in accordance with the approved methodology ACM0002 v13 /D1/.

re-consult Ltd. has assessed the relevant information contained in the PDD /D54/ and evidence obtained during on-site visit against the application criteria listed in the methodology. The applicability of this methodology is justified as below:

- The proposed project activity is a greenfield, grid connected renewable electricity generation project,
- The project activity is the installation of wind power plant
- The project does not involve capacity addition, a retrofit of (an) existing plant(s) or a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)Project activity does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of project activity
- The project does not involve combined heat and power generation activity
- The geographic and system boundaries for the relevant electricity grid can be clearly identified and information on the characteristics of the grid is available.

According to ACM0002 V13 /D1/, the latest approved tools shall be referenced in PDD like, “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (Version 3) /D21/ and “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”(Version 07.0.0) /D2/, which are the latest versions of the tools valid at the starting time and the above tools are applied to the PDD /D54/.

re-consult Ltd. confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology is applicable to the project activity, and this version will be valid at the time of submitted of the project activity for registration.

4.7. Additionality

In accordance with “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” (Version 07.0.0) /D2/, prior consideration of the CDM, identification of alternatives, investment analysis and common practice analysis have been checked by the validation team through document review, on-site visit and interview. re-consult Ltd. confirm that all data, rationales, assumptions and justifications presented in the PDD and documentation provided by PPs to support the demonstration of additionality are reliable and credible.

4.7.1. Prior CDM consideration

As seen from the timeline below, the Board took a decision on 01/11/2011 /D23/ to integrate carbon revenues into the project financial feasibility. In line with the CDM-EB-41, investment decision date has been selected as the equipment purchase contract as it is dated as the earliest contract indicating a concrete proof of the project owners realisation of the project.

According to Paragraph 105 of VVS/D23 prior consideration has been validated as follows (with /D65/:

re-consult Ltd. Reviewed all the documents contained in timeline table. As the investment decision date is later than the Board Decision on carbon credits /D23/, and contract with consultant /D24/, PP has been aware of GS-VER prior to the project activity start date. It has been demonstrated that GS-VER benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project.

In conclusion, re-consult Ltd. confirms that Çanta WPP complies with the applicable requirements related to the GS-VER prior consideration of VVS Version 5.

Table 4- 1: Timeline of the project activity

Activity	Related Document Date
Preliminary EIA /D18/	January 2009
EIA Decision /D25/	13/02/2009
License Issuance /D17/	18/08/2011
Board Decision /D23/	01/11/2011
Carbon Certification Agreement /D24/	01/01/2012
EM Equipment Purchase Contract* /D7/	26/03/2012
LSC Meeting	16/04/2012
License Revision /D17/	18/04/2012
Bankable Report (Micrositing) /D19/	13/06/2012
Forest Permission /D26/	25/06/2012
Grid Connection Agreement /D22/	03/10/2012
Loan Proposal /D27/	21/10/2012
Construction Start Date/D8/	01/03/2013
Agreement on construction of transmission line, wind park, assembly and test operation (ABB)	13/09/2013
Subcontractor Agreement for Substation Construction (Bilmer)	22/02/2013
Subcontractor Agreement for basement and Construction (Bilmer)	22/02/2013
Expected Commissioning Date	01/10/2014

4.7.2. Project alternatives

The most realistic and reliable alternatives to the project activity are:

1. Proposed project not undertaken as a VER project activity
2. Continuation of the current situation-supply of equal amount of electricity by the newly built grid connected power plants

The first alternative, which is the implementation of the project without carbon revenue is not financially attractive as discussed in investment analysis section below. The Second alternative

(Scenario 2) is the baseline scenario and implementation of the proposed project as a VER activity would be additional to this scenario.

The proposed project activity is not the only alternative amongst the project participants that is in compliance with mandatory regulations. Therefore, the proposed VER project activity is considered as additional.

Re-consult Ltd. confirms that in the PDD, the identified alternative is appropriate, credible and complete.

4.7.3. Investment analysis

A preliminary loan proposal /D27/ has been signed for the project activity. However, the project construction was completed based on 100% equity, thus, the project IRR is considered equal to the equity IRR for the financial analysis.

Choice of approach

For the investment analysis, the Benchmark Analysis (Option III of Step 2 of Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality) /D2/ is selected in project PDD /D54/, since:

-simple cost analysis (Option I) is not appropriate, because the proposed project generates financial or economic benefits through the sales of electricity other than GS-VER related income. This is in line with Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality /D2/.

-investment comparison analysis (Option II) is not appropriate because this option is applicable to projects whose alternatives are also investment projects, however the alternative baseline scenario of the proposed project is the continuation of the supply of electricity by the grid rather than a comparable investment project. This is in line with Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis /D28/.

Hence re-consult Ltd. confirms that the adoption of Benchmark analysis (Option III) is appropriate.

Benchmark selection

As a benchmark, figure defined by World Bank /D29/ for equity IRR for similar project types is chosen (15%).

Input parameters

Equity IRR is calculated for a 20 year period. Investment decision date has been identified as the date of equipment purchase agreement.

All the input parameters used in the financial analysis are taken from approved and trustworthy documents and all references are provided to DOE.

Re-consult Ltd. compared the input parameters for the financial analysis included in the PDD version 07 /D54/ and IRR spreadsheet /D30-D34/ with the parameters stated in the reference documents listed in below table and was able to confirm that the values applied are consistent with the values stated in the references.

With capital investment of 97.6 Million $ and installed capacity of 45.022 Mwe, project has 2.17 MUSD/MW costs. Compared to some GS and VCS projects in DOE's experience (with costs around 1.4 MUSD/MW and 1.9 MUSD/MW) this amount is acceptable.

IRR input documents were valid at time of investment decision.

Below is the table of inputs for IRR analysis and validation proofs:

Table 4-2: IRR inputs and reference documents

Parameter	Unit	Value	Reference Document	Date of Reference Document
Installed Capacity	(MWm) Mwe	(47.5) 45.022	Generation License /D17/	18/08/2011
Annual generation	GWh	163.2	Bankable Report (Micrositing-Feasibility)/D19/	13/06/2012
Capital Investment	Million $	97.6	Canta WPP Cash Flow /D35/	-
Licence purchase agreement	Million €	15	Bora WPP Company Acquisition Agreement /D57/	01/07/2011
Construction works agreement	Million TL	5,509.128	Turbine and Road Works Agreement /D55/	2013
Construction works agreement	TL	399,027.25	Switchyard Road Works Agreement /D58/	22/02/2013
Electrical works agreement	Million Euro	3.2	Electrical Works and Switchyard Agreement /D56/	13/09/2012
Turbine agreement	Million Euro	41.8	Turbine Purchase Agreement /D7/	26/03/2012

Parameter	Unit	Value	Reference Document	Date of Reference Document
Income tax rate	%	20	Report on Tax Regulation http://www.istanbulymmo.org.tr/_dosya/MaliPlatform/30.%205520%20sayili%20kurumlsr%20vergisi%20kanunu%20ac%C4%B1klamalari.pdf	15/06/2006
Depreciation	Years	25 for electromechanical equipment 40 for other facilities	Regulation	
Exchange Ratio	€ / $	1.32	Central Bank Turkey	March 2012
Exchange Ratio	$ / TL	1.78	Central Bank Turkey	March 2012
Expected Tariff	$ Cents / kWh	7.3	Renewable Energy Law	10/05/2005
Operation & Maintenance Cost	$/Year	1,555	Canta WPP Cash Flow /D35/	-

Calculation and conclusion

Equity IRR has been calculated as 7.11% in the absence of carbon revenue. The project will not use any credits and use solely equity. When we include the carbon revenue in the cash flow, equity IRR increases to 7.76% and the project becomes more attractive even though it is still below the benchmark.

It is appropriate to carry out the IRR analysis for 20 years as it covers the crediting period. The project operational lifetime is, on the other hand, 49 years which is the license period.

The calculations were verified and found to be correct by re-consult. The assumptions used in the calculations were deemed to be correct by re-consult.

Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity analysis has been carried out for Investment Cost (±10%), Operating Cost (±10%) and Electricity Sales revenue (generation and sales income) (±20%). All the variables not included in sensitivity analysis which constitute less than 20% do not have material impact on the analysis. Reasonable variations of the above stated parameters were checked.

	-10%	**10%**
Investment Cost	8.45	5.96
Operational Cost	7.23	6.98
	-20%	**20%**
Electricity Generation	4.71	9.37
Electricity Price	4.62	9.45

None of the parameters in the sensitivity analysis are considered to have any significant effect.

It is seen that project is not the most attractive option. Therefore project is considered as additional to the baseline scenario.

In conclusion, re-consult was able to confirm that this project activity is financially unattractive even after considering the possible fluctuation of the main parameters, and the above analysis is appropriate and in line with para.117-122 of Validation and Verification Standard version 03 /D3/.

4.7.4. Barrier analysis

No barrier analysis is used for additionality justification.

4.7.5. Common practice analysis

According to capacity projection report 2012-2021 published by TEIAS, there exist 44 wind power projects operational at time of investment decision having total capacity of 1710.2MW. Among the 44 operational plants, all wind power plants are developed as VER projects.

For the common practice analysis, the geographical boundary is also selected as the Turkish Electricity Grid to be in line with the methodology.

Step 1:Calculate applicable output range as +/-50% of the design output or capacity of the proposed project activity.
The design capacity of the proposed project is 45 Mwe. Therefore, the applicable output range is from 22.5 MW to 67.5 MW

Step 2: In the applicable geographical area, identify all plants that deliver the same output or capacity, within the applicable output range calculated in Step 1, as the proposed project activity and have started commercial operation before the start date of the project. Note their number Nall. Registered CDM project activities and projects activities undergoing validation shall not be included in this step:
All power plants that have same capacity, within the range 22.5 MW to 67.5 MW36 has been listed in common practice excel sheet. Properties of the power plants are also indicated in this excel sheet. After excluding the VER projects, no plants left in the list. These power plants are operational before the start date of the proposed project.

Nall=0

Step 3: Within plants identified in Step 3, identify those that apply technologies different that the technology applied in the proposed project activity. Note their number Ndiff.
All wind power plants have benefitted from VER. List of the power plants are given in PDD.

Ndiff=Nall=0

Step 4: Calculate factor F=1-Ndiff/Nall representing the share of plants using technology similar to the technology used in the proposed project activity in all plants that deliver the same output or capacity as the proposed project activity

F=1-Ndiff/Nall=1-1~0
Ndiff-Nall=0

According to the “Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality” (version 07.0.0) /D2/, if the factor F is greater than 0.2 and Nall-Ndiff is greater than 3, then the proposed project is a “common
practice”. For the proposed project, F=0 and Nall-Ndiff=0, therefore, the proposed project is not common practice within the region.

Common practice analysis excel file is submitted to DOE /D26/. Re-consult Ltd. Could validate the conclusion of the PP that the construction of Canta WPP is not a common practice in Turkey.
Based on the validation in 4.7 of this report, in summary, it is clearly demonstrated that the project is not a likely baseline scenario and the emission reductions are additional to what would have happened in absence of the project activity.

4.8. Monitoring

According to ACM0002 /D1/, the monitoring plan covers the following parameters required to be monitored and it is “net electricity supplied by the proposed project to the grid in year y, $EG_{facility,y}$”.
In order to gain $EG_{facility,y,}$ the following data shall be monitored:

- The quantity of electricity supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid, $EG_{export,y}$;

- The quantity of electricity delivered to the project plant/unit from the grid, $EG_{import,y}$;

And $EG_{facility,y}= EG_{export,y}-EG_{import,y}$

Data will be continuously measured and recorded at least monthly. Measurement results will be cross checked with records for sold electricity.

Net electricity generation will be measured and recorded via meters sealed by TEIAS for billing purposes therefore no new additional protocol will be needed for monitoring emission reduction. Power Plant Manager, will be responsible for the electricity generated, gathering all relevant data and keeping the records. Generation data will be used to prepare monitoring reports which will be used to determine the vintage from the project activity.

There are two meters. One is the main meter and the other is back-up meter of the main meter for cross-checking. Both meters are jointly inspected and sealed in order to be protected from interference by any of the parties. Installation of meter and data monitoring will be carried out according to the regulations by TEIAS. Data from metering devices will be recorded by TEIAS monthly (through remote reading). In addition to the two metering devices, generation of the plant can be cross checked from TEIAS – PMUM web site (http://pmum.teias.gov.tr) which is accessible using a password provided to electricity generation companies. ISVM (Electricity fed to the grid)and UECM (Electricity consumed from the grid) data given in PMUM records will be used for emission reduction calculations.

All data will be kept for at least two years after the crediting period for QA/QC purposes. The calibration and maintenance of the meters will be carried out in line with the Bylaw on Metering and Metering Devices. Accordingly, the meters are calibrated and sealed by TEIAS before the commissioning of the power plant. The meters will be calibrated by TEIAS when there is an inconsistency between two devices.
Re-consult Ltd. Can confirm that the list of parameters that need to be monitored ex post is complete and consistent with ACM0002 /D1/ and that the monitoring plan is in compliance with the applied monitoring methodology.

By document review and interview with project owner, it is confirmed by the validation team that the monitoring plan can be properly implemented and all monitoring arrangements are feasible within the project design, and the means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the Ers to be achieved by the project activity can be properly reported and verified.

4.9. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions

For calculation of the emission factor of Turkish Grid, “Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System” /D15/, has been used.

Since the share of low-cost / must-run sources is below 50%, method (d) is eliminated. Also due to insufficient data available, methods (b) and (c) are not considered and thus (a) simple OM method is used in calculations.

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'(version 3) /D15/. Seven steps of the tool are implemented as below:

Step1: Turkish national grid is identified as the relevant electric power system

Step2: Only grid power plants are included in the calculation (there are no off-grid power plants in Turkey)

Step3: Efgrid, OM, y is calculated as the generation-weighted average CO2 emissions per unit net electricity generation (tCO2/MWh) of all the generating plants serving the system, excluding low-cost/must-run power plants. As electricity generation from solar and low cost biomass facilities is insignificant and there are no nuclear plants in Turkey, the only low cost /must run plants considered are hydroelectric, wind and geothermal facilities.

Under this option, the ex-ante approach is selected. Data for calculating the three year average is obtained from the period 2009 – 2011, the most recent data available at the time of PDD submission to the DOE.

Low cost/must run resources and the equations used are provided in the PDD.

Step 4: Efgrid, OM, y has been calculated using option B which is based on Based on the total net electricity generation of all power plants serving the system and the fuel types and total fuel consumption of the project electricity system.

For the calculation of the Simple OM, the amount of fuel consumption (Fci, y) and heating values of fuels are taken from website of TEIAS, the official source of related data. The NCV of the fuels consumed have been calculated using data from the TEIAS web page. The emission factors required for calculation of CO2 emission coefficient have been obtained through IPCC 2006 guidelines for GHG inventories for fuels. Net electricity generated and supplied to the Grid by thermal plants has been calculated using data obtained from the TEIAS web page.

Efgrid, OM, y = 0.626 tCO2/MWh

Step 5: Option1 is chosen to calculate the build margin emission factor. SET≥20% is selected as (SETsample) because the set of power units that comprises the larger annual electricity generation. There is no power units in SETsample started to supply electricity to the grid more than 10 years ago. Efgrid, BMs, y is calculated as the generation-weighted average emission factor of a sample of power plants "m" for a specific year. The default efficiencies stated in the tool are used (39% default efficiency factors for coal and lignite power plants and 39.5% default efficiency factors for oil power plants).

Efgrid, BM, y = 0.478 tCO2/MWh

Step 6: Efgrid, CM, y = 0.75 *0.626 + 0.25 * 0.478 = 0.589

Calculation of emission reductions:

The emission reduction ER_y by the project activity during a given year y is defined as;

$$ER_y = BE_y - (PE_y + LE_y)$$

Where:

ER_y: Emission reductions achieved by the project activity in year y (tCO_2e)

BE_y: Baseline Emission in year y (tCO_2e)

PE_y: Project Emission in year y (tCO_2e)

Ley: Leakage Emissions in year y (tCO_2e)

The baseline emissions are the product of electrical energy baseline $EG_{BL,\,y}$ expressed in MWh of electricity produced by the renewable generating unit multiplied by the grid emission factor:

$BE_y=EG_{BL,y}*EF_{CO2,grid,y}$

where :

$EF_{CO2,grid,y}$:CO_2 emission factor of the grid connected power generation in year y (tCO_2/MWh)

$EG_{BL,y}$:Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh)

Project emissions are considered as “0”.
Pey = 0

Leakage is also considered as “0”.
Ley = 0

Total Emission Reduction is;
Ery = BE y

The annual total emission reduction will be 96,072 tCO_2.

Annual emission reductions are given in PDD section B.6.4 and are validated by emission reductions spreadsheet /D20-21/.

All assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD /D54/ and/or supporting documents including their references and sources. All documentation used by the project participants as the basis for assumptions and source of data is correctly quoted and interpreted in the PDD /D54/. All values used in the PDD /D54/ are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed GS-VER project activity. The baseline methodology has been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions. All estimates of the baseline, project and leakage emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the PDD /D54/.

4.10. Environmental Impacts

As per the Turkish regulations, projects first submit a Project Introduction File (PIF) /D18/ to the government. Then accordingly, the government provides the decision if further EIA is required or not. The PIF /D18/ for the project was made and submitted on January 2009 and the “EIA Not Required” decision /D25/ per the submitted PIF has been issued on 13/02/2009. No impact has been considered significant as a result of the preliminary environmental impact assessment. “EIA Not Required” decision /D25/ is submitted to DOE.

There is also an “ Environmental and Social Action Plan” prepared by Almer Proje /D37/. This report is prepared for the creditor bank and includes the risk assessment and monitoring of mostly the same parameters with the SD Matrix. Related gap analysis, non technical summary and stakeholder contribution plan are also provided to DOE /D37/.

LSC review by Gold Standard /D38/ has raised a FAR to the DOE saying that “The impacts stated in the Pre-EIA with given measures shall be addressed by the PP and integrated into the SD monitoring plan of the GS Passport. The responsive actions shall be validated by DOE during validation against the Pre-EIA report”. When PIF is checked it is realized that mentioned impacts are:

-Safety: trainings on first aid, firefighting, emergencies and safety shall be provided and project should be in lkine with work safety regulations. Trainings are monitored.
-Environment: waste water, solid waste and recyclables shall be disposed properly (monitored). All issues mentioned in the PIF are considered in the SD Matrix and monitored properly.

In the SD matrix, the potential environmental impacts like waste water, noise, solid waste, dust emissions, waste oil have been identified both for the construction period and the operation period.

During on site visit, a very clean operation is going on. DOE also asked stakeholders if they had any complaints on noise and dust and this questioning did not retrieve any negative results. For construction period dust emissions was considered to be an impact. Site visit interviews reflect that dust emissions are not more than the level it was before the project.

Validation of “Do No Harm Assessment”:

PP has evaluated the “Do No Harm Assessment” in a very conservative way.

Safeguarding principle 1: Turkey has already signed Human Rights Act.

Safeguarding principle 2: For the project resettlement is not required. Expropriation is needed for turbine erection and for the transmission line poles. In case of expropriation, payments will be made to land owners (and has been made so far).

Safeguarding principle 3: As per PIF, no protected site or critical heritage is identified in the project site

Safeguarding principle 4: All staff recruited is employed according to the national legislations.

Safeguarding principle 5:Working conditions and employment is aligned with laws and regulations.

Safeguarding principle 6: N/A in Turkey anyway

Safeguarding principle 7: N/A in Turkey anyway

Safeguarding principle 8: As explained under “Quality of employment”, both during construction phase and operation, all employees including subcontractor employees have been trained on “Working at high voltage” and “Health and safety”. Relevant training attendance sheets /D53/ are presented to DOE. Interviews with employees indicate that trainings are well practiced. Trainings are to be monitored each year.

Safeguarding principle 9: As explained in detail in section 4.10, project has minimum environmental impact.

Safeguarding principle 10: As explained under "Biodiversity", the project area is not in natural protection zone. Regarding Bern Convention /D52/, there isn't any endangered flora in project area. Still, effect on birds will be monitored via ornithology report once and report will be repeated if any turbine additions are done.

Safeguarding principle 11: N/A in Turkey anyway

Regarding the above stated, Do No Harm Assessment is validated.

Via site visit observations and interviews with stakeholders, re-consult validates that project did not have environmental impacts neither during construction stage nor during operation.

4.11. Local Stakeholder Comments

The local stakeholder meeting was held on 16/04/2012 in Canta Village, Silivri. Re-consult Ltd. Validated the "Local Stakeholder Consultation Report" /D40/ and confirms that the meeting was organised and implemented in accordance with GS guidelines /D6/.

During LSC meeting, comments arrived about the tumulus, expropriation, use of grassland and zoning for construction. It has been explained to stakeholders that as per the law, tumulus has been considered in the layout of turbines. Expropriation fees for private land will be paid as per the court decision (they have been paid). Grassland will be used after the project is implemented (grassland is being used). There were no comments that required alteration in the project design.

Local Stakeholder Consultation Report /D40/ and interviews by the DOE during site visit indicate that stakeholder comments are gathered properly and there were no negative comments from the stakeholders during the period of construction.

4.12. Global Stakeholder Consultation

4.12.1. Description of how the PDD is made publicly available

Since, no significant concern has appeared during LSC meeting SFR is not planned to be conducted as a live meeting. SFR has been initiated on 11/10/2013. Signed delivery protocol for the grievance mechanism notebook to muhtar /D41/ and the notebook copy are provided to DOE /D42/.

A summary of the consultation report prepared in Turkish was sent to the identified stakeholders and participants through mail or local authorities. Soft copies of the project documents (Project Introduction File, PDD, LSC) have been made available on the web site of consultant GTE (http://www.gtecarbon.com/projeler/canta/). Hard copies of the LSC Report and/or Passport were be available during the 2-month long feedback round for those who do not have internet access.

Feedback forms have also been made available in the coffee houses. To be able to gather feedback from other stakeholders, documents have been faxed or emailed with the simplified feedback form. During validation site visit, SFR process was going on and during the interviews with DOE and stakeholders, stakeholders did not claim any complaints.

4.12.2. Compilation of comments received

No written/phone call comments are received during SFR.

4.12.3. Explanation of how comments are taken into account

No written/phone call comments are received during SFR. During validation site visit, stakeholders assured DOE that whenever they wanted to be in touch, they could easily access PP. No changes have been made to the project design.

4.12.4. Summary on comments by parties, stakeholders and NGOs

No written/phone call comments are received during SFR.

4.13. Sampling Plan

Not applicable as no sampling approach is used in the PDD /D54/.

4.14. Sustainable Development

In the PDD it is discussed that the project will produce positive environmental and economic benefits through the following aspects:

-Contribute to the national economic development by creating direct and indirect job opportunities during construction and operation phases.

-Reduce import dependency of fossil fuel dominated electricity sector and diversify generation mix through use of local resources.

-Contribution to sustainable development through supporting local community and local economy.

These aspects are validated during site visit. During construction period, the project has created employment opportunities for the local community. Social security records for local employees /D43/ are provided to DOE.

The sustainable development matrix discusses the sustainable development indicators in the Gold Standard Passport /D44-D49/ of the project activity.

Air quality: Dust from the project activity appeared only for some time during the construction phase (digging foundations, land arrangement works and installation of the towers). During construction phase, dust emission was minimised with physical precautions. As confirmed during stakeholder interviews by DOE, there is and there was no complaint on dust. Still, dust will be monitored once after construction.

Also, avoided greenhouse gases, all other air pollutants (e.g. Sox, Nox) emissions are positive impacts of the project activity on air quality. Parameter will be monitored yearly.

Water quality and quantity: Water will be used only for daily consumptions of the workers and not be used for construction (ready-mix will be used in the construction process) and operation of wind farm. Therefore, the project does not have any positive or negative impacts on water reserves around.

Wastewater produced by workers during construction and operation is not released to the environment but is periodically transferred via sewage truck by municipality for proper handling with required fee. Parameter is monitored annually.

Soil condition: Excavation materials were stored in site area near to each hole drilled for base of towers for later usage for landscaping. This is in line with the regulations. Also, solid waste will be handled properly. Parameter is monitored annually. Contract with EAG Recycling Company is signed to handle hazardous and non hazardous waste /D50/. Topsoil is also prevented.

Other pollutants: Possible other pollutant determined is waste oil. It will be disposed by a licensed firm in line with the regulations. Parameter is monitored annually.

Biodiversity: According to the PIF /D18/ and ornithology report dated March 2012 /D51/, the project area is not in natural protection zone. Regarding Bern Convention /D52/, there isn't any endangered flora in project area. Still, effect on birds will be monitored via ornithology report once and report will be repeated if any turbine additions are done.

Quality of employment: Scored as positive. Both during construction phase and operation so far, all employees including subcontractor employees have been trained on following subjects:

Working at high voltage area for switchyard personnel

Health and safety for all personnel

Relevant training attendance sheets /D53/ are presented to DOE. Interviews with employees indicate that trainings are well practiced. Trainings are to be monitored each year. First aid trainings are planned but not yet given. Do No Harm Assessment (Section F1 of the SD Matrix) Safeguarding Principle 8 is therefore validated.

Livelihood of the poor: Scored as positive. As confirmed during site visit by stakeholders, any damage done to village and people are to be compensated and will be monitored once after construction.

Access to affordable and clean energy services: Will be monitored annually through comparing electricity generated by proposed project and natural gas that would be used to produce the same amount of electricity by a thermal power plant.

Quantitative employment and income generation: Indicator is scored as positive and employment during construction and operation phase is part of the monitoring, where employment contracts shall serve as evidence for this indicator.

During construction and operational period, the project has created employment opportunities for the local community. Social security records for local employees are provided to DOE /D43/.

Balance of payments and investment: The project will have a positive impact on lessening the dependency on imported energy resources. Parameter will be monitored each year via comparing electricity generated by proposed project and natural gas that would be used to produce the same amount of electricity by a thermal power plant.

Documents related to sustainable development indicators have been verified by re-consult. Related conclusions were confirmed by interview with stakeholders. An EIA not required is also provided. Re-consult Ltd. Confirms that project does not have any impacts on the environment and project is in line with environmental regulations of Turkey.

5. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

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

Table 5-1: List of persons interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview[1]	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Miyeser Tezgez	Local Employee	Sancantepe&Balaban village
I02	SV	Ahmet Tezgez	Local Employee	Sancantepe&Balaban village
I03	SV	Sezgin Baktır	Field Chief	Boydak
I04	SV	Ömer Ercan	Head of Sancaktepe Village	Sancantepe village
I05	SV	Hasan Susulu	Head of Balaban Village	Balaban village
I06	SV	Gülün Öztürk	Village resident	Sancantepe&Balaban village
I07	SV	Ibrahim Sönmez	Village resident	Sancantepe&Balaban village
I08	SV	Mustafa Çalışkan	Village resident	Sancantepe&Balaban village
I09	SV	Zeren Erik	Consultant	GTE
I10	SV	Berk Gürçınar	Project Manager	Boydak

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

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

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

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D1	ACM0002	13	04/10/2013
D2	Tool to for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality	7	23/11/2012
D3	CDM Validation and Verification Standard	5	23/11/2012
D4	CDM Project Standard	5	03/12/2012
D5	CDM Project Cycle Procedure	5	03/12/2012
D6	GS Toolkit and its relevant annexes	2.2	-
D7	Mechanical equipment purchase contract	-	26/03/2012
D8	Land delivery protocol	-	01/03/2013
D9	PDD	1	30/04/2013
D10	PDD	2	19/07/2013
D11	PDD	3	10/09/2013
D12	PDD	4	13/11/2013
D13	PDD	5	12/12/2013
D14	PDD	6	02/01/2014
D15	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system	3	23/11/2012
D16	Project design document form for CDM project activities (F-CDM-PDD)	04.1	11/02/2012
D17	Generation Licence	-	18/08/2011

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D18	Project Introduction File (PIF)	-	January 2009
D19	Bankable Report (Micrositing-Feasibility)	-	13/06/2012
D20	CM calculation excel sheet	1	30/04/2013
D21	CM calculation excel sheet	2	19/07/2013
D22	Grid Connection Agreement	-	03/10/2012
D23	Board Decision on Carbon Credits	-	01/11/2011
D24	Carbon Certification Agreement	-	01/01/2012
D25	EIA Decision	-	13/02/2009
D26	Permission from Ministry of Forestry	-	06/11/2013
D27	Loan Agreement	-	23/10/2012
D28	Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis	5	15/07/2011
D29	World Bank Report http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2009/05/11/000333037_20090511030724/Rendered/PDF/468080PAD0P112101Official0Use0Only1.pdf	-	01/05/2009
D30	IRR calculation excel file	1	30/04/2013
D31	IRR calculation excel file	2	19/07/2013
D32	IRR calculation excel file	3	10/09/2013
D33	IRR calculation excel file	4	12/12/2013
D34	IRR calculation excel file	5	02/01/2014
D35	Canta WPP Cash Flow	-	-
D36	Common practice analysis excel file	1	30/04/2013

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D37	Environmental and Social Action Plan	-	July 2012
D38	LSC review by Gold Standard		25/05/2012
D39	Local Stakeholder Consultation Report	1	25/05/2012
D40	GS approved Local Stakeholder Consultation Report	2	11/10/2012
D41	Signed delivery protocol for the grievance mechanism notebook to muhtar	-	30/09/2013
D42	Grievance mechanism notebook	-	-
D43	Social security records for local employees	-	2013
D44	Gold Standard Passport	1	30/04/2013
D45	Gold Standard Passport	2	19/07/2013
D46	Gold Standard Passport	3	31/07/2013
D47	Gold Standard Passport	4	13/11/2013
D48	Gold Standard Passport	5	12/12/2013
D49	Gold Standard Passport	6	02/01/2014
D50	Contract with EAG Recycling Company	-	01/06/2013
D51	Ornithology report	-	March 2012
D52	Bern convention http://www.tema.org.tr/Sayfalar/CevreKutuphanesi/Pdf/CesitliKonular/Sozlesmeler.pdf	-	1886
D53	Training attendance sheets	-	29/04/2013
D54	PDD	7	09/06/2014
D55	Construction works agreement	-	2013
D56	Electrical works and switchyard agreement	-	13/09/2012

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D57	Bora WPP company acquisition agreement	-	01/07/2011
D58	Switchyard road works agreement	-	22/02/2013

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Fikriye Seda YÜCEL, B.Sc. in Chemical Engineering has completed her M.Sc. degree in Istanbul Technical University in Energy Science and Technology. She is an auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and auditor for ISO 14001 and has about 2 years of experience in management systems and 7 years of experience in energy management in industry. She has been involved in more than 40 CDM, GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier/trainee validator/verifier especially in the energy sector. She has been working as voluntary market projects' team leader/validator/verifier and CDM validator/verifier under observation in the context of re-consult.

Seza DANISOGLU holds a B.Sc. degree in Management from Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. She also has M.Sc. in Business Statistics and Ph.D. in Finance degrees from Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Texas, USA. She is employed as an assistant professor of finance at the Middle East Technical University. She conducts academic research in the areas of investments and banking, teaches courses in Financial Management, Financial Derivatives and Microeconomics and is also employed as a visiting professor by the Texas Tech University during summer semesters. She has been working as a contracted financial expert in the context of re-consult.

Praveen PYATA, has B.Sc in Biology and Chemistry from Osmania University and M.Sc in Environmental Science and Technology from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University in India. He is a certified lead auditor for ISO 14001 and OSHAS 18001; he also successfully completed training modules A, B & C: Foundation in Corporate Responsibility, Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainability Reporting and Module D: Sustainability Assurance Practitioner Training. He has more than twelve years of work experience, initially for six years he worked on waste-to-energy, renewable energy, livestock-agro waste management projects in India supported by UNDP/GEF, Ministry of New and Renewable Energy. Later at TUV SUD he was CDM divisional in charge for South Asia region and until now he was involved in more than 100 CDM, PoA, and Gold Standard, VCS, VER projects as a team leader/technical reviewer / validator / verifier covering the sectoral scopes 1, 13 and 15. He has been working as a team leader, technical reviewer and biomass and renewable energy expert in the context of re-consult.

7.1. Appointment Certificates

re-consult Rüzgar Enerjisi Danışmanlık İç ve Dış Tic. Ltd. Şti. Bagis Plaza Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/14 TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara Tel.: 0090 312 287 61 22 Fax: 0090 312 287 33 73	Certificate of Appointment	re-consult part of the Natural Power group
	Carbon Department	Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Ms. Fikriye Seda YUCEL** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
Under observation 04 03 2013	Under observation 04-03-2013	N/A	N/A	04 03 2013

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
04 03 2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013	N/A	04-03-2013

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area	
			1.1	1.2
N/A	6 and 8	N/A	N/A	04-03-2013

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

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

The validity of each appointment is 1 year from the dates indicated above. The Certificate may be updated, suspended or withdrawn at any time, subject to changes in Appointee's qualification, changes in the requirements for appointment or expiry of one of the appointments above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Anil SOYLER	Certification Manager	4 March 2013	
Name	Position	Date	Signature

[illegible]

re-consult
Rüzgar Enerjisi Danışmanlık İç ve Dış Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Bagiş Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/14
TR / 06520 Balgat-Ankara

Tel: 0090-312-287 51 22
Fax: 0090-312-287 33 73

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Department

Page: 1/1

This Certificate of Appointment is given to **Ms. Seza DANIŞOĞLU** as a confirmation of compliance with internal qualification requirements as follows:

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	**Verifier**	**Team leader**	**Technical reviewer**	**Technical Expert**
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20-03-2013

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	**Verifier**	**Team leader**	**Technical reviewer**	**Technical Expert**
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20-03-2013

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area	
			1.1	1.2
Finance	Worldwide	20-03-2012	N/A	N/A

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

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

The validity of each appointment is 1 year from the dates indicated above. The Certificate may be updated, suspended or withdrawn at any time, subject to changes in Appointee's qualification, changes in the requirements for appointment or expiry of one of the appointments above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Anıl SÖYLER	Certification Manager	20-03-2013	
Name	**Position**	**Date**	**Signature**

F-C-041 / 14.02.2013 - 00

re-consult
quality in carbon auditing

re-consult
Rüzgar Enerjisi Danışmanlık İç ve Dış Tic. Ltd. Şti.
Bagi's Plaza
Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. 43/14
TR / 06520 Balgat Ankara
Tel.: 0090-312 287 51 22
Fax: 0090-312 287 33 73

Certificate of Appointment

Carbon Department

Page: 1/1

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

Clean Development Mechanism				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013

Verified Carbon Standard, Gold Standard, World Commission on Dams, Social Carbon				
Validator	Verifier	Team leader	Technical reviewer	Technical Expert
04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013

Speciality	Regional expertise	Financial expertise	Technical area	
			1.1	1.2
N/A	3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18	04-03-2013	04-03-2013	04-03-2013

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

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

The validity of each appointment is 1 year from the dates indicated above. The Certificate may be updated, suspended or withdrawn at any time, subject to changes in Appointee's qualification, changes in the requirements for appointment or expiry of one of the appointments above.

APPOINTMENT IS GRANTED BY			
Mr. Anil SÖYLER	Certification Manager	4 March 2013	
Name	Position	Date	Signature

F-C-001 / 17.02.2012-03

8. VALIDATION OPINION

re-consult Ltd. has performed the validation of the "Canta WPP" in "Turkey" between 27/06/2013 and 07/02/2014. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, GS and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation has been performed by a validation team consisting of "Seda YUCEL as team leader, Seza DANISOGLU as financial expert and Praveen PYATA as ITR", and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including CDM Validation and Verification Standard version 5, CDM Project Standard version 5, CDM Project Cycle Procedure version 5 and GS Toolkit version 2.2.

re-consult Ltd. hereby confirms that the proposed project activity "Canta WPP" in "Turkey", has applied all relevant EB-guidance as the selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and the associated methodological tools have been applied correctly. Total emission reductions from the project are estimated to be on the average 96,072 tCO_2e per year over the selected 7 year crediting period. The emission reduction forecast has been checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount is achieved given that the underlying assumptions do not change.

As a result, the validation team assigned by the re-consult Ltd. concludes that the proposed Project Activity "Canta WPP" in Turkey, as described in the PDD (version 6 and date 02/01/2014)

- meets all relevant Host Country criteria;
- meets all relevant requirements of the GS, 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 v13 /D1/;
- its additionality is sufficiently justified in the PDD;
- is likely to achieve estimated emission reductions;

Therefore, re-consult requests the registration of the proposed project activity as a GS project activity.

Seda YÜCEL	Praveen PYATA	Anıl SÖYLER
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
06/07/2015	06/07/2015	06/07/2015

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – Gold Standard Toolkit Requirements (In the Reference section, Gold Standard references are given by stating T for the Toolkit and R for the Requirements and the section number. All references given are from Gold Standard Toolkit Version 2.2 unless otherwise stated)

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Does the project activity claim green or white certificates, or equivalent certificates?	R 2.III.i.2	DR	No, there are no such certificate systems in Turkey anyway.	OK	OK
2. If the project activity claims green or white or equivalent certificates, has the project representatives provided a clear and convincing demonstration that no double counting and/or claiming would arise from the issuance of Gold Standard carbon credits?	R 2.III.i.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3. Does the proposed project activity involve facilities under the European Union-Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Scheme?	R 2.III.i.3	DR	No, there is no such involvement.	OK	OK
4. If the proposed project activity involves facilities under the European Union-Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Scheme, has the PPs provided the GS Foundation with satisfactory assurances that an equivalent number of allowances under the EU ETS will be retired to back-up the GS VERs issued?	R 2.III.i.3	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Table 2 – Gold Standard Passport Requirements (In the Reference section, Gold Standard references are given by stating T for the Toolkit and R for the Requirements and the section number. All references given are from Gold Standard Toolkit Version 2.2 unless otherwise stated)

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A. Project Title					
1. Is the project title given in the Passport same with the ones in the PDD and LSC Report?	T 1.6 & Annexes R & Q	DR	Title is Canta RES and Canta WPP in all documents. There is no inconsistency.	OK	OK
2. Does this project title also match with the GS registry?	T 1.6 & Annexes R & Q	DR	Document name in GS Registry is CANTA WPP. Titles are consistent.	OK	OK
B. Project Description					
1. Is the project description given in the Passport consistent with the one given in the PDD?	T 1.6 & Annex R	DR	Project descriptions are consistent.	OK	OK
2. Has the project proponent included pictures of the proposed project activity in the project description section? (not compulsory but encouraged)	T 1.6 & Annex R	DR	No pictures included.	OK	OK
3. Has the estimated project start date given as “the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of the project begins“under the Project description?	R 1.II T 2.5.1 & Annex R	DR	In GSP, estimated project start date is given as: “Estimated project start date: 18/03/2012”. This date is already in the past, please update expression.	CL1	OK
C. Proof of Project Eligibility					
C.1 Scale of project					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Has the scale of the proposed project activity been defined and justified as per Gold Standard Toolkit Section 1.2.1?	T 1.2.1 & Annex R	DR	Project is large scale. GSP is correct but in PDD, scale is stated as “small scale”. Please revise.	CL2	
C.2 Host country					
1. Is the project activity a Gold Standard CDM Project?	R III.b.1	DR	No, it is GS-VER.	OK	OK
2. If the project activity is a GS CDM project, is the project located in a non-Annex 1 country as defined by the UNFCCC?	R III.b.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3. Is the project activity a Gold Standard VER Project?	R III.b.3	DR	Yes	OK	OK
4. If the project activity is a GS VER project, does the host country have cap on its GHG emissions?	T 1.2.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
5. If the host country has cap on its GHG emissions, has the PPs provided an official approval from the relevant local authorities stating that an equivalent amount of allowances will be retired to back-up the GS VERs issued?	T 1.2.2 & T 3.5.1 & Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6. If the host country does not have a cap on its GHG emissions, has it been stated in the Passport?	T 1.2.2 & Annex R	DR	Please state in the GSP if Turkey has a cap on its emissions and if the project is a GS-VER project or a GS-CDM project.	CL3	OK
C.3 Project type					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Does the proposed project activity type belong to the below listed category?	T 1.2.3 & Annex R	DR		OK	OK
1.1. Renewable energy supply category		DR	Yes	OK	OK
2. Has the project type and eligibility of the proposed project activity been defined as per Annex C of Gold Standard Toolkit?	T 1.2.3 & Annex R	DR	Yes, project is stated a renewable energy project. Eligibility is discussed.	OK	OK
3. Does the project activity involve both eligible and ineligible project types?	R III.d.6	DR	Project is eligible.	OK	OK
4. If the project activity involves both eligible and ineligible project types, does the project claim credits for the emission reductions that are associated with the eligible parts of the project?	R III.d.6	DR	N/A	OK	OK
5. If the project activity is a bundle, does each project included in the bundle comply with the Gold Standard eligibility criteria?	R III.d.7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6. Has an announcement been made previously of the proposed project activity going ahead without the revenues from carbon credits?	R III.a.2 & T 1.2.6	DR	No	OK	OK
7. If an announcement has been made previously of the proposed project activity going ahead without the revenues from carbon credits, has the proposed project activity subsequently been cancelled or the design has been significantly revised?	R III.a.2 & T 1.2.6	DR	N/A	OK	OK
8. If the announcement hasn't been made previously of the proposed project activity going ahead	Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
without the revenues from carbon credits, has the PPs provided a pre-announcement statement under section C.3 in the Gold Standard Passport, attesting that no such previous announcement has been made?					
C.4 Greenhouse gases					
1. Does the proposed project activity reduce the emissions of one or more of the following GHGs?	T 1.2.4 & Annex R	DR		OK	OK
1.1. Carbon dioxide?	T 1.2.4 & Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
1.2. Methane?	T 1.2.4 & Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.3. Nitrous oxide?	T 1.2.4 & Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
2. If the proposed project activity reduces the emissions of any other GHGs other then the ones listed in Question 1 in this Section, has the PPs included the emission reductions of these GHGs in the emission reduction calculations?	T 1.2.4 & Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.5 Project registration type					
1. Does the proposed project activity apply the correct project cycle (regular vs. pre-feasibility assessment)?	T 3.5.1 & Annex R	DR	Project applies regular cycle.	OK	OK
2. Is the proposed project activity a regular	T 3.5.1 & Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
registration?					
3. Is the proposed project activity a retroactive registration?	R III.a.2 & T 1.2.6 & T 2.5.1 T 2.5.2 & Annex C T 2.5.3 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
4. If the proposed project activity is a retroactive project, has the project start date been given in dd/mm/yyyy format in the Passport?	Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
5. Are there any double counting occurring with other certification schemes?	T 3.5.1 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
D. Unique Project Identification					
D.1 GPS-coordinates of project location					
1. Has the PPs stated the exact GPS coordinates of project location for point source activities and the boundaries for projects spread over a broader area?	T 1.6 & Annex R	DR	Coordinates are stated.	OK	OK
D.2 Map					
1. Have the coordinates been illustrated with a map?	T 1.6 & Annex R	Dr	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E. Outcome Stakeholder Consultation Process					
E.1 Assessment of stakeholder comments					
1. Has the PPs inserted the "Table C.3.iii Assessment of all comments" which was given in the Stakeholder Consultation Report?	Annex R	DR	Yes, table is provided.	OK	OK
E.2 Stakeholder Feedback Round (Can Be Performed In Parallel To The Validation Process*)*					
1. Has the PPs organized a stakeholder feedback round as described in Section F of the LSC Report, to give feedback to the stakeholders on how their comments have been taken into account?	T 2.10 & Annex R	DR	Please state dates of the SFR period in PDD and GSP.	CL4	OK
2. Does the stakeholder feedback round include a physical meeting?	T.2.10	DR	Since, no significant concern has appeared during LSC meeting SFR is not planned to be conducted as a live meeting.	OK	OK
3. Have all the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round?	T.2.10	DR	Please show which stakeholders are included in the SFR period.	CL5	OK
4. Have all of the following documents been made available to the public for a period of at least two months prior to completion of the validation:	T.2.10	DR	Please state which documents are made public.	CL6	OK
4.1. The latest version of the complete PDD (including the EIA, if applicable)	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes, documents were available in consultant's web site.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
4.2. A non-technical summary of the proposed project (in appropriate local language(s)); and English summary.	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes, documents were available in consultant's web site.	OK	OK
4.3. The (revised) Gold Standard Passport (with the exception of micro-scale schemes)	T 2.10	DR	Yes, documents were available in consultant's web site.	OK	OK
4.4. If applicable, supporting documentation such as an environmental impact assessment (EIA) (if available, in appropriate local language(s)); in the case of an EIA, at least a one-page English summary is required	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes, documents were available in consultant's web site.	OK	OK
4.5. Additional, non-translated information must be made available as well and shall be translated to the local language upon any justified request of a stakeholder.	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes, documents were available in consultant's web site.	OK	OK
5. Does the PP also prepare hard copies to be publicly displayed at local places like the post office, municipality, etc?	T 2.11	DR	Yes, hardcopies are provided.	OK	OK
6. If the proposed project activity is a retroactive project, does the stakeholder feedback round include a site visit by the stakeholders participating in the process?	T 2.10	DR	N/A	OK	OK
7. If the proposed project activity is a retroactive Project, does the PPs follow the guidance provided by the Gold Standard in the pre-feasibility assessment?	T 2.10	DR	N/A	OK	OK
8. Does the stakeholder feedback round report given	T 3.5.1	DR	Please define in GSP	CL7	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
in the Passport include the following information?			How the feedback round was organized What the outcomes of the feedback round are (All written or oral comments received.) How did the Project proponents followed up on the feedbacks		
8.1. How the feedback round was organized	T 3.5.1	DR	Please see FAR6.	OK	OK
8.2. What the outcomes of the feedback round are (All written or oral comments received.)	T 3.5.1	DR	Please see FAR6.	OK	OK
8.3. How did the Project proponents followed up on the feedbacks.	T 3.5.1	DR	Please see FAR6.	OK	OK
E.3 Discussion on continuous input/ grievance mechanism					
1. Has the PP discussed the continuous input / grievance mechanism expression methods and details, as discussed with local stakeholders?	Annex R & Annex W	DR	Yes, included in meeting minutes.	OK	OK
2. Has the PP made a comment book available at the most appropriate and publicly accessible location(s) so that stakeholders can provide feedback on the project?	Annex W 2.2	DR	Please provide logbook when available.	CL8	OK
2.1 Is the location of the book explained and discussed at the LSC meeting?	Annex W 2.2	DR	Please see CL8.	OK	OK
2.2 Is the book formatted to include the five sections of the table template given in section 2.1 of Annex W?	Annex W 2.1	DR	Please see CL8.	OK	OK
2.3 Is the table formatted to allow for stakeholders to make anonymous comments if they wish?	Annex W 2.2	DR	Please see CL8.	OK	OK
3. Has the PP made a phone number available for	Annex W 2.3	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the stakeholders to provide feedback about the project?					
3.1 Has the telephone contact details been explained and discussed in the LSC meeting and justified in the passport?	Annex W 2.3	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.2 Does the PP make sure that the phone is answered by someone (or by an answering machine) in a language that is appropriate for the stakeholders of the project?	Annex W 2.3	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.3 Has the PP also provided the contact details of the regional Gold Standard office to the local stakeholders?	Annex W 2.3	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.4 Are the calls received logged and recorded in the same way as in the book?	Annex W 2.3	DR	Please clarify how the calls received by telephone recorded.	CL9	OK
3.5 Is it ensured that the stakeholders do not need to give their personal details when they wish to make a comment?	Annex W 2.3	DR	Please explain how you ensured that the stakeholders do not need to give their personal details when they wish to make a comment	CL10	OK
4. Has the PP made a web site or an e-mail address available for the stakeholders to provide continuous feedback about the project activity?	Annex W 2.4	DR	Yes	OK	OK
4.1 Has the email/website details been explained and discussed in the LSC meeting and justified in the passport?	Annex W 2.4	DR	Yes	OK	OK
4.2 Has the e-mail address of the Gold Standard's Local Manager been provided for the stakeholders to contact?	Annex W 2.4	DR	Yes	OK	OK
4.3 If the comments section is given on a website, has the project information and mechanism for providing comments been presented in a straightforward manner in the appropriate language(s) for the stakeholders?	Annex W 2.4	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4.4 Are the e-mails and/or website comments that are received logged and recorded in the	Annex W 2.4	DR	Please clarify how the e-mails and/or website comments are recorded.	CL11	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
same way as in the book with the date, comment, action requested and project response?					
4.5 Is it ensured that the stakeholders do not need to give their personal details when they wish to make a comment?	Annex W 2.4	DR	Please explain how you ensured that the stakeholders do not need to give their personal details when they wish to make a comment	CL10	OK
5. Has the PPs nominated an independent mediator (NIM)?	Annex W 2.5	DR	No	OK	OK
5.1 If PPs nominated an independent mediator (NIM), are the contacts between the mediator and the local stakeholders communicated to and recorded by the PP using the table template given under section 2.1 of Annex W?	Annex W 2.5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
6. Has the PPs implemented all the approved/selected methods of Continuous Input/Grievance Mechanism from the LSC Report on site?	Annex AB	DR			
F. Outcome Sustainability Assessment					
F.1 'Do No Harm' assessment					
1. Has the PPs considered the critical issues for their project type that are listed in Gold Standard Annexes C and G?	T 2.4.1	DR	All issues are considered and discussed.	OK	OK
2. Has the PPs discussed all of the safeguarding principles with the stakeholders?	T 2.4.1	DR	All issues are considered and discussed.	OK	OK
		DR	Please clarify if any "risk analysis" is carried out for DNHA and provide the study if available. Also please provide emergency action plan.	CL12	OK
3. Has the PPs openly discussed the guiding questions given in Annex H?	T 2.4.1	DR	All issues are considered and discussed.	OK	OK
4. Has the PPs introduced mitigation measures for	T 2.4.1	DR	Yes.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the safeguarding principles with a medium to high risk?					
5. Did Gold Standard raise any FARs regarding the “Do No Harm Assessment”in the LSC review document?	Annex AB	DR	Yes, GS has raised 2 FARs: “for pre-EIA (PIF) measures stated in the report to be added to sustainability monitoring” and “for best efforts to receive feedback from stakeholders during SFR”.	OK	OK
6. If Gold Standard raise any FARs regarding the “Do No Harm Assessment”in the LSC review document, has the PP addressed these FARs properly?	Annex AB	DR	The measures stated in the PIF are: Waste water management Solid waste management Vegetative soil conservation Dust emission control Waste oil management Emergency plan and trainings (first aid-fire) Firefighter report Personal protective equipment usage of employees Environment Audit Personnel Most of these are referred to in the SD Matrix. They are validated via questions in the SD matrix section and site visit observations. Missing ones are questioned in below questions.	OK	OK
			Please provide “Firefighter report” as stated in the PIF.	CL13	OK
			Please provide evidence that “Personal protective equipment are used by employees during construction and will be used in operation stage).	CL14	OK
			PIF states “Environment Audit Personnel”. Please state who this person is and provide relevant reference regarding his identity and his actions.	CL15	OK
7. Is the “Do No Harm Assessment” risk analysis in the GS Passport consistent with the final version presented in the approved LSC?	Annex AB	DR	Yes, they are same.	OK	OK
8. If there are any changes, have these changes been justified in the GS Passport?	Annex AB	DR	N/A	OK	OK
9. Has the PPs performed own do no harm assessment in line with the guidance given in Section 2.4.1 and Annex H of the Toolkit?	T 2.4.1 & T 3.5.1 & Annexes	DR	Yes.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	H & Q				
F.2 Sustainable Development Matrix					
1. Has the consolidated Sustainable Development Matrix table from Section D.3 of the Stakeholder Consultation Report been inserted in the Passport?	Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2. Has the proposed project activity been scored on the following indicators?	T 2.4.2	DR	Please state names of categories in SD matrix.	CL16	OK
2.1. Environmental	T 2.4.2				
2.2. Social development	T 2.4.2				
2.3. Economic and technological development	T 2.4.2				
3. Has the following indicators given in the sustainable development matrix?	T 2.4.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.1. Air quality					
3.1.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required	OK	OK
3.1.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Connected to MDG	OK	OK
3.1.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	SOx and NOx and dust emissions are relevant parameters. Dust emissions during construction are prevented by sprinkled water.	OK	OK
3.1.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Baseline is stated as "thermal electricity generation in Turkey" and "no dust formation in baseline scenario".	OK	OK
3.1.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required	OK	OK
3.1.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as +.	OK	OK
3.1.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information and data sources?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes	DR	Yes, references available. According to PIF, emission rate is below legal limits. Still, to minimize dust problem, construction site is	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	I & R		irrigated regularly to avoid dust. During site visit, stakeholders did not complain at all on dust emissions.		
3.2. Water quality and quantity					
3.2.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required	OK	OK
3.2.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.2.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter is "disposal of waste water".	OK	OK
3.2.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Baseline is "no domestic waste water generation in the baseline scenario".	OK	OK
3.2.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Currently, there is no municipal sewer system in the project area.	OK	OK
3.2.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.2.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	In SDM it says "The wastewater from the septic tank will be transported to a treatment plant where it will be treated to meet the standards in according with guidelines and national regulations." In site visit, PP said they would not be using a treatment system. PIF also does not state such a measure. Please clarify.	CL17	OK
3.3. Soil condition					
3.3.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required	OK	OK
3.3.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.3.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter is "amount of non-hazardous solid wastes during construction and operational phases and appropriate management of all waste in line with regulations".	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3.3.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Baseline is no aggregate production.	OK	OK
3.3.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3.3.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.3.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	Matrix says "Construction activities will be carried out in accordance with ESCP". Please clarify what ESCP is.	CL18	OK
		DR, SV	it is stated in site visit that after the topsoil is restored, a confirmation from Ministry of Agriculture will be obtained. Please provide the confirmation.	CL19	OK
		DR	In site visit it is stated by PP that in line with maintenance agreement with Nordex, waste oil disposal is Nordex's responsibility. Please clarify. In PIF, membrane based collector area is mentioned. Please provide evidence that waste oil is/will be stored in such an area.	CL20	OK
		DR	Municipal solid waste will be collected and disposed in line with regulations. Please provide evidence on that.	CL21	OK
3.4. Other pollutants					
3.4.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.4.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.4.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter is "no noise problem occurs".	OK	OK
3.4.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Baseline is "Noise or other pollutant source does not exist.	OK	OK
		DR	Turbines are far away from houses and it is not likely to produce flicker effect. Blazing effect s reduces painting the turbines.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3.4.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter is “no noise problem occurs”.	OK	OK
3.4.6. Is this indicator been scored ‘negative’, ‘positive’ or ‘neutral’ in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.4.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	Noise measurements is a reference.	OK	OK
3.5. Biodiversity					
3.5.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.5.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG’s (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.5.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Number of bird species and affected species.	OK	OK
3.5.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Natural flora&fauna of the region.	OK	OK
3.5.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.5.6. Is this indicator been scored ‘negative’, ‘positive’ or ‘neutral’ in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.5.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	Ornithology report and PIF are presented to DOE. According to ornithology report, there is no serious impact of the project on birds. In future, if number of turbines is to be increased, a similar study should be done first.	OK	OK
			Please clarify if any trees are cut and provide the permit if available.	CL22	OK
3.6. Quality of employment					
3.6.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.6.2. Is this indicator connected to the	T 2.4.2 &	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	Annex R				
3.6.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Number of certificates issued/trainings provided.	OK	OK
3.6.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No certificate exists	OK	OK
3.6.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3.6.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.6.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	"Trainings provided to visitors before site visit" is provided to DOE. A safety training is organized by the contracted work safety consultant for employees during construction and attendance sheet is provided to DOE. Besides, same consultant is implementing site audits. His findings are communicated with subcontractors and actions are followed. An example of such communication is provided to DOE.	OK	OK
		DR	Please also provide evidence on" training about emergencies, first aid and firefighting". Please provide emergency action plan and state if first aid material is provided for the site.	CL23	OK
3.7. Livelihood of the poor					
3.7.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.7.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.7.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Change in living standards of locals	OK	OK
3.7.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Project is a relatively developed region in terms of access to basic services.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3.7.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.7.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.7.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	Project will indirectly have impact on locals' living conditions due to supply of materials by local firms, recruitment of locals and by the maintenance on the roads due to the contraction phase.	OK	OK
3.8. Access to affordable and clean energy services					
3.8.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.8.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.8.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Fossil fuel replaced	OK	OK
3.8.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Project will decrease dependency on import fossil fuels (natural gas, coal and petroleum) compared to baseline scenario	OK	OK
3.8.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.8.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as +.	OK	OK
3.8.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.9. Human and institutional capacity					
3.9.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.9.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3.9.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter: Change in education & skills	OK	OK
3.9.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Empowerment, education and skills in the absence of project activity.	OK	OK
3.9.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.9.6. Is this indicator been scored ‘negative’, ‘positive’ or ‘neutral’ in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.9.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3.10. Quantitative employment and income generation					
3.10.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.10.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG’s (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.10.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter is “payment made to staff”. Please discuss if it is better to monitor number of employment created instead of payments.	CL24	OK
3.10.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No job opportunities currently at the project site. Project will create new job opportunities compared to baseline scenario.	OK	OK
3.10.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.10.6. Is this indicator been scored ‘negative’,	T 2.4.2 &	DR	Scored as +.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	Annex R				
3.10.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3.11. Balance of payments and investment					
3.11.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.11.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.11.3. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of this indicator been selected?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Parameter is "Currency saving due to avoided fuel import".	OK	OK
3.11.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Baseline is "Fossil fuel import and trade"	OK	OK
3.11.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	N/a	OK	OK
3.11.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as +.	OK	OK
3.11.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.12. Technology transfer and technological self-reliance					
3.12.1. Has the mitigation measures been provided?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not required.	OK	OK
3.12.2. Is this indicator connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.12.3. Have the corresponding parameters to	T 2.4.2 &	DR	Expenditure for the equipment	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
represent the status of this indicator been selected?	Annex R				
3.12.4. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for the selected parameter?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Not defined	OK	OK
3.12.5. Is the reason for choice of this parameter described and explanation given?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	No	OK	OK
3.12.6. Is this indicator been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T 2.4.2 & Annex R	DR	Scored as 0.	OK	OK
3.12.7. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information?	T 3.5.1 & Annexes I & R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4. If there are 'negative' indicators, are there any mitigation measures for these indicators?	T 2.4.2	DR	No	OK	OK
5. Has the matrix been filled by the stakeholders during the Local Stakeholder Consultation?	T 2.6	DR	Yes	OK	OK
6. Does the proposed project activity contribute positively to least at two of the three categories and neutral to the third category?	T 2.4.2	DR	Positive in all categories.	OK	OK
7. Is the scoring reproducible and verifiable?	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes.	OK	OK
8. Has the PPs filled in the sustainable development matrix in line with the guidance given in section 2.4.2 and Annex I of the Toolkit?	T 2.4.2 & Annexes I & Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
9. Does the proposed project activity demonstrate clear benefits in terms of sustainable development?	T 2.4.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
Sustainable Development Checklist for hydro, wind and biomass					
10. Hydro Power Plants (if the project is a hydropower plant please fill in questions from 10.1 to 10.20)					
10.1. Has the PPs ensured that mitigation measures	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
have been put in place and impacts minimized due to dust generated from construction activities including access roads?					
10.2. Does the PPs ensure that the workers on site and any inhabitants closeby are not affected by the noise from the project activity during construction (including dynamite blasting) and operation?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.3. Do the PPs ensure that there is no impact of noise on wildlife?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.4. Do the PPs ensure that the excavation debris, muck from the construction stage is disposed off safely and does not interact with the water stream or soil?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.5. Has the PPs ensured that the construction of the project activity does not result in soil erosion in and around the project location?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.6. Has the PPs ensured that the top soil excavated has been preserved and is available for reuse?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.7. Do the PPs ensure that it does not impact the migration of aquatic species in the river stream?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.8. Do the PPs have a sediment management plan in place?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.9. Does the sediment management plan ensure that the sediment passage is unobstructed?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.10. Are the sluice gates designed taking into consideration the incoming sediment load, grain size etc.?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.11. Is there any erosion and any accumulation in the river bed below storage dams and water intakes because of a deficit in sediments?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.12. Can sediment transport sustain morphological structures?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.13. Is there any accumulation of sediments below dam?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.14. Has the PPs ensured that the minimum flow required for maintaining the ecological balance of the river system is ensured?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.15. Has the PPs ensured that it does not impact the ground water level in the project areas?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.16. Has the PPs ensured that all competing uses of water resources at the project location have been identified, assessed and monitored?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.17. Do the project result in a physical displacement (relocation or loss of shelter) and/or economic displacement (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or means of livelihood) as a result of project-related land acquisition?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
10.18. If the project result in a physical displacement (relocation or loss of shelter) and/or economic displacement, then has it been demonstrated that these people are allowed to voluntarily relocate and compensated as per local regulations?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.19. Does the host country have its own credible legislation in place prohibiting involuntary resettlement?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
10.20. Will the project have an economic or other impact on people living nearby?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
11. Wind Power Plants (if the project is a wind power plant please fill in questions 11.1 to 11.15)					
11.1. Has the PPs ensured that the construction of the project activity does not result in soil erosion in and around the project location?	Annex G	DR	There is little excavation in construction. Only turbine locations are excavated and soil is used for landscaping. During site visit, stakeholders confirmed that top soil is preserved. As stated in the PIF, to prevent dust emissions, sprinkled water is used.	OK	OK
11.2. Has the PPs ensured that the top soil excavated has been preserved and is available for reuse?	Annex G	DR	Top soil is stored and reused. There is not much excavation in project area anyway, only turbine bases are excavated. During site visit, stakeholders confirmed that top soil is preserved.	OK	OK
11.3. Has the PPs ensured that mitigation measures have been put in place and impacts minimized due to dust generated from construction activities including access roads?	Annex G	DR	Dust emissions are calculated in PIF. Expected emissions are below the limits given in related regulation but still dust is minimized via sprinkling water. Stakeholders did not complain from dust during site visit.	OK	OK
11.4. Has the PPs ensured that mitigation measures are in place during the evacuation and civil works?	Annex G	DR	There is no resettlement for the project.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
11.5. Does the PP ensure that basic hygiene conditions are in place for workers?	Annex G	DR	Yes, as observed during site visit, site and offices are very clean.	OK	OK
		DR	Please show evidence that all employees are registered and their insurances paid.	CL25	OK
11.6. Is there an emergency plan in case of accidents?	Annex G	DR	Please clarify if any “risk analysis” is carried out for DNHA and provide the study if available. Also please provide emergency action plan.	CL12	OK
11.7. Is there a proper management system to ensure occupational health and safety in the site?	Annex G	DR	Please provide contract between Bora AS and safety consultant. Please provide consultants licenses. Please provide other available evidence on work safety. Please explain in more details all the actions taken regarding work safety.	CL26	OK
11.8. Does the installation of wind turbines impair the landscape view in the project area?	Annex G	DR	No, validated via site visit observations. Turbines are far from houses.	OK	OK
11.9. Does the PPs ensure that the workers on site and any inhabitants closeby are not affected by the noise from the project activity during construction?	Annex G	DR	According to measurements and calculations in PIF, noise level is below limits stated in regulations.	OK	OK
11.10. Does the PPs ensure that there is no impact of noise on fauna?	Annex G	DR	According to measurements and calculations in PIF, noise level is below limits stated in regulations.	OK	OK
11.11. Does the project alter, damage or remove tangible property and sites having archaeological, paleontological, historical, cultural, artistic or religious value?	Annex G	DR	There are tumulus nearby and turbine locations are arranged accordingly. Relevant permit is obtained from Ministry of Culture.	OK	OK
		DR	It is stated in validation site visit that permission from Ministry of Forestry is not yet obtained. DOE will raise a FAR for the inspection of the permit by verification DOE in first verification.	FAR1	OK
11.12. Are there critical natural habitats located at or close to the project site?	Annex G	DR	No, validated via PIF and ornithology report.	OK	OK
11.13. Does the project impact the faunal and floral species in the project location during construction?	Annex G	DR	No. Validated via EIA not required report.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
11.14. Does the shadow of the turbine impact the community living nearby?	Annex G	DR	No, as seen in site visit, houses are away from the turbines.	OK	OK
11.15. Has the PP taken precautions to ensure that the positioning of the wind turbines does not affect transmission systems in the vicinity?	Annex G	DR	No transmission systems in the vicinity.	OK	OK
12. Biomass (if the project is a biomass power plant that burns dry and woody fuels please fill in questions 12.1 to 12.16)					
12.1. Has the PPs ensured that mitigation measures have been put in place so as to limit the impact on ambient air quality due to stack emissions and non-GHG air pollutants from bioenergy feedstock production, processing, and transportation?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.2. Has the PPs prepared an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) according to the results of the EIA?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.3. Has the PPs ensured that mitigation measures have been put in place for an appropriate handling and disposal of ashes?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.4. Has the PPs included the relevant mitigation measures and EMP, in the internal manuals for the plant operation?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.5. Has the PPs put in place a plan to follow the national guidelines on the health and safety at the power plant during operation and	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
construction stages?					
12.6. Has the PPs ensured that appropriate mitigation measures have been put in place for any negative impacts due to husk/other biomass used in power generation?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.7. Has the PPs ensured that mitigation measures have been put in place and impacts minimized due to dust generated from construction activities including access roads?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.8. Does the PPs ensure that the workers on site and any inhabitants closeby are not affected by the noise from the project activity during construction (including dynamite blasting) and operation?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.9. Does the PPs ensure that there is no impact of noise on wildlife?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.10. Does the PPs ensure that they make use of surplus biomass?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.11. Has the PPs identified all the relevant changes in the land use pattern due to the project activity? (In case of dedicated plantations/energy crops)	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.12. Has the project ensured that all the mitigations measures have been put in place to avoid the impacts due to the construction of the project activity?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
12.13. Has the PPs ensured that all the relevant impacts due to the use/introduction of a Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) in an area/region has been identified and addressed in a satisfactory manner?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.14. Has the PPs ensured that the negative impacts due to the discharge of wasterwater from power generation have been mitigated with the help of a relevant mitigation plan?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.15. Has the PPs ensured that the negative impacts due to withdrawal of water for irrigation of energy plantations and the pollutant loadings to waterways and water bodies attributable to fertilizer and pesticide application for bioenergy feedstock production has been mitigated with the help of a relevant mitigation plan?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
12.16. Has the PPs ensured that the impacts due to oil and chemical spills at the power generation plant have been mitigated?	Annex G	DR	Project is a wind power plant.	OK	OK
G. Sustainability Monitoring Plan					
1. If the relevant indicator (e.g. air quality) is included in the sustainability monitoring plan, are the following added to the sustainability monitoring plan?	Annexes I& R	DR	Questions below are filled only for those included in SD monitoring.	OK	OK
		DR	Please also include waste oil in SD monitoring plan.	CAR1	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.1. Air quality		DR		OK	OK
1.1.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.1.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not required	OK	OK
1.1.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	SO_2 emissions from grid connected plants NO_x emissions from grid connected plants Measures issued to minimize dust emissions	OK	OK
1.1.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	SO_2 emitted from grid connected plants NO_x is emitted from grid connected power plants Construction is going on and measures are employed to minimize dust emissions	OK	OK
1.1.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Total SO_2 emission related to electricity generation is about 413.78 Gg for 2010 according to National Inventory of Turkey. Considering that electricity generation in 2010 is 211,208 GWh, SO_2 emission per MWh is calculated as 1.96 kg/MWh. Total NOx emission related to electricity generation is about 317.45 Gg for 2010 according to National Inventory of Turkey. Considering that electricity generation in 2010 is 211,208 GWh NO_x emission per MWh is calculated as 1.50 kg/MWh.	OK	OK
1.1.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Emission reduction corresponding to annual generation Minimize dust emissions via measures	OK	OK
1.1.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R	DR		OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.1.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Electricity generated by Canta WPP(gases), Documentation of measures (dust)	OK	OK
1.1.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Yearly (gases) , Once after construction (dust)	OK	OK
1.1.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner	OK	OK
1.2. Water quality and quantity					
1.2.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.2.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not required	OK	OK
1.2.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Disposal of the waste water	OK	OK
1.2.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.2.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	None	OK	OK
1.2.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Disposal of waste water as required by the relevant regulations	OK	OK
1.2.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R				
1.2.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Assessing disposal methods during site visits and checking waste disposal records.	OK	OK
1.2.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Annually	OK	OK
1.2.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner	OK	OK
1.3. Soil condition					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.3.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.3.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not required	OK	OK
1.3.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Amount of nonhazardous solid wastes during construction and operational phases. Appropriate management of all waste in line with regulations	OK	OK
1.3.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	No aggregate production	OK	OK
1.3.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR			
1.3.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R		Recyclable and non-recyclable wastes will be stored temporarily and will be disposed by the Silivri Municipality. Excavated soil will be used for landscaping	OK	OK
1.3.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R				
1.3.7.1. How	Annexes I& R		Site visit and checking waste disposal records.	OK	OK
1.3.7.2. When	Annexes I& R		Annually	OK	OK
1.3.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R		Project Owner and expert	OK	OK
1.4. Other pollutants		DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.4.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.4.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.5. Biodiversity					
1.5.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.5.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Migration of birds	OK	OK
1.5.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Number of bird species and affected species	OK	OK
1.5.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Natural flora & fauna of the region	OK	OK
1.5.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.5.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.5.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R				
1.5.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Ornithology report	OK	OK
1.5.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Please state if the ornithology report shall be renewed for different migration seasons in a year.	CL27	OK
1.5.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner and Ornithologist	OK	OK
1.6. Quality of employment					
1.6.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included.	OK	OK
1.6.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	All recruited technical staff is trained for operation and maintenance of equipment and Health and safety measures. Also, staff working with high voltage equipment during operation phase will be certified (also required by regulations). The trainings will be renewed for new staff if necessary	OK	OK
1.6.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Number of personnel certified/trained during operation phase	OK	OK
1.6.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	“Construction activities are going on” is irrelevant info for “current situation of the parameter”. Please revise.	CAR2	OK
1.6.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR			
1.6.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Staff will be trained positions created during construction & operation phases. All Health and Safety measurements will be applied according to local regulations.	OK	OK
1.6.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.6.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Through review employment records and training documents/certificates	OK	OK
1.6.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Yearly	OK	OK
1.6.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner	OK	OK
1.7. Livelihood of the poor					
1.7.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.7.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Compensation for expropriation	OK	OK
1.7.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Compensations made to locals	OK	OK
1.7.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	None	OK	OK
1.7.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	If no baseline will be determined for the indicators, still, please include the baseline row in the SD Monitoring tables but mark it as "-".	CL28	OK
1.7.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Compensation will be made if expropriation is still necessary in the final layout of the turbines and for transmission lines	OK	OK
1.7.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R				
1.7.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Interview with owner of the expropriated land	OK	OK
1.7.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Once after construction	OK	OK
1.7.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.8. Access to affordable and clean energy services					
1.8.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.8.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not required	OK	OK
1.8.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Fossil Fuel replaced	OK	OK
1.8.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	In 2010, about 21.8 billion m^3 natural gas been used for about 98,143.7 GWh electricity generation	OK	OK
1.8.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR			
1.8.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Approximately consumption of 7.78 million m^3 of natural gas is expected to be avoided	OK	OK
1.8.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R	DR			
1.8.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Through comparing electricity generated by proposed project and natural gas that would be used to produce the same amount of electricity by a thermal power plant	OK	OK
1.8.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Yearly	OK	OK
1.8.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner	OK	OK
1.9. Human and institutional capacity		DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	T 2.4.3				
1.9.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.9.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.10. Quantitative employment and income generation					
1.10.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.10.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not required	OK	OK
1.10.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Parameter is “payment made to staff”. Please discuss if it is better to monitor number of employment created instead of payments.	CL29	OK
1.10.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	No payment	OK	OK
1.10.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	No payment	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.10.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Project will create new job opportunities compared to baseline scenario	OK	OK
1.10.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R			OK	OK
1.10.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Through evaluation documents for wages paid and social security documents.	OK	OK
1.10.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Yearly	OK	OK
1.10.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project owner	OK	OK
1.11. Balance of payments and investment				OK	OK
1.11.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Included	OK	OK
1.11.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not required	OK	OK
1.11.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Currency saving due to avoided fuel import	OK	OK
1.11.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	“Project is under construction” is irrelevant for current situation for the parameter. Please revise.	CL30	OK
1.11.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	In 2010, about 21.8 billion m^3 natural gas been used for about 98,143.7 GWh electricity generation and about € 7 billion has been spent.	OK	OK
1.11.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Approximately consumption of 7.78 million m^3 of natural gas is expected to be avoided corresponding to € 2.5 million annually.	OK	OK
1.11.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1.11.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Through comparing electricity generated by proposed project and natural gas that would be used to produce the same amount of electricity by a thermal power plant.	OK	OK
1.11.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Yearly	OK	OK
1.11.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Project Owner	OK	OK
1.12. Technology transfer and technological self-reliance		DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.1. Number	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.2. Mitigation measure	Annexes I& R T 2.4.3	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.3. Chosen parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.4. Current status of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.5. Estimation of baseline situation of parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.6. Future target of the parameter	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.7. Way of monitoring	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.7.1. How	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.7.2. When	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK
1.12.7.3. By who	Annexes I& R	DR	Not monitored	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
2. For each indicator, if there more than one parameter used to monitor the indicator, has the PP filled in the table for each parameter?	Annex I	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3. Are these parameters planned to be monitored over the crediting period and on a recurrent basis?	Annexes I& R	DR	Some are once after construction, some are yearly. All are appropriate.	OK	OK
4. Are all the non-neutral indicators included in the monitoring plan? (positive and negative)	T 2.4.3	DR	Yes	OK	OK
		DR	Please put parameters of indicators in order of appearance as in the matrix.	CL31	OK
		DR	Please include exact names and references of regulations wherever mentioned in the Passport and PDD.	CAR3	OK
		DR	Please check final documents for non-neutral indicators.	CL32	OK
5. Is the sustainability monitoring plan feasible?	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
H. Additionality and Conservativeness					
1. If the section of additionality does not follow Gold Standard guidance, has the additionality been proven with a self developed tool according to the guidance given in section 5.2 of the Toolkit?	T 5.2	DR	Additionality assessment is performed according to the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”	OK	OK
2. If the additionality been proven with a self developed tool according to the guidance given in section 5.2 of the Toolkit, has the tool been approved by the Gold Standard and published on	T 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the GS Website?					
3. If the section of the choice of the baseline does not follow Gold Standard guidance, has the conservativeness of the baseline been proven with a self developed tool according to the guidance given in section 5.1 of the Toolkit?	T 5.1	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4. If the conservativeness of the baseline been proven with a self developed tool according to the guidance given in section 5.1 of the Toolkit, has the tool been approved by the Gold Standard and published on the GS Website?	T 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
ANNEX 1 Official Development Assistance (ODA) Declaration					
1. Does the proposed project activity receive ODA under the condition that the credits coming out of the project are transferred to the donor country?	T 3.5.1	DR	Please fill in information in Annex 1 of the GSP.	CL33	OK
2. Is a scanned copy of the ODA Declaration statement signed by the project owner given in Annex 1?	Annex D	DR	Annex provided to DOE.	OK	OK

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

Table 3 – Gold Standard Local Stakeholder Consultation Report Requirements (In the Reference section, Gold Standard references are given by stating T for the Toolkit and R for the Requirements and the section number. All references given are from Gold Standard version 2.2 unless otherwise stated)

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A. Project Description					
A.1 Title of the project activity					
		DR	Title is stated as "Canta WPP" and that is in line with other documentation.	OK	OK
A.2 Project eligibility under Gold Standard					
1. Is it clearly identified under section A.1 of the GS Local Stakeholder Consultation Report (LSCR), how the proposed project activity complies with the eligibility criteria given in section 1.2 and Annex C of the Toolkit?	T1.2 & Annex C	DR	Eligibility criteria are provided in section A.1.	OK	OK
		DR	Section A1 of LSC gives date "December 12th, 2007" which is not correct. Please revise.	CAR4	OK
A.3 Current project status					
1. Has the PPs provided information on the status of key project cycle stages (financing, equipment procurement, construction, commissioning) with dates where possible/ relevant under section A.2. of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	At time of LSC report preparation situation was "Construction is expected to start in July 2012 and expected to be finalized by the end of December 2012." At first loop of validation in July 2013, construction was still going on.	OK	OK
B. Design of the Stakeholder Consultation					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Process					
B.1 Design of physical meetings					
1. Is the meeting agenda given under section B.1.i?	Annex Q	DR	Provided.	OK	OK
2. Is the meeting agenda consistent with the guidance given in the Toolkit?	T 2.6.1	DR	Consistent.	OK	OK
3. Does the meeting agenda include the following sections?	T 2.6.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3.1. Opening of the meeting	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
3.2. Explanation of the project	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
3.3. Questions for clarification about project explanation	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
3.4. Blind sustainable development exercise	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
3.5. Discussion on continuous input/grievance mechanism	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
3.6. Discussion on monitoring sustainable development	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
3.7. Closure of the meeting	T 2.6.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
4. Has a non-technical summary in local language been included in the LSCR, as well as an English summary?	T 3.5.1	DR	Included	OK	OK
5. Has an invitation tracking table been filled out?	Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
6. Is it explained in section B.1.iii of the LSCR how it is decided that the organizations/individuals invited are relevant stakeholders to the proposed project activity?	Annex Q	DR	Stakeholders have been identified according to GS Toolkit. Government, GS, other NGOs and locals are invited. Locals were identified considering settlements impacted by the project. Both two villages' heads of all neighbouring settlements have been contacted initially.	OK	OK
7. Is it discussed under secton B.1.iii of the LSCR how the invitation methods seek to include a broad range of stakeholder?	Annex Q	DR	E mail, fax and registered post are used to deliver the invitations. Confirmations received from all.	OK	OK
8. Is the text of individual invitations given in section B.1.iv of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
9. Are copies of the invitations that are sent out available?	T 3.5.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
10. Is the text of public invitations given in section B.1.v of the LSCR both in local language and in English?	Annex Q	DR	Yes, presented in both languages.	OK	OK
11. Are copies of the invitations that are published available?	T 3.5.1	Dr	Yes	OK	OK
B.2 Description of other consultation methods used					
1. Has the PPs used any other consultation method?	Annex Q	DR	No	OK	OK
2. If any other consultation method is used, are these methods described clearly under section B.2. of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
C. Consultation Process					
C.1 Participants' in physical meetings					
1. Is a participant list presented under section C.1.i of the LSCR in a tabular format?	T 3.5.1 & Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2. Is the original participants' list given in Annex 1 of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3. Has the PPs given a summary of the comments given in the stakeholder evaluation forms under section C.1.ii of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
4. Have the evaluation forms been given under Annex 2 of the LSCR?	T 3.5.1 & Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2 Pictures from physical meeting(s)					
1. Has the pictures from the meetings been included under section C.2. of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	Included	OK	OK
C.3 Outcome of the consultation process					
1. Are the minutes of the meeting(s) given under section C.3.i of the LSCR?	T 3.5.1 & Annex Q	DR	Provided	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
2. Does the given minutes of the meeting include a summary of the meeting as well as all comments received?	Annex Q	DR	Summary is provided	OK	OK
3. Does the given minutes of the meeting include the discussion on continuous input / grievance expression methods; comments, agreement or modifications suggested by the stakeholders?	Annex Q	DR	Issue is highlighted in the meeting, also confirmed during site visit via interviews.	OK	OK
4. Are minutes of other consultations given under section C.3.ii of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	The 3D layout of the project is also brought to the meeting by Bora Energy, so the locals had a chance to examine the location of the turbines closer.	OK	OK
5. Has the PPs assessed the comments properly under section C.3.iii of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	Yes	OK	OK
		DR	The questions/comments raised at the meeting are related to expropriation process (value of the land and the crops) and the tumulus in the project area. In validation site visit, stakeholders confirmed that expropriation fees are paid as per the court decision. Still, some land owners whose land is expropriated are complaining that the land is divided in two by the project roads and now those land pieces lost value. According to legal procedures, they have the right to raise court as a response. The court decided on what should be the price the PP shall pay for the land and crops. For the tumulus in the project area, layout is changed to replace the turbines in some distance away from the turbines.	OK	OK
6. Has the comments received by e-mail or other means actually been considered by the PPs?	T 3.5.1 & Annex R	DR	Please clarify if any comments by other means is received other than the stakeholder meeting.	CL34	OK
7. If stakeholders required a revisit fo the sustainable	T 3.5.1 &	DR	No revisit is planned.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
development assessment, has this been done?	Annex Q				
8. Has the PPs justified their decisions on the revisiting of the sustainable development assessment, under section C.3.iv of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	No changes in the project is seen necessary. Project will be implemented in compliance with relevant national regulations and also international standards.	OK	OK
9. Has the PPs given a summary of the changes to project design based on the comments of the stakeholders, under section C.3.v of the LSCR?	T 2.6.2 & Annex Q & Annex R	DR	No significant changes needed in the project design. Location of tumulus has been considered in project design and two turbine location has been cancelled as per letter of council of nature and culturage heritage protection.	OK	OK
D. Sustainable Development Assessment					
D.1 Own sustainable development asessment					
1. Has the PPs included comments and justifications about their own SD Matrix under section D.1.ii of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	In own matrix and consolidated matrix in the LSC Report, some numbers (employment etc) are different than the matrix given in the Passport. Please clarify the difference between matrices. Also LSC justification section says "project includes only five turbines". Please clarify.	CL35	OK
D.2 Stakeholders blind sustainable development matrix					
1. Has the PPs performed a blind SD Matrix exercise during the LSC with the stakeholders, without telling them their own results?	T 2.6.1	DR	Yes	OK	OK
2. Has the PPs commented on the results of the blind SD Matrix exercise under section D.2 of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	PP comment is "The locals are positive about the project." This is also validated by the DOE in validation site visit.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
3. Has the PPs given an analysis of difference between own SD Matrix and the one resulting from the blind exercise with stakeholders under section D.2 of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	Please comment on similarities and differences between the blind matrix by stakeholders and own matrix of the PP.	CL36	OK
D.3 Consolidated sustainable development matrix					
1. Has the PPs given an explanation on how the own SD Matrix and the one resulting from the blind exercise SD Matrices were consolidated?	Annex Q	DR	Please comment on "how the own SD Matrix and the one resulting from the blind exercise SD Matrices were consolidated".	CL37	OK
2. Are there any negative scores after the consolidation of the blind SD exercise realized during the stakeholder consultation meeting and the SD Matrix previously filled in by the PPs?	T 2.6	DR	No	OK	OK
3. If there are any negative scores in the consolidated matrix, has the sustainability assessment been revisited with an independent party?	T 2.6	DR	N/A	OK	OK
E. Sustainability Monitoring Plan					
E.1 Discussion on sustainability monitoring plan					
1. Has the PPs included a summary of the discussion made with stakeholders about their ideas on	T 2.4.3 & T 2.6.1 &	DR	Discussion is included and is appropriate.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
monitoring SD Indicators under section E.1 of the LSCR?	Annex Q				
E.2 Discussion on continuous input / grievance mechanism					
1. Has the PPs provided a discussion about the continuous input/grievance mechanism expression method and details, as discussed with local stakeholders?	Annexes Q & W	DR	Please explain how you communicated the grievance mechanism with the stakeholders.	CL38	OK
F. Description of the Design of the Stakeholder Feedback Round					
1. Has the PPs included a description on how the stakeholder feedback round is planned, under section F of the LSCR?	Annex Q	DR	It is stated that “For the feedback round, a summary of the consultation report prepared in Turkish will be sent to the stakeholders”. Please provide the file to DOE too.	CL39	OK
		DR	GS review indicates “The PP shall ensure best efforts to get more feedbacks from local stakeholders during the Stakeholder Feedback Round”. Please explain the plan to enable more stakeholders to comment for the SFR.	CL40	OK

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

Table 4 – CDM Validation Requirements

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
General Requirements					
1. Does the PDD contain any information that the PPs wish to be treated as confidential/proprietary?	EB66 Report Annex 8 §12	DR	No	OK	OK
2. If the PDD contains confidential information, did the PPs submit two versions of the PDD, one version with the confidential information are made illegible, and another version including all information that is to be treated strictly confidential?	EB66 Report Annex 8 §12	DR	N/A	OK	OK
3. Does the confidential information include any information used to demonstrate additionality, describe the application of the selected methodologies and support the environmental impact assessment?	EB66 Report Annex 8 §13	DR	N/A	OK	OK
4. If there are any documents or attachments in another language other than English, do all attached documents contain a full translation of relevant sections into English?	EB66 Report Annex 8 §14	DR	No documents in other language than English.	OK	OK
5. Has the PPs made any modifications to the fonts, headings or logos of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 §15	DR	No	OK	OK
6. Has the PPs modified the tables and their columns in the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 §16	DR	No	OK	OK
Cover Page					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
1. Has the following information been indicated in the cover page of the PDD?		DR		OK	OK
1.1. Title of the project activity	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Title is Canta WPP and it is in line with other documentation.	OK	OK
1.2. Version number of the PDD	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Version is 1.	OK	OK
1.3. Completion date of the PDD in (DD/MM/YYYY) format	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Date is 30/04/2013.	OK	OK
1.4. Project participants	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	PPs are: BORA RUZGAR ELEKTRİK URETiM SANAYi VE TiCARET AS. - (Project Owner) Global Tan Energy Ltd (Project Developer)	OK	OK
1.5. Host party(ies)	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	TURKEY	OK	OK
1.6. Sectoral scope and selected methodologies	EB66 Report Annex 8		Sectoral scope 1: Energy Industries (Renewable-/non-renewable sources) Methodology: ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources”	OK	OK
1.7. Estimated amount of annual average GHG emission reductions	EB66 Report Annex 8		ERs are stated as 96,072 tCO2e. Number is checked in relevant section of this table.	OK	OK
A. Description of Project Activity					
A.1. **Purpose and general description of project activity**					
A.1.1. Is the purpose of the project activity described including the summary of the scope of	EB70 Report Annex 2	DR	Purpose of the proposed project is to generate electricity by utilizing the renewable energy potential to meet increasing	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
activities/measures that are to be implemented within the project activity?	§31b		electricity demand and thus reduce fossil fuel consumption.		
A.1.2. Is it explained how the proposed project activity will reduce GHG emissions or increase GHG removals?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31c	DR	Project will increase share of WPPs in electricity generation mix of Turkey and reduction of GHG emissions.	OK	OK
A.1.3. Is the situation 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?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Please state situation existing prior to the implementation of the project activity, what the land is used for etc.	CL41	OK
A.1.4. Is the baseline scenario described as identified in section B4 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Baseline is explained in summary text.	OK	OK
A.1.5. Has the PPs provided an estimation of annual average and total GHG emission reductions for the chosen crediting period?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Estimated ERs is 96,072 tCO_2 avoided annually. Number is checked in relevant section of this table.	OK	OK
A.1.6. Has a brief description of how the project activity contributes to sustainable development been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §31g	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.2. **Location of the project activity**					
A.2.1. Is the location of the project activity clearly identified including:	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR		OK	OK
A.2.1.1. Host Party(ies)?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Host country is Turkey.	OK	OK
A.2.1.2. Region/State/Province etc.	EB66 Report	DR	Project is located within boundaries of Silivri District of İstanbul	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Annex 8		Province of Turkey.		
A.2.1.3. City/Town/Community etc.	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Nearest settlement to the project boundaries is Canta village which is about 650 m from the project nearest turbine.	OK	OK
A.2.1.4. Details of physical location, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity and a map.	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Map and layout are provided.	OK	OK
A.2.2. Are there more than one set of coordinates in the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	There is one set of coordinates.	OK	OK
A.2.3. If there are more than one set of coordinates in the PDD, is the map including coordinates with decimal format provided?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
A.3. **Technologies and measures**					
A.3.1. Does PDD include the accurate and complete description of the proposed project activity and provide an understanding of the proposed CDM project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §64	DR	The proposed project involves installation of 19 turbines each having 2.5 MW capacity (Total capacity will be 47.5 MWm and 45MWe).	OK	OK
A.3.2. Is the proposed CDM project activity in existing facilities or utilizing existing equipment?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §65	DR	No	OK	OK
A.3.3. Does the proposed CDM project activity involve the alteration of an existing installation or process?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §68	DR	No	OK	OK
A.3.4. If the proposed CDM project activity is the alteration of an existing installation or process, does the project description clearly state the	EB70 Report Annex 3 §68	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	differences resulting from the project activity compared to the pre-project situation?					
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?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes, technical specifiations are given and validated on site.	OK	OK
A.3.6.	Has the PP provided a list of facilities, systems and equipment in operation under the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
A.3.7.	Has the PP provided a list of facilities, systems and equipment in the baseline scenario, as established in section B.4 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Baseline scenario is a fossil fuel based grid.	OK	OK
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?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Baseline scenario is a fossil fuel based grid.	OK	OK
A.3.9.	Has the PPs 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?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Lifetime is stated as 25 years. Please state if that is a manufacturer information and provide reference.	CL42	OK
A.3.10.	Has the energy and mass flows and balances of the systems and equipment included in the project activity, been given?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
A.3.11.	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	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Project will be connected to the existing grid.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
and/or installed under the project activity and their relation, if any, to other manufacturing/production equipment and systems outside the project boundary, been given?					
A.3.12. Has the PPs described the technology to be employed by the project activity to enable the identification of the following:	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR		OK	OK
A.3.12.1. Project's sectoral scope	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	Sectoral scope 1: Energy Industries (Renewable-/non-renewable sources)	OK	OK
A.3.12.2. Project's type	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	Wind Power Plant	OK	OK
A.3.12.3. Project's scale	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	Project is large scale. Please revise sentence in the PDD "The proposed project is a small scale wind power plant project located within the boundaries of Silivri District of Istanbul province"	CAR5	OK
A.3.12.4. Demonstration of additionality	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	Additionality is demonstrated with IRR analysis.	OK	OK
A.3.12.5. Application of the selected methodology and calculations of GHG emission reductions or net GHG removals	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	ERs are calculated in line with the relevant tools.	OK	OK
A.3.12.6. How environmentally safe and sound technology(ies) applied in the project activity	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	Wind energy is environmental friendly.	OK	OK
A.3.12.7. Know-how to be used are transferred to the host Party(ies)	EB70 Report Annex 2 §31	DR	Turbines are bought from Nordex.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
A.4. **Party(ies) and project participant(s)**					
A.4.1. Has the Party(ies) and Project Participant(s) involved in the project activity been identified and listed in the tabular format under section A.4 of the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §33 EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	PPs are stated as: BORA RUZGAR ELEKTRİK Uretim Sanayi VE Ticaret AS - (Project Owner-Private Entity) Global Tan Energy Ltd (Project Developer-Private Entity)	OK	OK
A.4.2. Has the contact information been provided in Appendix 1 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §46	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.4.3. Is all PP's information listed in a consistent manner in the project documentation? (PDD, Modalities of Communication and Letters of Approval)	EB70 Report Annex 3 §46	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A.4.4. Are there any entities other than those approved as project participants included in Section A.4 and Appendix 1 of the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §47	DR	No	OK	OK
A.5. **Public funding of project activity**					
A.5.1. Does the project activity receive public funding from Parties included in Appendix 1?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No	OK	OK
A.5.2. If the project activity receives public funding, has the PP provided information on Parties providing	EB66 Report	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	the public funding?	Annex 8				
A.5.3.	If the project activity receives public funding, has the PP attached in Appendix 2 of the PDD an affirmation obtained from Parties included in Appendix 1 that such funding does not result in a diversion of Official Development Assistance (ODA), is separate from, and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §34	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.	**Application of Selected Approved Baseline and Monitoring Methodology**					
B.1.	**Reference methodology**					
B.1.1.	Does the project use an approved methodology?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §70	DR	The UNFCCC approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002, version 13.0.0[2] valid from 11/05/2012 was applied for the project activity.	OK	OK
B.1.2.	Are the references including the number, title, and the version of the selected methodology(ies) given in the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §37	DR	Please state methodology version on cover page of PDD, too.	CL43	OK
B.1.3.	Are the references including the number, title, and the version of any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology(ies) refer given in the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §36 §37	DR	N/A	OK	OK

[2] http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/UB3431UT9I5KN2MUL2FGZXZ6CV71LT

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.1.4. Do the PPs use the version of the selected methodology(ies) that is valid at the time of submission of the CDM project activity for registration, taking into account the grace period of the methodology(ies) if it has been revised?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §35 EB70 Report Annex 3 §70-73	DR	The UNFCCC approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002, version 13.0.0[3] valid from 11/05/2012 was applied for the project activity.	OK	OK
		DR	In PDD text "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 06.0.0" is listed but reference is given for v7. V7 is the latest version. Please revise accordingly.	CAR6	OK
B.2. **Applicability of methodology**					
B.2.1. Has the PPs justified the choice of the selected methodology(ies) by showing that the project activity meets each applicability condition of the methodology(ies)?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §38	DR	Yes, applicability conditions are: The proposed project activity is a greenfield, grid connected renewable electricity generation project The project activity is the installation of wind power plant The project does not involve capacity addition, a retrofit of (an) existing plant(s) or a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)Project activity does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of project activity The project does not involve combined heat and power generation activity The geographic and system boundaries for the relevant electricity grid can be clearly identified and information on the	OK	OK

[3] http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/DB/UB3431UT9I5KN2MUL2FGZXZ6CV71LT

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
				characteristics of the grid is available.		
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?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §76	DR	Please also discuss if tools are applicable.	CL44	OK
B.2.3.	Has the PPs explained the documentation that has been used and provided the references to applicability of methodology or included the documentation in Appendix 3 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	There is no need for any documentation to prove applicability.	OK	OK
	ACM 0002					
B.2.4.	Is the type of proposed project activity defined?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Project is a WPP.	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 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
	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 reservoirs?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	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 any of reservoirs is increased and the power density of each reservoir, as per the definitions given in the project emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m^2?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
	B.2.5.3. Is the project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the power density of each reservoir, as per the definitions given in the project emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m2?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.2.6. If the proposed project activity is a hydro power plant using multiple reservoirs where the power density of any of the reservoirs is lower than 4 W/m^2, do all the following conditions conform the project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.1. The power density calculated for the entire project activity using equation 5 is greater than 4 W/m^2	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.2. Multiple reservoirs and hydro power plants located at the same river and where are designed together to function as an integrated project that collectively constitute the generation capacity of the combined power plant	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3. Water flow between multiple reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.4. Total installed capacity of the power units, which are driven using water from the reservoirs with power density lower than 4 W/m^2, is lower than 15 MW	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.5. Total installed capacity of the power units, which are driven using water from reservoirs with power density lower than 4 W/m^2, is less than 10% of the total installed capacity of the project activity from multiple reservoirs	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3. **Project boundary**					
B.3.1. Has the PP described the emission sources and	EB66 Report	DR	The project boundary is considered as the National Electricity Grid	OK	OK

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

	Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	GHGs included in the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project emissions and baseline emissions, in the tabular format?	Annex 8		of Turkey according to applied tool. The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system that the power plant is connected to. Emission source is CO2 from baseline emissions.		
B.3.2.	Has the PP 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?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §39	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.3.3.	Has the PP 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 boundary and the data and parameters to be monitored?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.3.4.	Does the selected methodology allow the PPs to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §40	DR	No, sources are clearly stated.	OK	OK
B.3.5.	If the selected methodology allows the project participants to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary, do the project participants explain and justify their choices?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §40	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?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §82	DR	Emission source is CO2 from baseline emissions.	OK	OK
B.3.7.	Are there any relevant sources or gases which haven't included into the calculations?	EB70 Report	DR	No	OK	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
		Annex 3 §82				
B.3.8.	If any relevant sources or gases which haven't included into the calculations, have such exclusion been properly justified in the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §87	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3.9.	Does the PDD correctly describe the project boundary and the physical delineation of the proposed CDM project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §82	DR	The project boundary is considered as the National Electricity Grid of Turkey according to applied tool. The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system that the power plant is connected to.	OK	OK
B.3.10.	Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to project boundary?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §72	DR	Yes	OK	OK
	ACM 0002					
B.3.11.	Is the spatial extent of the project boundary identified correctly?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	The project boundary is considered as the National Electricity Grid of Turkey according to applied tool. The spatial extent of the project boundary includes the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system that the power plant is connected to.	OK	OK
B.3.12.	Are the greenhouse gases and emission sources included in or excluded from the project boundary given in the tabular form as per the guidance given in Table1 of ACM 0002?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Emission source is CO2 from baseline emissions. Tabular format is presented.	OK	OK
B.4.	**Establishment and description of the baseline scenario**					
B.4.1.	Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed CDM project activity prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §115	DR	Yes, methodology states the baseline scenario as: "the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity that otherwise would have been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources".	OK	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.4.2.	Does the PDD identify the baseline for the proposed CDM project activity, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §88 §92 EB70 Report Annex 2 §42	DR	PDD defines the baseline scenario correctly.	OK	OK
B.4.3.	If the methodology requires use of the tools to identify the baseline scenario, have all those been applied?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §89	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.4.	Are there relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §93 EB70 Report Annex 2 §44-45	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	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?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §93	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.6.	Are there relevant circumstances to identify the baseline scenario?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §93	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.7.	Does the methodology require several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most reasonable baseline scenario?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §90 §113	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	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	EB70 Report Annex 3	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK

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

	Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	credible scenarios that are in the PDD and are supplementary to those required by the methodology reasonable in the context of the proposed CDM project activity?	§90 §113				
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?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	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?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.11.	Has any reasonable alternative scenario been excluded?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §90	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.12.	If any reasonable alternative scenario been excluded, has it been justified why these alternatives are excluded?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §90 EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.13.	Does the list of alternative scenarios given in the PDD include the following?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §114	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
	B.4.13.1. The project activity is undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity	EB70 Report Annex 3 §114	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
	B.4.13.2. All plausible alternatives	EB70 Report Annex 3 §114	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
	B.4.13.3. Comply with all applicable and enforced	EB70 Report	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
legislation	Annex 3 §114		further analysis.		
B.4.14. Has the PP explained how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §43	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.15. Where the procedure in the selected methodology(ies) involves several steps, has the PPs described how each step is applied and transparently documented the outcome of each step?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.16. Has the PP provided and explained all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources, etc.)?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §91	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.17. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonably supported by correct and verifiable references, assumptions, calculations and ratinonales?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §91	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.18. 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?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §46	DR	According to the methodology baseline scenario has been identified as "*the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity that otherwise would have been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources*".	OK	OK
B.4.19. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to baseline identification?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §72	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
ACM 0002					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.4.20. If the project activity involves the installation of a new grid-connected renewable power plant/unit (greenfield plant), is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM 0002?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis. According to the methodology baseline scenario has been identified as "the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity that otherwise would have been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources".	OK	OK
B.4.21. 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 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.22. If the proposed project activity is a capacity addtion, retrofit or replacement (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects), have 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 and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion or retrofit 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 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.23. 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 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.24. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	following the step-wise procedure in accordance with the ACM0002?					
B.4.25.	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 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.26.	Is "the proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity" listed as one of the alternatives?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §114a ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.27.	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?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §114b ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.28.	Has "continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken" been listed as an alternative?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §114b ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.4.29.	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"	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	applied appropriately?					
B.4.30.	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 13.0	DR	Methodology states the baseline scenario and there is no need for further analysis.	OK	OK
B.5. Demonstration of additionality						
B.5.1.	Has it been clearly stated in the PDD which analysis method(s) has been chosen for additionality assessment?	Kyoto Protocol Art. 12.5c, Marrakesh Accords, CDM Modalities and Procedures §43 EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §101	DR	In beginning of Section B5, please clearly indicate the names and versions of the tools used to demonstrate additionality.	CL45	OK
Prior consideration of CDM						
B.5.2.	Has it clearly demonstrated and supported by the documented evidence that the project start date is the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §106	DR	Please discuss prior consideration in the PDD. Please explain how the investment decision date is selected.	CAR7	OK
			DR	Please include in the timeline the following events:	CAR8	OK

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

Question		Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
				Board decision Licence revision Contracts signed with subcontractors (Bilmer, ABB, Affa) Feasibility study Please provide following documents that are listed in the timeline: Contracts signed with subcontractors (Bilmer, ABB, Affa) Construction Start Date-18/03/2013		
B.5.3.	Is the start date of the proposed project activity prior to the date of publication of the PDD for the global stakeholder consultation?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §26	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.4.	If the start date of a proposed CDM project activity, is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for the global stakeholder consultation, have the PPs demonstrated that the CDM benefits were considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §26	DR	Yes, investment decision date is selected as the EM equipment purchase contract date (26/03/2012). This is the first real action for the project. The contract with carbon consultants is signed before on 01/01/2012. This is acceptable and sufficient to prove prior consideration.	OK	OK
B.5.5.	If the project was not published and the starting date is on or after 2nd August 2008, have there been list of prior consideration notifications from the UNFCCC website and communication between the project proponent, the Secretariat and the host Party DNA regarding the commencement of a new project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §107 EB70 Report Annex 2 §27	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.6.	For the project activities with a starting date before 2nd August 2008 and before the actual publication of PDD, did PPs have an awareness of the CDM prior to the project activity start date, and that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §108a EB70 Report Annex 2 §28	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.5.7. For the project activities with a starting date before 2nd August 2008 and before the actual publication of PDD, was there enough evidence presented to prove that PPs were taking continuing and real actions to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §108b EB70 Report Annex 2 §28	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.8. In case of significant gap in the project development history, can a clear conclusion on prior CDM consideration be made? •	EB70 Report Annex 3 §110	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Sub-Step 1a: Definition of alternatives	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Continuation of the current situation is not considered as a realistic alternative due to increasing electricity demand therefore new power plants should be constructed which includes mainly thermal power plants. Implementation of the project is additional to the baseline scenario and therefore reduces the emissions.	OK	OK
Sub-Step 1b: Consistency with mandatory laws and regulations	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.9. Has the analysis of compliance of the defined alternatives with the mandatory laws and regulations carried out appropariately?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §114c	DR	The proposed project activity is not the only alternative amongst the project participants that is in compliance with mandatory regulations. Therefore, the proposed VER project activity is considered as additional.	OK	OK
Step 2: Investment analysis	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.10. Are the input values used in all investment analysis valid, consistent and applicable at the time of the investment decision taken by the PP?	EB 62 Report Annex 5 EB70 Report	DR	Please provide in the PD a table of IRR inputs with the following information:	CAR12	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Annex 3 §117		Input name/input value/reference document/page number/date of document The table should include all costs, financial values used (loan details etc). All data should be dated before the investment decision date. Please make sure all reference documents are provided like loan details. Please give references clearly with links (for example provide link for ref 19) Also, in PDD it is stated that "Investment decision date has been identified as the date of construction agreement." Which is not true, please correct.		
B.5.11. Are all the listed input values been consistently applied in all calculations?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.12. Do the PPs rely on values from Feasibility Study Report (FSR) that are approved by national authorities for proposed CDM project activities?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §120 §122	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.13. If PPs rely on FSR,					
B.5.13.1. Is it possible to conclude that in the period of time between the finalization of the FSR and the investment decision input values would not have materially changed?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §122	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.13.2. Are the values used in the PDD and associated annexes fully consistent with the FSR?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §122	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.14. Is the plant load factor defined ex-ante in the PDD appropriately?	EB 48 Report Annex 11	DR	Please define load factor in the PDD and provide reference.	CL59	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Sub-step 2a: Determine appropriate analysis method	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.15. Has the PDD described the selection process of investment analysis method (simple cost, investment comparison and benchmark analysis) for the proposed project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes, the PDD describes the benchmark analysis as the chosen methodology for analyzing the investment decision.	OK	OK
B.5.16. Is the choice of the investment analysis method appropriate to the proposed project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes, the benchmark analysis is the appropriate methodology for the type of project described in the PD. The other two methods (simple cost and investment comparison) are not appropriate since there are revenues to be earned and the project owner does not provide other investment alternatives as a basis for comparison.	OK	OK
Sub-step 2b: Option I-Simple cost analysis	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.17. Have all costs associated with the CDM project activity and the alternatives identified in Step 1 been documented?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.18. Has it been demonstrated and supported by valid evidence that at least one of the alternatives defined in Step 1 is less costly than the proposed project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Sub-step 2b: Option II-Apply investment comparison analysis	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.19. Has the PPs identified a financial indicator (such as IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or unit cost of service (e.g., levelized cost of electricity production in $/kWh or levelized cost of delivered heat in $/G)) which is most suitable for the project type and decision-making context regarding the investment comparison analysis?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Sub-step 2b: Option III. Apply benchmark analysis	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.20. Has the PPs identified a financial indicator (such as IRR) which is most suitable for the project type and decision-making context including the alternatives for the benchmark analysis?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB 62 Report Annex 5 EB70 Report Annex 3 §121	DR	Yes, the PPs have identified the Equity IRR as the basis for their decision. This is an appropriate decision criterion from the point of view of the project owner.	OK	OK
B.5.21. Has a pre-tax benchmark been applied?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	No, since the benchmark for the Equity IRR is the cost of equity for the project owners, a pre-tax benchmark cannot be used. The cost of equity, by definition, is an after-tax cost and, therefore, the benchmark is an after-tax measure.	OK	OK
B.5.22. If post tax benchmark is applied, has actual interest payable been taken into account in the calculation of income tax?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes, in the Equity IRR calculations, the interest payable is taken into account when the project income taxes and net income are calculated.	OK	OK
If the project participant has applied investment comparison or benchmark analysis	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.23. If the benchmark is based on parameters that are standard in the market, is the cost of equity determined appropriately? Guideline either by:	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Benchmark is provided in a World Bank report (for similar project types it is given as 15%). In the PDD, please provide exact reference and link for the report.	CL60	OK
B.5.23.1. selecting the values provided in Appendix A of Guidelines on the Assessment of Investment Analysis? or	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Benchmark is provided in a World Bank report.	OK	OK
B.5.23.2. by calculating the cost of equity using best financial practices?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Benchmark is provided in a World Bank report.	OK	OK
B.5.24. If the benchmark based on parameters that are standard in the market, has the cost of debt been calculated as the cost of financing in the capital	EB 62 Report Annex 5 EB70 Report	DR	Please provide the reference for %9 interest rate (TSKB termsheet) and other parameters used in calculating cost of debt.	CL61	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
markets (e.g. commercial lending rates and guarantees required for the country and the type of project activity concerned), based on documented evidence from financial institutions with regard to the cost of debt financing of comparable projects?	Annex 8				
		DR	In the Excel worksheet titled "Loan Payment" the grace period for the repayment of the loan is stated as 36 months in cell B5 and it is stated as 24 months in cell E20. This difference needs to be clarified.	CL62	OK
B.5.25. Has the discount rates and benchmarks been derived and supported appropriately?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes, the discount factors and cost of equity benchmark are derived and applied appropriately in line with the best financial practices.	OK	OK
If the company's internal benchmark has been used for the expected return on equity: (Only applicable to benchmark analysis)	EB 62 Report Annex 5				
B.5.26. Has it been demonstrated that there is only one possible project developer?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.27. Has it been demonstrated that same benchmark values are used for similar projects with similar risks, developed by the same company or, if the company is brand new, would have been used for similar projects in the same sector in the country/region?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.28. If the company's expected return on equity is used as a benchmark, does the percentage of debt financing and equity financing reflect the long-term debt/equity finance structure of the legal entity owning the assets of the project activity?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.5.29. If the company's expected return on equity is used as a benchmark, has the cost of debt been based on the weighted average cost of debt financing of the legal entity owning the CDM project activity?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.30. In case of loans, is the weighted average cost of outstanding long-term debt used as a benchmark?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.31. In case of bonds, is the weighted average yield of the bonds used as a benchmark?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.32. In case of bonds, are the key parameters of the bond including the time of maturity, yield, registration issuance in the financial system and set-up in the market documented?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.33. In case of debt financing from a parent company, is the transfer of capital to the legal entity documented?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.34. In case of loans from a financial institution, is the contract of lending between the financial institution and the legal entity owning the assets of the project activity, or, in absence of the contract, a letter from the bank stating its intention to award the loan and the key terms for the loan documented and supported by the appropriate evidence?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Sub-step 2c: Calculation and comparison of financial indicators (Only applicable to investment comparison and benchmark analysis)	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.35. Has the period of assessment including IRR and equity IRR calculations been chosen appropriately?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	The operational lifetime of the project is estimated to be 49 years based on the license issued. The Equity IRR calculations are carried	CAR13	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			out for 47 years since the first two years are spent on construction and project preparation. In the PPD, it is stated that the project will use a renewable crediting period. According to CDM-EB73-A08 Clarification Version 01.0, "if project participants choose a renewable crediting period and if the technical lifetime of the CDM project activity is more than 20 years, the investment analysis shall be conducted for 20 years and include the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period." Based on this clarification note, the Equity IRR calculations must be carried out for a period of 20 years and the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period must be included as a cash flow in year 20. Please revise the calculations, the PDD and justify your selection of "years IRR is calculated for"		
B.5.36. Have the PPs justified the period of assessment in the context of the underlying project activity?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.37. In case IRR assessment period doesn't cover the technical lifetime of the project, does the cash flow in the final year include a fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.38. Has the fair value of the project activity assets been calculated in accordance with local accounting regulations where available, or international best practice?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	All checked by financial expert.	OK	OK
B.5.39. Do the fair value calculations include both the book value of the asset and the reasonable expectation of the potential profit or loss on the	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	All checked by financial expert.	OK	OK

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

	Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	realization of the assets?					
B.5.40.	Have all relevant costs been included for the calculation of IRR or other relevant financial indicator?	EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes, all relevant costs have been included in the calculation of the Equity IRRs. Further clarification is needed for the following cost items that are included in the calculations: 1. "Unexpected costs" that are included as part of the annual operating expenses. 2. "Overhead and management costs" that are included as part of the annual operating expenses. 3. "Contingency cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost. 4. "Design consultancy cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost (This may be potentially a "sunk cost") Correction is needed for the following cost deduction: The tribune and transmission line assets are planned to be renewed at the end of year 25 during the life of the project. The related investment cash outflow in year 25 is deducted from the taxable income of the project. Investment outlays are not tax deductible expenses. The investment amount should be taken into account as a cash outflow but it should not be deducted from the taxable income.	CAR14	OK
B.5.41.	Has the cost of financing expenditures (i.e. loan repayments and interest) been included?	EB 62 Report Annex 5		Yes, the principal and interest payments have been included in the calculation of the Equity IRR. However, there seems to be a timing inconsistency in the cash flow calculations. In the loan repayment calculations that are	CAR15	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
			provided in Excel worksheet titled “Loan Payment”, the payments start in year 2012. In the Equity IRR calculations that are provided in the Excel worksheet titled “Cash Flow” the initial investments are stated to be made in the year 2012 and the project cash flows start one year after that (which should correspond to the year 2013). This creates a timing inconsistency because according to the “Loan Payment” worksheet loan interest payments start in 2012 but according to the IRR calculations in the “Cash Flow” worksheet loan interest payments start in 2013. This inconsistency must be corrected and/or explained.		
B.5.42. Has the depreciation, and other non-cash items related to the project activity, (those deducted in estimating gross profits on which tax is calculated) been added back to net profits in the calculation of the financial indicator (e.g. IRR, NPV)?	EB 62 Report Annex 5		Yes, the depreciation expenses have been first deducted from the project’s income in order to calculate the tax expenses, and then, the depreciation expenses have been added back to net income in order to calculate the cash flows to equity. However, the tribune and transmission line assets are planned to be renewed at the end of year 25 during the life of the project. The depreciation expense for the new investment after this point in time has not been taken into account. Further clarification is needed as to why the additional depreciation has not been taken into account.	CAR16	OK
B.5.43. In case of using post-tax bencmark, has taxes been included as an expense in the IRR/NPV calculation?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes, taxes have been included in the cash flow calculations since the cost of equity benchmark is an after-tax measure by definition.	OK	OK
B.5.44. In case any risk premiums are applied in determination of the benchmark, are the same risks associated with the project type or activity, too?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §121 EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	The benchmark is determined based on the May 2009 World Bank report and does not include any risk premiums.	OK	OK
B.5.45. In the equity IRR, has the cost of debt (loan, bond etc.) been considered as the net cash outflow?	EB 62 Report Annex 5	DR	Yes, the loan interest and principal payments have been taken into account as cash outflows.	OK	OK
B.5.46. Has it been demonstrated that CDM revenue	EB70 Report				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
makes the proposed project activity economically or financially feasible (i.e. helps to reach the selected benchmark)?	Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §117				
Sub-step 2d: Sensitivity analysis (Only applicable to investment comparison and benchmark analysis)	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.47. Has a sensitivity analysis showing whether the conclusion regarding the financial/economic attractiveness is robust to reasonable variations in the critical assumptions, been included in the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB 62 Report Annex 5 EB70 Report Annex 3 §120	DR	Yes, a sensitivity analysis has been conducted in which the key input amounts are varied in several scenarios in order to demonstrate the robustness of the initial calculations.	OK	OK
B.5.48. Has the range of variations selected been justified in the context of the project?	EB 62 Report Annex 5 EB70 Report Annex 3 §120	DR	Yes, the range of variations is appropriate and justified in the context of the project. Due to the project's nature, many of the inputs are not expected to vary by large percentage amounts. Therefore, the plus/minus 5%-10% range selected is appropriate.	OK	OK
		DR	Please examine "electricity sales price" and "production amount" separately.	CAR17	OK
Step-3: Barrier analysis	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.49. Have the PPs used and referred the "Guidelines for Objective Demonstration and Assessment of Barriers"?	EB 50 Annex 13	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK
Sub-step 3a: Identify barriers that would prevent the implementation of the proposed CDM project activity					
B.5.50. Has the PPs established realistic and credible barriers that would prevent the implementation of	EB70 Report	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
the proposed CDM project activity? •	Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0				
Sub-step 3b: Show that the identified barriers would not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives (except the proposed project activity)	EB70 Report Annex 8				
B.5.51. Has the identified barriers that would prevent the implementation of the proposed project activity, but not the implementation of at least one of the alternatives in particular the identified baseline scenario, been supported by the clear and valid evidence?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §124 §126 EB 50 Annex 13	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK
B.5.52. Is it demonstrated and supported by proper evidence how the CDM alleviates each of the identified barriers to a level that the project is not prevented anymore from occurring by any of the barriers?	EB 50 Annex 13 EB70 Report Annex 3 §126 EB70 Report Annex 8	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK
Investment, technological and other barriers					
B.5.53. In case of investment barriers, is it demonstrated in the PDD that the financing of the project was assured only due to the benefit of the CDM?	EB 50 Annex 13	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK
B.5.54. Can any of the indicated barriers be eliminated by additional financial investments into the proposed project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §125	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	EB 50 Annex 13				
B.5.55. While demonstrating barriers related to the lack of access to capital, technologies and skilled labour, do the PPs provide information on the nature of the companies and entities involved in the financing and implementation of the project?	EB 50 Annex 13	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK
Barriers due to prevailing practice					
B.5.56. In case PPs claim that project activity is "first-of-its-kind" have those claims been substantiated and supported by proper evidence?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §128 EB 69 Report Annex 7 §5	DR	Not applied.	OK	OK
Step-4: Common practice analysis					
B.5.57. If the project is not "first-of-its-kind", have PPs applied the common practice analysis appropriately?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §128 EB 69 Report Annex 8	DR	Project is not "first-of-its-kind". Yes, common practice analysis is applied appropriately.	OK	OK
		DR	Reference link in footnote 28 is not accessible. Please clarify.	CL46	OK
B.5.58. Is the selection of the assessment region explained and justified completely and correctly?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §129 EB 69 Report Annex 8 §1	DR	Please explain and justify the selected geographical area used for common practice analysis.	CL47	OK
Sub-step 4a: The proposed CDM project activity(ies) applies measure(s) that are listed below <u>(Questions from B.5.59</u>	EB70 Report Annex 8				

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
<u>to B.5.65 are applicable</u>) Fuel and feedstock switch • **Switch of technology with or without change of energy source (including energy efficiency improvement as well as use of renewable energies);** • **Methane destruction** • **Methane formation avoidance**	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §2				
B.5.59. Have all projects within an applicable output range (+/-50%) been included into the common practice analysis?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §5	DR	The design capacity of the proposed project is 45 MWe. Therefore, the applicable output range is from 22.5 MW to 67.5 MW.	OK	OK
B.5.60. Have the similar projects (both CDM and non-CDM) been identified?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	All wind power plants are included.	OK	OK
B.5.61. If the similar projects have been identified, are the following conditions fullfilled?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR		OK	OK
B.5.61.1. Are the projects located in the applicable geographical area?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.61.2. Are the projects applied the same measure as the proposed project activity?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.61.3. Do the projects use the same energy source/fuel and feedstock as the proposed project activity, if a technology switch measure is implemented by the proposed project activity?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	All wind power plants are included.	OK	OK
B.5.61.4. Do the plants in which the projects have been implemented produce goods or services with comparable quality, properties and applications areas (e.g. clinker) as the proposed project plant?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	All wind power plants are included.	OK	OK
B.5.61.5. Are the capacity or output of the projects within the applicable capacity or output range	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	The design capacity of the proposed project is 45 MWe. Therefore, the applicable output range is from 22.5 MW to 67.5 MW.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
calculated in Question B.5.60?					
B.5.61.6. Do the projects start commercial operation before the PDD published for global stakeholder consultation or before the start date of proposed project activity, whichever is earlier for the proposed project activity?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §6	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.62. Within the projects identified in Question B.5.61, have the following project activities been identified?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §7	DR		OK	OK
B.5.62.1. Non registered CDM project activities	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §7	DR	All are GS or VCS projects.	OK	OK
B.5.62.2. Project activities not submitted for registration	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.62.3. Project activities not undergoing validation	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.63. Within similar projects identified in Question B.5.62, have the projects applying technologies that are different to the technology applied in the proposed project activity been identified?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §4 §8 EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §129	DR	All are wind power plants.	OK	OK
B.5.64. Has the factor (F=1-Ndiff / Nall) been calculated correctly?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §9	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.5.65. Based on an analysis provided in the PDD, is it possible to conclude that the proposed project activity is not common practice?	EB 69 Report Annex 8 §10	DR	It is not common practice to implement such projects without VER.	OK	OK
Sub-step 4b: The proposed CDM project activity(ies) doesn't					

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
apply any of the measures that are listed in Sub-step 4a above (<u>Questions B.5.66 and B.5.67 are applicable</u>):					
B.5.66. Has the PPs provided an analysis of any other activities that are operational and that are similar to the proposed project activity in the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §129	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5.67. If similar activities have been identified, has it been demonstrated that there are essential distinctions between them and proposed project activity, which demonstrate the necessity of the CDM benefits?	EB70 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §129	DR	N/A	OK	OK
In all cases to check additionality at the final stage					
B.5.68. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to additionality?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §72	DR	Yes, methodology is correctly applied with respect to additionality	OK	OK
B.5.69. As a result, has the PPs demonstrated that the project activity is additional in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and tool(s)?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 3 §101	DR	Project is additional.	OK	OK
B.6. **Emission reductions**					
B.6.1. **Explanation of methodological choices**					
B.6.1.1. Has the PPs explained how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology(ies), for calculating baseline emissions, project emissions, leakage and emission reductions are applied?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR		OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.6.1.1.1. Baseline emissions	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	For calculation of the emission factor of Turkish Grid, "Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System", has been used.	OK	OK
B.6.1.1.2. Project emissions	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	The proposed project activity involves the generation of electricity by a wind power plant which has does not cause any significant emissions. Therefore project emissions are considered as "0".	OK	OK
B.6.1.1.3. Leakage	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	The energy generating equipment is not transferred from or to another activity. Therefore leakage is also considered as "0".	OK	OK
B.6.1.1.4. Emission reductions	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	The ex-ante emission reductions (ERy) are calculated via formula 11 of ACM0002 v13.	OK	OK
B.6.1.2. Has the PPs clearly stated which equations will be used in calculating emission reductions?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Equations are provided in PDD Table 7.	OK	OK
B.6.1.3. Has the PPs explained and justified all relevant methodological choices including the following?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §51	DR		OK	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	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §51	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	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §51	DR	Selections are explained and justified.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	EB70 Report Annex 3 §97				
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.	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §51	DR	Value and data selection from reference sources are correct and justified.	OK	OK
B.6.2. **Data and parameters fixed ex ante**					
B.6.2.1. Have the PPs 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.6.2 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Parameters available at validation are provided in PDD.	OK	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?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §52	DR	Yes, included.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3. Are the following information regarding the data and parameters specified correctly?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR		OK	OK
B.6.2.3.1. Data/parameter name	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Names and indices are correct.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.2. Data/parameter unit	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Units are stated correctly.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.6.2.3.3. Description of the data/parameter	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Descriptions are clear.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.4. Values applied to data/parameter	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Please provide relevant annexes and links for values indicated in “value applied” cells in section B.6.2.	CL48	OK
B.6.2.3.5. Source of data and parameter	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Reference link for FCiy does not include year 2011. Please revise.	CL49	OK
		DR	Please provide IPCC reference link in PDD.	CL50	OK
		DR	For OM calculation sheet, please provide links in excel for values starting from B20.	CL51	OK
		DR	Please provide linked cells or reference for internal consumption percentages	CL52	OK
		DR	For BM, please unhide cells in cohort built by VER sheet.	CL53	OK
		DR	For BM, please provide references for “generation efficiency values”	CL54	OK
		DR	In sentence “Since no data is available on actual commissioning date of the plant, plants commissioned in 2011 was fully included in the calculations”, 2011 should be replaced by 2009? Please clarify.	CL55	OK
B.6.2.4. Where applied values have been measured, are the following included in the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.1. The equipment used	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.6.2.4.2. The standards used	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.3. Responsible person/entity having undertaken the measurement	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.4. The date of measurement(s)	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.5. The frequency of measurement(s)	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.6. The measurement results	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	No measured values.	OK	OK
B.6.2.5. Has the purpose of data been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Purpose is to calculate baseline emissions and emission reductions.	OK	OK
B.6.2.5.1. Calculation of baseline emissions;	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Purpose is to calculate baseline emissions and emission reductions.	OK	OK
B.6.2.5.2. Calculation of project emissions;	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Purpose is to calculate baseline emissions and emission reductions.	OK	OK
B.6.2.5.3. Calculation of leakage.	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Purpose is to calculate baseline emissions and emission reductions.	OK	OK
B.6.3. **Ex ante calculations of emission reductions**					
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)?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §50 EB70 Report Annex 3 §96 §97	DR		OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.6.3.1.1. project emissions	EB70 Report Annex 2 §50 EB70 Report Annex 3 §96 §97	DR	The proposed project activity involves the generation of electricity by a wind power plant which has does not cause any significant emissions. Therefore project emissions are considered as "0".	OK	OK
B.6.3.1.2. baseline emissions,	EB70 Report Annex 2 §50 EB70 Report Annex 3 §96 §97	DR	For calculation of the emission factor of Turkish Grid, "Tool to Calculate the Emission Factor for an Electricity System", has been used.	OK	OK
B.6.3.1.3. leakage	EB70 Report Annex 2 §50 EB70 Report Annex 3 §96 §97	DR	The energy generating equipment is not transferred from or to another activity. Therefore leakage is also considered as "0".	OK	OK
B.6.3.1.4. emission reductions	EB70 Report Annex 2 §50 EB70 Report Annex 3 §96 §97	DR	The ex-ante emission reductions (ERy) are calculated via formula 11 of ACM0002 v13.	OK	OK
B.6.3.2. Where the methodology allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, has adequate justification been provided in the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §97	DR	Equations and parameters are clearly selected and justified.	OK	OK
B.6.3.3. Has the PPs used the values contained in the tables in section B.6.2 of the PDD for data and parameters available before registration?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes, data in B62 matches with excel sheet and remainder of PDD.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.6.3.4. Has the PPs used the estimates contained in the table in section B.7.1 of the PDD for the data/parameters not available before registration and monitored during the crediting period?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Electricity generation is estimated via licence.	OK	OK
B.6.3.5. If any of these estimates has been determined by a sampling approach, has the PP 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"?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §53	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.6. Has the PPs provided a sample calculation for each equation used?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.7. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology to calculate emissions like project emissions, baseline emissions and leakages are applied by the PPs?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §98	DR	All calculations are clearly explained.	OK	OK
B.6.3.8. Has the selected methodology been correctly and transparently applied with respect to algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §72 EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Methodology is correctly applied.	OK	Ok
ACM 0002					
B.6.3.9. Are baseline emissions calculated using equation (6) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Yes.	OK	OK
B.6.3.10.Is the quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y ($EG_{PJ,y}$) calculated using equations (7), (8) or (9) given in the	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Equation 7 for renewable Greenfield plants is used.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
methodology depending on the project type?					
B.6.3.11. When the methodology offers options for approaches in calculations, is it documented in the PDD which option is applied?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	All selections are documented.	OK	OK
B.6.3.12. 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 CPA, chosen in a conservative manner?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.13. In the case of capacity additions, retrofits or replacements (except for capacity addition projects for which the electricity generation of the existing power plant(s) or unit(s) is not affected)	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.13.1. 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 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.13.2. Is it defined in the baseline emission section that no capacity addition or retrofit 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 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.14. Are the project emissions calculated using equations (1), (2), (3) or (4) given in the methodology depending on the project type?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	The proposed project activity involves the generation of electricity by a wind power plant which has does not cause any significant emissions. Therefore project emissions are considered as “0”.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.6.3.15. Where project emissions are taken as "0", has the PP made proper justification?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	The proposed project activity involves the generation of electricity by a wind power plant which has does not cause any significant emissions. Therefore project emissions are considered as "0".	OK	OK
B.6.3.16. Are the emission reductions calculated using equation (11) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.4. **Summary of the ex-ante estimates of emissions reductions**					
B.6.4.1. Have the PPs summarized the results of the ex-ante calculation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, using the tabular format?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Tabular format is presented and values in table are correct.	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 the each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	EGfacility,y is monitored.	OK	OK
B.7.1.2. Has the unit of the each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Unit is MWh/yr.	OK	OK
B.7.1.3. Has the description of the each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56-b	DR	Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year *y*	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	ACM 0002 Version 13.0				
B.7.1.4. Has the source of the each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Source of data is "Electricity meter(s)".	OK	OK
B.7.1.5. Where several sources of data/parameters are used, is the choice of data/parameter sources explained and justified?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.6. Has the applied value of the each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Expected value is stated as "163.2". Reference for this number is bankable report (feasibility). Please clarfiy why the licence is not used. Also this number is expressed in the PDD in both MWh and GWh. Please correct.	CAR10	OK
) B.7.1.7. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	The quantity of electricity supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid; and The quantity of electricity delivered to the project plant/unit from the grid will be monitored. Net electricity fed to the grid will be used in calcualtions.	OK	OK
B.7.1.8. Has the PPs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring?	EB66 Report Annex 8 ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	Please provide information on type, model of meters.	CL56	OK
B.7.1.9. Have the PPs included description of calibration procedures for the monitoring equipment including the following?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR		OK	OK
B.7.1.9.1. Frequency of the calibration	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report	DR	Calibration of the metering devices will be made by TEIAS and sealed before the commissioning of the power plant. The meters will be calibrated by TEIAS when there is an inconsistency between	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Annex 2 §56f ACM 0002 Version 13.0		two devices.		
B.7.1.9.2. Accuracy of the calibration	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Please explain how PP will ensure accuracy of calibration. Please explain any legal procedures regarding calibration of meters in Turkey. What is the level of uncertainity?	CL57	OK
B.7.1.9.3. Uncertainty of the calibration	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.9.4. Calibrating agency/person	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.9.5. The relevant national/international standards	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.10. Has the accuracy level of the measurement method included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.11. Has the responsible person/entity for the measurements included?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.12. Has the interval for the measurements included?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Continuous measurement and at least monthly recording	OK	OK
B.7.1.13.Has the monitoring frequency for each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Continuous measurement and at least monthly recording	OK	OK
B.7.1.14.Has the QA/QC procedures of the each data/parameter been included?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56d	DR	Measurement results can be cross checked with records for sold electricity. In addition to the two metering devices, generation of the plant can be cross checked from TEIAS – PMUM web site (http://pmum.teias.gov.tr) which is accessible using a password	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	ACM 0002 Version 13.0		provided to electricity generation companies.		
B.7.1.15.Has the purpose of data/parameter been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR		OK	OK
B.7.1.15.1. Calculation of baseline emissions;	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56	DR	Purpose is to calculate emission reductions, meaning baseline emissions.	OK	OK
B.7.1.15.2. Calculation of project emissions;	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.15.3. Calculation of leakage.	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.Have the PPs developed and described the monitoring plan for the proposed CDM project activity in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and all other applicable CDM rules and requirements?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §54 EB70 Report Annex 3 §72 §131	DR	Monitoring plan is in accordance with the methodology.	OK	OK
B.7.1.17.Does the monitoring plan include all data, parameters and related information required by the selected methodology(ies)?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §55 EB70 Report Annex 3 §132a ACM 0002	DR	Monitoring plan is in accordance with the methodology.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Version 13.0				
B.7.1.18. Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §132b	DR	Monitoring plan 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?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB 69 Report Annex 4	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	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 PP provided a description of the sampling plan in accordance with the recommended outline for a sampling plan in the "Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities"? (	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB 69 Report Annex 4 § 25 § 26 § 27	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.3. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, does the sampling plan present a reasonable approach for obtaining unbiased, reliable estimates of the variables?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38a	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.4. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the proposed sampling approach clear?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38c	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.5. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the elements of objectives and reliability requirements complete?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38a-i	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
B.7.2.6. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, do the requirements specified agree with those stated in the appropriate standards?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38a-i	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.7. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the population in the sampling plan clearly defined?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38b	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.8. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, does the sampling approach comply with the description of the population?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38c-ii	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.9. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the sample representative of the population?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38e	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.10. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the proposed sample size adequate to achieve the minimum confidence/precision requirements?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38d	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.11. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is the ex-ante estimate of the population variance needed for the calculation of the sample size adequately justified?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38d	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.12. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, is it identified how the sampling frame would be kept?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38e-ii	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.13. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the methods of data collection clear and unambiguous?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38f-i	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.14. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the procedures for the data measurements defined appropriately and	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38g	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
clearly?					
B.7.2.15. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, do the procedures for measurements adequately provide for minimizing non-sampling errors?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38g	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
B.7.2.16. If the sampling approach is used by the PPs, are the proposed skill sets, qualifications and experience of the personnel to be engaged to conduct sampling adequate?	EB69 Report Annex 5 §38h-i	DR	No sampling plan will be necessary.	OK	OK
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?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56a	DR	Responsibilities are stated in PDD.	OK	OK
B.7.3.2. Has the PP clearly indicated the responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §56c	DR	Responsibilities are stated in PDD.	OK	OK
C. Duration and crediting period					
C.1. **Duration of project activity**					
C.1.1. **Start date of project activity**					
C.1.1.1. Has the start date of the project activity, in the format of DD/MM/YYYY been stated under section C.1.1 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report	DR	Start date of project activity is determined as 26/03/2012, date of turbine agreement.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Annex 2 §57				
C.1.1.2. Has the PP described how this date has been determined?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §57	DR	Start date of project activity is determined as 26/03/2012, date of turbine agreement.	OK	OK
C.1.1.3. Has the PP provided evidence to support this date?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §57	DR	Turbine agreement is provided.	OK	OK
C.1.2. **Expected operational lifetime of project activity**					
C.1.2.1. Is the expected operational lifetime of the project activity stated in years and months under section C.1.2 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	The operational lifetime of the project is about 49 years as per the license issued. According to the technical lifetime of turbines which is given as 25 years as per the tool and also estimated as 20-25 years by experts, turbines will be renovated or replaced and project will continue to be operated by the project owner until end of the license period.	OK	OK
C.2. **Crediting period of project activity**					
C.2.1. **Type of crediting period**					
C.2.1.1. Has the PPs stated the type of crediting period chosen for the project activity (renewable or fixed)?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §59	DR	Project will use renewable crediting period	OK	OK
C.2.1.2. For renewable crediting period, is it indicated in the PDD whether it is the first,	EB66 Report	DR	It is stated that this is the first crediting period.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
second or third crediting period?	Annex 8				
ACM 0002- For renewal of crediting period (Questions from C.2.1.3 to C.2.1.6 are not valid for the first crediting period)					
C.2.1.3. Are there any changes in the relevant national and/or sectoral regulations at the beginning of new crediting period?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.1.4. If there are any changes in the relevant national and/or sectoral regulations, are they applicable to the existing projects?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.1.5. If these changes are applicable to the existing projects, is the baseline scenario revised and updated in line with these changes?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.1.6. If these changes are applicable to the existing projects, is the baseline scenario revised and updated in line with the new data available?	ACM 0002 Version 13.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.2. **Start date of the crediting period**					
C.2.2.1. Is the start date of the crediting period of the project activity given in DD/MM/YYYY format?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §60 §62	DR	It is stated that the first crediting period is expected to start in 01/12/2014. Please check this date.	CL58	OK
C.2.2.2. Have the PPs determined only one start date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation of the proposed CDM project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §61	DR	It is stated that the first crediting period is expected to start in 01/12/2014. Please check this date.	CL58	OK
C.2.2.3. Has the PPs used any qualifications to the start date, such as “expected”?	EB70 Report	DR	It is stated that the first crediting period is expected to start in	CL58	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
	Annex 2 §62		01/12/2014. Please check this date.		
C.2.3. **Length of the crediting period**					
C.2.3.1. 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?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	First crediting period will be valid for 7 years and 0 month	OK	OK
D. Environmental Impacts					
D.1. **Analysis of the environmental impacts**					
D.1.1. Have the PPs carried out an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed CDM project activity including transboundary impacts?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §63 EB70 Report Annex 2 §134	DR	Environmental impacts are assessed in GS Passport. In PDD only a summary is provided. There are Project Introduction file and ornithology report carried out for the project. All potential harm to environment are assessed and precautions taken.	OK	OK
D.2. **Environmental impact assessment**					
D.2.1. Has a summary of the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity and references to all related documentation, provided under Section D.2 of the PDD?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §63	DR	Environmental measures are discussed in the PDD.	OK	OK
D.2.2. Has the PPs provided all conclusions and references to all related documentation?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §64	DR	Environmental measures are discussed in the PDD.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
D.2.3. Do the procedures of the Host Party require the PPs to conduct an environmental impact assessment?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §135	DR	EIA not Required report is provided to DOE.	OK	OK
D.2.4. If the procedures of the Host Party require the PPs to conduct an environmental impact assessment, has the PPs conducted an environmental impact assessment in accordance with the Host Party's procedures?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §135 EB70 Report Annex 2 §64	DR	EIA not Required report is provided to DOE.	OK	OK
E. Local Stakeholder Consultation					
E.1. **Solicitation of comments from local stakeholders**					
E.1.1. Has the PPs described the process by which comments from local stakeholders have been invited for the project activity?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Section E1 explains related info.	OK	OK
E.1.2. Has the PPs demonstrated how due steps/actions were taken to appropriately engage stakeholders and solicit comment?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §65	DR	During validation site visit stakeholders confirmed that PP always asked for their opinions and encouraged them to comment.	OK	OK
E.1.3. Has the PPs invited comment from local stakeholders in an open and transparent manner, in a way that facilitates comments to be received from local stakeholders and allows for a reasonable time for comments to be submitted?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §66 EB70 Report Annex 3 §139a	DR	During validation site visit stakeholders confirmed that PP always asked for their opinions and encouraged them to comment.	OK	OK
E.1.4. Has the PPs described the proposed CDM project activity in a manner that allows the local stakeholders to understand the project activity, taking into account confidentiality provisions of the applicable CDM M&Ps and requirements?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §66	DR	Meeting minutes include clear and detailed information on the project.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
E.2. **Summary of comments received**					
E.2.1. Has the PP identified the stakeholders that have made comments?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.2.2. Has the PP provided a summary of the local stakeholder comments in a complete and clear manner?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §67 EB70 Report Annex 3 §139b	DR	Yes, comments and commentors are listed in the PDD.	OK	OK
E.3. **Report on consideration of comments received**					
E.3.1. Has the PPs provided information demonstrating that all comments received have been considered?	EB66 Report Annex 8 EB70 Report Annex 2 §68 §69	DR	Answers given to comments are provided in PDD. These were validated in validation site visit via interviews.	OK	OK
E.3.2. Is the process on how the PPs taken due account of all comments received described in the PDD?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §139c	DR	There are no comments that require changes in project.	OK	OK
F. Approval and Authorization					
F.1. Have letters of approval been provided from all Parties involved? .	EB70 Report Annex 3 §45 §48 EB70 Report Annex 38 §1 §2	DR	Project is developed as a VER project. Since Turkey does not have a cap and trade system or issue approval letter, no authorization or approval is needed.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
F.2. Have all private/public PPs been authorized by an involved Party?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §45	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.3. Has the Designated National Authority (DNA) of each Party in section A.2.1 of the PDD provided a written letter of approval?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §38	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.4. Does the letter of approval from DNA of each Party involved:		DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.4.1. Confirm that the Party is a Party of the Kyoto Protocol?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §39 EB70 Report Annex 2 §70a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.4.2. Confirm that participation is voluntary?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §39 EB70 Report Annex 2 §70b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.4.3. Confirm that, in the case of the host Party, the proposed CDM project activity contributes to the sustainable development of the country?	Kyoto Protocol Article 12.2 EB70 Report Annex 3 §39 §50 §51 EB70 Report Annex 2 §71	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.4.4. Refers to the precise proposed CDM project activity title in the PDD being submitted for registration?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §39	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.4.5. Confirms that project participants are authorized to participate in the proposed CDM project activity?	EB70 Report Annex 2 §70c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
F.5. Is (are) the letter(s) of approval unconditional with respect to F.4.1 to F.4.5 above?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §40	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
F.6. Is(are) the letter(s) of approval authentic and issued from the relevant DNA?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §41 §42 §48	DR	N/A	OK	OK
G. Other Requirements in CDM					
G.1. **Modalities of communication**					
G.1.1. **Modalities of communication (MoC)**					
G.1.1.1. Has the MoC statement been correctly completed and duly authorized?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §59 §60	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK
G.1.1.2. Has the latest version of the Form "Modalities of Communication Statement" (F-CDM-MOC) been used?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §60	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK
G.1.1.3. Do the PP's authorized signatories signing the F-CDM-MOC correspond to the PP's authorized signatories included in Annex-1 of F-CDM-MOC?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §60	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK
G.2. **General**					
G.2.1. Are the corporate identities of all PPs and focal points included in the MoC statement? •	EB70 Report Annex 3 §53 §54	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK
G.2.2. Are the personal identities, including specimen signatures and employment status, of all PPs and focal points' authorized signatories included in the MoC statement?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §53 §54	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
G.2.3. If the validity of this information is checked through the written confirmation by the PP, is the MoC statement received from a PP with whom re-consult has a contractual relationship?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §55	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK
G.2.4. If the official who submits the MoC statement to re-consult and the official who signed the written confirmation is a different person, has it been demostrated that this person duly authorized to do so on behalf of the respective PP?	EB70 Report Annex 3 §56	DR	This is a GS-VER project.	OK	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Appendix-1 Contact information of project participants					
1. Is the contact information of PPs listed in Section A.4 of PDD provided in Appendix 1?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes	OK	OK
Appendix-2 Affirmation regarding public funding					
1. If applicable, have the PPs attached the affirmation obtained from Party(ies) providing public funding to the project activity in Appendix 2?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	It was stated in section A5 that no public funding is used for the project.	OK	OK
2. If any further background information regarding the public funding additional to the Section A.5 is provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Appendix-3 Applicability of the selected methodology(ies)					
1. If any further background information regarding the applicability of the selected methodology is provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Annex 3 and Annex4 are referred in PDD text but there is no information in annexes. Please revise.	CAR11	OK

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

Question	Reference	Means of validation*	Findings, comments, references and document sources	Draft opinion	Final opinion
Appendix-4 Further background information on ex ante calculation of emission reductions					
1. If any further background information regarding ex-ante calculation of emission reductions is provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	Yes. All data validated.	OK	OK
Appendix-5 Further background information on monitoring plan					
1. If any further background information used in the development of the monitoring plan is provided, is this information correct and supported by the appropriate evidence?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
Appendix-6 Summary of post registration changes					
1. If applicable, is the summary of the post registration changes provided?	EB66 Report Annex 8	DR	N/A	OK	OK

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

Table 5 – 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CAR1 Please also include waste oil in SD monitoring plan.	Table 2 G.1	Response 1 Waste oil is added in the monitoring plan in the Passport.	Review 1 Included in SD Monitoring. Request is closed.
CAR2 "Construction activities are going on" is irrelevant info for "current situation of the parameter". Please revise.	Table 2 G.1.6.4	Response 1 Revised	Review 1 Current situation revised to "Staff are already trained for health and safety measures, regular trainings and exams are held regularly" Request is closed.
CAR3 Please include exact names and references of regulations wherever mentioned in the Passport and PDD.	Table 2 G.4	Response 1 Provided Response 2 Provided	Review 1 Work Safety law, Regulation of Disposal of Hazardous wastes, Regulation of Disposal of Solid wastes are referenced where relevant. Please also apply for items 3,4 and 7 in the Monitoring plan. Request is not closed. Review 2 Provided. Request is closed.
CAR4 Section A1 of LSC gives date "December 12th, 2007" which is not correct. Please	Table 3 A.2	Response 1 Corrected	Review 1 Date is 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
revise.			Request is closed.
CAR5 Project is large scale. Please revise sentence in the PDD "The proposed project is a small scale wind power plant project located within the boundaries of Silivri District of Istanbul province"	Table 4 A.3.12	Response 1 Corrected	Review 1 Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR6 In PDD text "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality", Version 06.0.0" is listed but reference is given for v7. V7 is the latest version. Please revise accordingly.	Table 4 B.1.4	Response 1 Corrected Response 2 Corrected	Review 1 End of section B5 still need to be corrected. Request is not closed. Review 2 Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR7 Please discuss prior consideration in the PDD. Please explain how the investment decision date is selected.	Table 4 B.5.2	Response 1 Included in Section A1 of the PDD. Response 2 Corrected	Review 1 It is explained in section A1 of the PDD that prior consideration is proved by the board decision dated 01/11/2011 which is dated before the investment decision date (EM contract agreement on 26/03/2012). Information is true but board decision date is typed wrong in the PDD. Request is not closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			Review 2 Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR8 Please include in the timeline the following events: Board decision Licence revision Contracts signed with subcontractors (Bilmer, ABB, Affa) Feasibility study Please provide following documents that are listed in the timeline: Contracts signed with subcontractors (Bilmer, ABB, Affa) Construction Start Date-18/03/2013	Table 4 B.5.2	Response 1 Board decision, Bankable Report and subcontractor agreements added in Table 1. AFFA is not added as it is not considered as a milestone. The project does not have a Feasibility Study, but, only the Project Introduction File. Also, the financial terms are based on the "Bankable Report". Contracts are provided. Construction date is revised. Response 2 License revision date is added in the milestones table. ABB contract was provided to the DOE on 18/06/2013 in the folder "Şalt OG İsleri".	Review 1 Requested events are added to timeline. Please include license revision date in the timeline. Please provide contract for ABB. Request is not closed. Review 2 Included. Request is closed.
CAR9 Please provide in the PD a table of IRR inputs with the following information: Input name/input value/reference	Table 4 B.5.10	Response 1 Revised Response 2 These information is confidential and cannot be disclosed in the PDD. The	Review 1 Please prepare a table with the following columns: Input name/input value/reference

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
document/page number/date of document The table should include all costs, financial values used. All data should be dated before the investment decision date. Please make sure all reference documents are provided.		inputs stated in the table are the ones that have been used so far even for issued and registered projects and we have not received GS comment on that. So, we would like to keep the table as it is. Further, there is no lona agreement yet in place. Operational cost is already available. Depreciation and exchange rates are added. Response 3: The inputs are revised in the excel sheet to include the relevant references. Response 4: Table prepared as the 1st tab of the excel.	document/page number/date of document Please include: -breakdown of each cost item -equity ratio -depreciation -operating cost -interest rate -tax amount -loan amount, interest -exchange rates -etc. Besides providing references as comments in cells, please be more definitive with this table. Request is not closed. Review 2 Please provide the asked table for DOE to validate inputs. You don't have to put all parameters in the PD. You still are requested to provide the inputs table. Request is not closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			Review 3 Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR10 Expected value is stated as "163.2". Reference for this number is bankable report (feasibility). Please clarify why the license is not used. Also this number is expressed in the PDD in both MWh and GWh. Please correct.	Table 4 B.7.1.6	Response 1 MWh is corrected. Explanation is added under Section A1 of the PDD. The Bankable Report is more recent based on which the specifics of the preferred technology has been changed (80 m versus 100 m long-poles). Response 2 MWh is corrected	Review 1 Table 3 of PDD still indicated MWh. Please revise. Justification on why bankable report is used instead of license is provided in PDD. Request is not closed. Review 2 Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR11 Annex 3 and Annex4 are referred in PDD text but there is no information in annexes. Please revise.	Table 4 Annex 3	Response 1 Annex part is revised Respose 2 Annex 3 states that "Information on applicability of project activity is given in Section B.2" which has been used as such in all of our projects including the issued ones. So, no changes has been made. Response 3: The sentence is revised on page 26 of the PDD.	Review 1 PDD still states "Details of the data used for the calculations are given in Annex 3" but Annex 3 is empty. Request is not closed. Review2 Either remove sentence "Details of the data used for the calculations are given in Annex 3" or fill in Annex 3. Request is not closed. Review 3

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR12 Please provide in the PD a table of IRR inputs with the following information: Input name/input value/reference document/page number/date of document The table should include all costs, financial values used (loan details etc). All data should be dated before the investment decision date. Please make sure all reference documents are provided like loan details. Please give references clearly with links (for example provide link for ref 19) Also, in PDD it is stated that "Investment decision date has been identified as the date of construction agreement." Which is not true, please correct.	Table 4 B.5.10	Response 1 Statement about investment decision date is revised. As there is still no loan agreement, the loan details are not included in the PDD. The project currently uses equity. Response 2: Please see our response for CAR 9. Response 3: Please see CAR 9. Response 4: Table prepared as the 1st tab of the excel.	Review 1 Statement is corrected as "Investment decision date has been identified as the date of equipment purchase agreement". Please prepare a table with the following columns: Input name/input value/reference document/page number/date of document Please include: -breakdown of each cost item -equity ratio -depreciation -operating cost -interest rate -tax amount -loan amount, interest -exchange rates -etc. Besides providing references as comments in

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			cells, please be more definitive with this table. Request is not closed. Review 2 Please provide the asked table for DOE to validate inputs. You don't have to put all parameters in the PD. You still are requested to provide the inputs table. Request is not closed. Review 3 Corrected. Request is closed.
CAR13 The operational lifetime of the project is estimated to be 49 years based on the license issued. The Equity IRR calculations are carried out for 47 years since the first two years are spent on construction and project preparation. In the PPD, it is stated that the project will use a renewable crediting period. According to CDM-EB73-A08 Clarification	Table 4 B.5.35	Response 1 Financial analysis is revised for 20 years and added in the PDD in Sub-step 2c. Calculation and comparison of financial indicators Response 2 The other GS wind projects are investigated as it is seen that the GS requests the financial analysis to cover the license period. Thus, the financial analysis is revised back to fit the 47 years. Response 3: Based on the EB decision the FA is revised to cover 20 years and the DOE	Review 1 The IRR calculations have been revised to reflect a 20-year investment horizon. Following corrections are needed in the calculation of the fair value of project activity assets: 1. When the IRR calculations are performed for a period of 20 years, the 2012 investment in turbine and electrification of $66,959,000 is

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

re-consult
quality in carbon auditing

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Version 01.0, "if project participants choose a renewable crediting period and if the technical lifetime of the CDM project activity is more than 20 years, the investment analysis shall be conducted for 20 years and include the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period." Based on this clarification note, the Equity IRR calculations must be carried out for a period of 20 years and the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period must be included as a cash flow in year 20. Please revise the calculations, the PDD and justify your selection of "years IRR is calculated for"		comments for 20 years were taken into account. 1- The residual value which has been carried out for has already been included as positive cash flow at the end of the 20 year. Therefore the book value for 5 years is not relevant. 2- The residual value which has been carried out for has already been included as positive cash flow at the end of the 20 year. Therefore the book value for 20 years is not relevant. 3- To remain conservative the investment cost's year-20 present value is not included. 4- At the end of the license period the project will be delivered to the government at no cost. Thus, the project has no fair value.	depreciated for a period of 20 years. This means that this investment is not fully depreciated at the end of year 20 since the depreciation expenses are calculated for a period of 25 years. Therefore, 5 years' worth of book value remains and this should be included as a positive cash flow in year 20. 2. When the IRR calculations are performed for a period of 20 years, the 2012 investment in construction of $6,030,000 is depreciated for a period of 20 years. This means that this investment is not fully depreciated at the end of year 20 since the depreciation expenses are calculated for a period of 40 years. Therefore, 20 years' worth of book value remains and this should be included as a positive cash flow in year 20. 3. The new IRR calculations do not include the cash outflow for the second investment in turbine, electrification and construction that will be undertaken in year 25. This investment cost's year-20 present value should be included as a negative cash flow.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			4. The new IRR calculations include a fair value for the second investment in turbine, electrification and construction that will be undertaken in year 25. Since the project's life is estimated to be 45 years and since the second investment is undertaken in year 25, this fair value ignores the costs that will not be fully depreciated at the end of year 45. Therefore, when the fair value of the second investment is taken into account, the remaining book values should be taken into account (in the manner described in items 1 and 2 of this CAR13 Review above). Also, the fair value should be taken into account as a year-20 present value. Request is not closed. Review 2 According to CDM-EB73-A08 Clarification Version 01.0, "if project participants choose a renewable crediting period and if the technical lifetime of the CDM project activity is more than 20 years, the investment analysis shall be conducted for 20 years and include the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			assessment period." Therefore, the IRR analysis must provide the results for a 20-year investment horizon. The project owners may provide the 47-year results as additional information. The 20-year IRR calculations should include a fair value of assets at the end of year 20. This fair value should reflect the unamortized portions of the depreciable asset book values. Request is not closed. Review 3 The cash flows for year 20 correctly include the unamortized portions of the depreciable asset book values. This request is closed.
CAR14 Yes, all relevant costs have been included in the calculation of the Equity IRRs. Further clarification is needed for the following cost items that are included in the calculations:	Table 4 B.5.40	Response 1 The financial analysis is revised to include the first 20 years of the project. Response 2 1. and 2. The expected annual operation and maintenance cost of the project has been obtained from the project owner and submitted to the DOE with this document. As it can be seen, the estimation	Review 1 Further clarification is still needed for the following cost items that are included in the calculations: 1."Unexpected costs" that are included as part of the annual operating expenses.

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
1."Unexpected costs" that are included as part of the annual operating expenses. 2. "Overhead and management costs" that are included as part of the annual operating expenses. 3. "Contingency cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost. 4. "Design consultancy cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost (This may be potentially a "sunk cost") Correction is needed for the following cost deduction: The tribune and transmission line assets are planned to be renewed at the end of year 25 during the life of the project. The related investment cash outflow in year 25 is deducted from the taxable income of the project. Investment outlays are not tax deductible expenses. The investment amount should be taken into account as a		for Canta is very conservative. 2. Contingency cost is a given in the project feasibility and taken directly from the report. 3. Design consultancy cost is a given in the project feasibility and taken directly from the report. Response 3 The FA has been revised to cover 20 years. Clarification: "Desing Consultancy Item" is a sunk cost that is paid to the 3rd party consulant company to develop the design of the project and it cannot be recovered Response 3: Removed. PDD revised in line with excel.	2. "Overhead and management costs" that are included as part of the annual operating expenses. 3. "Contingency cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost. 4. "Design consultancy cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost (This may be potentially a "sunk cost") In addition, the correction requested at the end of CAR14 is still needed and it is explained initems 3 and 4 of Review 1 for CAR13. Request is not closed. Review 2 In the 47-year IRR calculations, the following correction is needed: The tribune and transmission line assets are planned to be renewed at the end of year 25 during the life of the project. The related investment cash outflow in year 25 is

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
cash outflow but it should not be deducted from the taxable income.			deducted from the taxable income of the project. Investment outlays are not tax deductible expenses. The investment amount should be taken into account as a cash outflow but it should not be deducted from the taxable income. The following clarification is needed regarding the cost items: Is the "Design consultancy cost" that is included as part of the initial investment cost a "sunk cost"? Please provide additional information about this cost item. Request is not closed. Review 3 "Design consultancy cost" is confirmed by the project owner to be a sunk cost. Therefore, it should be excluded from the total project cost calculations. This request is not closed. Review 4 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			The request is closed.
CAR15 Yes, the principal and interest payments have been included in the calculation of the Equity IRR. However, there seems to be a timing inconsistency in the cash flow calculations. In the loan repayment calculations that are provided in Excel worksheet titled "Loan Payment", the payments start in year 2012. In the Equity IRR calculations that are provided in the Excel worksheet titled "Cash Flow" the initial investments are stated to be made in the year 2012 and the project cash flows start one year after that (which should correspond to the year 2013). This creates a timing inconsistency because according to the "Loan Payment" worksheet loan interest payments start in 2012 but according to the IRR calculations in the "Cash Flow" worksheet loan interest payments start in 2013. This inconsistency must be corrected and/or explained.	Table 4 B.5.41	Response 1 The analysis is corrected on the financial model.	Review 1 The timing inconsistency has been corrected. The request is closed.
CAR16 Yes, the depreciation expenses have been first deducted from the project's income in	Table 4 B.5.42	Response 1 The analysis has been revised as 20 year.	Review 1 The depreciation expense calculations for the second-time investment in project activity

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
order to calculate the tax expenses, and then, the depreciation expenses have been added back to net income in order to calculate the cash flows to equity. However, the tribune and transmission line assets are planned to be renewed at the end of year 25 during the life of the project. The depreciation expense for the new investment after this point in time has not been taken into account. Further clarification is needed as to why the additional depreciation has not been taken into account.		Response 2: The other GS wind projects are investigated as it is seen that the GS requests the financial analysis to cover the license period. Thus, the financial analysis is revised back to fit the 47 years. Thus, the comment is not relevant. Response 3: Please see CAR13.	assets are incorrect (incomplete). Please refer to items 3 and 4 of Review 1 for CAR13. Request is not closed. Review 2 The following correction is needed in the depreciation calculations: The tribune and transmission line assets are planned to be renewed at the end of year 25 during the life of the project. The depreciation expense for the new investment after this point in time should be included in the calculations. Request is not closed. Review 3 The IRR analysis has been revised to present the results of a 20-year investment horizon only. Therefore, the additional investment in year 25 and its depreciation expense are no longer relevant items for the IRR calculations. This request is closed.
CAR17 Please examine "electricity sales price" and	Table 4 B.5.48	Response 1 Corrected.	Review 1 Electricity sales price and production amount

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
"production amount" separately.			are expressed separately in the IRR calculations table. The request is closed.
FAR1 It is stated in validation site visit that permission from Ministry of Forestry is not yet obtained. DOE will raise a FAR for the inspection of the permit by verification DOE in first verification.	Table 2 11.11	Response 1 The permit will be submitted to the DOE as it is obtained.	
FAR2 Emergency action plan is provided in PIF pg 47. In this section, 4 types of trainings are foreseen for employees. This FAR is raised so that the realization of these trainings are checked during first verification and refresher trainings are stated in the training plan for future years.			
FAR3 Please provide "contract with licensed waste oil collector" to verification DOE as a proof of "waste oil being disposed in line with regulations. Also, verification DOE should check if municipal solid waste is disposed adequately.		Response 1 Contract to deliver the hazardous waste to a licensed collector is provided to the DOE with this document.	
FAR4 The verification DOE shall please check			

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
information electricity meters, if they are in line with the regulations by means of model, accuracy and calibration essentials.			
FAR5 Please provide "Firefighter report" as stated in the PIF.			
FAR6 A FAR is raised so that during first verification DOE makes sure the logbooks are collected back at end of SFR and PP acted appropriately to answer any comments raised by stakeholders via logbooks or other means.			
CL1 In GSP, estimated project start date is given as: "Estimated project start date: 18/03/2012". This date is already in the past, please update expression.	Table 2 B.3	Response 1 Revised Response 2 Only in Table 1 the date is referred which is correct. Please specify the location of the wrong date. Response 3: Revised Response 4: Corrected.	Review 1 PDD says that "The project construction started on 01/03/2012". It should be 2013. Please revise. Request is not closed. Review 2 Not the PD but GS Passport section B please.Request is not closed. Review 3 Date in GSP section B should be 01/03/2013 as it is in the PD. GSP is not corrected as it should be.Request is not closed. Review 4

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			Revised Request is closed.
CL2 Project is large scale. GSP is correct but in PDD, scale is stated as "small scale". Please revise.	Table 2 C.1.1	Response 1 PDD is revised	Review 1 Revised Request is closed.
CL3 Please state in the GSP if Turkey has a cap on its emissions and if the project is a GS-VER project or a GS-CDM project.	Table 2 C.2.6	Response 1 Added under C2.	Review 1 Clarification added to GSP. Request is closed.
CL4 Please state dates of the SFR period in PDD and GSP.	Table 2 E.2.1	Response 1 Added in the PDD	Review 1 The SFR is planned to be initiated in July 2013. Request is closed.
CL5 Please show which stakeholders are included in the SFR period.	Table 2 E.2.3	Response 1 Added	Review 1 All stakeholders that were invited to the LSC, which were identified in line with the GS toolkit, will be included. Request is closed.
CL6 Please state which documents are made public.	Table 2 E.2.4	Response 1 Added	Review 1 Soft copies of the project documents (Project Introduction File, Project information note, PDD, LSC) will be available on the web site of GTE (www.gtecarbon.com). Hard copies of the LSC Report and/or Passport will be available during the 2-month long feedback round for those who do not have internet

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			access. Request is closed.
CL7 Please define in GSP How the feedback round was organized What the outcomes of the feedback round are (All written or oral comments received.) How did the Project proponents followed up on the feedbacks	Table 2 E.2.8	Response 1 SFR will be held in July 2013. These information will be added at the end of the SFR period. Response 2: SFR process has been initiated on 11/10/2013 and will be finalized on 11/12/2013 formally. The documents related to the organization of the SFR have been added in the Passport. The feedback will also be included at the end of the process. Response 3: Received comments are added as Annex 4 in the GSP and Section E2	Review 1 Please include recent info when available. Request is not closed. Review 2 Please include recent info when available. Request is not closed. Review 3 Evidence that logbooks are provided to muhtars of nearby villages are provided as annex to GSP. In section E.2 of the Passport details on SFR are added. A FAR is raised so that during first verification DOE makes sure the logbooks are collected back at end of SFR and PP acted appropriately to answer any comments raised by stakeholders via logbooks or other means. Request is not closed.
CL8 Please provide logbook when available.	Table 2 E.3.2	Response 1 OK	Review 1 Please provide logbook when available. Request is not closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
		Response 2: The logbook is delivered to the muhtars. The delivery protocol is provided to the DOE with this document. Response 3: Please, include as FAR. The logbook is included in the monitoring plan as well.	Review 2 Please provide filled in logbook when available. Request is not closed. Review 3 Please see CL8. Request is not closed.
CL9 Please clarify how the calls received by telephone recorded.	Table 2 E.3.3.4	Response 1 Will be included once after the logbook is placed Response 2: Information added in the Passport, page 11. Response 3: It is already stated that the calls will be filled in the logbook available at the project site by the project owner. Please, note that these will be monitored during verification as well.	Review 1 Please include recent info when available. Request is not closed. Review 2 Please clarify how the calls received by telephone recorded. Request is not closed. Review 3 Please see CL8. Request is not closed.
CL10 Please explain how you ensured that the stakeholders do not need to give their personal details when they wish to make a	Table 2 E.3.3.5	Response 1 Will be included once after the logbook is placed Response 2:	Review 1 Please include recent info when available. Request is not closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
comment		The logbook states that the stakeholder does not need to state his or her name. A copy of the logbook is provided to the DOE with this document.	Review 2 As seen in the logbook provided, commenting stakeholder can provide his name optionally. Request is closed.
CL11 Please clarify how the e-mails and/or website comments are recorded.	Table 2 E.3.4.4	Response 1 Will be included once after the logbook is placed Response 2: Information added in the Passport, page 11. Response 3: The process is simple and have been explained, however, more information is added. Please, note that these will be monitored during verification as well.	Review 1 Please include recent info when available. Request is not closed. Review 2 Please clarify how the e-mails and/or website comments are recorded. Request is not closed. Review 3 Please see CL8. Request is not closed.
CL12 Please clarify if any "risk analysis" is carried out for DNHA and provide the study if available. Also please provide emergency action plan.	Table 2 F.1.2	Response 1 The emergency action plan is provided as part of the Project Introduction File (page 47) The risk assessment for the DNHA	Review 1 Emergency action plan is provided in PIF pg 47. In this section, 4 types of trainings are foreseen for employees. A FAR will be raised so that the realization of these trainings are checked during first verification and refresher trainings are stated in the training plan for future years. Request is closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CL13 Please provide "Firefighter report" as stated in the PIF.	Table 2 F.1.6	Response 1 No reference could be found in the PIF specific to PIF. However, all contracts and work related to EHS is provided to the DOE with this document. Response 2 The fire report will be obtained after the facility is in operation. Response 3: Please include this as Far. This report can only be provided to the finished buildings. It can only be obtained during operation.	Review 1 Please refer to pg 50 section 1e of the PIF. Request is not closed. Review 2 Included as FAR. Request is closed.
CL14 Please provide evidence that "Personal protective equipment are used by employees during construction and will be used in operation stage".	Table 2 F.1.6	Response 1 Photos from the field with the workers using protective equipment is provided to the DOE including the invoice showing that the project owner bought the equipment.	Review 1 Evidences accepted. Request is closed.
CL15 PIF states "Environment Audit Personnel". Please state who this person is and provide relevant reference regarding his identity and his actions.	Table 2 F.1.6	Response 1 Environment audit personnel is provided by the AFFA, EHS subcontractor to the project which is stated in the contract. The contract is provided to the DOE with this document.	Review 1 EHS subcontractor contract is provided. Request is closed.
CL16 Please state names of categories in SD matrix.	Table 2 F.2.2	Response 1 All names are stated in the Passport and LSC, please clarify. Response 2	Review 1 Insert in the Matrix the names of categories like "Environment, Social Development and Economic & Technological Development".

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
		Done	Request is not closed. Review 2 Corrected. Request is closed.
CL17 In SDM it says "The wastewater from the septic tank will be transported to a treatment plant where it will be treated to meet the standards in according with guidelines and national regulations." In site visit, PP said they would not be using a treatment system. PIF also does not state such a measure. Please clarify.	Table 2 F.2.3.2.7	Response 1 Revised. The project uses a cesspit system.	Review 1 Justification on "Water quality and quantity" is revised. Request is closed.
CL18 Matrix says "Construction activities will be carried out in accordance with ESCP". Please clarify what ESCP is.	Table 2 F.2.3.3.7	Response 1 The statement is revised.	Review 1 Justification on "soil condition" is revised. Request is closed.
CL19 It is stated in site visit that after the topsoil is restored, a confirmation from Ministry of Agriculture will be obtained. Please provide the confirmation.	Table 2 F.2.3.3.7	Response 1 Photo of the topsoil and the Protocol to Rehabilitate the meadow will be provided to the DOE as soon as obtained. Response 2 The protocol is provided to the DOE with this document.	Review 1 To be provided. Request is not closed. Review2 "Grant to government for grazing area" is provided.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			Request is closed.
CL20 In site visit it is stated by PP that in line with maintenance agreement with Nordex, waste oil disposal is Nordex's responsibility. Please clarify. In PIF, membrane based collector area is mentioned. Please provide evidence that waste oil is/will be stored in such an area.	Table 2 F.2.3.3.7	Response 1 Wasteoil will occur once the project is in operation. As the project is under construction currently no wasteoil accumulates. The PO will contract with a licensed collector when the project is commissioned.	Review 1 FAR will be raised so that contract with licensed waste oil collector is provided to verification DOE and that verification DOE also checks if municipal solid waste is disposed adequately. Request is closed.
CL21 Municipal solid waste will be collected and disposed in line with regulations. Please provide evidence on that.	Table 2 F.2.3.3.7	Response 1 Currently, the only significant domestic waste comes from the kitchen currently which is gathered in a barrel and taken to the garbage barrel in the village.	Review 1 FAR will be raised so that contract with licensed waste oil collector is provided to verification DOE and that verification DOE also checks if municipal solid waste is disposed adequately. Request is closed.
CL22 Please clarify if any trees are cut and provide the permit if available.	Table 2 F.2.3.5.7	Response 1 No trees are cut up to date. However, 3 turbines locations fall under the constituency of the Forestry Department. Currently, permit is awaited for these turbines which will be submitted to the DOE once obtained. Response 2: The forest permission for the turbines is provided to the DOE with this document.	Review 1 To be provided. Request is not closed. Review 2 Permits from Ministry of Forestry are provided. Request is closed.
CL23	Table 2	Response 1	Review 1

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Please also provide evidence on" training about emergencies, first aid and firefighting". Please provide emergency action plan and state if first aid material is provided for the site.	F.3.6.7	The training documents are submitted to the DOE with this document. y of the Forestry Department. Currently, permit is awaited	Attendance sheets are provided to DOE. Emergency plain is provided in PIF and photos of first aid materials are also provided. Request is closed.
CL24 Parameter is "payment made to staff". Please discuss if it is better to monitor number of employment created instead of payments.	Table 2 F.3.10.3	Response 1 The parameter has not been changed as this includes also the number of employees plus income generation aspect.	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL25 Please show evidence that all employees are registered and their insurances paid.	Table 2 11.5	Response 1 The SGK extract is provided to the DOE with this document.	Review 1 Provided to DOE. Request is closed.
CL26 Please provide contract between Bora AS and safety consultant. Please provide consultants licenses. Please provide other available evidence on work safety. Please explain in more details all the actions taken regarding work safety.	Table 2 11.7	Response 1 All EHS work is and will be carried out in line with the laws which are stated in the contracts and the Passport as well.	Review 1 Different measures regarding work safety are evaluated in relevant questions of the protocol. Request is closed.
CL27 Please state if the ornithology report shall be renewed for different migration seasons in a year.	Table 2 G.1.5.7	Response 1 If the number of turbines change it will be assessed accordingly.	Review 1 Renewal of ornithology report is only considered if turbine number is to be changed. Request is closed.
CL28	Table 2	Response 1	Review 1

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
If no baseline will be determined for the indicators, still, please include the baseline row in the SD Monitoring tables but mark it as "-".	G.1.7.5	All parameters have the Baseline identified. Please, clarify. Response 2 Added	For example in SD monitoring for item "livelihood of the poor", baseline row is deleted from the format. Please do not change the format, insert the missing lines for some of the parameters and enter the relevant baseline identified. Request is not closed. Review 2 Format corrected. Request is closed.
CL29 Parameter is "payment made to staff". Please discuss if it is better to monitor number of employment created instead of payments.	Table 2 G.1.10.3	Response 1 We would rather keeping it like this as payments made is more concrete and also includes income generation aspect.	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL30 "Project is under construction" is irrelevant for current situation for the parameter. Please revise.	Table 2 G.1.11.4	Response 1 Revised Response 2 Revised Response 3: The version we had sent was revised to change the "under construction" and was in Track Change. The Passport is resent (with the new changes as well).	Review 1 Current situation is still indicated as such for "balance of payments". Request is not closed. Review 2 Doesn't seem to be corrected. Besides, track changes are not visible for changes made in v3 of the documents. This can be a problem during ITR review. Do not forget to reflect

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			track changes in next versions otherwise you may have to do them all over again. Request is not closed. Review 3 Related section revised to avoid inconsistency. Request is closed.
CL31 Please put parameters of indicators in order of appearance as in the matrix.	Table 2 G.4	Response 1 Corrected	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL32 Please check final documents for non-neutral indicators.	Table 2 G.4	Response 1 Removed/ Corrected Response 2 Corrected	Review 1 Table 10 of PDD needs correction. Request is not closed. Review 2 OK Request is closed.
CL33 Please fill in information in Annex 1 of the GSP.	Table 2 Annex 1.1	Response 1 Done	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL34 Please clarify if any comments by other means is received other than the stakeholder meeting.	Table 3 C.3.6	Response 1 Added at the end of Section E.2.	Review 1 Only validation site visit is stated as "other way of receiving comments" Request is closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CL35 In own matrix and consolidated matrix in the LSC Report, some numbers (employment etc) are different than the matrix given in the Passport. Please clarify the difference between matrices. Also LSC justification section says "project includes only five turbines". Please clarify.	Table 3 D.1	Response 1 All matrices are aligned in the LSC and Passport The biodiversity part under the "Justifications" is revised.	Review 1 Statement revised. Matrices are aligned now. Request is closed.
CL36 Please comment on similarities and differences between the blind matrix by stakeholders and own matrix of the PP.	Table 3 D.2.3	Response 1 Added	Review 1 Stated at end of section D.2 in LSC. Request is closed.
CL37 Please comment on "how the own SD Matrix and the one resulting from the blind exercise SD Matrices were consolidated".	Table 3 D.3.1	Response 1 Added	Review 1 Stated at end of section D.2 in LSC. Request is closed.
CL38 Please explain how you communicated the grievance mechanism with the stakeholders.	Table 3 E.2.1	Response 1 The information is already available under Section C.3.i.	Review 1 Stated in Section C.3.i. Request is closed.
CL39 It is stated that "For the feedback round, a summary of the consultation report prepared in Turkish will be sent to the stakeholders". Please provide the file to DOE too.	Table 3 F.1	Response 1 We will share the SFR documents with the DOE. Response 2: You can reach the documents on our website: http://www.gtecarbon.com/projeler/canta/	Review 1 Not done yet. Request is not closed. Review 2 Provided.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
		The emails and delivery documents are also added in the Passport already.	Request is closed.
CL40 GS review indicates "The PP shall ensure best efforts to get more feedbacks from local stakeholders during the Stakeholder Feedback Round". Please explain the plan to enable more stakeholders to comment for the SFR.	Table 3 F.1	Response 1 Added. Response 2 1-2 more sentences added under E2 of Passport. Please note that a large number of participants have already been invited to the LSC.	Review 1 Please state where it is added. Request is not closed. Review 2 OK. Request is closed.
CL41 Please state situation existing prior to the implementation of the project activity, what the land is used for etc.	Table 4 A.1.3	Response 1 Added under Section A1. Of PDD.	Review 1 It is now stated in the PDD that "The project area consists of private land and Treasury land used as meadow and agricultural land, and, besides unused land". Request is closed.
CL42 Lifetime is stated as 25 years. Please state if that is a manufacturer information and provide reference.	Table 4 A.3.9	Response 1 25 year-lifetime is used as per the tool. In the PDD the reference to the related tool is provided. (http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-10-v1.pdf)	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL43 Please state methodology version on cover page of PDD, too.	Table 4 B.1.2	Response 1 Done	Review 1 OK Request is closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CL44 Please also discuss if tools are applicable.	Table 4 B.2.2	Response 1 Added	Review 1 Discussed in section B.1 of PDD. Request is closed.
CL45 In beginning of Section B5, please clearly indicate the names and versions of the tools used to demonstrate additionality.	Table 4 B.5	Response 1 It is already stated under B1. But, also added here…	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL46 Reference link in footnote 28 is not accessible. Please clarify.	Table 4 B.5.57	Response 1 Corrected both in the pdd and the excel. Response 2 Renewed	Review 1 Footnote "http://pmum.teias.gov.tr/UzlasmaWeb/" is still not accessible. Request is not closed. Review 2 OK Request is closed.
CL47 Please explain and justify the selected geographical area used for common practice analysis.	Table 4 B.5.58	Response 1 Added	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL48 Please provide relevant annexes and links for values indicated in "value applied" cells in section B.6.2.	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 Provided	Review 1 References provided. Request is closed.
CL49	Table 4	Response 1	Review 1

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Reference link for FCiy does not include year 2011. Please revise.	B.6.2.3	Revised. Response 2 Corrected to include year 2011	Table 16 in annex is not corrected. Please recheck ER data for consistency. Request is not closed. Review 2 Corrected. Request is closed.
CL50 Please provide IPCC reference link in PDD.	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 Added.	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL51 For OM calculation sheet, please provide links in excel for values starting from B20.	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 The references are already provided in line 20 for all values.	Review 1 References are provided in comments. Request is closed.
CL52 Please provide linked cells or reference for internal consumption percentages	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 The reference is already provided in line 20 for all values.	Review 1 References are provided in comments. Request is closed.
CL53 For BM, please unhide cells in cohort built by VER sheet.	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 It cannot be unhide as this is the whole list relevant to the calculations. The numbers cannot be corrected.	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL54 For BM, please provide references for "generation efficiency values"	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 Added in the pdd and cm calculation excel	Review 1 OK Request is closed.
CL55 In sentence "Since no data is available on actual commissioning date of the plant,	Table 4 B.6.2.3	Response 1 The phrase is revised. But, 2011 data is correct as it is. 2011 data is the most recent data available at time of first PDD submission based on the	Review 1 OK Request is closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
plants commissioned in 2011 was fully included in the calculations", 2011 should be replaced by 2009? Please clarify.		Capacity Projection report published by EPDK.	
CL56 Please provide information on type, model of meters.	Table 4 B.7.1.8	Response 1 The project is still construction and no specific details are available at the moment. However, it is an imperative that the meters are in line with the regulations including type Model..etc.	Review 1 A FAR will be raised so that all details on electricity meters can be checked by verifying DOE. Request is closed.
CL57 Please explain how PP will ensure accuracy of calibration. Please explain any legal procedures regarding calibration of meters in Turkey. What is the level of uncertainity?	Table 4 B.7.1.9.2	Response 1 Minor addition is made under B7.3. The project is still construction and no specific details are available at the moment. However, it is an imperative that the meters are in line with the regulations including type Model..etc.	Review 1 A FAR will be raised so that all details on electricity meters can be checked by verifying DOE. Request is closed.
CL58 It is stated that the first crediting period is expected to start in 01/12/2014. Please check this date.	Table 4 C.2.2	Response 1 Revised as 01/10/2013 based on the validation site visit with the DOE. Response 2 Corrected	Review 1 Table 1 in PDD still indicates 2014. Request is not closed. Review 2 OK Request is closed.
CL59 Please define load factor in the PDD and provide reference.	Table 4 B.5.14	Response 1 Added in Section A.1.	Review 1 OK Request is closed.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CL60 Benchmark is provided in a World Bank report (for similar project types it is given as 15%). In the PDD, please provide exact reference and link for the report.	Table 4 B.5.23	Response 1 The link is provided. Response 2: Link is revised	Review 1 The given link refers to year 2004 but PDD text refers to report of year 2009. Request is not closed. Review 2 Revised. Request is closed.
CL61 Please provide the reference for %9 interest rate (TSKB termsheet) and other parameters used in calculating cost of debt.	Table 4 B.5.24	Response 1 The interest rate reference is changed as a credit agreement from another energy project and its terms are applied in the loan agreement part. The credit agreement is provided to the DOE with this document. Response 2: We have checked with the PO (11/12/2013) that there is no credit agreement yet in place and it was also stated that there was a possibility of the project might be realized solely with equity. For this reason, the financial analysis (FA) is revised to include no bank loan and the PD D is alsp revised accordingly.	Review 1 Please clarify what do you mean with "as an credit agreement from another energy project". Please provide interest rate reference document applicable for this project. The request is not closed. Review 2 The project is assumed to be financed by equity only in the new version of the IRR calculations. Therefore, CL61 is no longer relevant. This request is closed.
CL62 In the Excel worksheet titled "Loan Payment" the grace period for the repayment of the loan is stated as 36	Table 4 B.5.24	Response 1 Corrected as 36 months	Review 1 The grace period for the loan principal repayment is correctly taken as 36 months in the IRR calculations.

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
months in cell B5 and it is stated as 24 months in cell E20. This difference needs to be clarified.			The request is closed.
CL63 Please revise PDD last version as 6 and date 02 january 2014		Response 1 Revised	Review 1 Corrected. The request is closed.
CL64 In PDD, crediting period expected date shall be revised (as it is already past)		Response 1 Revised	Review 1 Expected crediting period start date is revised. The request is closed.
CL65 PDD shall include SFR data		Response 1 Included	Review 1 SFR section is included in the PDD and GSP. The request is closed.
CL66 Passport and PDD contain future tense "will" although it is already in the past, that shall be revised		Response 1 The relevant parts which were at odds with the final version of the PDD and Passport are changed. Please, note that the project is still under construction and future tense applies to the PDD. The SFR part has been revised with the past tense.	Review 1 Future tenses are revised wherever necessary. The request is closed.
CL67 There is a reference called "cash flow". What is the real reference document for that?		Response 1 The original cash flow document was sent to the DOE on 19/07/2013 and is resent again.	

* 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, Table-2, Table-3 & Table-4	Summary of Project Participants' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CL68 Fonts to be adjusted to be the same throughout the document.		Response 1 Revised	Review 1 Format corrected. The request is closed.

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