VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION REPORT

RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.

CANTA WPP

in

Türkiye

MONITORING PERIOD:
From 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 (both days inclusive)

Organizational Unit	re-carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti. (RE Carbon Ltd.)		
Project Title	CANTA WPP		
GS Registry No.	**Client**		**Internal project code**
1235	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.		1249
Date of First Issue of this Report	**Date of Current Version of this final Report**	**Version Number of this final Report**	**Date and Version number of the MR**
19/08/2025	07/02/2026	05	23/12/2025 (10)
Verification Number		**Monitoring Period**	
1st Verification within the 2nd Crediting Period		From: 11/01/2023	To: 19/08/2024

Summary:

Host Country: Türkiye

Project is Reviewed Against:

☒ Kyoto Protocol ☒ UNFCCC CDM rules and regulations and associated documents

☒ Gold Standard rules and regulations ☐ Other (Please Specify)

Methodology: ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", **Version:** 21.0

Activity Requirements applied: Renewable Energy

Product Requirements applied: GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration

Verified Emissions Reductions: 160,583 tCO_2e

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

Deviation applicable to the project (accepted and rejected both):

Project cycle: Retroactive

Project Developers:	GTE KARBON SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR ENERJİ EĞİTİM DANIŞMANLIK VE TİC. AŞ

Verification Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Verification Findings: During the process of this Verification, 19 Corrective Action Requests and 08 Clarification Requests were raised, all of which were resolved before the issuance of this Verification report. Forward Action Requests were not issued.

Having applied the requirements of ISO 14064-3 in verifying the project titled " CANTA WPP " (GS Registry No. 1235) in Türkiye, RE Carbon Ltd. is of the opinion that the project is monitored in compliance with its registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP) and the MP therein and complies with all relevant requirements of ISO 14064-2, GS4GG and all applicable Host Party criteria. The project correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (Version 21.0).

In conclusion, RE Carbon Ltd. is of the opinion that the GHG emission reductions are calculated correctly as per the applied methodology and the emission reductions given in the MR (Version 10), dated 23/12/2025 are fairly stated.

re-carbon®
quality in carbon auditing

<table>
<tr><td colspan="4">Therefore, RE Carbon Ltd. certify that the total emission reductions from the project activity during the monitoring period, spanning from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive) amount to 160,583 tCO2e and request issuance of these GS VERs.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Verification Team Leader:</td><td>Mrs. Beyda Altuntaş</td><td>Indexing Terms:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Verification Team Members:</td><td>N/A</td><td>☒ No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Approved By
(Technical Reviewer):</td><td>Name:</td><td>Signature:</td><td>☐ Limited Distribution</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mr. Rohit Badaya</td><td>RBadaya</td><td>☐ Unrestricted Distribution</td></tr>
</table>

Abbreviations

CAR : Corrective Action Request
CDM : Clean Development Mechanism
CMD : Certification Management Department
CL : Clarification request
CO_2 : Carbon dioxide
CO_2e : Carbon dioxide equivalent
EF : Emission Factor
ER : Emission Reductions
FAR : Forward Action Request
GHG : Greenhouse gas
GS : Gold Standard
GS4GG : Gold Standard for Global Goals
GS VER : 1 tCO_2e reduction/removal under Gold Standard
IPCC : Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
kWh : Kilo Watt Hour
MP : Monitoring Plan
MR : Monitoring Report
MW : Mega Watt
MWh : Mega Watt Hour
PDD : Project Design Document
PD : Project Developer
PP : Project Proponent
SDG : Social Development Goal
tCO2e : Tons of CO2 equivalents
UNFCCC : United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVB : Validation & Verification Body

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND SUMMARIZED VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

RE Carbon Ltd. performed the Verification of the “CANTA WPP” a Gold Standard project activity with the registry reference number “GS1235”

The project activity is owned by “RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.” (PP); for this Verification activity “GTE Karbon Sürdürülebilir Enerji Eğitim Danişmanlik Ve Tic. A.Ş.” acted as the PP’s Consultant.

The project activity comprises a 47.5 MWm / 45 MWe greenfield wind power plant located in the province of İstanbul in Türkiye and uses “renewable” wind energy to generate electricity, while displacing fossil fuel dominated electricity generation in the country’s grid and thus resulting in greenhouse gases emission reductions.

The purpose and scope of this Verification was the independent and objective review of the project activity's monitored GHG reductions, as described and calculated in the MR (Version 10), dated 23/12/2025. The MR is based on the MP in the validated and registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023. The scope of this Verification covers a Monitoring Period that spans from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive).

Although the Verification was conducted rigorously, there remains some uncertainty regarding the accuracy of the emission reductions due to the use of conservative assumptions in the baseline scenario and potential variations in future activity levels. These uncertainties however do not exceed 5%.

As a result of this verification, RE Carbon Ltd. conclude:

Having applied the requirements of ISO 14064-3 in verifying the "CANTA WPP (GS Registry No.: 1235)" project activity in Türkiye, as outlined in the Monitoring Report (Version 10), dated 23/12/2025, the project activity **complies** with all relevant requirements of 14064-2, GS4GG and all applicable Host Party criteria. The monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements as per the applied approved methodology “ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” (Version 21.0).

Therefore, RE Carbon Ltd. confirm that the total emission reductions from the project activity during the monitoring period, spanning from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive) amount to 160,583 tCO_2e and we request issuance of these GS VERs.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Under a Verification Agreement dated 05/08/2024, "re-carbon Gözetim Denetim ve Belgelendirme Ltd. Şti." (hereafter referred to as "RE Carbon Ltd.") was engaged by "RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş." (hereafter referred to as "PP") to carry out the 1st Verification from CP 02 of the "CANTA WPP (GS Registry No.: 1235)" project activity. The aim of this Verification was to conduct an independent and objective review to determine whether:

- the MR is in conformity with the requirements of the MP in the validated and registered Project Description (PD) and the approved methodology.
- the project activity is in conformity with the MP and the registered PDD, and
- the data reported in the MR are complete and transparent.

"Verification" is mandatory for all Gold Standard projects and serves to assure stakeholders that the project activity has achieved verified emission reductions (GS VERs).

2.2. Scope

The scope of this Verification covers the independent and objective review of the project activity's monitored GHG reductions for an MP, spanning from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive).

Hereby, the MR (Version 10), dated 23/12/2025 was assessed against conformity with the requirements of the MP, as described in the validated and registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023, as well as the requirements of "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (Version 21.0), the GS4GG Principles and Requirements (Version 2.1), the GS4GG Validation and Verification Standard (Version 2.0) and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

The sole purpose of this Verification and certification is for use in the issuance process as part of the GS4GG project cycle. As such, RE Carbon Ltd. cannot be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the Verification and Certification opinion that extend beyond this purpose.

2.3. Description of the Project Activity

The project activity is located close to the "Çanta" village in the "Silivri" district of the "İstanbul" province in Türkiye. During the physical on-site visit, the physical address and the "centroid" geographic decimal coordinates with a WGS84 datum of the project activity were confirmed as 41.124647N // 28.066456E.

The project entails the construction and operation of a 47.5 MWm / 45MWe grid-connected wind power plant.

The wind farm comprises 19 Nordex N100 wind turbines, each with a rated capacity of 2.5 MW. These turbines feature a rotor diameter of 99.8 meters and are mounted on towers with hub heights of up to 100 meters, optimized for the site's wind regime.

Electricity generated by the wind turbines is stepped up from 850V to 33.6 kV via “ABB brand” step-up transformers, adjacent to each wind turbine and distributed via an internal medium-voltage network to an on-site switchyard. Here, voltage is stepped up to 154kV Silivri TM for export to the national grid through a dedicated 11.5 km transmission line. The electrical infrastructure is designed in full compliance with Türkiye’s grid connection standards.

The plant is equipped with a centralized SCADA system, enabling remote monitoring, fault diagnostics, and performance tracking in real-time. Three-phase electricity meters are installed at the point of interconnection, calibrated and sealed for accurate measurement of net electricity exported to the grid.

Capacity extension activities were initiated in 2017 through a turbine agreement; however, construction commenced only at the end of 2018. As the application to the Gold Standard (GS) was not submitted within one year of the project’s start date, the extension component was deemed ineligible for GS certification. Accordingly, electricity generation from the two additional turbines (T20 and T21) has been excluded from GS certification, and GS-VER claims are limited to the initial 19 turbines (T1 to T19). The exclusion was implemented by deducting the generation of the two ineligible turbines from the EPİAŞ records with SCADA data of these turbines (T20 and T21).

For the net energy generation value, the Project Participant (PP) subtracted the SCADA-recorded generation of the 2 unregistered turbines (T20 and T21) from the total gross generation of all 21 turbines as recorded by EPİAŞ. This method yielded a registered production figure of 47.5 MWm/ 45 MWe for the 19 turbines.

Specifically for January 2023, electricity generation was calculated for the period from January 11 to January 31 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Also, for August 2024, electricity generation was calculated for the period from August 1 to August 19 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Apportioning months calculation was done correctly for January 2023 and August 2024 in line with monitoring period.

Throughout the monitoring period, the project activity has operated efficiently, generating a total of 247,738.78 MWh of net electricity, delivered to the grid. There were no changes to the project or applicable legislation during this first monitoring period. RE Carbon Ltd. confirmed the project’s technical details during a physical on-site audit through site visit interviews, a walk-over of the project site and a thorough review of the technical specifications, photos and supporting documentation.

2.4. Parties Involved

“RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.” is the PP and owns the project activity. “GTE Karbon Sürdürülebilir Enerji Eğitim Danışmanlık ve Ticaret A.Ş.” is the PD and/or the consultant, whereas Türkiye is the host country.

2.5. Verification Period Covered

The first crediting period was start on 02/02/2015 and end on 01/02/2022 (both days are inclusive). The second crediting period was start on 02/02/2022 and end on 01/02/2029 (inclusive of both dates) and covers first Monitoring Period was start on 11/01/2023 and end on

19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive). This is the 01 (1st Monitoring Period from 2nd Crediting Period).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Verification Process

RE Carbon Ltd. apply standard auditing techniques to assess the information provided by the PD. In doing so, RE Carbon Ltd. employ the means of verification specified throughout this document and, where appropriate, standard auditing procedures, including but not limited to:

- Document review
- Follow-up actions (e.g., on-site inspections, telephone or e-mail interviews)
- Reference to available information relating to projects or technologies similar to the activity under verification
- Review—based on the selected methodologies and related documents (e.g., standardized baselines, tools, and guidelines)—of the appropriateness of formulae and the accuracy of all calculations

This assessment is conducted in five phases, as described below, and is planned and executed in line with RE Carbon Ltd.'s "Assessment Planning and Execution SOP.":

Phase-1: Desk Review/ Planning Phase:

As part of a desk review, the initial project documentation submitted by the PP (or on her/his behalf the PD or Consultant) is reviewed.

During this phase:

- The Team Leader (TL) performs a strategic analysis to understand the activities and complexity of the project and to determine the nature and extent of the Verification activities.
- The TL develops a Verification Assessment Plan that describes the Verification activities and schedules during the desk review, prior to the site visit. The TL communicates this Verification Assessment Plan to the PP in order to ensure that related PD-Personnel are informed prior to the physical on-site visit. An "Assessment Planning Form" is sent to the PP by the TL for approval (or suggestions of changes) by the PD.
- The TL conducts a risk assessment of the GHG statement to identify potential risks of material misstatements or nonconformities with the criteria. This assessment takes into account the results of the materiality evaluation. The TL evaluates the risk of misstatement and determines the appropriate nature and scope of evidence-gathering activities.
- The evidence-gathering plan is developed based on the results of the TL's risk assessment and aims to reduce Verification risk to an acceptable level. It outlines the type and scope of evidence-gathering activities.

Phase-2: On-Site Visit:

The TL carries out a physical or remote on-site visit to observe the implementation of the project activity and to engage with stakeholders and local individuals potentially affected by the project's implementation and operation.

Phase-3: Verification Protocol and Draft Verification Report:

The Verification is carried out in accordance with Re Carbon Ltd's "Assessment Planning and Execution SOP," which includes the use of a Verification Protocol. This Verification Protocol serves as the main tool for communicating findings to the PP and is included in the Verification Report as " Annex 1". Following completion of the Verification process, the TL prepares a draft Verification Report, which includes the Verification Protocol and the draft Verification Opinion.

Phase-4: Independent Technical Review (ITR):

All documentation, including the draft Verification Report and its annexes, undergoes an internal quality control process known as the Independent Technical Review (ITR). This review is conducted by a separate TL who was not involved in this project's Verification. During the ITR, the full set of documents (e.g., MR, EF calculations, additionality evidence, relevant Excel files, etc.) is carefully assessed. As part of this process, the ITR may raise additional Clarification Requests (CLs) or Corrective Action Requests (CARs) to address outstanding issues.

Phase-5: Final Verification Report and Submission:

Once all CLs and CARs are addressed and the ITR is successfully completed, the TL prepares the final Verification Report and has it reviewed by Re Carbon Ltd's "Certification Manager". Upon approval, a "submission package" (including the final Verification Report, the positive Verification Opinion and all supporting documents) is delivered to the PP. If the Verification Opinion is negative, the Verification Agreement is terminated.

3.2. Verification Team and ITR Selection

For the Verification of this specific project activity, particularly in assessing the emission reductions achieved during the applicable monitoring period, a Verification Team was appointed, considering their required technical expertise in "wind energy", their knowledge of Project-Level Group 01 and GHG Project Type "Renewable Energy Production", as well as their experience in the host country, Türkiye.

The selection of team members and the Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR) also took into account their relevant GS4GG Verification experience and prior roles in similar Verification Projects. The Verification Team and the ITR were assigned to this Verification activity on 26/07/2024, following the evaluation of these factors and the completion of RE Carbon Ltd.'s internal contract review process.

Details of the Verification Team and the Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR) for this project activity are presented in the table below, while their appointment certificates are provided in Chapter 5.1.:

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Involvement

Mrs. Beyda Altuntaş	Team Leader	Yes	Yes	Yes	Administrative, Desk Review, Site Visit, Reporting
Mr. Rohit Badaya	ITR	No	Yes	Yes	Independent Technical Review (ITR)

The ITR is independent of the audit team and was not involved in any project development or consultancy activities for this project activity. Any prior assurance role (if applicable) is disclosed in Section 3.3 and has been evaluated under RE Carbon Ltd.'s impartiality procedures in line with ISO 14065, ISO 17029 and the GS4GG Validation and Verification Standard.

The mapping of competence elements demonstrates that all required expertise (including host country context, SDG contributions, safeguarding requirements and monitoring methodology ACM0002) is fully met for this verification.

3.3. Disclosure of previous and/or ongoing assurance engagements by RE Carbon Ltd.

RE Carbon Ltd. confirm that it has previously conducted validation, design certification renewal and verification services for this Gold Standard project activity. These engagements are disclosed below together with the full names and roles of the personnel involved.

RE Carbon Ltd. further confirm that these assurance activities were performed in accordance with the GS4GG Validation and Verification Standard (Version 2.0). Potential impartiality risks arising from multiple engagements were identified, assessed and managed in line with ISO 14065, ISO 17029 and GS4GG requirements.

Details of the relevant prior engagements are presented below:

Engagement type	Submission date to Gold Standard	Personnel (full names)	Role(s)	Independence safeguards applied
Design certification renewal	03.01.2023	Mrs. Seda Atabek	Team Leader	ITR: Mr. Rohit Badaya
Verification	14.06.2024	Mr. Anıl Söyler	Team Leader	ITR: Mr. Sandeep Kanda
Validation	07.02.2014	Mrs. Seda Atabek	Team Leader	ITR: Mr. Johann Thaler

3.4. Audit Techniques

Complying with the guidance in the "GS4GG-Audit Techniques Template", the use of the latest version of the "GS4GG-Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements (Version 2.0)" renders the completion of the GS4GG-Audit Techniques Template as "non-mandatory". However, "*the VVB is still required to ensure that all relevant information regarding verification methods and auditing techniques is appropriately documented in the validation/verification report*".

For this Verification, the "GS4GG-Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements (Version 2.0)" were applied. To mitigate any potential risks associated with remote site visit, a physical on-site visit was conducted. The mode of site visit and the applied audit techniques are described in detail in lower sections of this Verification Report.

The site visit was carried out by a verification team with local expertise, ensuring context-specific understanding and evaluation.

In conclusion, RE Carbon Ltd. have conducted the audit in full compliance with the GS4GG-Site Visit and Remote Audit Requirements (Version 2.0) and express a positive conclusion regarding all Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised during the process.

The following audit techniques were employed during the verification of this project:

☒ observation; ☒ inquiry; ☒ analytical testing; ☒ confirmation; ☐ recalculation;
☒ examination; ☐ retracing; ☐ tracing; ☒ control testing; ☐ sampling; ☐ estimate testing;
☒ cross-checking; ☒ reconciliation.

3.5. Desk Review of Documents

The basis for the Verification activity is the MR (Version 01), dated 12/08/2024 which was submitted to RE Carbon Ltd. on same day. This MR was revised several times due to issued CARs and CLs, with (Version 10), dated 23/12/2025 being the final version. RE Carbon Ltd. reviewed and confirm that there are no FAR from previous stages of the project activity. The MR and the monitoring activities were assessed against:

- the registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023.
- "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", (Version 21.0,) the relevant GS4GG rules and regulations
- the registered Validation (CP-Renewal) report by "Re-carbon Ltd." (Version 04), dated 20/05/2023
- Previous Verification Reports.

The Desk Review included the following actions:

- An assessment of the data and information provided to verify their completeness
- A review of the MP and the methodology with a focus on the measurement frequency, the quality of metering equipment (including calibration requirements) and the quality assurance and quality control procedures
- An evaluation of data management, as well as the quality assurance and quality control system, in terms of their impact on the generation and reporting of emission reductions.

The list of documents which were reviewed during the Verification is given in the table below:

Document No.	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	MR	01	12/08/2024
D02	MR	02	09/09/2024
D03	MR	03	08/11/2024
D04	MR	04	21/01/2025
D05	MR	05	16/04/2025
D06	MR	06	16/07/2025
D07	MR	07	18/08/2025
D08	MR	08	20/10/2025
D09	MR	09	04/11/2025
D10	MR	10	23/12/2025
D11	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	01	12/08/2024
D12	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	02	09/09/2024

Document No.	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D13	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	03	08/11/2024
D14	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	04	21/01/2025
D15	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	05	16/04/2025
D16	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	06	16/07/2025
D17	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	07	18/08/2025
D18	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	08	20/10/2025
D19	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	09	04/11/2025
D20	ER Calculation Excel Sheet	10	23/12/2025
D21	SDG Impact Tool	01	18/08/2025
D22	SDG Impact Tool	02	23/12/2025
D23	KMZ File of Project Location	-	-
D24	Photographic Evidence of Grievance Book (Logbook)	-	20/08/2024
D25	Generation License	-	18/08/2011
D26	EPİAŞ Meter Readings Screenshots	-	11/01/2023-19/08/2024
D27	SCADA Data Set		2023-2024
D28	TEİAŞ Meter Reading Records	-	11/01/2023-19/08/2024
D29	EIA Report	-	01/2009
D30	EIA Not Required Certification		13/02/2009
D31	Technical Environmental Review Report	-	16/10/2017
D32	Provisional Acceptance Document of T1, T2, T4, T6, T16, T17, T18 and T19	-	28/06/2014
D33	Provisional Acceptance Document of T3, T7, T8, T9 and T15	-	24/07/2014
D34	Provisional Acceptance Document of T5, T10, T11, T12, T13 and T14	-	31/05/2014
D35	Social Security Records	-	29/04/2024, 26/08/2024
D36	Employee Training records	-	2023-2024
D37	Ornithology Report	-	2022,2023,2024
D38	Waste Disposal Declaration	-	2023-2024
D39	Meter Change Protocol for Both Main and Back-up Meters	-	23/12/2020
D40	First Index Protocol of Meters Both Main and Back-up Meters	-	23/12/2020
D41	Meter Test Protocols	-	22/09/2022
D42	Trade Registry Gazette About Name Change of Company	-	26/08/2021
D43	Technical Properties of Equipment	-	-
D44	Noise Level Assessment Report	-	16/04/2021
D45	Donations	-	-
D46	Expropriation Declaration from EPDK for T1-T19	-	22/05/2014

Document No.	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D47	Declaration by PP for No Legal Dispute		29/08/2024, 23/09/2024
D48	Signed Declaration from Sancaktepe Village Mukhtar for No Grievance	-	06/01/2025
D49	Biologist Assignment Letter	-	14/04/2025
D50	H&S Analysis Report	-	09/06/2023
D51	Single line diagram	-	-
D52	Organization structure	-	-
D53	Validation Report (CP Renewal)	04	20/05/2023
D54	Previous Verification Report (2nd Verification Report of 1st Crediting Period)	2.2	22/01/2025
D55	Registered PDD	V2.6 SOP	20/05/2023
D56	ACM0002 - Grid-connected electricity generation from	21.0	-
D57	Transition Annex	2.1	01/05/2020
D58	Waste Water Disposal Invoices		13/02/2023, 10/03/2023, 10/04/2023 08/05/2023 15/01/2024, 10/02/2024, 07/03/2024, 15/04/2024, 10/05/2024, 10/06/2024, 18/07/2024, 22/08/2024, 23/09/2024, 24/10/2024, 23/11/2024, 24/12/2024
D59	Design Renewal Review Final	-	20/05/2023

3.6. Site Visit and Interviews with stakeholders

As a part of the verification activities, a physical on-site visit was conducted on 20/08/2024, where the below listed topics were assessed:

Topics Assessed	Source of Information
Implementation and operation of the proposed GS4GG project activity as per the registered PDD	Document review, physical on-site visit and interviews with the PP representatives and stake holders.
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating, and reporting the monitoring parameters	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with the PP representatives and stake holders.
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the MP in the PDD	Interviews with the PP representatives
Cross-check between information provided in the Monitoring Report and data from other sources	Document review and on-site visit

such as plant logbooks, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Document review, on site visit and interviews with the PP representatives.
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Document review
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Document review, interviews with the PP representatives.
Grievance mechanism: please indicate how you verified this issue and what kind of evidence you collected and how, please indicate the result of your verification and how the comments received were handled.	Document review, interviews with the PP representatives, and other stakeholders
Legal Dispute: please describe your verification and evidence	Document review, interviews with the PP representatives.
Walk-over of the entire power plant, including each wind turbine, the control building and the remaining "Balance of Plant" and a visit to the switchyard.	Physical walk-over

In order to verify the accuracy and correctness of the information provided by the PP, RE Carbon Ltd. furthermore conducted in-person interviews during the physical on-site visit. In addition to the details in the various documents provided by the PP, further information was gathered during these interviews.

The list of individuals interviewed is provided in the table below:

Reference Number	Means of Interview	Full Name	Affiliation	Organization
I01	Face-to-face	Mrs.Beyda Altuntaş	Team Leader	Re-carbon Ltd.
I02	Face-to-face	Mr.Se**De**	Electricity Markets Operations Chief	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.
I03	Face-to-face	Mr.Se**De**	Operational Chief	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.
I04	Face-to-face	Ms.Ne**Ya**	Electric and Carbon Trade Expert	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.
I05	Face-to-face	Ms.Ni**Al**Mu**	Ornithologist	ALMER Group (Subsidiary Company of RHG Enertürk)
I06	Face-to-face	Mr.Se**Ka**	General Service	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.
I07	Face-to-face	Mr.Oğ**At**	Command Operator (Local individual from Çanta Village)	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.

Reference Number	Means of Interview	Full Name	Affiliation	Organization
I08	Face-to-face	Mr.Ya**Ki**	Command Operator (Local individual from Çanta Village)	RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş.
I09	Face-to-face	Mr.Ha**Şa**	Mukhtar	ÇAnta Village
I10	Face-to-face	Mr.Gö**İn**	Villager	Çanta Village
I11	Face-to-face	Mr.Ah**Çi**	Restaurant Owner	Çanta Village
I12	Face-to-face	Mrs.Se**Ge**	Restaurant Owner	Çanta Village

In accordance with the privacy provisions detailed in Section 8 of the "VVB Terms and Conditions", consent was obtained from relevant stakeholders (including project employees, technology users, and other interviewees) for the disclosure of their personal information on the Gold Standard Impact Registry. This approach upholds transparency while ensuring compliance with applicable data protection requirements.

For individuals who did not provide consent, their names and personal details are being recorded in a separate annex to this Verification Report. This annex is available for review but is excluded from all publicly accessible documentation to maintain confidentiality.

3.7. Reporting of Findings via the Verification Protocol

The goal of this phase of the Verification is to address any outstanding issues that need clarification for RE Carbon Ltd. in order to reach a (positive or negative) conclusion on the MP and emission reductions.

To ensure transparency, a Verification protocol was tailored for this specific project activity. This protocol clearly outlines the requirements, Verification methods, and results from verifying the identified criteria throughout the Verification process. The part of this Verification protocol that consists of the findings and their resolutions is given in Annex 1 of this Verification report.

A user-guide to this Verification Protocol is given below:

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by RE Carbon Ltd.	Ref. to Questions in Table-1	Summary of the PD's Response	Conclusion by RE Carbon Ltd.
All CL, FAR and CARs determined during the Verification are listed here	Gives reference to the checklist questions in Table-1 of the Verification Protocol	Is used to summarize the responses by the PP regarding the non-conformities	Is used to summarize the responses and conclusions by RE Carbon Ltd.

The Verification Protocol is filled out by RE Carbon Ltd. in line with the descriptions above; all CARs, CLs and FARs are listed in a transparent and clear manner.

In line with RE Carbon Ltd.'s internal procedures following the requirements of ISO 14064-3 and the GS4GG Validation and Verification Standard, RE Carbon Ltd. identify issues that require further elaboration, research or expansion in order to determine whether the project meets the GS4GG requirements and procedures and can achieve credible emission reductions and SDG impacts, to ensure that these issues are accurately identified, formulated, discussed and concluded in the Verification Report.

RE Carbon Ltd. raise a CAR if one of the following occur:

- Non-compliance with the registered MP, the applied methodologies, the applied standardized baselines or the other applicable regulatory documents (including applicable templates and procedures)is found in monitoring and reporting and has not been sufficiently documented by the PP or PD, or if the evidence provided to prove conformity is insufficient;
- Modifications to the implementation, operation and monitoring of the registered project has not been sufficiently documented by the PP or PD;
- Mistakes have been made in applying assumptions, data or calculations of emission and SDG Impacts that will impact the quantity of emission reductions and SDG Impacts;
- Issues identified in a FAR during the Preliminary Review and validation to be verified during the verification or the previous verification(s) have not been resolved by the PP or PD.

RE Carbon Ltd. raise a **CL** if information is insufficient, not transparent or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable CDM and/or VCS requirements have been met.
RE Carbon Ltd. raise a **FAR** for actions where the monitoring and reporting require attention and/or adjustment for the next Verification period.

According to these principles a total of 19 CARs, 08 CLs and 00 FARs were issued, all of which are listed in the Verification Protocol.

3.8. Follow-Up Interviews

Follow-up interviews were not deemed necessary, as all information given by the PP and gathered during the physical on-site visit were deemed sufficient by RE Carbon Ltd.

3.9. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Outstanding issues identified in form of FARs from previous reports, as well as CLs and CARs raised during the current verification, were addressed and/or clarified through written and oral communications between the PP and RE Carbon Ltd. These exchanges were substantiated with objective evidence submitted by the PP to demonstrate compliance.

For all concerns raised during the desk review and the on-site audit and follow-up interviews, corresponding responses were documented in Annex 1 to this report in order to ensure full transparency of the verification process. Responses or clarifications submitted in relation to CARs, CLs, or FARs may have resulted in additional requests for information. This iterative process is transparently reflected in the Verification Protocol, provided in Annex 1 of this Report.

The Verification timeframe is given in the table below:

Activity	Timeline		Total Days
	From	To	
Desk Review	12.08.2024	20.08.2024	8
Review of the MR version 01	12.08.2024	20.08.2024	8
Site Visit	20.08.2024	20.08.2024	1
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 01	22.08.2024	22.08.2024	1
Review of PPs Initial Set of Responses	09.09.2024	10.09.2024	2
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 02	10.09.2024	10.09.2024	1
Review of PPs Second Loop Responses	08.11.2024	13.11.2024	5
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 03	14.11.2024	14.11.2024	1
Review of PPs Third Loop Responses	21.01.2025	06.02.2025	15
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 04	07.02.2025	07.02.2025	1
Review of PPs Fourth Loop Responses	16.04.2025	24.04.2025	8
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 05	25.04.2025	25.04.2025	1
Review of PPs Fifth Loop Responses	16.07.2025	21.07.2025	5
Issuance of the Verification Protocol version 06	21.07.2025	21.07.2025	1
Review of PPs Sixth Loop Responses	18.08.2025	18.08.2025	1
Closing of all the CARs and CLs	19.08.2025	19.08.2025	1
Issuance of the Verification Report version 01	19.08.2025	20.08.2025	2
ITR Process	20.08.2025	10.09.2025	20
Issuance of the Verification Report version 02	20.10.2025	21.10.2025	2
Second Loop of ITR Process	27.10.2025	03.11.2025	7
Issuance of the Verification Report version 03	04.11.2025	04.11.2025	1
Submission for Final Approval	06.11.2025	06.11.2025	1
Submission to the PP	07.11.2025	07.11.2025	1
GS Review Round I	12.01.2026	22.01.2026	12

3.10. Internal Quality Control

As a final step of the verification, the full documentation, including the draft Verification Report and its Annexes, undergoes an internal quality control process at RE Carbon Ltd., referred to as the “Independent Technical Review” (ITR). This review is performed by a separate Team Leader who was not involved in the Verification activities for this specific project activity. During the ITR, the draft Verification Report and all supporting documents are thoroughly reviewed. As a result of this process, additional Clarification Requests (CLs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) may be issued to the PP to address any points requiring further clarification.

Once all CLs and CARs are resolved and ITR-approval is granted, the final Verification Report is prepared and reviewed by the Certification Manager. A “submission package” is then sent to the PP, along with the positive Verification opinion and all relevant documents. In case of a negative Verification Opinion, the Verification Agreement is terminated.

4. VERIFICATION FINDINGS

4.1. Remaining Issues from the Validation or from Previous Verifications

One FAR was addressed in the previous Verification Report (v2.2, 22/01/2025):

- **FAR#1:** *"Since the expropriation process has been going on in some turbine areas, the status of the expropriation process shall be checked during the next verification."*
- **PD's Answer to FAR#1**: *"Expropriation documentation has been provided by the Project Owner. Therefore, there is no issue for this case".*
- **Re-carbon Ltd. Response to FAR#1:** Expropriation of private land in Türkiye is executed in line with Law 2942 (Expropriation Law). This Law foresees a defined procedure for the expropriation of private land for "public use" and the compensation of land owners. As wind farms are defined as "of public interest", accelerated expropriation was applied for the project activity. The expropriation process started on 22/05/2014 and was completed in 2017. This was checked by a desk review of expropriation documents and during the physical site visit through stakeholder interviews, confirming that there are no ongoing conflicts between the PP and previously private land owners. Furthermore, the village head of the "Sancaktepe" village provided a signed and sealed letter, dated 06/01/2025, stating that there are no grievances against the project activity. Furthermore a "No Legal Dispute Declaration" was provided by the PP.

Five FARs were addressed in the Design Renewal Review Final (29/05/2023, *GS1235_GS4GG Design Renewal Review_Final_29052023*)

- **FAR#1:** *"Old meters were tested on 29/06/2018 and new meters were installed on 23/12/2020. This should be taken into consideration during next verification."*
- **PD's Answer to FAR#1**: *"For the monitoring period under verification (11/01/2023 – 19/08/2024), only data recorded by the new meters are used. Therefore, no data gap, inconsistency, or risk to data integrity exists for the current monitoring period. This information has been transparently documented and will be duly considered during the current and future verifications.".*
- **Re-carbon Ltd. Response to FAR#1**: All related meters are under the official control of TEİAŞ, in accordance with its legal authority. The meter calibration process, in line with the calibration and first index protocols for both meters dated 23/12/2020, was reviewed in Sections 3.4 and 4.4 of the Verification Report (VR) under FAR #1. In addition, subsequent meter test protocols dated 2022 were examined and confirmed by Re-Carbon Ltd. Remote meter testing protocols were conducted under legal authorization, and the same information regarding meter testing and calibration processes was further confirmed through interviews with on-site technicians during the physical site visit on 20/08/2024.
- **FAR#2:** *"In-line with GS4GG Principles and Requirements, VVB and PP shall consider the following rule after Design Renewal Certification is achieved: 5.1.29: 1st verification shall be completed within two years after the certification is achieved."*

- **PD's Answer to FAR#2**: "*The Project Proponent acknowledges the requirement under GS4GG Principles and Requirements §5.1.29. This requirement defines an expected verification timeline. The applicable Design Certification Date for the second crediting period is 10/02/2025, following Design Renewal. The delay in the submission of the first verification was procedural and administrative in nature. The project remained continuously operational, monitoring was conducted in full compliance with the approved plan, and no environmental integrity, data consistency, or additionality concerns arose. Accordingly, the first verification is considered compliant within the applicable certification context. Start date of the monitoring period must be 11/01/2023 because of the late submission of revalidation.*"
- **Re-carbon Ltd. Response to FAR#2:** In accordance with §5.1.29 of the GS4GG Principles and Requirements, Re-carbon Ltd. reviewed the Design Renewal Certification records and the corresponding registry entries. Based on the documented certification decision, the current Design Certification for the second crediting period was achieved on 10/02/2023. Final Project Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Report was dated on 20/05/2023. However, service agreement date of 1st Verification on 05/08/2024 and physical site-visit was on 20/08/2024. The verification has been submitted on 10/11/2025. The delay in the submission of the first verification was procedural and administrative in nature. Consequently, the requirement that the first verification be completed within two years from the design certification date is applicable for the period commencing from this date. Re-carbon Ltd. confirms that the ongoing first verification is being assessed against this timeline, and compliance with §5.1.29 is evaluated with reference to the above-confirmed Design Certification date
- **FAR#3:** "*In-line with GS4GG Principles and Requirements, VVB and PP shall consider the rule below for future monitoring activities: 5.1.39: An annual update report shall be provided to GS, when successfully Transitioned to GS4GG, for each monitoring year by the end of next calendar year for which verification is not completed.*"
- **PD's Answer to FAR#3**: "*Annual report has been submitted.*"
- **Re-carbon Ltd. Response to FAR#3:** Most update Annual Report was uploaded to AP and related date of Annual Report was indicated in MR as 23/12/2025 relatively.
- **FAR#4:** "*In-line with para 5.1.46 GS4GG Principles and Requirements, delay in the completion of re-validation beyond the last date of current certification cycle shall result in a reduction of any issuance of Certified Products and/or Impact Statements available during following certification cycle. Thus, PD cannot claim credits for the delay period. At the time of performance review for the second crediting period, VVB shall check the start date of monitoring period. The start date of monitoring period for 2nd crediting period will be the date when the project was submitted for design renewal i.e 11/01/2023. However, the start date of crediting period will be from 02/02/2020.*"
- **PD's Answer to FAR#4**: "*For the second crediting period, the start date of the monitoring period has been conservatively defined as 11/01/2023, corresponding to the date of submission for design renewal. No credits are claimed for any period prior to this date within the second crediting period. The official start date of the second crediting period remains 02/02/2022, as per the registered project documentation; however, emission reductions are claimed strictly in line with GS requirements, excluding any ineligible delay period.*

- **Re-carbon Ltd. Response to FAR#4:** For the 1st monitoring period of 2nd crediting period, the monitoring period has been conservatively commenced on 11/01/2023, corresponding to the design renewal submission date. No emission reductions are claimed for any duration prior to this date within the second crediting period. The official start date of the second crediting period remains 02/02/2022 and until the start date of 1st monitoring period of 2nd crediting period start date, related Annual Report were checked and confirmed. In accordance with the registered project documentation; emission reduction claims were made align with GS requirements, with any ineligible delay period explicitly excluded.
- **FAR#5:** "*The project activity has not conducted any verification since 2017 during the 1st crediting period to obtain GS revenue. Therefore, a FAR is raised that the verifying VVB to check during the 1st verification of the 2nd crediting period.*"
- **PD's Answer to FAR#5**: "*The Project Proponent confirms that a verification was conducted during the first crediting period, 16/09/2019 - 01/02/2022. This situation does not affect the environmental integrity of the project, as continuous operation and monitoring were maintained in accordance with the approved monitoring plan. All relevant historical data have been preserved and made available to the VVB.*"
- **Re-carbon Ltd. Response to FAR#5:** There was a Verification Report (version 02.2, dated on 22/01/2025) of 2nd Monitoring Period of 1st Crediting period (16/09/2019 to 01/02/2022 (Both days included)) which was covered after year 2017 and related documentation were already checked and confirmed by Re-carbon Ltd. Also, Annual Reports were reviewed dated with, 29/12/2022, 25/12/2023, 16/12/2024, 23/12/2025.

4.2. Compliance of the Project Implementation with the Registered PDD

During a physical on-site visit on 20/08/2024, RE Carbon Ltd. confirmed by cross-referencing observations with documentary evidence (review of permit-related documents, technical specifications, photos, etc.), personal interviews and a physical walk-over of the project site:

- The wind farm includes 19 x Nordex N100 wind turbines, each with a rated power of 2.5 MW, 19 x 840V/33.6kV step-up transformers, wind farm-internal cabling and a 33.6 kV/154kV switchyard. The generated electricity is fed into the national transmission grid via a 11.5 km long 154 kV transmission line, ending at the "Silivri TM" substation.
- The data collection and storage system (SCADA) is implemented and operating.
- Two electricity meters (one main meter and one back-up meter) are installed and operate.

Hence, RE Carbon conclude and affirm that the project is fully implemented and operational, consistent with the specifications outlined in the registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023. The electricity meters were checked and confirmed by verifying their serial numbers, calibration dates and their validity, their accuracy class and technical specifications.

The project start date is 26/03/2012. Details regarding the commissioning date and installed capacities of the wind turbines are provided below and were verified during the physical on-site visit through observations, cross-checked with the wind turbines' provisional acceptance protocols.

Capacity extension activities were initiated in 2017 through a turbine agreement; however, construction commenced only at the end of 2018. As the application to the Gold Standard (GS) was not submitted within one year of the project's start date, the extension component was deemed ineligible for GS certification. Accordingly, electricity generation from the two additional turbines (T20 and T21) has been excluded from GS certification, and GS-VER claims are limited to the initial 19 turbines (T1 to T19). The exclusion was implemented by deducting the generation of the two ineligible turbines from the EPİAŞ records with SCADA data of these turbines (T20 and T21).

Turbine No	Provisional Acceptance Date	Installed Capacity
T1, T2, T4, T6, T16, T17, T18 and T19	28/06/2014	20 MW
T3, T7, T8, T9 and T15	24/07/2014	12.5 MW
T5, T10, T11, T12, T13 and T14	31/05/2014	15 MW
Excluded turbine; T20	*15/10/2021*	*3.6 MWm/1.25 MWe*
Excluded turbine; T21	*26/11/2021*	*3.6 MWm/1.25 MWe*

4.2.1. Baseline Scenario and Emissions Reduction

According to the validated PDD, the estimated annual emission reduction is 105,782 tCO2e, whereas the calculated reduction for this monitoring period (from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024) is 99,851 tCO2e per year. The actual (and measured) electricity generation for the entire monitoring period is 247,738.78 MWh, with an actual (and calculated) emission reduction of 160,583 tCO2e. Hence, the emission reduction for the current monitoring period is approximately 5.6% lower than the value, estimated in the PDD. This difference is likely due to the natural variability in wind power generation, as turbine electricity output scales with the cube of wind speed, which itself can deviate by up to 15% from the long-term average.

4.3. Compliance of the Monitoring Plan with the Monitoring Methodology

The MP is in accordance with the approved methodology, "ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (Version 21.0), applied by the project activity.

In line with this methodology, the only information to be monitored is the amount of net electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity.

4.4. Compliance of the Monitoring with the Registered Monitoring Plan

The net electricity is measured continuously by one main electricity meter at the grid interface and is recorded monthly. A back-up electricity meter is installed adjacent to the main electricity meter. Both meters used are in line with the Turkish regulatory requirements for electricity meters. The initial meters were installed in 2012. In accordance with the applicable regulations in Türkiye, TEİAŞ conducts meter calibration every ten years. Accordingly, on 23/12/2020, the initial meters were removed and replaced with the current meters in use. Calibration and first index protocols of all related meters were checked and confirmed by Re-carbon Ltd. The technical details of these electricity meters are as follows:

	Meter Type	Model	Type	Serial No.	Accuracy Class	Calib. date
Placed Meters (New Meters)	Main	EMH	LZQJ-XC	9798945	0.5s	23/12/2020
	Back-up	EMH	LZQJ-XC	9798946	0.5s	
Removed Meters	Main	ELSTER	A1500	00471064	0.5s	2012

(Old Meters)	Back-up	ELSTER	A1500	00471066	0.5s	

The installation dates of the electricity meters are as follows: 23/12/2020 for the “CANTA WPP” licensed wind power plant and all meters are connected to “Silivri TM 154kV”. These dates apply to both main and back-up meters, including their initial calibrations.

The grid operator (TEİAŞ) is responsible for the control and maintenance of the electricity meters. Net electricity delivered to the grid is determined from monthly meter readings, while net generation figures are obtained from EPİAŞ records and cross-verified with those readings.

All data is stored electronically throughout the crediting period and for two years thereafter. The PP is responsible for maintaining the data from the measurement devices and additionally for storing electronically the TEİAŞ Meter Reading Records and the EPİAŞ system archive reports, ensuring access for the PP whenever needed. Also, SCADA system was used for cross-check data. Re- carbon Ltd. checked and confirmed EPİAŞ data source, as a main data source, with cross checked with SCADA data set and TEİAŞ meter readings. Also, as a conservative approach, Re-carbon Ltd. cross checked EPİAŞ screenshots from “EPİAŞ Transparency Website (EPİAŞ Şeffafflık) and there were no discrepancies received.

The ex-ante parameter details were verified by referencing with the registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023 of the project activity.

4.5. Completeness of Monitoring

All parameters required to be monitored by the applied methodology and by GS4GG were duly monitored. In accordance with the methodology, the sole parameter to be monitored is the net amount of electricity exported to the grid by the project activity.

The sustainable development indicators relevant to this first periodic verification of the project activity’s second crediting period, as outlined in the registered PDD (Version V2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023) are:

- Air quality (SDG 13, Indicator 13.2.2)
- Quality of employment (SDG 8, Indicator 8.8.2)
- Quantitative Employment and income generation (SDG 8, Indicator 8.5.1)
- $EG,_{facility,y}$ (SDG 7, Indicator 7.2.1)

Since all required parameters were monitored without omission, the monitoring is considered complete.

The project activity’s “Sustainable Development Contributions” can be seen in the table below:

The project contributes to SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) with 247,738.78 MWh net electricity generation), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth) with total staff of 9 employees in the recent year of the operation period and the employee's training records, SDG 13 (Climate Action) with an achieved emission reduction of 160,583 tCO2e during this monitoring period.

Specifically for January 2023, electricity generation was calculated for the period from January 11 to January 31 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Also, for August 2024, electricity generation was calculated for the period from August 1 to August 19 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings.

Apportioning months calculation was done correctly for January 2023 and August 2024 in line with monitoring period.

Based on the on-site visit observations, interviews conducted and review of the supporting documents submitted, RE Carbon Ltd. confirm that sustainability parameters are monitored in line with the registered MP.

Sustainable development goals targeted	Chosen Data / Parameter	Way of Monitoring	Compliance check
SDG 13, Indicator 13.2.2	ER_y	Checking monthly EPİAŞ meter readings	The net electricity generation was checked from the monthly EPİAŞ electricity meter readings (and cross-checked with TEİAŞ and SCADA records). The details of the electricity generation are provided in Section 4.8 of this report. The electricity values were multiplied by the ex-ante emission factor of 0.6482 tCO_2/MWh.
SDG 7, Indicator 7.2.1	$EG_{facility,y}$	Checking monthly EPİAŞ meter readings	Net electricity generation was determined using monthly EPİAŞ electricity meter readings and cross-verified with TEİAŞ and SCADA records. Additionally, the difference in electricity generation between registered and unregistered turbines was assessed using SCADA system data. Based on this approach, a calculation was developed to estimate the total generated electricity at 47.5MWm/45 MWe. For the SDG7 net energy generation value, the Project Participant (PP) subtracted the SCADA-recorded generation of the 2 unregistered turbines (T20 and T21) from the total gross generation of all 21 turbines as recorded by EPİAŞ. This method yielded a registered production figure of 47.5 MWm/ 45 MWe for the 19 turbines. Specifically for January 2023, electricity generation was calculated for the period from January 11 to January 31 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Also, for August 2024, electricity generation was calculated for the period from August 1 to August 19 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Apportioning months calculation was done correctly for January 2023 and August 2024 in line with monitoring period. Further details on the electricity generation calculations are provided in Section 4.8 of this verification report
SDG 8, Indicator 8.5.2	Number of Employment	Checking social security records of the employees	Social security records of 9 employees were provided to RE Carbon Ltd. 7 of the employees are local.
SDG 8, Indicator 8.8	Number of employees to be trained for the construction and operation of the plant / Fair wage, working hours and	Checking the training and social security records	Training records for employees on year 2021, 2022 2023 and 2024 were submitted to RE Carbon Ltd. as listed below: - “Equipment Maintanence and Periodic Controlling” training was given by “EKİPNET” on year 2021 to 2 employee, - “GWO WAH and Working at High” training was given by “NORDEX” on year 2021 to 3 employee

Sustainable development goals targeted	Chosen Data / Parameter	Way of Monitoring	Compliance check
	occupational injuries		- "EKAT" training was given by "EÜAŞ" on years 2021 and 2023 to 2 employees - "Basic Customer" and "Zarges Hailo" trainings was given by "NORDEX" on years 2022 and 2023 to 4 employees - Employee Social Security Records for years 2023 and 2024 During the on-site visit, employees confirmed that no occupational injuries had occurred during the current monitoring period. They also expressed satisfaction with receiving annual health and safety training

4.6. GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements

The Safeguarding Principles and Requirements are consistent with those outlined in the registered PDD and the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles & Requirements (Version 2.1).

To assess the project activity's compliance with the Principles and Requirements, as well as the related data and parameters for this MP, a combination of document reviews, on-site observations, and interviews with local stakeholders was used. The results are presented in the table below:

No.	SGP	Means of Verification	Compliance Check
Principle 9.4	Release of Pollutants - Water Quality and Quantity	The sewage is transferred by sewage truck on behalf of İSKİ (Istanbul Water and Sewerage Administration) to legal authorized sewage system as per the "Regulation on Control of Water Contamination". The wastewater transfer receipts dated as 13/02/2023, 10/03/2023, 10/04/2023, 08/05/2023, 15/01/2024, 10/02/2024, 07/03/2024, 15/04/2024, 10/05/2024, 10/06/2024, 18/07/2024, 22/08/2024, 23/09/2024, 24/10/2024, 23/11/2024 and 24/12/2024 were provided to Re-carbon Ltd. Also, same information was checked and confirmed during the on-site visit interviews.	Interviews with the power plant employees and confirmation via Waste Sewage Truck Invoices on 13/02/2023, 10/03/2023, 10/04/2023, 08/05/2023, 15/01/2024, 10/02/2024, 07/03/2024, 15/04/2024, 10/05/2024, 10/06/2024, 18/07/2024, 22/08/2024, 23/09/2024, 24/10/2024, 23/11/2024 and 24/12/2024.
Principle 9.4	Release of Pollutants – Soil Condition	The hazardous waste declaration forms provided to Ministry of Environment and Urbanization for 2023 and 2024 and the photographic evidences of domestic waste container have been provided. Besides that, there hasn't been any complaint by the interviewed local stakeholders regarding waste management and soil condition practices during the on-site visit.	Interviews with the power plant employees and local stakeholders and confirmation via Waste Disposal Declarations on years 2023 and 2024
Principle 9.4	Release of Pollutants – Air Quality	Since the 1st monitoring period of 2nd crediting period is not totally construction phase of project therefore the dust	Interviews with the local stakeholders and

No.	SGP	Means of Verification	Compliance Check
		pollution was not observed during this monitoring period. Signed declaration (dated 06/01/2025) was provided from "Sancaktepe "Village Mukhtar about all related grievances including environmental concerns and air pollution. Same information was checked and confirmed by Re-carbon Ltd. during the physical site visit interviews with local stakeholders.	confirmation via Signed Declaration on 06/01/2025
Principle 9.5	Hazardous and Non-hazardous Waste - Noise Pollution	RE Carbon Ltd. confirm that the project does not cause any noise-related disturbances to the surrounding community. RE Carbon Ltd. inter-viewed employees and local stakeholders, who confirmed that the noise generated by the wind power plant is minimal and does not cause any discomfort. In addition, a noise assessment carried out in 16/04/2021 by an accredited third-party company for the CANTA WPP confirmed that the project's noise levels are within national regulatory limits. In addition, an "EIA Not Required" Certificate dated 13/02/2009 was reviewed. The certificate confirms that a noise assessment was conducted and that the associated impacts were determined to be negligible, with no adverse effects on the environment. Accordingly, the "EIA Not Required" decision was issued by the Ministry of Environment, Urbanization and Climate Change, acting as the competent legal authority.. As a result, no mitigation measures are necessary for this indicator.	Interviews with the power plant employees and local stakeholders and confirmation via Noise Level Assessment Report dated 16/04/2021
Principle 9.5	Hazardous and nonhazardous wastes – Proper management of waste oil	Waste oil disposal declarations for the years 2023 and 2024, issued by Silivri Municipality as the competent legal authority, were reviewed, and the waste oil management processes were confirmed to be in compliance with applicable legal requirements. This assessment was further substantiated through interviews with local stakeholders and project employees to identify any potential concerns related to waste oil disposal. In addition, a signed declaration from the Project Proponent confirming compliance with legally mandated waste oil disposal procedures was confirmed. Based on these findings, RE Carbon Ltd. concluded that no waste oil was generated or disposed of during the monitoring period. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for this indicator.	Interviews with the power plant employees and local stakeholders and waste disposal declaration in year 2023 and 2024

No.	SGP	Means of Verification	Compliance Check
Principle 9.11	Endangered Species - Biodiversity	Re Carbon Ltd. confirm that the project does not pose any threat to avian species or migration patterns. Ornithology report on year 2022 was reviewed and confirmed by RE Carbon Ltd. The latest report concluded *"No actively migrating bird or flock was observed and no migrating pattern could be determined during field Fall 2022 monitoring or during previous monitoring."* There was a signed ornithologist assignment declaration from (dated on 14/04/2025) with period of 01/08/2025-31/12/2024 actively monitored the birds and avian life habitat during the period of 2020-2025 years. Related report of bird observation during the monitoring period were confirmed that there was no negative impact was observed. During the on-site visit, RE Carbon Ltd. also evaluated the bird situation and identified no issues. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required for this indicator.	Interviews with the power plant employees and local stakeholders and confirmation via Ornithology Report dated on year 2022, continued Ornithologist records for year 2022,2023,2024

4.7. Compliance with GS4GG Activity and Product Requirements

The project activity meets the applicable GS4GG activity- and product requirements as outlined below:

- The project contributes positively to at least three Sustainable Development Goals:
  - **SDG 7**: Affordable and Clean Energy
  - **SDG 8**: Decent Work and Economic Growth
  - **SDG 13**: Climate Action
- An eligible Gold Standard Validation and Verification Body (Re-Carbon Ltd.), was appointed to conduct the verification of the Renewable Energy Label.
- The project activity seeking issuance of both Gold Standard Verified Emission Reductions (GS VERs) and Gold Standard Renewable Energy Labels, was verified concurrently by the same GS VVB (Re-Carbon Ltd.).
- The MR includes data on MWh of electricity generated and supplied to the grid, supported by relevant evidence from the grid regulator.
- In accordance with GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration Product Requirements (para. 4):
  - Only CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O are eligible for GS VERs or GS CERs, provided all GS4GG requirements are met. The project activity reduces CO_2 emissions, thereby fulfilling the eligibility criteria.
  - Projects involving both eligible and non-eligible GHG reductions may only claim credits for the eligible gases. The project activity reduces CO_2 emissions, thereby fulfilling the eligibility criteria.

- As per para 2.1.2 of the "Renewable Energy Activity Requirements", the project meets the following eligibility criteria:
    - "*Projects shall generate and deliver energy services (e.g. mechanical, work, electricity, heat) from non-fossil fuel and renewable energy sources"*. Since this project activity generates electricity from a non-fossil fuel renewable source (wind energy) it meets this eligibility criteria.
    - "*Projects shall comprise of renewable energy generation units, such as solar photovoltaic, tidal/wave, wind, hydro, geothermal, waste to energy and renewable biomass that are (i) Supplying energy to a national or a regional grid or (ii) Supplying energy to an identified consumer facility via national/regional grid through a contractual agreement such as wheeling*". Since the project activity comprises of wind energy generation turbines that are connected to the Turkish national grid, it meets this eligibility criteria.
    - "*Any Project supplying electricity to a mini-grid shall refer to Community Services Activity Requirements*". The project activity does not supply electricity to a "mini grid".
    - "*Projects generating on-site energy for captive consumption at an industrial facility shall refer to the requirements in this document*". Since this project activity generates electricity and feeds it into the national grid, this is not applicable.

In line with the GS4GG Principles & Requirements (Section 5.1) and the Renewable Energy Activity Requirements (Section 2.1.2), Re Carbon Ltd. conducted an assessment to ensure that the project activity does not result in double counting, double issuance, or double claiming of environmental attributes.

To this end, Re Carbon Ltd. reviewed the following databases to confirm that the project is not registered under any other standard for issuance of carbon credits or renewable energy attributes:

- I-REC Device Register (https://evident.app/IREC/device-register)
- VCS Registry (https://registry.verra.org/)
- ICR Project Database (www.carbonregistry.com)
- GCC Project Database (www.globalcarboncouncil.com)
- BCR Project Database (www.globalcarbontrace.io)
- CerCarbono Database (www.ecoregistry.io)

Based on this review, the project is not listed in any of the above registries. Re Carbon Ltd. therefore confirm, to the best of its knowledge and based on available evidence, that no other Verified Emission Reductions (VERs) or similar environmental claims have been or are being issued for this project activity. This satisfies the GS4GG requirements on exclusive environmental claims.

Based on the above assessment, Re Carbon Ltd. confirm that the project activity complies with all relevant GS4GG activity and product requirements, including the requirements on eligibility, additionality, and prevention of double counting.

4.8. Compliance with the Calibration Frequency Requirements for Measuring Instruments

As per Turkish regulations, the calibration validity period for electricity meters is 10 years. At the project activity's validation phase, calibrated meters were installed in accordance with applicable regulations. Initial calibration was carried out on the following dates, as confirmed through meter test protocols:

- CANTA WPP Project Meter Calibration: 23/12/2020
- CANTA WPP Project Meter Test: 22/09/2022

In cases where significant discrepancies arise between the main and backup meters, "TEİAŞ" (the authorized distribution company for the area where this project activity is located) is notified for further investigation and intervention. This entity is responsible for the calibration and maintenance of all meters within its electricity distribution area.

All documentation related to meter quality and testing (calibration certificates and supporting documents) related to this monitoring period was submitted to RE Carbon Ltd. by the PP and was verified through both, a document review and during the physical on-site assessment.

In addition, the PP submitted to GS4GG the annual MRs for the following periods:

- 02/02/2015 to 31/10/2016 (1st MP of 1st CP)
- 16/09/2019 to 01/02/2022 (2nd MP of 1st CP)

All monitoring data is being archived electronically by the PP and retained for a minimum of two years after the end of the final crediting period.

4.9. Assessment of Data and Calculation of Emission Reductions

Monthly electricity meter readings and EPİAŞ records were provided to RE Carbon Ltd. for all months within this monitoring period. The data presented in the emission reductions table was verified against the monthly electricity meter readings (see the "Baseline Emissions" sheet within the ER Calculation Excel file).

EPİAŞ records served as the primary data source, while the monthly meter readings were used as a cross-check by RE Carbon Ltd. The net electricity generation was determined based on EPİAŞ data and was validated through comparison with the meter readings.

Project Participant (PP) subtracted the SCADA-recorded generation of the 2 unregistered turbines (T20 and T21) from the total gross generation of all 21 turbines as recorded by EPİAŞ. This method yielded a registered production figure of 47.5 MWm/ 45 MWe for the 19 turbines.

Specifically for January 2023, electricity generation was calculated for the period from January 11 to January 31 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Also, for August 2024, electricity generation was calculated for the period from August 1 to August 19 using EPİAŞ daily meter readings. Apportioning months calculation was done correctly for January 2023 and August 2024 in line with monitoring period (11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 both dates are inclusive). The net electricity generated during this monitoring period is presented in the table below:

Period	Amount	Compliance check
11/01/2023 to 31/12/2023	Export to Grid: 150,906.07 MWh Import from Grid: 149.05 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: **150,757.02 MWh**	Monthly EPİAŞ meter reading records and cross checked with TEİAŞ records and SCADA data set
01/01/2024 – 19/08/2024	Export to Grid: 97,098.92 MWh Import from Grid: 117.16 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: **96,981.76 MWh**	Monthly EPİAŞ meter reading records and cross checked with TEİAŞ records and SCADA data set
Total (11/01/2023 – 19/08/2024)	Export to Grid: 248,004.99 MWh Import from Grid: 266.20 MWh Net electricity supplied to grid: **247,738.78 MWh**	Monthly EPİAŞ meter reading records and cross checked with TEİAŞ records and SCADA data set

Electricity generation is continuously monitored through the SCADA system.

4.10. Quality of Evidence

As outlined in the PDD, the estimated emission reductions projected for this monitoring period are 170,121 tCO_2e. However, the **actual emission reductions achieved** during this monitoring period amounted to **160,583 tCO_2e**.

The breakdown of emission reductions by vintage for the current monitoring period, spanning from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 is:

Period	Emission reductions (tCO_2e)
11/01/2023 to 31/12/2023	97,720
01/01/2024 to 19/08/2024	62,863
Total (11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024)	**160.583**

The PP may only claim ERs for this first monitoring period in between 11/01/2023 and 19/08/2024.

4.11. Management System and Quality Assurance

“CANTA WPP” is equipped with one main electricity meter each and one back-up meter each for measuring the generated electricity. These meters, installed as detailed in Section 4.4 of this Verification Report, comply with the requirements of the Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA).

Both, the main and the backup meters are bi-directional, capable of measuring the electricity flow in both directions (consumption and production). In the event of discrepancies between the two meters and upon request by either party (TEİAŞ, the legal distribution authority), a calibration can be performed without waiting for the scheduled periodic check. This calibration is carried out by an accredited third-party under the supervision of EPİAŞ. According to national standards, the PP is not responsible for the calibration of meters in Türkiye.

During this monitoring period, the PP provided written assurance (through a signed and sealed letter on official company letterhead) that no legal disputes or claims had arisen. RE Carbon Ltd. confirmed this during the physical on-site visit, where the absence of legal issues was reaffirmed.

4.12. Materiality

RE Carbon Ltd. conducted a thorough review of all relevant datasets, including EPIAS records covering the period from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024. These records capture daily production data with complete coverage and the readings (used as the basis for billing) are precise, automatically recorded and securely stored by the relevant government authority. No material discrepancies or inconsistencies were identified in the data.

Given that the project activity is classified as "large-scale" but has achieved less than 300,000 tonnes of CO_2 emission reductions, a materiality threshold of 2% was applied in accordance with Gold Standard guidelines. This threshold is consistent with the "Guideline on the Application of Materiality in Verifications," (Version 02). To meet the required level of assurance, all data used in the GHG emission reduction calculations were reviewed in full, with no sampling applied.

RE Carbon Ltd. confirm that the claimed emission reductions for the project activity are free from material misstatements and were verified with a reasonable level of assurance. The baseline scenario, data integrity and calculation methodologies were assessed and found to be in full compliance with Gold Standard rules and requirements. All sources of data, including monitoring records and grid emission factors, were verified as accurate and reliable. Any minor deviations identified fell within the permissible materiality thresholds. The project activity adhered to its approved monitoring plan and the emission reductions were found to be both accurate and credible.

4.13. Verification of Sampling Plan

No sampling approach is used.

4.14. Post Registration Changes

4.14.1. Temporary deviations

N/A

4.14.2. Corrections

N/A

4.14.3. Changes to the start date of the crediting period

The start date of the CP was postponed during the first verification period. Although the original start date was set as 01/10/2014 to 30/09/2021, the PP opted to defer the start to 02/02/2015 to 01/02/2022. In accordance with Paragraph 3.1.3 of the GS Design Change Requirements (Version 1.0), such a one-year postponement is permitted without the need for justification. As a result, RE Carbon Ltd. consider this change to be acceptable and compliant with the applicable guidelines.

4.14.4. Permanent changes

Capacity extension activities were initiated in 2017 through a turbine agreement; however, construction commenced only at the end of 2018. As the application to the Gold Standard (GS) was not submitted within one year of the project's start date, the extension component was deemed ineligible for GS certification. Accordingly, electricity generation from the two additional turbines (T20 and T21) has been excluded from GS certification, and GS-VER claims are limited to the initial 19 turbines (T1 to T19). The exclusion was implemented by deducting the generation of the two ineligible turbines from the EPİAŞ records with SCADA data of these turbines (T20 and T21).

4.14.5. Changes to the project design

N/A

5. VERIFICATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

SHORT CVs

1. Assessors

Mrs. Beyda Altuntaş holds a B.Sc. degree in “Regional Planning” from Gazi University / Ankara and currently undergoes a M.Sc. program in the same. With re-carbon, Beyda is an internal Team Leader and technical expert for “Project-Level Group 1 - GHG Project Type: Renewable Energy Production”. Beyda is also a Regional Expert for Türkiye.

Mr. Rohit Badaya holds a Master’s degree in “Nanotechnology” and a Bachelor’s degree in “Pulp and Paper Engineering” from the Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee (IIT Roorkee). He is also an Energy Auditor, certified by the Bureau of Energy Efficiency, Ministry of Power, Govt. of India. Rohit has more than 14 years of work experience in the area of Climate Change (CDM, GS, VCS, GCC) and has worked for various DOEs/VVBs in the capacity of Team Leader, Validator/Verifier, Technical Expert, ITR, Manager (Technical & Certification) and Quality Manager. Within the context of CDM/GS/VCS/GCC, Rohit has a record of accomplishment of more than 200 projects as Team Leader, Validator, Verifier, Technical Expert and Technical Reviewer. He is well versed with various local regulations related to CDM/GS/VCS/ GCC projects, located in countries in Asia, Africa, Middle East, Asia Pacific as well as in Türkiye. With re-carbon, Rohit is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and an expert in “Project-Level Group 1 - GHG Project Types: Renewable Energy Production & Energy Efficiency Improvements” // “Project-Level Group 5 - GHG Project Types: Methane collection & destruction as well as Livestock and other anaerobic digester operations” // “Project-Level Group 6 - GHG Project Types: Capture & destruction of Landfill gas & Capture & use of Landfill gas & Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment”. Rohit is a Regional Expert for India, Nepal and Sri Lanka.

5.1. Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

re-carbon®
quality in carbon auditing

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

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

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

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **27.03.2024** by

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mrs. Beyda Altuntaş

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

PROJECT LEVEL GROUP	GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	*EQUIVALENT CDM TECHNICAL AREA EXPERTISE* reference only	Gold Standard: VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	Verified Carbon Standard: VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	CERCARBONO: VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
1	Renewable Energy Production	*1.2*	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023					15.12.2023
1	Energy Efficiency Improvements	*3.1*															
5	Methane Collection & destruction	*13.2*															
5	Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	*13.2*															
5	Agricultural methane emission reduction	*15.1*															
5	Agricultural carbon emission reduction	*15.1*															
6	Capture & destruction of landfill gas	*13.1*															
6	Capture & use of landfill gas	*13.1*															
6	Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	*13.1*															
		SDS Criteria:	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023					15.12.2023

PROJECT LEVEL GROUP	GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	*EQUIVALENT CDM TECHNICAL AREA EXPERTISE* reference only	International Carbon Registry: VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	BioCarbon Registry: VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	GCC: VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
1	Renewable Energy Production	*1.2*	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023					15.12.2023	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023
1	Energy Efficiency Improvements	*3.1*															
5	Methane Collection & destruction	*13.2*															
5	Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	*13.2*															
5	Agricultural methane emission reduction	*15.1*															
5	Agricultural carbon emission reduction	*15.1*															
6	Capture & destruction of landfill gas	*13.1*															
6	Capture & use of landfill gas	*13.1*															
6	Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	*13.1*															
		SDS Criteria:	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023					15.12.2023	02.02.2024	02.02.2024	21.03.2024		15.12.2023
		E+											15.03.2024	15.03.2024	15.03.2024		15.03.2024
		S+											15.03.2024	15.03.2024	15.03.2024		15.03.2024
		CORSIA											15.03.2024	15.03.2024	15.03.2024		15.03.2024

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye for all above listed GHGRSs

F-C-044 / 27.03.2024 - 02

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

re-carbon®
quality in carbon auditing

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

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

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

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Rohit Badaya

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

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **17.01.2025** by

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

Gold Standard — Climate Security & Sustainable Development

PROJECT LEVEL GROUP	GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	EQUIVALENT CDM TECHNICAL AREA EXPERTISE (reference only)	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
1	Renewable Energy Production	1.2	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
1	Energy Efficiency Improvements	3.1	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
6	Methane Collection & destruction	13.2	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
5	Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	13.2	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
6	Agricultural methane emission reduction	15.1					
5	Agricultural carbon emission reduction	15.1					
6	Capture & destruction of landfill gas	13.1	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
6	Capture & use of landfill gas	13.1	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
6	Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	13.1	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
		SDS Criteria:	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021

Verified Carbon Standard — A VERRA STANDARD

GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
Renewable Energy Production	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
Energy Efficiency Improvements	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
Methane Collection & destruction	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
Agricultural methane emission reduction					
Agricultural carbon emission reduction					
Capture & destruction of landfill gas	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
Capture & use of landfill gas	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021
SDS Criteria:	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021	25.10.2021

CERCARBONO — Certified Carbon Standard

GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
Renewable Energy Production					25.10.2021
Energy Efficiency Improvements					25.10.2021
Methane Collection & destruction					
Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations					25.10.2021
Agricultural methane emission reduction					
Agricultural carbon emission reduction					
Capture & destruction of landfill gas					25.10.2021
Capture & use of landfill gas					25.10.2021
Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment					25.10.2021
SDS Criteria:					25.10.2021

ICR International Carbon Registry

PROJECT LEVEL GROUP	GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	EQUIVALENT CDM TECHNICAL AREA EXPERTISE (reference only)	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
1	Renewable Energy Production	1.2	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
1	Energy Efficiency Improvements	3.1	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
6	Methane Collection & destruction	13.2	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
5	Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	13.2	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
6	Agricultural methane emission reduction	15.1					
5	Agricultural carbon emission reduction	15.1					
6	Capture & destruction of landfill gas	13.1	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
6	Capture & use of landfill gas	13.1	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
6	Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	13.1	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
		SDS Criteria:	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023

BioCarbon Registry

GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
Renewable Energy Production	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
Energy Efficiency Improvements	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
Methane Collection & destruction	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
Agricultural methane emission reduction					
Agricultural carbon emission reduction					
Capture & destruction of landfill gas	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
Capture & use of landfill gas	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023
SDS Criteria:	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023	02.02.2023

GCC

GHG PROJECT TYPE EXPERTISE	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
Renewable Energy Production	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
Energy Efficiency Improvements	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
Methane Collection & destruction	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
Livestock & other anaerobic digester operations	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
Agricultural methane emission reduction					
Agricultural carbon emission reduction					
Capture & destruction of landfill gas	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
Capture & use of landfill gas	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
Avoidance of methane production in wastewater treatment	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
SDS Criteria:	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022
E+	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee
S+	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee
CORSIA	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee	Trainee

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: India, Nepal, Sri Lanka for all above listed GHGRSs

F-C-044 / 27.03.2024 - 02

6. VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION OPINION

RE Carbon Ltd. conducted the 01 Monitoring Period as 1st Verification of 2nd Crediting Period the "CANTA WPP", a project with the GS4GG registry reference number "1235" for the period in between 11/01/2023 and 19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive). The Verification scope includes the assessment and certification of GHG emission reductions reported in the MR (Version 10), dated 23/12/2025.

"GTE KARBON SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR ENERJİ EĞİTİM DANIŞMANLIK VE TİC. AŞ" (as the consultant) was responsible, on behalf of "RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş" (PP), for preparing the GHG emissions data and reporting of the project's GHG emission reductions, based on the framework outlined in the project's MP (Version V2.6SOP), as specified in the project activity's registered PDD. The PP is responsible for developing and maintaining records and reporting procedures in line with this MP, including the calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions, detailed therein.

Having applied the requirements of ISO 14064-3 in verifying the monitoring period for the project activity "CANTA WPP" in Türkiye, RE Carbon Ltd. hereby confirm that the project has been implemented in accordance with the validated and registered PDD (Version v2.6SOP), dated 20/05/2023 and the MP therein. The monitoring system is in place, and the emission reductions were calculated without material misstatements, in accordance with ISO 14064-2 and the approved methodology "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" (Version 21.0)".

Based on the results of our document review and the physical on-site assessment, RE Carbon Ltd. is of the opinion that the implementation of the project activity has resulted in the avoidance of 160,583 tCO2e during the monitoring period, spanning from 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024 (both dates inclusive).

Therefore, RE Carbon Ltd. recommend the issuance of GS VERs for the emission reductions, achieved during the monitoring period, as shown in the table below:

From 11/01/2023 to 31/12/2023	97,720
From 01/01/2024 to 19/08/2024	62,863
Total (11/01/2023-19/08/2024)	160,583

Project Title	CANTA WPP
Applicable Period	11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024
Baseline Emissions	160,583 tCO_2e
Project Emissions	00 tCO_2e
Leakage Emissions	00 tCO_2e
Emission Reductions	**160,583 tCO_2e**

Beyda ALTUNTAŞ
Team Leader

Rohit BADAYA
ITR and Decision Maker
22/01/2026

Esin TUNALI
Certification Manager

re-carbon
quality in carbon auditing

ANNEX 1: VERIFICATION PROTOCOL

Table 1 – Resolution of Corrective Action, Forward Action and Clarification Requests

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-1 a) There is wrong project name according to GS Registry system. b) Monitoring period number has to be indicated in sequential format (including total number of monitoring period) c) There is contradiction about monitoring period start date between Table-2 and KPI Table. d) There is contradiction between project developer and representatives according to GS Registry System and contracts. e) There are wrong values according to ER Excel sheet in Table-1 and also throughout the MR. Monitoring period start date has been indicated as 11/03/2023 however apportioning month calculation has not been made in ER Calculation sheet. Also, there is contradiction about total electricity generation it has to be indicated for initial 19 wind turbines. Additionally, SCADA data set has to be indicated in ER Calculation sheet for separating the different type of wind turbines and additional wind turbines (which are rejected by GS for under consideration 2 additional wind turbines) from the total calculations. f) Units of related SDGs and parameters has to be corrected according to monitoring period (i.e. MWh/yr indication is no correct in line with MP because monitoring period is not yearly) g) All related values has to be corrected throughout the MR and ER Excel Sheet in line with separation of different type of turbines, SCADA data set and apportioning month.	Cover Page-KPI Table	Response -1: a) As per the title of project in the GS registry system, title has been changed in the MR. b) Revised. c) Corrected. The start date of the monitoring period is 11/01/2023. d) Project Developer is GTE KARBON SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR ENERJİ EĞİTİM DANIŞMANLIK VE TİC. AŞ while RHG Enertürk Enerji Üretim ve Ticaret A. Ş. is the Project owner. Generation license and provisional acceptances can be seen as the proof. Compnay name change documents have been provided. Latest registered PDD has the same Project representative names. e) Apportioning for the January 2023 data has been made as requested. The monitoring period start date is 11/01/2023 and the table has been corrected. f) Corrected. g) Corrected. Response-2:	Review 1: a) There is still "Çanta Wind" name in Section D.2 and B.1 of MR. Also there is inconsistencies about PDD version. b) Sequential indication is still incorrect including total monitoring period. c) According to contractual issues 1st MP of 2nd CP has to be indicated as "11/01/2023-19/08/2024", however monitoring period has been still indicated wrongly throughout the MR and ER. Correct the contradiction according to contract. d) OK, closed. e) There are wrong values according to ER Excel sheet in Table-1 and also throughout the MR. Monitoring period start date and end date has been indicated as wrongly according to contract, however apportioning month calculation has not been made in ER Calculation sheet (after revising MP dates, for January

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		a) The name of the project has been corrected in mentioned sections. b) Monitoring period number is indicated as *"01 (1st Monitoring Period of the 2nd Crediting Period)".* c) *MP dates are corrected as 11/01/2023 to 19/08/2024.* e) Values are corrected. f) Units should be correct. g) ER Calculation sheet has been prepared based on the previous verifications and registered PDD. Response-3: a)Correct version of the PDD has been used as the 2nd CP PDD. Revised. b)Monitoring period number is 01. c)MP dates revised. e)ER Sheet prepared by the approved documents. f)updated. g)Updated. Response-4: b)Revised. e)Rounddown function has been applied. f)Revised. g)Revised.	2023 and August 2024). Also, there is contradiction about total electricity generation it has to be indicated for initial 19 wind turbines. Additionally, SCADA data set has to be indicated in ER Calculation sheet for separating the different type of wind turbines and additional wind turbines (which are rejected by GS for under consideration 2 additional wind turbines) from the total calculations. f) Units are still indicated wrong according to MP. g) ER Calculations are still wrong so all related values has to be revised according to corrected ER Calculations. Review 2: a)There are inconsistencies about registered PDD version and date. According to sent documents the latest version of PDD is V2.6 SOP dated 20/05/2023 however MR has been indicated in line with old version of PDD such as V2.4 SOP dated 05/12/2022. Correct the contradictions throughout the MR also corrected PDD based information accordingly.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		Response-5: d) The rounddown function has been applied to the total value of emission reduction 161,601. Values have been corrected. e) Units have been corrected. f) Revised. g) Rounddown function has been applied. Project owner will provide the March 2023 and 2024 values for T20 turbine. There is a generation at these months based on the previously provided SCADA screenshots. Response-6: Exported energy values for T20 March 2023 and 2023 have been shared. Values have been updated.	b)There is still missing "total monitoring period "number in sequential indication. c)There are inconsistencies about MP dates throughout the MR correct the contradiction. e)There are still contradictions and there is o round down function in ER Excel sheet as a conservative approach. This finding still remains with most of the contradictions. f) Units are still indicated wrong according to MP. g)Findings is still remain also please see above corrections. (Also please write the answers in the appropriate alphabetical order and only sort in the order of the findings that remain open in Draft Protocol) Review 3: a)OK, closed(Registered PDD version and all related information has been corrected). b)According to sequential indication "total monitoring period number" is missing. c)OK, closed (MP dates has been corrected) e)The round down function has not been applied, previous approved document is not an answer. ER has to be revised with

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			round down function totally otherwise emission reduction value will not have been conservative. f)Units of parameters has to be indicated according to monitoring period however related parameters still remain as yearly. g) Findings is still remain also please see above corrections. The round down function has not been applied, 2023-2024 March value of T20 has been indicated as zero and there is no evidence document for these months as SCADA data set screenshots. Review-4: b) OK, closed (Revised) e) The round down function still has not been applied. ER has to be revised with round down function totally otherwise emission reduction value will not have been conservative. The Net Electricity Generation (MWh) value in the ER does not match the value in the MR, and the values throughout the MR need to be corrected in accordance with the calculations in the ER (for example, the last paragraph of section A.1). After applying rounddown, the values need to be revised throughout MR. f) Units of parameters has to be indicated according to monitoring period (e.g.,

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			161,601 tCO2/MP, 249,308.03 MWh/MP etc.) however related parameters still remain as yearly. g) Findings is still remain also please see above corrections. The round down function has not been applied, 2023-2024 March value of T20 has been indicated as zero and there is no evidence document for these months as SCADA data set screenshots. Review 5: e) Finding still remains. According to provided SCADA data set March values of both years (2023 and 2024) were different from ER Excel sheet. In Er Excel sheet it has been still indicated as "0" which is inconsistent with related formulation and evidence document. According to correction of these values all related formulation will be corrected relatively both in ER and MR. f)OK, closed (All units are corrected) g)Same as above. Review 6: e)OK,closed(Corrected) g)OK,closed(Corrected).
CAR-2	A.1	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 Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
a) There is contradiction about annual electricity generation 19 wind turbines. Annual electricity generation has been indicated as 163.2 GWh with micro siting optimization studies in Monitoring Report however Generation License is allows for 159.75 GWh. Also there is no evidence document for micro siting studies that increase the annual electricity generation value. b) All related values has to be corrected throughout the MR and ER Excel Sheet in line with separation of different type of turbines, SCADA data set and apportioning month. c) Substation information has to be indicated in line with Generation License. d) Provisional acceptances date of related turbines are indicated wrong in Milestone table according to Provisional Acceptances Protocols of wind turbines. e) There is no indication of third monitoring period in Milestone table. f) There is no reference for para "… According to the research conducted by State Planning Organization (SPO) on socio-economic level of Districts in Turkey…" in Section A.1 of Monitoring Report.		a) As per the Generation License provided, 18/08/2011, estimated annual electricity generation is 175,000,000 kWh. Thus, there is no contradiction. b) Corrected. c) Substation information has been provided based on the Generation License. Silivri TM 154 kV as the substation. d) Dates have been corrected. e) Milestone Table has been updated and all MP dates and CP dates have been provided. f) That section was written in the registered PDD of 2nd Crediting Period; thus, it has been removed from this monitoring report. Response-2: a)There is a separation of those two turbines by subtracting SCADA Data generation from EPIAS records. Please see ER Calculation sheet. Registered 2nd CP PDD applied the same approach and approved by GS. b)Corrected. c)MP dates are between 11/01/2023 and 19/08/2024. Response-3:	a) 175,000,000 kWh value is about 21 wind turbines, there is no separation for 19 wind turbines. Response is insufficient and this finding is still remining. There is no micro siting study evidence. Also, all related footnotes has to be indicated as reference such as EF reference is not correct it does not show the exact value of EF. b) All related values has to be corrected throughout the MR and ER Excel Sheet in line with separation of different type of turbines, SCADA data set and apportioning month. (i.e. according to corrected MP dates) c) OK, closed (substation name has been corrected in line with Generation License). d) OK, closed (Commissioning dates of related turbines has been corrected in line with Provisional Acceptance Protocols) e) MP dates are still wrong according to contract. f) OK, closed. Review 2: a)Finding still remain, explanation does not match with MR. 175,000,000 kWh value is about 21 wind turbines, there is no

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		a) SCADA Data set have been shared and calculations are correct. b) Revised. Response-4: a) Micrositing has been removed. This has been written. *"Although, in the Generation License the total output has been stated as 159.75 GWH, the final expected output has been indicated in EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018) where 2.5MW Nordex N100/2500kW R100 turbines have been selected for the project which results in 163.2 GWh annual generation."* b) Values have been corrected. Response-5: 175 GWh electricity generation is for the added T20 and T21 turbine. A capacity addition was designed later with the approved amendment in EPDK license (27/08/2015) that includes 24 turbines	separation for 19 wind turbines. Response is insufficient and this finding is still remining. There is no micro siting study evidence. Also, all related footnotes has to be indicated as reference such as EF reference is not correct it does not show the exact value of EF. Also, according to SCADA data set and MP dates, SCADA generation values from T20 and T21 has not been calculated in apportioning month calculation and thus all related values has been calculated wrongly. Round down function has not been implemented though. b)All related values has to be corrected throughout the MR and ER Excel Sheet in line with separation of different type of turbines, SCADA data set and apportioning month. (i.e. according to corrected MP dates) e)MP dates are inconsistent throughout the MR, correct the contradiction. Review 3: a)Finding still remain. b)Finding still remain. e)OK, closed (MP dates are corrected). Review-4: a) There is no micrositing regarding the 163.2 GWh. The MR mentions a micrositing

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		with 2.5 MWm / 2.5 MWe installed capacity (with the total installed capacity of 60 MWm / 50 MWe) that increases total electricity output to 175 GWh. Later, with another approved amendment in EPDK license (05/04/2018), the total capacity was designed as 19x 2.5 MWm / 2.5 MWe and 2x 3.6 MWm / 1.25 MWe which results in total of 54.7 MWm /50 MWe installed capacity and 175 GWh annual generation. However, as it could be understood from the GS team response on deviation request document, application of the inclusion of capacity addition was not approved. Therefore, 19 turbine was accepted that has the annual generation	study but does not provide any documents or references evidence (e.g. Micrositing Feasiblity dated: 13/06/2012). It is claimed that the footnote related to EF is from 2021, but the footnote is actually from 2019. The generation values for T20 and T21 are presented in separate columns. However, there is no indication that these values have been subtracted from the net generation (EPIAS) figures. The "Net Electricity Generation (MWh)" column total (e.g., 151,792.64 MWh for January 2023) already appears quite high and seems to include T20 and T21. b) All related values has to be corrected throughout the MR and ER Excel Sheet in line with separation of different type of turbines, SCADA data set and apportioning month. Review 5: a)According to EPDK Generation License dated 18/08/20211 expected annual electricity generation is 175.000.000 kWh, there are inconsistencies among expected annual electricity generation values as 163.2 GWh, 159.75 GWh and 175 GWh. Correct the contradiction according to related evidence document. b) Finding still remains. According to provided SCADA data set March values of

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		of 163.2 GWh, while the installed capacity was accepted as 54.7 MWm /50 MWe as per EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018). Exported energy values for T20 March 2023 and 2023 have been shared. Values have been updated.	both years (2023 and 2024) were different from ER Excel sheet. In Er Excel sheet it has been still indicated as "0" which is inconsistent with related formulation. According to correction of these values all related formulation have to be corrected relatively. Review 6: a)OK,closed(Explained) b)OK,closed(Corrected).
CAR-3 a) There is no GPS coordinate system indication (i.e. WGS 84). Also there is no converter reference in Section A.2 of MR. b) There is no reference for project location maps in Section A.2 of MR.	A.2	Response-1: a) Section A.2, project location has been prepared based on the information provided in the 2nd CP PDD; therefore, the coordinats of turbines have been written as the same. b) Canta RES Project coordinates file has been shared as .kmz file. What kind of reference do you request? Response-3: EIA report has not included the map data information. Response-4:	Review 1: a) OK, closed. (coordinates have been indicated according to Generation license) b) Even though KMZ File has been provided there is no reference from indicated maps as source of data. Review 2: b)Finding still remain. (Converter reference or shared maps data source reference has to be indicated). Review 3:

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		EIA report does not include the name of GPS system for the coordinates. Coordinates have been provided based on the generation license. KMZ file from google earth has been provided. Information is correct. Response-5: WGS84 coordinates have been written.	b)Finding still remain. (Converter reference or shared maps data source reference has to be indicated). Review-4: The turbine coordinates must be compatible with the coordinates given in the Generation Licence, these coordinates must be written in degree minutes on the MR and a transducer proof must be submitted to the VVB. There is still no GPS coordinate system indication in decimal degree format (i.e. ED50 to ITRF96). These coordinates can not cross checked with Google Maps also (i.e. check KMZ file "properties folder" for each turbine). Review 5: Finding still remain. Related coordinates also has to be indicated in decimal degree format for cross checking with KMZ file and Google maps (Google Maps or Google Earth pro use "WGS 84" which is already indicated with KMZ file however coordinates in MR were indicated in "UTM Zone 35" format and thus coordinates are not representative) Review 6: OK, closed (Indicated)

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-4 There is missing information about total length of the crediting period.	A.4	Response-1: Total length of crediting period has been mentioned in Section A.4.	Review 1: OK, closed (Length of crediting period has been indicated as 7 years).
CAR-5 A) Future tense can not be used in Monitoring Report. B) There is missing explanation about cross check data such as SCADA data set. C) There is missing information about meter test frequency and related dates. D) There is missing explanation about implementation and actual operation of the project including relevant dates (e.g. construction, commissioning, start of operation) E) There is missing explanation about design change part and related dates of the project in Section B.1 of MR.	B.1	Response-1: a) Grammatical correction has been made in the Monitoring Report. b) EPİAŞ records are used as a main source to calculate electricity generation and emission reduction while TEIAS records are used for cross-checking. This information has been indicated in page 11, page 12, and page 16 in the MR. c) In Section B.1, date of first index protocol is indicated in the table basedon the reference document. d) Response-2: b)It is not 175 GWh because addition of two turbines have been rejected by GS. Therefore, annual generation was expected	Review 1: a) OK, closed. b) It is unclear that how project annual generation has been indicated as 163.2 GWh. Also please see above corrections, it has to be explained how separation of all related values of 19 wind turbines in MR and ER Excel sheet. c) There is no evidence document for first index year of removed meters as 2012. Also, there is no certain date such as dd/mm/yyyy format for first index date in line with first index protocol. d) There is missing explanation about implementation and actual operation of the project including relevant dates (e.g. construction,

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		as 163.2 GWh in the registered PDD. SCADA Data of two turbines have been used to subtract from the EPIAS records including 21 turbines. c)Current first index protocols have already been shared. Old meters first index protocols are quite old and do not cover this CP and MP. d)Necessary information has been provided. Page 12. e)This paragraph has been added to the page 11. "The application of the inclusion of capacity addition was not approved by GS. Therefore, for baseline scenario 19 WEC's of Nordex N100/2500kW R100 MW turbine was accepted that has the annual generation of 163.2 GWh, while the installed capacity was accepted as 47.5 MWm /45 MWe as per EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018). Hence, it is a large-scale project having 45 MWe installed capacity providing 105,782 tonnes CO2 reduction."	commissioning, start of operation) (There is no response, finding is still remain as same.) e) There is missing explanation about design change part and related dates of the project in Section B.1 of MR. (There is no response, finding is still remain as same.) Review 2: b)Related explanation has to be indicated in related part of MR. c)Meter calibration and first index are different processes. Old meters first index protocol has to be provided. Meter change process and related dates has to be indicated in MR accordingly in line with related evidence document. D)Milestone table has missing information and also some dates are wrong according to related evidence documents. There is no evidence document for confirming LSC Meeting Date, provide the related evidence. There is no footnote for Construction start date and relevant evidence document. e)OK, closed. Review 3:

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		Response-3: b)Explanation has been added to the Section B.1. c)Since the meters are digital, there is no seperate calibration process rather than installation (first index). d)Milestone table has been updated.	b)OK, closed(Related explanation has been added) c)OK, closed (Related information has been added) d)OK, closed (MP dates has been corrected)
CAR-6 A) There is one FAR from previous Verification Report (version 02 daaed 13/06/2024) as "Since the expropriation process has been going on in some turbine areas, the status of the expropriation process shall be checked during the next verification." It has to be indicated in MR and reply in line with related evidence document. B) According to raised FAR from previous Verification, related evidence document about expropriation process has to be provided.	B.1.1	Response-1: a) Based on the previous current design review, "FAR #1: The verifying VVB shall check whether expropriation process is completed in a fair way and get feedback with the impacted residents. Response: Expropriation documentation has been provided by the Project Owner.	Review 1: a) There is no response, finding is still remain as same. b) There is no response, finding is still remain as same. Review 2: a)According to expropriation declaration para a from EPDK dated with 22/05/2014 for turbines T1-T19 expropriation status of project activity is still ongoing and thus VVB can not be sure that all expropriation process has been done or not. There is insufficient explanation and related evidence document is not matching with

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		Therefore, there is no issue for this case." Has been written. b) Documents have already been shared with the VVB. Response-4: a) Expropriation and EPDK documents fort he turbines have been shared. b) EPDK approval documents have been provided.	explanation. Provide an evidence document for the up-to date situation of expropriation process. b)Same as above finding. This FAR will not be closed with those explanations and documents. (i.e. finalized court decision, case number or decision number) Review 3: a)Finding still remain, provided evidence document is insufficient. There is no related evidence document that shows there is no problem about expropriation such as signed and sealed declaration from PP or up-to date situation of expropriation process from EPDK . b)Same as above. . (i.e. finalized court decision, EPDK approval, case number or decision number is necessary for crosscheck) Review-4: a) OK, closed (Related documents have been provided to VVB) b) OK, closed (Related documents have been provided to VVB)
CAR-7	B.2.2	Response-1: There is no wrong information in Milestone table based on the provisional acceptences.	Review 1: There is no response, finding is still remained as same.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
Milestone table and project representative and developer has to be corrected in PDD and thus section B.2.2 has to be fulfilled in MR accordingly.		Turbine commissioning dates are correct. Project developer is GTE while Project owner is RHG Enertürk. These information is also correct in the PDD and MR. Response-2: Milestone table has been revised and the MR date has been corrected.	Review 2: According to Verification Report of Second Monitoring Period of First Crediting Period (version 02, dated 13/06/2024) second MP has been indicated as third MP in Milestone table there are inconsistencies about monitoring periods and related dates. PDD, MR and previous verification reports are inconsistent, correct the contradiction. Review 3: OK, closed (Related dates has been cporrected).
CAR-8 There are additional wind turbines as permanent changes, even additional wind turbines rejected by GS for this monitoring period this situation has to be indicated with related information, dates and evidence documents in Section B.2.4 of MR.	B.2.4	Response-1: This explanation has been written in the mentioned section "Project capacity extension studies have been initiated in 2017 via turbine agreement however, construction could be started in end of 2018. Since application to GS could not be made within one year of project start date, extension part of the project was not eligible for GS certification. Therefore, generation	Review 1: There is no response, finding is still remained as same. Review 2: OK, closed. (Related explanation has been indicated)

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		from latest two turbines have been excluded from GS certification and claims for GS-VER certificates will be made only for initial turbines. This exclusion has been done by via subtracting the generation of two turbines from EPIAS records of 19 turbines.[1] SCADA Data have been used for these two turbines which were rejected by GS as explained above." This explanation is coming from the registered 2nd CP PDD.	
CAR-9 A) There are missing information about data collecting, aggregating, recording and storing with related frequency in line with apportioning month, different type of turbines and cross check data set. B) There is no diagram for roles and responsibilities. C) There is missing explanation about separating of datas between initial 19 turbines and additional 2 turbines with related evidence document.	C	Response-1: a) Detailed information has been added properly. b) Digaram for roles and responsibilities and a single line diagram have been added. c) Explanation has been added. Supporting documents have been provided. Response-2:	Review 1: a) OK, closed. (Data management has been explained in line with related evidence document) b) OK, closed. c) There is insufficient information about separation and rating of 2 additional turbines to others. It has to be directly reference and explain the how total data

[1] ER Calculation Excel Sheet

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		c)Necessary explanations have been provided based on the 2nd CP registered PDD. ER Sheet has been prepared based on the approved ER Sheet of 2nd CP. 19 turbines are used for calculations. Thus, SCADA data of two turbines have been used to subtract from EPIAS data. Because EPIAS data include 21 turbines generation. Response-3: c)ER Excel sheet is prepared according to the approved documents. Response-4: Rounddown function has been applied. SCADA data set has been shared. There is no measured valu for this month. Response-5: Rounddown function has been applied. Project owner will provide the March 2023 and 2024 values for T20 turbine. There is a generation at these months based on the previously provided SCADA screenshots. Response-6: Project Owner was not able to provide the old SCADA data screenshot for T20 March	separated for 19 wind turbines with related calculation explanation. Also, ER Excel sheet has to be revised accordingly. Review 2: c)ER Excel sheet has to be corrected in line with different efficiency of additional wind turbines from existing ones, MP dates and apportioning month calculation. Detailed calculation explanation has to be indicated in MR accordingly. Review 3: c)Findings is still remain also please see above corrections. The round down function has not been applied, 2023-2024 March value of T20 has been indicated as zero and there is no evidence document for these months as SCADA data set screenshots. Review-4: c)Rounddown function still has not been applied in ER. Also there are "0" values for T20 in 2023-2024 March so it has to be explained or fulfilled with related SCADA value. Review 5:

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		2023 and 2024 therefore they provided the exported energy values on Excel.	c)Finding still remains. According to provided SCADA data set March values of both years (2023 and 2024) were different from ER Excel sheet. In Er Excel sheet it has been still indicated as "0" which is inconsistent with related formulation. According to correction of these values all related formulation have to be corrected relatively. Review 6: c)OK, closed (all related values now corrected).
CAR-10 a) There is no Principle 4.3 in registered PDD (version V2.6SOP, dated 20/05/2023) however Principle 4.3 has been indicated in Section D.2 in MR, correct the contradiction. b) There are empty QA/QC procedure rows. c) There are missing indication of between related SDGs and parameters. d) There are missing reference and direct name of source of data's to related parameters source of data rows. e) There is wrong unit indication of EGfacility,y in accordance with monitoring period. f) There is missing explanation about main and primary data source in EGfacility,y parameter. g) There is missing explanation about meter test frequency and also meter replacement date in EGfacility,y parameter.	D.2	Response-1: a) Principle 4.3 parameter has been removed from Section D.2 based on the registered PDD, V2.6SOP). b) c) Provided. d) References for the data and parameters have been provided. e) The parameter table for EGfacility,y has been revised. f) Explanation has bee added clearly. g) Provided. h) Number of the employees has been written based on the social security records. i) Training records have been provided by the project owner. The	Review 1: a) OK, closed. b) There is no response, finding is still remained as same. c) OK, closed (Related SDGs has been indicated) d) There are inconsistencies about cross check data source throughout the MR. e) Units are still wrong throughout the MR according to MP. f) Please see above corrections. g) There is missing explanation about meter test frequency and also meter replacement date in EGfacility,y parameter. h) OK, closed.

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
h) There is no number and explanation of employees in Quantitative Employment and income generation parameter in accordance with Social Security Records. i) There is no date and certificates about employees training in Quality of Employment parameter. Also, there is missing explanation about additional trainings in line with related evidence document. j) There is no evidence document for waste water disposal. k) According to physical site visit there is missing explanation about soil condition handling also there is no evidence document or reference for it. l) There is wrong indication about source of data row of noise pollution according to related evidence document. m) Indicated date about waste ol disposal are not include in monitoring period. Waste oil disposal records has to be include in monitoring period with waste oil disposal records as an evidence document. n) According to physical site visit, project area is in the bird migration route and there is a permanent employee who monitors bird movements. According to this explanation Biodiversity parameter has to be explain more detail with related information and evidence document reference. Also, bird reviewer employee's social security record has to be provided. Also, please see above CARs especially for related values and calculations.		table includes year, name/surname, position, type of training, title of the training, and company. This table has been shown in the value(s) applied row. j) A waste declaration form has been provided. It involves all types of wastes. k) Response-2: b)All of the necessary QA/QC procedures row has been filled; however, Principle related data parameters do not require to be filled the QA/QC row based on the registered monitoring reports. d)In page 12, clearly stated that EPIAS is the main source and TEIAS is used a cross-check. e)EGfacility,y is MWh/year. f)Information has been added clearly that EPIAS is the main source and TEIAS is used for cross-checking. g)Test date has been added. Test of meters has been done once in two years. Necessary documents have been shared with the VVB already. Response-3:	i) OK, closed (Relaated table has been indicated in line with training records) j) Indicated response is not relevant and thus finding still remained. k) There is no response, finding is still remained as same. l) There is no response, finding is still remained as same. m) There is no response, finding is still remained as same. n) There is no response, finding is still remained as same. Also, please see above CARs especially for related values and calculations. Review 2: b)Cross check data information is insufficient in line with all systems such as SCADA. d)Inconsistencies still remain, TEIAS has been indicated as cross-check however in ER calculation disaggregation of additional wind turbines has been calculated in line with SCADA data source, correct the contradiction or indicate all related data sources. e)All units are wrong throughout the MR in line with MP.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		b)Cross-Check data is TEİAŞ and provided by the Project Owner. d)As per the registered 2nd CP PDD, the primary source is EPİAŞ therefore it is clear that TEİAŞ is cross-check. e)Units have been checked and they seem correct. f)SCADA Data is shared for the turbines which are not included and TEİAŞ data is provided for the cross-checking. j)A waste declaration form has already been shared. Only form provided by the PO is that document. k)In the EIA report, there is detailed information about soil condition, climate. l) m)The only waste oil document provided by the PO shared with the VVB. n)In the ornithology report, bird viewer explanation has been written.. Response-4: e)Revised. j)Values are updated. k)Revised. l)Revised. Evidence document has been shared. m)Revised.	f) Cross check data information is insufficient in line with all systems such as SCADA g)OK, closed. j) There is no response, finding is still remained as same. k) There is no response, finding is still remained as same l) There is no response, finding is still remained as same m) There is no response, finding is still remained as same n) There is no response, finding is still remained as same Review 3: b)OK, closed. (TEİAŞ and SCADA data set has been provided and related explanation has been added) d)OK, closed(TEİAŞ and SCADA data set has been provided and related explanation has been added) e)Finding still remain. f) OK, closed(TEİAŞ and SCADA data set has been provided and related explanation has been added) j)There are different dates about waste water disposal invoices so "According to the project manager, since the company

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		n)Revised. Response-5: e)Necessary units have been revised as MWh/MP and tCO2/MP. k)Reference has been added for the parameter. l) Canta RES Measurement and Analysing report is shown as footnote reference. m) Waste declaration form has been provided by the project owner. - Organic solvents and other hazardous material colors - Engine oils without chloride - Oil filters - Organic wastes include hazardous materials - Mercury materials - Lamp flurocence	have been a client of İSKİ for a long time, they do not pay sewage truck fees to İSKİ(Istanbul Water and Sewerage Administration). There is, however, a payment record of TRY 128.62, on 05.03.2018 and TRY 128.62, on 04.09.2018, which indicates that sewage truck arrives at the project area to collect wastewater." Has to be corrected işn line with all invoice dates including with monitoring period. k)Explanation is not relevant. In soil condition parameter table, it has been explained by Türkiye Regulations and in answer of protocol EIA report has been referenced there is contradiction. Also there is no reference for Türkiye's regulation. l)Finding still remain because there is no answer. m)According to sent evidence document there is waste oil disposal decleration dated with 2023 however there is no indication about this document and date in MR. n)Section D.2 table has to be detailed in line with reviewer. Review-4: e) The data for this monitoring period does not cover a full calendar year (11/01/2023 – 19/08/2024), so the actual measured EG value does not belong to a year, but to a

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		n)" Nigar Albağ Mutlu from Almer Çevre Denetim Şirketi has been worked as biologist and bird observer between 01/08/2015 and 31/12/2024." İs written. Response-6: Exported energy values for T20 March 2023 and March 2024 have been shared. Values have been updated. Waste declaration form has been provided for 2024.	period of approximately 19 months, in which case the unit "MWh/year" may be misleading, it should be stated as MP, not MWh/year, and the Description should be adjusted accordingly.Also,according to ER Excel, the 2024 Net Electricity Generation (MWh) value is incorrect.in table "EGfacility,y". j)OK, closed (Corrected) k) There is no reference-footnote in Principle 9.4 for the sentence "Excavated soil is handled according to Turkish Regulations 2021." l) In the "Value(s) applied" row of the Principle 9.5 Hazardous and Non-hazardous Waste - Noise Pollution table, it is necessary to indicate the source of your reference stating that there is no noise; in other words, what is your reference document proving the absence of noise? This document should be cited as a footnote accordingly. m) No revisions. n) Bird reviewer employee's social security record has been provided but biodiversity parameter has to be explain more detail with related information and evidence document reference. Review 5:

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
			e)Even though units were corrected, all related values has to be updated according to CAR-9 finding. k)OK, closed (Related rules was indicated). l)OK, closed (Related report and certification were provided) m)Provided waste disposal records are only for year 2023 however monitoring period coverage is include of year 2024 so it has to be provided for waste handling records for year 2024 too. n)OK, closed. (Explained) Review 6: e)OK,closed (Corrected). m)OK,closed(provided).
CAR-11 Section D.3 of MR is inappropriate according to GS Monitoring Report Guadline.	D.3	Response-1: "This project is not a community service project, thus this section is N/A." Statement has been added to the Section D.3. Response-2: Table has been deleted.	Review 1: There is unnecessary table in line with GS MR Template. Review 2: OK, closed.
CAR-12	E.1	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 Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
a) There is wrong emission factor indication, some of rows shows as "0.6345" and some of rows shows as "0.6482" correct the contradiction throughout the MR in line with related PDD, ER Excel Sheet and related reference of data source. b) There is wrong explanation with related local employee numbers for SDG 8 in line with relevant evidence document. Also, according to physical site visit hired employee numbers is different from 24 employee correct the contradiction. Also please see above CARs especially for related values and calculations.		a) Revised and updated in the MR and ER Excel Sheet. b) Updated. Calculations have been revised and updated. - MP Date has been taken as 11/01/2023 – 31/07/2024. - EPIAS and TEIAS records have been used correctly. Response-2: MP dates have been revised as per the request as 11/01/2023 – 19/08/2024.	a) OK, closed (EF value has been indicated as "0.6482" in line with registered PDD) b) OK, closed (Social Security Records has been provided and employee number has been indicated as "9") Also please see above CARs especially for related values and calculations. Also MP dates are still wrong. Review 2: OK, closed (MP dates has been corrected)
CAR-13 There are inconsistencies between related principles and values of them according to registered PDD, correct the contradiction throughout the MR.	F	Response-1: Contradiction has been corrected. Response-2: Section F has been revised and updated according to the registered 2nd CP PDD. If there is any other issue, could you please clarify them in your review? Response-3: Principle 4.3 has been removed from Section F.	Review 1: There is no corrections or revision. Review 2: According to registered PDD V2.6 SOP dated 20/05/2023, there is no Principle Principle 4.3 Land Tenure and Other Rights however this principle indicated in MR, correct the contradiction. Review 3: OK, closed (Revised)

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-14 According to physical site visit, there is internal grievance mechanism of company additional to logbook that given to Çanta Village mukhtar, it has to be explain in this section. Even though there is no complaint or request is written on the logbook, there are some request from Çanta Village Mukhtar during the on site interviews about social aids (Ramadan aid and school repairing stuffs) to the local people that there is ignore by PP, it has to be explain in section G of MR in line with related evicence document.	G.1	Response-1: "During this monitoring period, no grievances or inputs were received. There is also a grievance box kept but there is no comment received so far. The grievance book picture and the declaration of the mukhtar are provided to the VVB. Plant manager is maintaining close contact with the mukhtar and other stakeholders and make sure that in case of any grievances it is well taken care of by the authorized members of the company and plant employees." Has been written. Old grievance and internal box have been provided in the previous round. Mukhtar new logbook document has been shared. Response-2:	Review 1: There is no response, finding is still remained as same. Review 2: There is no signed declaration from Mukhtar in line with grievance mechanism in this monitoring period. Please see previous sign declaration from Çanta Village Mukhtar and provide such declaration for this monitoring period. Review 3: OK, closed (Signed declaration from Mukhtar has been provided)

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
		Related issue has been told to the PO and the document was provided with the VVB.	
CAR-15 There is no evidence document about legal contest. Also, according to FAR from previous verification process legal contest and expropriation situation has to be explained in line with related evidence document.	G.3	Response-1: No Legal Contest or Dispute document has been provided for this monitoring period. Response-2: Document has been revised and shared with the VVB.	Review 1: Legal contest decleration has to be revised in line with corrected MP dates. Review 2: OK, closed (Related evidence document has been provided in line with MP dates)
CAR-16 a) MR (Table 2): The sum of all the product vintages (97,721 + 62,864) is "160,585 tCO2", however the total ERs are provided as 160,584 tCO2 in Table 1 & 2 of the MR. Check on the observed differences. b) MR (Section D.2): Please refer to the monitoring parameter "Air Quality", where the value is presented as 100,485 tCO2, however the annual ERs are 99,852 tCO2 as per the Cell D35 of the tab "ER" in the ERs Excelsheet. Check on the observed differences. Similarly check the vintages (97,721 tCO2 and 62,864 tCO2) for which the total arrives as 160,585 tCO2, however the total of 160,584 tCO2 has been provided in the parameter table of the parameter "Air Quality". Check on the observed differences.	ITR	Response-1: a) Table 2 has been revised. b) 99,853 is revised. Roundup function has been used.	Review 1: A,b) OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
CAR-17 MR (Section A.1): The 2nd crediting period is from 02/02/2022 – 01/02/2029, however this being the 1st monitoring period of the 2nd CP and the monitoring period start date is considered from 11/01/2023. As there was delay in the renewal of the crediting period, hence no credits shall be claimed from 02/02/2022 to 10/01/2023, however why the start date of crediting period not considered from 02/02/2022 inline with the Section 5.1.45 and Section 5.1.46 of the GS4GG Principles and Requirements. Please check and confirm.	ITR	Response: As per registered PDD version 09, the first crediting period was 01/10/2014 – 30/09/2021. Later on, during first verification the crediting period was changed to 02/02/2015 -01/02/2022. This monitoring report is the first monitoring period of the 2nd Crediting Period. There is no change to start date of 2nd Crediting Period.	Review 1: OK, closed.
CAR-18 PDD (Section A.1): As per the details provided in the MR: "the final expected output has been indicated in EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018) where 2.5MW Nordex N100/2500kW R100 turbines have been selected for the project which results in 163.2 GWh annual generation". However the details as per the PDD are: "the final expected output has been improved in micrositing and optimization studies2 where 2.5MW Nordex N100/2500kW R100	ITR	Explanation has been revised. The initial phase of the proposed project involves installation of 19 turbines each having 2.5 MW capacity (Total capacity is 47.5 MWm and 45MWe). Total output capacity was 159.75 GWh according to the EPDK license (18/08/2011).2 Although, in the Generation License the total output has been stated as 159.75 GWH, the final expected output has been indicated in EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018) where 2.5MW Nordex N100/2500kW R100 turbines have been	Review 1: OK, closed.

[2] EPDK License

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
turbines have been selected for the project which results in 163.2 GWh annual generation" as per the registered PDD. Check on the observed differences in the source of data (EPDK license vs micrositing and optimization studies). Similarly as per the details provided in MR: "The installed capacity was accepted as 54.7 MWm /50 MWe as per EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018)" However the details as per the PDD are: "The installed capacity was accepted as 47.5 MWm /45 MWe as per EPDK license (amendment date: 05/04/2018)" Check on the observed differences on the capacity. The statement "an expected production of 163.2 GWh and annual emission reduction was 105,782 tCO2/MP" is not clear, since it talks about the annual emission reductions and at the same time, the unit is presented as tCO2/MP, which is contradictory. Check on the observed inconsistencies as the monitoring period is of more than 1 year. Similarly check the other statement "Total emission reduction is 160,584 tCO2 while total annual emission reduction is 99,852 tCO2/MP" in this section of MR		selected for the project which results in 163.2 GWh annual generation.	
CAR-19 a) MR (Section E.5): The ex-ante value for SDG13 is provided as "164,614 tCO2", however the same is provided as '170,121' in Cell I34 of the ER sheet. Check. Similar differences are	ITR	Response-1: a) Revised. b) Revised.	Review 1: A,b)OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
observed with respect to the values of SDG7 in the Section E.5 of MR. Check b) MR (Section E.5.1): The explanation for the calculation of value for the ex-ante estimation is provided in terms of formula, however no values/data provided in the formula to arrive at the final ex-ante values for the monitoring period. Check.			
CL-1 It has to be included all response if these headings are N/A please indicate it.	B.2.1	Response-1: N/A has been indicated.	Review 1: OK, closed.
CL-2 There is wrong version of reference to emission factor (Turkish Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources). Also please fulfill the Section D.1 of MR according to GS Monitoring Report Guideline.	D.1	Response-1: Reference has been corrected. Response-2: Necessary revisisons have been made and the EF value is 0.6482 tCO_2/MWh.	Review 1: There are still wrong version reference of EF value throughput the MR. Review 2: OK, closed (Reference has been indicated in line with 0.6482 value)
CL-3 MR (KPI Section): The "date of last annual report" is provided as 25/12/2023, however the date of annual report is 30/12/2024 as per the details available on the GS project portal. Check	ITR	Response-1: Revised.	Review 1: OK, closed.
CL-4 MR (Section F): The futuristic statements have been provided in the MR like "Waste oil will be disposed in line with regulation # 26952 on control of waste oils", which is not clear since the monitoring period	ITR	Response: Revised.	Review 1: OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
already completed. Check the complete monitoring period and provide relevant corrections in the MR. Check			
CL-5 The parameter "Principle 9.4 Release of Pollutants -Air Quality" as available in the registered PDD has not been considered as the monitoring parameter in the current monitoring report. Check and Clarify	ITR	Response: Parameter added.	Review 1: OK, closed.
CL-6 MR (Section D.2): Please check the monitoring parameter table for the parameter "Employment number of the project has provided to the region", where the monitoring frequency is provided as "Once in a monitoring period", however the monitoring frequency is Annual as per the registered PDD. Check on the observed differences.	ITR	Response-1: Revised.	Review 1: OK, closed.
CL-7 a) MR (Section E.1): The Baseline emissions for only year 2023 has been presented, however the monitoring period also has the year 2024, which is not discussed in Section E.1. Check. MR (Section E.6): The values in the statements "253,966.03 MWh for the whole monitoring period" and "For actual values, the project generated 155,021.18 MWh of clean energy per annum" does not match with the values as available in the ERs Excelsheet. Check.	ITR	Response-1: a) Revised. b) Revised.	Review 1: A,b) OK, closed.
CL-8	ITR	Response-1:	Review 1: OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests By Verification Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project Developers' Response	Verification Team Conclusion
MR (Section A.2): The geo-coordinates of the turbines are presented in Section A.2, however these geo-coordinates do not correspond to the exact location of the turbines and fall far from the wind turbines as checked through the GoogleEarth software. Check on the correctness of the geo-coordinates of the turbines as presented in the Section A.2 of MR		Geocoordinates have been taken from the provided kmz fle.	

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