

GS PROJECT RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD VALIDATION REPORT

Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.

Çorum Solar Power Plant Project

IN

TURKEY

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd.		
Project Title:	Çorum Solar Power Plant Project		
Project Number:	Client:	Current PDD Version:	
933	Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.	0.3	
Date of First Issue:	Date of Current Version:	Version Number:	Number of Pages:
16/11/2022	23/11/2022	02	89
Summary:			
Host Country: Turkey			
Project is Reviewed Against:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kyoto Protocol <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNFCCC CDM Rules and Regulations and associated documents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gold Standard Rules and Regulations <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please Specify)			
Methodology: AMS-ID		Version: 18	
Project Developers: Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. ; Rüzgar Danışmanlık			
Average Annual Emission Reduction Estimate in the 2nd Crediting Period: 9,122 tCO ₂ e			
Project Size: <input type="checkbox"/> Large Scale <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small Scale <input type="checkbox"/> Micro Scale			
Registry Number:	Crediting Period Renewal No:	Crediting Period Start Date:	
GS6566	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1st <input type="checkbox"/> 2nd	19/12/2022	
Validation Stages:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Desk Review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Visit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Interviews <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolution of Outstanding Issues			
<p>Validation Findings: During the validation 16 Corrective Action Requests and 5 Clarification Requests were raised, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this validation report. 00 Forward Action Requests were raised during the validation all of which shall be addressed during the initial verification of the proposed project activity.</p> <p>In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Çorum Solar Power Plant Project" in Turkey, as described in the PDD, version 0.3 and dated 21/11/2022, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM, GS and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-ID, version 18. Hence, Re Carbon Ltd. requests the renewal of crediting period of this registered GS project activity.</p>			
Validation Team Leader:	Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK	Indexing Terms:	
Validation Team Members:	Ms. Öykü YAKUPOĞLU-Validator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted Distribution	
Approved By (Technical Reviewer):	Name:	Signature:	
	Mr. Anıl SÖYLER		

Abbreviations

BM	: Build Margin
CAR	: Corrective Action Request
CDM	: Clean Development Mechanism
CER	: Certified Emission Reduction(s)
CL	: Clarification request
CM	: Combined Margin
CO₂	: Carbon dioxide
CO₂e	: Carbon dioxide equivalent
DNA	: Designated National Authority
DOE	: Designated Operational Entity
DR	: Document Review
EF	: Emission Factor
EIA	: Environmental Impact Assessment
ER	: Emission Reductions
ERPA	: Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement
FAR	: Forward Action Request
FSR	: Feasibility Study Report
GHG	: Greenhouse gas(es)
GS	: Gold Standard
GS4GG	: Gold Standard for Global Goals
GWP	: Global Warming Potential
I	: Interview
IPCC	: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRR	: Internal Rate of Return
kWh	: Kilo Watt Hour
LoA	: Letter of approval
MoV	: Means of Validation
MW	: Mega Watt
MWh	: Mega Watt Hour
NCV	: Net Calorific Value
NGO	: Non-governmental Organisation
ODA	: Official Development Assistance
OM	: Operating Margin
PDD	: Project Design Document
PD	: Project Developer(s)
tCO₂e	: Tonnes of CO ₂ equivalents
UNFCCC	: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION	6
2. INTRODUCTION	7
2.1. Objective	7
2.2. Scope.....	7
2.3. GHG Project Description	8
2.4. Parties Involved	8
3. METHODOLOGY.....	9
3.1. Validation Team and ITR Selection	11
3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents	12
3.3. Site Visits	13
3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Validation Protocol.....	15
3.5. Follow-Up Interviews.....	16
3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues	16
3.7. Internal Quality Control	17
4. VALIDATION FINDINGS	19
4.1. Baseline Scenario.....	19
4.2. Application of the Selected Baseline and Monitoring Methodology or Standardized Baseline.....	20
4.3. Monitoring	21
4.4. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions	25
4.5. Sampling Plan	25
5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED.....	26
6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	27
7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE	29
7.1. Appointment Certificates.....	30



8. VALIDATION OPINION..... 33

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL 34

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the second crediting period validation of the “ÇORUM SOLAR POWER PLANT PROJECT” in “Turkey” between 01/09/2022 and 16/11/2022. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

- The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Re Carbon Ltd. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and Gold Standard for Global Goals. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. recommend the renewal of crediting period of the project by Gold Standard.
- The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have not provided Re Carbon Ltd. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. do not recommend the renewal of crediting period of the project by Gold Standard and will inform the project developer(s) and Gold Standard on this decision.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Objective

Re Carbon Ltd. was appointed by “Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.” to perform the crediting period renewal validation of the “Çorum Solar Power Plant Project” in Turkey through a contract dated 01/03/2022. The objective of this validation activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the project and to ensure that the selected baseline, estimated emission reductions and monitoring plan is still in line with the applied methodologies and the applicable CDM and GS4GG requirements. In particular;

- the project’s baseline is assessed against “Tool: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period version 3.0.1”
- the project’s monitoring plan is assessed against “AMS-ID: Grid connected renewable electricity generation”, Version 18
- the projects compliance with the requirements of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes to this decision, subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other relevant rules, including the Host Country legislation and sustainability criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0
- CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0
- GS4GG v1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements

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

2.2. Scope

The scope of the validation is the independent and objective review of the Project Design Document (PDD) which is revised for second crediting period. The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see Section 2.1) and decisions by the CDM Executive Board, including the approved baseline and monitoring methodology. The validation was based on the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0, GS4GG and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

The validation team employed a risk-based approach to assess the completeness and accuracy of the claims and conservativeness of the assumptions in the PDD. The main focus of the validation team is to determine if the identified baseline is still applicable to the project activity, if the estimated emission reductions for the second crediting period are still conservative and if the monitoring plan is still feasible for the project activity.

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

2.3. GHG Project Description

The “Çorum Solar Power Plant Project” (hereafter referred to as the “project activity”) is operated by Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. The project names are Deniz SPP, Doğanay SPP, Hilalay SPP, Karagül SPP, Kızıl SPP, Maviay SPP, Portakal SPP and Şenay SPP. The projects are newly built grid-connected solar power plant project. All project capacities are same an 1 MWe and total capacity is 8 MWe AC. The project is locating in Merkez District, Tatar village of Çorum. The connection point of the project activity is Çorum TM-2 TRA-DM 12/1A. The project operational lifetime is 25 years. Project commissioning date is 19/12/2017. The project activity has 29,376 Photovoltaic Modules and 135 invertors.

The annual estimated electricity generation value is 14,060 MWh based on the Feasibility Report dated August 2017. The annual estimated emission reduction value is 9,122 tCO₂ with respect to the published emission factor which is 0.6488 tCO₂/MWh by Turkish Republic Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources dated 2020.

The purpose of the project activity is to produce renewable electricity using solar as the power source and contribute to Turkey’s electricity demand.

The second crediting period start date is 19/12/2022 and the end date is 18/12/2027. The length of the crediting period is 5 years 0 months renewable once as in the previous crediting period.

2.4. Parties Involved

Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. is the project developer and host country is Turkey.

3. METHODOLOGY

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

- Assessment whether the baseline of the project activity is revised in the PDD to reflect the most recent situation for the project activity, via a desk review of the revised PDD between 01/09/2022 and 16/11/2022.
- Assessment whether the applied methodology AMS-ID: Grid Connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 18, in the revised PDD has been applied correctly, including the baseline selection and monitoring plan.
- An on-site audit was conducted on 05/04/2022 in order to assess the implementation process of the project activity and to confirm stakeholders' comments (On-Site Audit was carried out together for this CP renewal validation and verification of Monitoring Period 2 dated 01/08/2019 to 28/02/2022).
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions.
- Issuance of the renewal of crediting period validation report
- Independent technical review (ITR)
- Approval of the validation report and request of renewal of crediting period

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

The Validation Protocol consists of two tables:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. Validation Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the validation team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and the related host country experience required amongst team members for the accurate and thorough assessment of the project design. The relevant GS validation and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and the Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The validation team and ITR were assigned to this validation activity on 01/03/2022 taking all the above factors into consideration and as a result of the contract review process.

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

Table 3-3: Validation team and ITR details

Name	Role	Host Country Experience	Scope Coverage	Technical Expertise	Financial Expertise	Involvement*
Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK	Team Leader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A, DR, SV, R
Ms. Öykü YAKUPOĞLU	Validator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A, DR, SV, R
Mr. Anıl SÖYLER	ITR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ITR

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

- A : Administrative
- DR : Desk Review
- SV : Site Visit
- RA : Remote Assessment
- R : Reporting
- ITR : Independent Technical Review

3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents

The basis for the crediting period renewal validation activity is the PDD version 10, dated 01/09/2022 which was submitted to the validation team on 01/09/2022. This PDD was revised several times due to the raised CARs and CLs, version 0.3 dated 21/11/2022 being the final version. The PDD was assessed against;

- The project’s baseline is assessed against “AMS-ID: Grid connected renewable electricity generation, version 18” and “Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period”, Version 03.0.1”
- Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 07.0
- Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment, Version 01
- the Host Country criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0,
- CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0
- GS4GG v2.1 and other relevant GS4GG requirements
- and other relevant documents, rules and regulations listed in section 2.1 of this report

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

3.3. Site Visits

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

Table 3-4: On-site Audit details

Date	05/04/2022	
Location	Tatar village, Çorum	
Participant	Company Name	Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit
Tunay Bilan	Tatar Village	Muhtar
Mauş Peker	Tatar Village	Resident-Female
Meryem Diker	Tatar Village	Resident-Female
Remziye Çağıl	Tatar Village	Resident-Female
Ali Çağıl	Tatar Village	Resident-Male
Nihat Eker	Tatar Village	Resident-Male
Ali Eyim	Galata wind	Employee, Security
Points Verified	Source of Information	
Implementation and operation of the proposed CDM project activity as per the registered PDD	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with PP (representatives and consultant)	
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with PP representatives and consultant	
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD	Interviews with PP representatives and employees who are also local residents	
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	Document review and on-site visit	
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Document review, on-site visit and interviews with the PP representatives, consultant and local stakeholders	

Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Document review
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Document review and interviews with PP representatives and consultant

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Validation Protocol

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

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

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

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

According to these principles, a total of 16 CARs, 5 CLs and 00 FARs were raised, all of which are listed in the Validation Protocol.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

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

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

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

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

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

Table 3-5: Validation Timeframe

Activity	Timeline		Total Days
	From	To	
Desk Review	01/09/2022	01/09/2022	1
Review of the PDD version 01	01/09/2022	01/09/2022	1
Site Visit	05/04/2022	05/04/2022	1
Issuance of the Validation Protocol version 01	08/11/2022	08/11/2022	2
Review of PDDs Initial Set of Responses	11/11/2022	11/11/2022	1
Closing of all the CARs and CLs	11/11/2022	11/11/2022	1
Issuance of the Validation Report version 01	16/11/2022	16/11/2022	3
ITR Process	21/11/2022	21/11/2022	1
Issuance of the Validation Report version 02	22/11/2022	22/11/2022	1
Submission for Final Approval	22/11/2022	22/11/2022	1
Submission of Final Documents to the PD	23/11/2022	23/11/2022	1

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

3.7. Internal Quality Control

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

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

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

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

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS

4.1. Baseline Scenario

The project activity was earlier registered using the methodology AMS-ID version 18. All the applicability conditions of the methodology have been justified appropriately in the revised PDD version 0.3 dated 21/11/2022.

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

There has been no significant change in the relevant policies and circumstances, which would impact the baseline scenario since 21/01/2019 (date of initial PDD, v5) till date. The earlier registered PDD takes into account all the relevant national and sectoral policies and circumstances that were applicable as on date. The discussion on the same has also been provided in the updated PDD.

The project activity is supplying power to the Turkish national grid. Thus, the baseline scenario continues to remain same as earlier, as follows: “Electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM) calculations described in the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”.

Further, the emission factor has been updated and fixed ex-ante for the 2nd renewable crediting period. The procedures as defined in the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”, version 07.0 have been followed. The grid emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) in the earlier registered PDD was 0.5605 tCO₂/MWh whereas the grid emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) in the updated PDD is 0.6488 tCO₂/MWh as per the published emission factor by Turkish Republic Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources dated 2020.

Calculation of the Operating Margin Emission Factor: It’s been published as 0.7424 tCO₂/MWh by the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources.

Calculation of the Build Margin Emission Factor: It’s been published as 0.3680 tCO₂/MWh by the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources.

$$CM = 0.75 \times OM + 0.25 \times BM = 0.75 \times 0.7424 + 0.25 \times 0.3680 = 0.6488 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}$$

The same has been checked from the following link and the document available: <https://enerji.gov.tr//Media/Dizin/EVCED/tr/%C3%87evreVe%C4%B0klim/%C4%B0klimDe%C4%9Fi%C5%9Fikli%C4%9Fi/TUESEmisyonFktr/Belgeler/Bform2020.pdf>

No updates in policy and regulatory framework comparing with the initial validation process have been found in Turkey. Therefore, it can be concluded that the baseline scenario has not changed and continues to be the same as during the second crediting period.

No new additionality assessment has been done for CP renewal validation.

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

The project activity was earlier registered using the methodology AMS-ID version 18. The PDs have used the most recent version of the same methodology as the original registered PDD, i.e., the version that is valid at the time of submission of the revised PDD for the renewal of the crediting period.

The project activity applies approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology “AMS-ID version 18: “Consolidated baseline methodology for Grid connected renewable electricity generation” and the associated tools:

- Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, Version 07.0
- Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment, Version 01
- Tool 11: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period, Version 03.0.1

Therefore, it could be concluded that the title, version and reference of the methodology including the associated tools are correct and valid.

Double Counting:

VVB has checked the I-REC Registry (<https://v-1.evident.app/Public/ReportDevices/>), wherein 349 projects from Turkey are listed as of the validation report date and this project isn't available within I-REC Registry database. Similarly, VCS project database (<http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home>) and GCC project database (https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects) were checked and this project isn't available within VCS and GCC projects' databases, either. Given that CDM projects are not applicable in Turkey and the project does not appear on domestic REC scheme, I-REC and VCS registries, it could be confirmed that no RECs and other VER carbon credits are being issued for the project at the time of this validation.

Ongoing Financial Need:

The status of ERs and carbon credits from the start date of second CP-2018 until 2022:

PP provided confidential data that shows the income and cost for carbon credits and project income and sales for 2018-2022. VVB has investigated the confidential calculations declared by PP to evaluate below numbers: In CP1, Income occurring from electricity sales (sole income except carbon revenues) is 1.16 times the net income and overall expenses (including depreciation costs) make up to 16.09 times the net income. Revenues from carbon credit sales make only 1.22 percent of net income. Carbon certification costs amount to 1.21 percent of the net income and net carbon sales income amount 0.01 percent of net electric sales income. VVB approves that PP currently needs credits to financially support the project.

By document review and on-site visit observations, it is also confirmed by the validation team that the monitoring plan can be properly implemented, all monitoring arrangements are feasible within the project design, and the means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity can be properly reported and verified.

4.3. Monitoring

SDG13: Climate Action and SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy: According to AMS-ID version 18, one of the parameters required to be monitored is “net electricity supplied by the proposed project to the grid in year y , $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ which will be continuously measured and recorded at least monthly.

Net electricity generation will be based on measured value of electricity export and import and recorded via meters sealed by TEIAS (the distribution and grid company) for billing purposes therefore no new additional protocol will be needed for monitoring emission reduction. According to meter reading protocols, the internal consumption of the facility was subtracted from the gross generation. Meter reading protocols (OSOS records) will be used as the main source for the quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid, and it has been cross checked with YEDAŞ distribution company’s notice via e-mail or fax mail.

The site electricity technicians and plant manager will be responsible for the electricity generated, gathering all relevant data and keeping the records.

There are two electricity meters, one main meter and one back up meter for each unlicensed portion. All meters are inspected and sealed by TEIAS before the commissioning of the power plant in order to be protected from interference by any of the parties and the relevant information about the electricity meters including the serial numbers have been provided by the PP. Installation of the meters and data monitoring will be carried out according to the relevant regulation by TEIAS which will record the meter readings via EPIAS system and through remote reading. The details about the currently available electricity meter details are as follow as in the table below:

Doğanay SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001349	65003325
Date of installation	12/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	07/09/2016	31/10/2017

Portakal SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001148	65003416

PROJECT NUMBER: 933



Date of installation	13/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	08/09/2016	31/10/2017

Hilalay SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001374	65003370
Date of installation	13/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	08/09/2016	31/10/2017

Şenay SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001237	65003389
Date of installation	13/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	07/09/2016	31/10/2017

Deniz SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001094	65003361
Date of installation	13/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	08/09/2016	31/10/2017

Maviay SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001333	65003363
Date of installation	12/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	07/09/2016	31/10/2017

Kızıl SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65001047	65003339
Date of installation	08/09/2021	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	07/09/2016	31/10/2017

Karagül SPP	Electricity Meter	Electricity Meter (Secondary)
Manufacturer	MAKEL	MAKEL
Model	C510.AMT.5851	C510.AMT.5851
Serial number	65000979	6503351
Date of installation	12/12/2017	14/12/2017
Date of initial calibration	15/05/2016	31/10/2017

First Index Report and calibration evidences of the meters has been provided to VVB.

All data will be kept for at least two years after the crediting period for QA/QC purposes. The calibration and maintenance of the meters will be carried out in line with the "Regulation of

Metering and Testing of Metering Systems”. The meters will be calibrated by TEIAS when there is an inconsistency between main and back-up meters.

According to the Article 9 of the relevant regulation ([Mevzuat Bilgi Sistemi](#)), periodical inspections of “gauges for electric, water, coal gas, natural gas and, current and voltage measuring transformers will be made once in 10 years”. This is in line with the monitoring plan and national requirements.

TEIAS is deciding when to carry out the next calibration. The Project owner has no control over or access to the measurement devices and is not entitled to perform any type of maintenance or calibration.

Plant Load Factor is the ratio of the actual output of a power plant over a period of time and its output if it had operated a full capacity of that time period.

Plant Load Factor = Gross Generation / (Installed Capacity * Number of Hours) Plant load factor is 20,06%

$PLF = 14,060 / (8 * 8760) * 100 = 20,06\%$

Besides, validation team has not identified emission sources that are not addressed by the applied methodology which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the annual emission reduction.

SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth: The project contributes to the following indicators 8.5.2 “Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities” and following target: “8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value” The target will be monitored by the number of employment generation with the social security records and Health and Safety Training Records during the verification process.

SDG Impact tool has been prepared by PP and reviewed by VVB. VVB confirms that the tool correctly defines the SDG impacts. All related safeguarding principles have been included in the assessment.

Safeguarding Principles:

Water Quality and Quantity (Disposal of the waste water): The employees produce insignificant amount of wastewater during the operation of the proposed project activity. This wastewater has been collected in an impermeable septic tank and collected via vacuum trucks and disposed according to Regulation on Control of Water Contamination.

Verification report of second monitoring period (01/08/2019 to 28/02/2022) stated 0 FARs.

Gs Performance Review of second monitoring period (01/08/2019 to 28/02/2022) stated 1 FARs due for next verification:

FAR-1: The PD should ensure that the grievance book is accessible by all. Accessibility of the grievance book by all should be checked by the VVB during the next verification.

VVB evaluation at CP renewal: The Continuous Input and Grievance Mechanism logbook was given to the headman of Tatar village in 2018 as agreed with villager during LSC. So, if whenever local stakeholders have a complaint or a request, they can be able to fill in the grievance book

which can be located at a headman office of Tatar village. Furthermore, the contact details of the project owner, consultant and the GS Manager's were shared with remote stakeholders via email. All these details have been given in the logbook for stakeholders to make any comments they want to write. The grievance (logbook) book was checked and no complaints about the project until now. Another logbook for CP2 has been submitted to muhtar on 01/09/2022. It is accessible by all stakeholders. Still, the verification VVB will check this also in next verification.

By document review and on-site visit observations, it is also confirmed by the validation team that the monitoring plan can be properly implemented, all monitoring arrangements are feasible within the project design, and the means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions to be achieved by the project activity can be properly reported and verified.

Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. Can confirm that the list of parameters that need to be monitored ex post for the second crediting period is complete and consistent with the relevant applied methodology which is AMS-ID version 18.

4.4. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions

The emission reduction calculation estimations have been included in the PDD in line with the latest approved version of the methodology AMS-ID version 18. The baseline emissions are calculated based on the combined emission factor multiplied by the expected net electricity generation, which amounts to 9,122 ton CO₂ per annum.

Emission factor had been calculated in line with the selected methodology and the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources document named as "Turkey's National Electricity Network Emission Factor Factsheet, EF of wind and solar plants" as 0.6488 tCO₂/MWh.

$$BE_y = 14,060 \text{ MWh/yr} * 0.6488 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh} = 9,122 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/year}$$

As the proposed project activity is a new grid-connected solar power plant. For this reason, PE_y is considered as "0" in line with AMS-ID Version 18.

There are no project emissions or leakage emissions associated with the solar power project. Thus, the emission reductions correspond to the baseline emissions and the project is expected to result in an average emission reduction of 9,122 tCO₂e/year during the second crediting period.

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$$

$$LE_y = 0, \quad PE_y = 0$$

$$ER_y = BE_y = 9,122 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

4.5. Sampling Plan

No sampling was deemed necessary and the validation process includes the whole project.

5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

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

Table 5-1: List of individuals interviewed

Reference Number	Means of Interview ¹	Full Name	Organization	Title
I01	SV	Tunay Bilan	Muhtar	Tatar Village
I02	SV	Mauş Peker	Resident-Female	Tatar Village
I03	SV	Meryem Diker	Resident-Female	Tatar Village
I04	SV	Remziye Çağıl	Resident-Female	Tatar Village
I05	SV	Ali Çağıl	Resident-Male	Tatar Village
I06	SV	Nihat Eker	Resident-Male	Tatar Village
I07	SV	Ali Eyim	Employee, Security	Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.

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

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

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

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D01	PDD for the 2 nd Crediting Period	0.1	01/09/2022
D02	PDD for the 2 nd Crediting Period	0.2	10/11/2022
D03	Registered PDD for CP1	5	21/01/2019
D04	ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet	0.1	01/09/2022
D05	AMS-ID: Grid connected renewable electricity generation	18	28/11/2014
D06	CDM Validation and Verification Standard version	3.0	09/09/2021
D07	CDM Project Standard	3.0	09/09/2021
D08	GS4GG Standard	2.1	-
D09	National Emission factor of Turkey	-	20/09/2022
D10	SDG Impact Tool of the Project activity	1	01/09/2022
D11	Acceptances	-	09/12/2017
D12	Meter first index and meter change	-	07/09/2016, 31/10/2017, 13/12/2017, 14/12/2017, 08/09/2021
D13	Training certificates	-	2019-2022
D14	employment records	-	2019-2022
D15	GS Performance Review	-	05/09/2022
D16	ODA-Declaration-Form	-	15/05/2018
D17	Connection Agreements	-	18/10/2017
D18	technical specifications of panels	-	-
D19	OFN excel	-	01/09/2022
D20	Feasibility	-	August 2017
D21	Logbooks	-	2018, 2022
D22	PDD for the 2 nd Crediting Period	0.3	21/11/2022

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D23	SDG Impact Tool of the Project activity	0.2	21/11/2022
D24	ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet	0.2	21/11/2022

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK, B.Sc. in Chemical Engineering has completed her M.Sc. degree in Istanbul Technical University in Energy Science and Technology. She is a lead auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and has been working about management systems, ISO 14064 and energy management in industry since 2004. She has been involved in more than 80 GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier especially in the energy sector. She has been working as contracted voluntary market projects' team leader/validator/verifier/ITR and CDM validator/verifier in the context of Re Carbon.

Ms. Öykü YAKUPOĞLU holds a B.Sc. degree in "Environmental Engineering" from Middle East Technical University/Ankara and currently undergoes a M.Sc. program in Chemical Engineering. She is experienced in ISO 14001: 2015 - Environment Management System, ISO 50001: 2018- Energy Management System, ISO 45001: 2018 - Occupational Health and Safety, Management System, ISO 9001: 2015 - Quality Management System Internal Auditor, ISO 14001: 2015 - Environment Management System Internal Auditor, ISO 50001: 2018- Energy Management System Internal Auditor. With Re Carbon, Öykü is a Validator/Verifier Trainee for GS Projects and trainee for CDM and VCS Projects.

Mr. Anıl SÖYLER, Bsc. in Environmental Engineering, has completed his Bachelor degree in Middle East Technical University, Turkey. He has more than 15 years of professional experience in environmental management, monitoring and auditing, waste and waste water management, environmental and social impact assessment, GHG emission report and projects' validation and verification, environmental reports, team and client relationship management and quality management systems and has been involved in the validation/verification services of more than 200 GHG emission reduction projects in total. He has also been involved in both national and international projects supported by IFC, World Bank and EBRD. He has been working as contracted voluntary market projects' team leader/validator/verifier/ITR and CDM validator/verifier in the context of Re Carbon.

7.1. Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT



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

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

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

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **01.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mrs. Fikriye Seda Atabek

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



SECTORIAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	CC					Gold Standard					Verified Carbon Standard				
		VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Power plant	06.02.2022	06.02.2022			03.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	03.02.2022	03.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	03.02.2022	03.02.2022	06.02.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	06.02.2022	06.02.2022			03.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	03.02.2022	03.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022	06.02.2022
	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	08.12.2021	08.12.2021			06.12.2021	08.12.2021	08.12.2021	06.12.2021	06.12.2021	08.12.2021	08.12.2021	08.12.2021	06.12.2021	06.12.2021	08.12.2021
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															



SECTORIAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	GCC					ICR					BioCarbon				
		VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Power plant	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
	TA 3.1: Energy demand	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Turkey, China

F-01-0269 / 13.04.2022-F-02

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT



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

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

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

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **03.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Anıl Söyler

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



SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	ClimatePartner					Gold Standard					Verified Carbon Standard				
		VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables	08-02-2021	08-02-2021		03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	08-02-2021	08-02-2021		03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	08-02-2021	03-08-2022	08-02-2021	
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															



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

COUNTRY EXPERTISE:

Turkey, China



CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT



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

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

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

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **01.08.2022** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. Öykü Yakupoğlu

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



Gold Standard
Climate Security & Sustainable Development



SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	Gold Standard					Verified Carbon Standard				
		VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
95 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation										
	TA 1.2: Renewables						30.06.2022	30.06.2022			30.06.2022
95 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution										
95 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand										
95 02: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater										
	TA 13.2: Manure										
95 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture										



ICR International Carbon Registry

BioCarbon Registry

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	GCC					ICR					BioCarbon				
		VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
95 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation															
	TA 1.2: Renewables	30.06.2022	30.06.2022			30.06.2022										
95 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution															
95 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand															
95 02: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
95 15: Agriculture	TA 15.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE:

Turkey

8. VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the 2nd crediting period validation of the “ÇORUM SOLAR POWER PLANT PROJECT” in “Turkey” between 01/09/2022 and 16/11/2022. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) v2.1 and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation has been performed by a validation team consisting of “Fikriye Seda Atabek as team leader, Öykü Yakupoğlu as Validator and Anil SÖYLER as an ITR”, and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0 and GS4GG version 2.1 and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the proposed project activity “Çorum Solar Power Plant Project” in Turkey, has applied all relevant EB-guidance as the selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and the associated methodological tools have been applied correctly. The total emission reductions from the project are estimated to be around 9,122 tCO₂e per annum over the 2nd crediting period (VERs). The emission reduction forecast was checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount will be achieved given that the underlying assumptions do not change.

As a result, the validation team assigned by the Re Carbon Ltd. concludes that the proposed Project Activity “Çorum Solar Power Plant Project” in Turkey, as described in the PDD (version 0.3 and 21/11/2022)

- meets all relevant Host Country criteria;
- meets all relevant requirements of the GS4GG, UNFCCC for CDM project activities [including Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the Modalities and Procedures for CDM (Marrakesh Accords) and the subsequent decisions and guidance by the COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board];
- applies correctly the baseline and monitoring methodology AMS-ID: Grid connected renewable electricity generation, version 18
- is likely to achieve estimated emission reductions;

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



Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK
Team Leader
21/11/2022



Mr. Anil SÖYLER
ITR
22/11/2022



Ms. Esin TUNALI
Certification Manager
23/11/2022

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

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

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
Cover Page-Key Project Information					
1. Has the following information been indicated in the cover page of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.1. GS ID of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.2. Title of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.3. Time of first submission date	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.4. Date of design certification	GS-PDD-FORM	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Ver. 1.2				
1.5. Version number of the PDD	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.6. Completion date of version	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.7. Project developer	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.8. Project representative	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.9. Project developers and any communities involved	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.10. Host country (ies)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
1.11. Activity requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.12. Scale of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.13. Other requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.14. Methodology (ies) applied and version number	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.15. Product requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
1.16. Project cycle	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
2. Has the estimated sustainable development contributions of the project activity been provided in the relevant tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
A. Description of Project					
A.1. Purpose and general description of project					
1. Is the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project activity including, where applicable, the type of facility where the project activity will take place or replace, described in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
2. Is the baseline scenario described as identified in section B4 of the PDD? (If baseline scenario is the same with the scenario existing prior to the start of the project activity, then no need to repeat the description, but it shall be stated in the PDD that both scenarios are the same.)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
3. Has the PDs provided an estimation of annual average and total GHG emission reductions for the chosen crediting period?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a)Please revise EF with 2020 final data and update PDD (including B.6) b)The sum of D11 and D16 do not match with D15 in excel, please adjust. The sum of L11 and L16 do not match with L15 in excel, please adjust.	CAR-1	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
4. Is the purpose of the project activity described including how it contributes to the sustainable development of the Host Party?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
		DR	a)Please revise footnote 1 format b)Please revise indice of “8 MWeI” c)Footnote 8 is not working	CAR-2	OK
A.1.1. Eligibility of the project under Gold Standard		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
A.1.2. Legal ownership of products generated by the project and legal rights to alter use of resources required to service the project					
A.1.2.1. Is it justified that the project owner has full and uncontested legal ownership of the products that are generated under Gold Standard Certification and has legal rights concerning changes in use of resources required to service the Project for e.g water rights, where applicable?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
A.2. Location of the project activity		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
A.3. Technologies and/or measures		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
		DR	Please provide Technical specifications of modules and invertors	CL-1	OK
A.4. Scale of the project					
A.4.1. Has the scale of the project defined (micro scale, small scale or others)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
A.4.2. Is the justification for the scale of the project provided referring to relevant activity requirement?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated	OK	OK
A.5. Funding source of project		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
		DR	Please provide GS ODA Declaration Form	CL-2	OK
B. Application of Approved Gold Standard Methodology (ies) and/or Demonstration of SDG Contributions					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.1. Reference of approved methodology(ies)					
B.1.1. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of the selected methodology(ies) given in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
B.1.2. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology(ies) refers to given in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §54	DR	a)Please revise version of “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”, Version 06.0.0” b)In PDD B1, please refer to “ Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period ” c)“Demonstration of additionality of small scale project activities Version 10.0” is not the most up to date version	CAR-3	OK
B.2. Applicability of methodology(ies)					
B.2.1. Has the PDs justified the choice of the selected methodology(ies), if applicable, by showing that the project activity meets each applicability condition of the methodology(ies)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for	DR	In applicability conditions, please revise statement “Solar power plants with reservoirs that satisfy at least one of the following conditions are eligible to apply this methodology:”	CAR-4	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	project activities §54 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67				
B.2.2. Does the project activity meet each of the applicability conditions of the tools or other methodology components referred to in the applied methodology?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.2.3. Has the PDs explained the documentation that has been used and provided the references to applicability of methodology?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, stated correctly.	OK	OK
AMS-I.D.					
B.2.4. Does the proposed project activity comprises renewable energy units such as photovoltaic, hydro, tidal/wave, wind, geothermal and renewable biomass, supplying one of the following?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §2 §4 §7	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.2.4.1. Electricity to a national or a regional grid, or	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §2 §4 §7	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.2.4.2. Electricity to an identified consumer facility via national/regional grid through a contractual arrangement such as wheeling?	AMS I.D. Version 20.0 §2 §4 §7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.4.3. Does the new unit (proposed project activity) have both renewable and non-renewable components?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §6 §11	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5. Does the new unit co-fires fossil fuel?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §7	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6. Does the proposed project activity involve the addition of renewable energy generation units at an existing renewable power generation facility?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §8	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.7. Is the project activity a retrofit, rehabilitation or a replacement?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §9	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.8. If the proposed project activity is a hydro power plant project, does one of the following conditions conform to the proposed project activity?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.9. Is the proposed project activity implemented in an existing reservoir, with no change in the volume of reservoir?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §5	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.2.10. Is the project activity implemented in an existing reservoir, where the volume of reservoir is increased and the power density of the project activity, as per the definitions given in the project emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m ² ?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.11. Is the project activity results in new reservoirs and the power density of the power plant, as per the definitions given in the project emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m ² ?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §5	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3. Project boundary					
B.3.1. Has the PD described the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project emissions and baseline emissions, in the tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, given correctly	OK	OK
B.3.2. Has the PD presented a flow diagram of the project boundary, physically delineating the project activity, based on the description provided in section A.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, given correctly	OK	OK
B.3.3. Has the PD included in the flow diagram the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described in section A.3 of the PDD, and indicated in the diagram the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary and the data and parameters to be monitored?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes, given correctly	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.3.4. Does the selected methodology allow the PDs to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary?	CDM project standard for project activities §58	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.3.5. If the selected methodology allows the project developers to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary, do the project developers explain and justify their choices?	CDM project standard for project activities §58	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.3.6. Have all sources and GHGs necessary for the calculation of emissions been included within the project boundary?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §69	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.3.7. Does the PDD correctly describe the project boundary and the physical delineation of the proposed project activity?	CDM project standard for project activities §57	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.3.8. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to project boundary?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63a	DR	Yes	OK	OK
AMS-I.D.					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.3.9. Is the spatial extent of the project boundary identified correctly?	AMS I.D. Version 20.0 §18	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.4. Establishment and description of the baseline scenario					
B.4.1. Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed GS project prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §94 CDM project standard for project activities §59	DR	Yes, described	OK	OK
B.4.2. Does the PDD identify the baseline for the proposed GS project, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed GS project?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §75 CDM project standard for project activities §61	DR	Yes, described	OK	OK
B.4.3. If the methodology requires use of the tools to identify the baseline scenario, have all those been applied?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §77	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.4. Are there relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §81 CDM project standard for project activities §64	DR	No	OK	OK
B.4.5. If there are relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario, have those been considered correctly in the PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §83d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.6. Are there relevant circumstances to identify the baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §81	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.7. Does the methodology require several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most reasonable baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §78	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.8. If the methodology requires several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most reasonable baseline scenario, are all credible scenarios that are in the PDD and are supplementary to those required by the methodology reasonable in the context of the proposed GS project?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §78	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.9. If the proposed project activity includes several different facilities, technologies, outputs or services, do the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.10. If the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately, are the realistic combinations of these be considered as possible alternative scenarios to the proposed project activity?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11. Does the list of alternative scenarios given in the PDD include the following?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11.1. The project activity is undertaken without being registered as a GS project	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11.2. All plausible alternatives	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.11.3. Comply with all applicable and enforced legislation	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93c	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.12. Has the PD explained how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §59	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.13. Where the procedure in the selected methodology(ies) involves several steps, has the PDs described how each step is applied and transparently documented the outcome of each step?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.14. Has the PD provided and explained all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources, etc.)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.15. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonably supported by correct and verifiable references, assumptions, calculations and rationales?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.16. Has a transparent description of the baseline scenario been provided including the technology(ies) that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §80				
B.4.17. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to baseline identification?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
AMS I.D.					
B.4.18. If the project activity is greenfield power plant, is the baseline scenario identified as “the electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources into the grid?”	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §19	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.4.19. If the project activity involves retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements of an existing facility, is baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with AMS I.D.?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §20	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.20. Have the PDs demonstrated the remaining lifetime of the equipment replaced according to the requirements described in the general guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §21	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.4.21. If the project activity involves capacity addition to existing grid-connected renewable energy power plant/unit,, is baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with AMS I.D.?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §21	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.22. Have the PDs explained and documented the quantities and types of biomass and the biomass to fossil fuel ratio (in case of co-fired system) to be used during the crediting period in the PDD?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §44	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5. Demonstration of additionality		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
		DR	Please provide feasibility report for reference Please provide license and connection agreement.	CL-3	OK
B.5.1. Prior consideration of CDM					
1. In case of projects undergoing design changes, has the request for design change approval is within one year design change start date?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.5.2. Ongoing financial need					
B.5.2.1. Has a short narrative that demonstrates how the revenue from Gold Standard certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the project been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please revise sentence “Income occurring from electricity sales (sole income except carbon revenues) is 116.09 times the net income and overall expenses (including depreciation costs) make up to 16.09 times the net income”	CAR-5	OK
B.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) outcomes					
B.5.1. Has the PDs specified the relevant SDG target for each of three SDGs addressed by the project?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG outcome					
B.6.1.1. Has the PDs explained how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology(ies), for calculating baseline and project outcomes are applied?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.1.1.1. Baseline	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72				
B.6.1.3.2. Where the methodology(ies) provide different options to choose from , indicate and justify which option is chosen for the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.1.3.3. Where the methodology(ies) allow different default values, indicate and justify which of the default values have been chosen for the project activity.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
		DR	<p>a)Please revise “SGK records with “social security records”</p> <p>b)“The project’s contribution is done through training and awareness raising of local people and setting good example by investing to the climate friendly technology.” Not related to SDG13, please revise.</p> <p>c) Please remove duplication of “The project contributes to the following indicators 8.5.2 “Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities” and following target: “8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent</p>	CAR-6	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
			work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value” The target will be monitored by the number of full-time employees with the SGK records during the verification process. Because of the social conditions of the project area, employment of woman and persons with disabilities is not possible.”		
B.6.2. Data and parameters fixed ex ante					
B.6.2.1. Have the PDs included a compilation of information on the data and parameters that are not monitored during the crediting period but are determined before the registration and remain fixed throughout the crediting period under section B.6.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.2. Are the data that are calculated with the equations provided in the selected methodology(ies) or default values specified in the methodology(ies) included in the compilation?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.3. Is the following information regarding the data and parameters specified correctly?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.2.3.1. Relevant SDG indicator	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.2. Data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer to CAR-1	CAR-1	OK
B.6.2.3.3. Data/parameter unit	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.4. Description of the data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.5. Source of data	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.6. Values applied to data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.4. Where applied values have been measured, are the following included in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.2.4.1. The equipment used	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.2. The standards used	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.3. Responsible person/entity having undertaken the measurement	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.4. The date of measurement(s)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.5. The frequency of measurement(s)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.4.6. The measurement results	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2.5. Has the purpose of data been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.2.5.1. Calculation of baseline;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.5.2. Calculation of project;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.2.5.3. Calculation of leakage.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3. Ex ante estimation of SDG impact					
B.6.3.1. Do the steps taken and equations applied to calculate following comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.1.1. project outcome	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	standard for project activities §110				
B.6.3.1.2. baseline outcome	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.1.3. leakage	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.1.4. Net outcomes	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	a)PDD states that “The project provides employment to 8 people during the operation phase” however 5 people are employed, please revise. b)Please revise footnote 18-19-20	CAR-7	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.2. Where the methodology allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, has adequate justification been provided in the PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §111	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.3. Has the PDs used the values contained in the tables in section B.6.2 of the PDD for data and parameters available before registration?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.4. Has the PDs used the estimates contained in the table in section B.6 of the PDD for the data/parameters not available before registration and monitored during the crediting period?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.5. If any of these estimates has been determined by a sampling approach, has the PD provided a description of the sampling efforts undertaken in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.6. Has the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.7. Have the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used, substituting the values used in the equations?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.8. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology or standardized baseline(s) to calculate emissions like project emissions, baseline emissions and leakages are applied by the PDs?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §112	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.9. Has the selected methodology or standardized baseline(s) been correctly and transparently applied with respect to algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63c	DR	Yes	OK	OK
AMS I.D.					
B.6.3.10. Are baseline emissions calculated using equation (1) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §22	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.11. Is the emission factor calculated using one of the following options:	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §23	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.11.1. A combined margin (CM), consisting of the combination of operating margin (OM) and build margin (BM) according to the procedures prescribed in the “Tool to calculate the Emission Factor for an electricity system	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §23	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.11.2. The weighted average emissions (in t CO ₂ /MWh) of the current generation mix.	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §23	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.12. Have the calculations been based on data from an official source (where available) and made publicly available?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §24	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.13. In case of green field power plant, is the generated electricity as a result of project activity calculated using equation (2) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §26	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.14. In case of capacity addition in wind, solar, wave or tidal power plants, are the baseline emissions calculated using equation (3) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §27	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.15. In case of capacity addition in hydro or geothermal power plants, have the requirements defined in Section 5.5.1.3 of the methodology been followed?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §28	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.16. In case of capacity addition to biomass power plants, are the baseline emissions calculated using equations (4) and (5) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §29 §30	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.17. In case of retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement in hydro, solar, wind, geothermal, wave and tidal plants, are the baseline emissions calculated using equation (6) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §31	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.18. In case of retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement in biomass plants, are the baseline emissions calculated using equations (7) and (8) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §32	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.19. In case of retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement, have the PDs used among the following two time spans of historical data to determine EGHistorical?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §33 §35 §36	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.19.1. The three last calendar years (five calendar years for hydro project) prior to the implementation of the project activity	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §35	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.19.2. The time period from the calendar year following <i>DATEhist</i> , up to the last calendar year prior to the implementation of the project, as long as this time span includes at least three calendar years (five calendar years for hydro project), where <i>DATEhist</i> is latest point in time between:	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §35	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.19.3. The commercial commissioning of the plant/unit;	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §35	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.19.4. If applicable: the last capacity addition to the plant/unit; or	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §35	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.19.5. If applicable: the last retrofit of the plant/unit	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §35	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.20. In case of retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement, have PDs followed the latest applicable version of “Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment” to estimate DATEBaselineRetrofit? DATEBaselineRetrofit is the point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced/retrofitted in the absence of the project activity. The point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced/retrofitted in the absence of the project activity should be chosen in a conservative manner that is, if a range is identified, the earliest date should be chosen.	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §37 §38	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.21. Where the project emissions are taken as “0” have the PDs made proper justification?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §39	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.3.22. If the proposed project activity is a geothermal power plant or a hydropower plant, have the project emissions been considered following	AMS I.D. Version 18.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
the procedure described in most recent version of ACM0002?	§39				
B.6.3.23. If necessary, have the PDs calculated the CO2 emissions from on-site consumption of fossil fuels due to the project activity using the latest applicable version of the “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion?”	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §40	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.24. In case biomass is sourced from dedicated plantations, have the procedures in the tool “Project emissions from cultivation of biomass” been followed to calculate project emissions?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §41	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.25. Has the general guidance on leakage in biomass project activities been followed to quantify leakages pertaining to the use of biomass residues?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §42	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.3.26. Are the emission reductions calculated using equation (9) given in the methodology?	AMS I.D. Version 18.0 §43	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimates of each SDG impact					
B.6.4.1. Have the PDs summarized the results of the ex-ante calculation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, using the tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Ver. 1.2				
B.7. Monitoring Plan					
B.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored					
B.7.1.1. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each relevant SDG indicator been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.2. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.3. Has the unit of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.4. Has the description of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.5. Has the source of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.6. Where several sources of data/parameters are used, is the choice of data/parameter sources explained and justified?	GS-PDD-FORM	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Ver. 1.2				
B.7.1.7. Has the applied value of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.8. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included?)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.9. Has the PDs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Meter change document is provided however changed meter does not appear in PDD (1047 instead of 1373)	CAR-8	OK
B.7.1.10. Have the PDs included description of calibration procedures for the monitoring equipment including the following?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.1. Frequency of the calibration	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §81c ACM 0002 Version 20	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.2. Accuracy of the calibration	CDM project standard for	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	project activities §81b				
B.7.1.10.3. Uncertainty of the calibration	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.4. Calibrating agency/person	CDM project standard for project activities §81c	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.5. The relevant national/international standards	CDM project standard for project activities §81c	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.11. Has the accuracy level of the measurement method included?	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.12. Has the responsible person/entity for the measurements included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.13. Has the interval for the measurements included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.14. Has the monitoring frequency for each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.1.15. Has the QA/QC procedures of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §81a ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.16. Has the purpose of data/parameter been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.1. Calculation of baseline outcome;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.2. Calculation of project outcome;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.3. Calculation of leakage.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.17. Have the PDs developed and described the monitoring plan for the proposed project activity in accordance with the	CDM project standard for project activities §78	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
selected methodology(ies) and all other applicable rules and requirements?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §117				
B.7.1.18. Does the monitoring plan include all data, parameters and related information required by the selected methodology(ies)?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118a-ii ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.1.19. Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118b	DR	Yes	OK	OK
B.7.2. Sampling plan					
B.7.2.1. Are the data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 of the PDD determined by a sampling approach?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §29e CDM Guideline: Sampling and	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities				
B.7.2.2. If the data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 of the PDD are to be determined by a sampling approach, has the PD provided a description of the sampling plan in accordance with the recommended outline for a sampling plan in the latest applicable version of “Standard for Sampling and Surveys for CDM Project Activities and Programme of Activities”?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §29 §30 §31 §32 §33	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.3. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, does the sampling plan present a reasonable approach for obtaining unbiased, reliable estimates of the variables?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40a	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.4. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, are the elements of objectives and reliability requirements complete?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	activities §40a-i				
B.7.2.5. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, do the requirements specified agree with those stated in the appropriate standards?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40a-i	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.6. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the population in the sampling plan clearly defined?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40b	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.7. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the proposed sampling approach clear?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40c	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.8. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, does the sampling approach comply with the description of the population?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40c-ii	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.2.9. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the proposed sample size adequate to achieve the minimum confidence/precision requirements?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.10. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the ex-ante estimate of the population variance needed for the calculation of the sample size adequately justified?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40d	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.11. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the sample representative of the population?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40e	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.12. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is it identified how the sampling frame would be kept?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40e-ii	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.13. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, are the methods of data collection clear and unambiguous?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	activities and programmes of activities §40f-i				
B.7.2.14. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, are the procedures for the data measurements defined appropriately and clearly?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.15. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, do the procedures for measurements adequately provide for minimizing non-sampling errors?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.16. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, is the quality control and assurance strategy adequate?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g-i	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.7.2.17. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, are the proposed skill sets, qualifications and experience of the personnel to be engaged to conduct sampling adequate?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	activities §40h-i				
B.7.3. Other elements of monitoring plan					
B.7.3.1. Has the operational and management structure been given in the monitoring plan to monitor emission reductions and any leakage generated by the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82a	DR	Organization chart provided	OK	OK
B.7.3.2. Has the PD clearly indicated the responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82c	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C. Duration and crediting period		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
C.1. Duration of project					
C.1.1. Start date of project					
		DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
C.1.2. Expected operational lifetime of project		This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.			
C.2. Crediting period of project					
C.2.1. Start date of crediting period					
C.2.1.1. Is the start date of the crediting period of the project activity given in DD/MM/YYYY format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.1.2. Have the PDs determined only one start date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation of the proposed project activity?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §89	DR	Yes	OK	OK
C.2.1.3. Has the PDs used any qualifications to the start date, such as “expected”?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §90	DR	No	OK	OK
C.2.2. Total length of crediting period					
C.2.2.1. Is the length of the crediting period of the proposed project activity stated in years and months under section C.2.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
D. Summary of Safeguarding Principles and Gender Sensitive Assessment					
D.1. Safeguarding principles that will be monitored					
D.1.1. Has the safeguarding principles that will be monitored been summarized including the mitigation measures added to the monitoring plan? Have the PDs carried out an analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts following the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please revise SDG impact tool after other CARs are corrected.	CAR-9	OK
D.1.2. Are all the safeguarding principles stated?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.3. Are all the relevant assessment questions included pertaining to the safeguarding principles?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.4. Is the relevance of the principle cited correctly (Yes/potentially/no)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.1.5. Is proper justification for the safeguarding principle indicated?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
D.2. Assessment that project complies with 'gender sensitive' requirements					
D.2.1. Has the evidence been provided that the project concept and design cover the overall societal context from a gender perspective?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.2. Does the project reflect the key issues and requirements of Gender Sensitive design and implementation as outlined in the Gender Policy?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.3. Has it been explained how the project align with existing country policies, strategies and best practices?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.4. Has an expert been involved for the Gender Safeguarding Principles & Requirements, where required?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
D.2.5. Has it been explained how the project address the questions raised in the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
D.2.6. Does the project apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.					
E. Summary of Local Stakeholder Consultation					
E.1. Summary of stakeholder mitigation measures					
E.2. Final continuous input / grievance mechanism					
E.2.1. Has the relevant methods and all details of chosen methods been provided in the related tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide evidence on the complimentary stakeholder consultation dated 01/09/2022 and the current logbook	CL-4	OK
E.2.2. Has the following been provided as the mandatory methods as part of the final continuous input / grievance mechanism	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
E.2.2.1. Continuous input / grievance expression process book	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
E.2.2.2. GS contact	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. Forward action requests (FARs) identified during previous verification and/or design change review					
F.1.1. Are there any FARs from the previous verification and/or design change review, if applicable, stages?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §36	DR	Please provide final version of Performance Review by GS If there are any FARs in the review, please discuss them in PDD.	CL-5	OK
	DR				
Appendix-1 Safeguarding principles assessment					
1. Has the safeguarding principles assessment been completed for each principle using the relevant tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
2. Has the justification of relevance for the related safeguarding principles assessment been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
3. If the respond is yes for the justification of relevance, has all relevant requirements from the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements document been included in the tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
4. If the respond is no or potentially for the justification of relevance, has this been justified clearly and adequately?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
Appendix-2 Contact information of project developers					
1. Is the contact information of PDs provided in Appendix 2?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Yes	OK	OK
Appendix 3- LUF additional information					
1. In case of land use and forest projects, has the additional information been provided in Appendix-3?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
Appendix-4 Summary of approved design changes					
1. If applicable, is the summary of the approved design changes been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
<p>CAR-1</p> <p>a) Please revise EF with 2020 final data and update PDD (including B.6)</p> <p>b) The sum of D11 and D16 do not match with D15 in excel, please adjust.</p> <p>The sum of L11 and L16 do not match with L15 in excel, please adjust.</p>	<p>3 B.6.2</p>	<p>a) There is already used EF with 2020 final data in the PDD.(including B.6) PP has already shared new PDD with VVB on 13/10/2022 via email.</p> <p>b) As you know PP has to rounddown of the sum value. That's why PP has used rounddown value for D15 and L15. There is no changes in ER and PDD.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>a) OK Closed (EF revised).</p> <p>b) OK Closed (Round down used).</p>
<p>CAR-2</p> <p>a) Please revise footnote 1 format</p> <p>b) Please revise indice of "8 MWeI"</p> <p>c) Footnote 8 is not working</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>a) It is correct but not clear for PP. ??</p> <p>b) There is already 8 MWe in the PDD.</p> <p>c) It has been revised accordingly</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>a) OK Closed (Corrected).</p> <p>b) OK Closed (Corrected).</p> <p>c) OK Closed (Corrected).</p>
<p>CAR-3</p>	<p>B.1.2</p>	<p>a) It has been revised as version07.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
<p>a) Please revise version of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", Version 06.0.0"</p> <p>b) In PDD B1, please refer to "Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period"</p> <p>c) "Demonstration of additionality of small scale project activities Version 10.0" is not the most up to date version</p>		<p>b) It has added under section B.1.2 of the PDD</p> <p>c) Demonstration of additionality of small scale project activities Version is has changed as 13.1.</p>	<p>a) OK Closed (Revised).</p> <p>b) OK Closed (added).</p> <p>c) OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-4</p> <p>In applicability conditions, please revise statement "Solar power plants with reservoirs that satisfy at least one of the following conditions are eligible to apply this methodology:"</p>	B.2.1	<p>It has changed as "The power plants with reservoirs that satisfy at least one of the following conditions are eligible to apply this methodology:" in the PDD.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-5</p> <p>Please revise sentence "Income occurring from electricity sales (sole income except</p>	B.5.2	<p>It has revised as "Income occurring from electricity sales (sole income except carbon revenues) is 1.16. times the net income and</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
carbon revenues) is 116.09 times the net income and overall expenses (including depreciation costs) make up to 16.09 times the net income”		overall expenses (including depreciation costs) make up to 16.09 times the net income”	
<p>CAR-6</p> <p>a) Please revise “SGK records with “social security records”</p> <p>b) “The project’s contribution is done through training and awareness raising of local people and setting good example by investing to the climate friendly technology.” Not related to SDG13, please revise.</p> <p>c) Please remove duplication of “The project contributes to the following indicators 8.5.2 “Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities” and following target: “8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities,</p>	B.6.1	<p>a) It has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>b) It has deleted from SDG13 under section B.6.1 of the PDD</p> <p>c) It has revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>a) OK Closed (Revised).</p> <p>b) OK Closed (Revised).</p> <p>c) OK Closed (Revised).</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
and equal pay for work of equal value” The target will be monitored by the number of full-time employees with the SGK records during the verification process. Because of the social conditions of the project area, employment of woman and persons with disabilities is not possible.”			
<p>CAR-7</p> <p>a)PDD states that “The project provides employment to 8 people during the operation phase” however 5 people are employed, please revise.</p> <p>b)Please revise footnote 18-19-20</p>	B.6.3	<p>a) It has been revised as “The project provides employment to 5 people during the operation phase”.</p> <p>b) These footnotes have been already revised on last PDD. PP has already shared new PDD with VVB on 13/10/2022 via email.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>a-b)OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-8</p> <p>Meter change document is provided however changed meter does not appear in PDD (1047 instead of 1373)</p>	B.7.1.9	The changed meter has appeared in PDD (as 1047 instead of 1373) now.	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-9</p>	D.1	The SDG Impact Tool has been already revised and shared with VVB on 13/10/2022 via email	<p>Review 1:</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Please revise SDG impact tool after other CARs are corrected.			OK Closed (Revised).
CL-1 Please provide Technical specifications of modules and invertors	A.3	Technical specifications of modules and invertors have been already provided under section A.3 of the PDD.	Review 1: OK Closed (References provided).
CL-2 Please provide GS ODA Declaration Form	A.5	The GS ODA Declaration Form has been provided to the VVB	Review 1: OK Closed (Provided).
CL-3 Please provide feasibility report for reference Please provide license and connection agreement.	B.5	Feasibility report and connection agreement have been provided to the VVB. But there is no license is here.	Review 1: OK Closed (Provided).
CL-4	E.2	The related e-mail and current logbook photo has been provided to the VVB	Review 1: OK Closed (Provided).

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Please provide evidence on the complimentary stakeholder consultation dated 01/09/2022 and the current logbook			
<p>CL-5</p> <p>Please provide final version of Performance Review by GS</p> <p>If there are any FARs in the review, please discuss them in PDD.</p>	F.1	<p>The final version of Performance Review by GS has already shared with VVB via email on 3/11/2022.</p> <p>FAR is as below but there is no section or place to add this FAR under PDD. This will be provided in MR during next verification.</p> <p>“The PD should ensure that the grievance book is accessible by all. Accessibility of the grievance book by all should be checked by the VVB during the next verification.” PP response: Yes, the grievance book is accessible by all and Accessibility of the grievance book by a checked by the VVB during the last verification and this revalidation site visit.</p> <p>..</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (FAR will be discussed in VR).</p>
CAR-10		The baseline emissions values has added an integer value in the column E of the ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Please include the baseline emissions values as an integer value in the column E of the ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.			
<p>CAR-11</p> <p>Please clarify the data available in the rows J10-J17, L10-L17 and M10-M17 of ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.</p>		The ER Calculation excelsheet has been revised accordingly.	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-12</p> <p>Please correct the typo in the B18 cell of the ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.</p>		The typo mistake has corrected as "Reduction" in the B18 cell of the ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-13</p> <p>Please include the units in the D10,E10,F10 and G10 cells of ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.</p>		The units have been added as tCO2 in the D10,E10,F10 and G10 cells of ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
<p>CAR-14</p> <p>Please remove the expected term in the last row of Table-7 of Section B.5 of the PDD.</p>		<p>The expected term has been removed in the last row of Table-7 of Section B.5 of the PDD.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>
<p>CAR-15</p> <p>In PDD, please clarify about the status of ERs and carbon credits from the start date of second CP (2017) to the submission of the project to GS (2022)</p>		<p>The carbon credits of 2017 and 2018 has sold and other remaining volume will be sold soon. The related OFN excel sheet and PDDhas already included all financial information.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Explained).</p>
<p>CAR-16</p> <p>Please correct the SDG-13 values in SDG Impact Tool in line with the ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet</p>		<p>The SDG-13 values have been corrected in SDG Impact Tool and all of them in line with the ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet now.</p>	<p>Review 1:</p> <p>OK Closed (Revised).</p>

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