GS PROJECT RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD VALIDATION REPORT

Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.

Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey

IN

TURKEY

PROJECT NUMBER: 1083

Organizational Unit:	Re Carbon Ltd.		
Project Title:	Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey		
Project Number:	**Client:**		**Current PDD Version:**
1083	Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş.		04
Date of First Issue:	**Date of Current Version:**	**Version Number:**	**Number of Pages:**
07/08/2023	08/02/2024	03	87

Summary:

Host Country: Turkey

Project is Reviewed Against:

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

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

Methodology: ACM0002 **Version:** 21.0

Project Developers:

Average Annual Emission Reduction Estimate in the 3rd Crediting Period: 97,481 tCO_2e

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

Registry Number:	Crediting Period Renewal No:	Crediting Period Start Date:
GS672	☐1st ☒ 2nd	11/08/2023

Validation Stages:

☒ Desk Review ☒ Site Visit ☒ Follow-up Interviews

☒ Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Validation Findings: During the validation 28 Corrective Action Requests and 02 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.

In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey" in Turkey, as described in the PDD, version 04 and dated 06/02/2024, meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM, GS and all relevant host Party criteria and correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002, version 21.0. Hence, Re Carbon Ltd. requests the renewal of crediting period of this registered GS project activity.

Validation Team Leader:	Sandeep KANDA	Indexing Terms:
Validation Team Members:	İrem TAŞKIRAN (Trainee Validator)	☒No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit
Approved By (Technical Reviewer):	Name: Fikriye Seda ATABEK	Signature:  ☐ Limited Distribution ☐ Unrestricted Distribution

Abbreviations

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the 3rd crediting period validation of the "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey" in "Turkey" between 03/05/2023 and 08/02/2024. 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 "Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş." to perform the crediting period renewal validation of the "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey" in Turkey through a contract dated 23.03.2023. The objective of this validation activity is to have an independent third party for the assessment of the project and to ensure that the selected baseline, estimated emission reductions and monitoring plan is still in line with the applied methodologies and the applicable CDM and GS4GG requirements. In particular;

- the project's baseline is assessed against "ACM0002: Grid connected electricity generation from renewable electricity generation - Version 21.0"
- the project's monitoring plan is assessed against "ACM0002: Grid connected electricity generation from renewable electricity generation - Version 21.0"
- Tool: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period version 3.0.1
- the projects compliance with the requirements of Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM Modalities and Procedures as agreed in the Marrakech Accords under decision 3/CMP.1, the annexes to this decision, subsequent decisions and guidance made by COP/MOP & CDM Executive Board and other relevant rules, including the Host Country legislation and sustainability criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0
- CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0
- GS4GG version 1.2 and 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 3rd crediting period. The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see Section 2.1) and decisions by the CDM Executive Board, including the approved baseline and monitoring methodology. The validation was based on the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0 and GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

The validation team employed a risk-based approach to assess the completeness and accuracy of the claims and conservativeness of the assumptions in the PDD. The main focus of the validation team is to determine if the identified baseline is still applicable to the project activity, if the estimated emission reductions for the 3rd 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

Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. has installed a 51.5 MWm / 51.5 MWewind power plant in Aşağıkırıklar Village in Bergama District of İzmir Province in Turkey. The purpose of the project is to generate electricity and to feed it into the public grid. Project activity is connected to the Turkish national grid.

The first crediting period start date of the project stated in the registered PDD is 11/08/2009 with choice of renewable crediting period. The second crediting period start date was 11/08/2016. The PDD submitted for second renewal indicates the second renewable crediting period start date as 11/08/2023.

It consists of GE 2.5-100 and GE 2.75-100 wind turbines with a rated output of 2.5 MW and 2.75 MW, hub height 85 meters and rotor diameter of 100 meters. There are 20 wind turbines in total in the validation process. The annual net electricity production is expected to be 152,900 MWh per year.

The net electricity will be measured continuously by two main electricity meters at the grid interface and will be recorded monthly. There is also two back-up electricity meters. The meters used are in line with the regulatory requirements for electricity meters.

First index date of the electricity meters is 04/03/2016. The technical details of the electricity meters are as follows:

First metering point (A)

	Primary Meter	**Secondary Meter**
Brand/Model	EMH	EMH
Serial Number	11590286	8088829
Accuracy of Meters	0.2S	0.2S
First Index Date	28/08/2022	08/12/2019
Calibration Date	08/2032	12/2029
Test Dates	28/08/2022	24/10/2020 28/02/2022

Second metering point (B)

	Primary Meter	Secondary Meter
Brand/Model	EMH	EMH
Serial Number	11590287	8088830
Accuracy of Meters	0.2S	0.2S
First Index Date	28/08/2022	08/12/2019
Calibration Date	08/2032	12/2029
Test Dates	28/08/2022	24/10/2020 28/02/2022

The calibration documents (i.e. first index protocol) dated 28/08/2022 and 08/12/2019 has been provided by the project owner. Also, the meter tests dated 28/08/2022, 28/02/2022 and 24/10/2020 have been provided by the project owner. The technical features of the electricity meters were confirmed by the validation team via these documents.

The electricity meters have been controlled and maintained by the grid owner. EPIAS records will be used as the source of net generated electricity value and meter reading forms or OSF forms issued by TEIAS will be used for the crosscheck.

2.4. Parties Involved

The PDD submitted for second renewal of crediting period indicates Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. as the project participant 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 03/05/2023 and 08/02/2024.
- Assessment whether the applied ACM0002, Version 21.0, in the revised PDD was applied correctly, including the baseline selection and monitoring plan.
- A remote site visit was conducted on 03/05/2023 in order to assess the implementation process of the project activity and to confirm stakeholders' comments.
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions.
- Issuance of the renewal of crediting period validation report
- Independent technical review (ITR)
- Approval of the validation report and request of renewal of crediting period

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

The Validation Protocol consists of two tables:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. Validation Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the validation team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and the related host country experience required amongst team members for the accurate and thorough assessment of the project design. The relevant GS validation and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and the Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The validation team and ITR were assigned to this validation activity on 16.03.2023 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*
Sandeep KANDA	Team Leader	☒	☒	☒	☐	A, DR, R, RA
İrem TAŞKIRAN	Trainee Validator	☒	☒	☒	☐	A, DR, R, RA
Fikriye Seda ATABEK	ITR	☒	☒	☒	☐	ITR

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

A : Administrative
DR : Desk Review
SV : Site Visit
RA : Remote Assessment[1]
R : Reporting
ITR : Independent Technical Review

1 The physical site visit was not executed. Instead of that, alternative means like a remote inspection is handled by the Validation Team carrying out the same activities as in a physical on-site inspection through information and communication technologies (ICT) tools, including but not limited to the following: Teleconference/video or other online meetings, Interviews with relevant stakeholders, local authorities, project participants, persons responsible for data collections, end user and/or beneficiaries of the Project, Photographic evidence (e.g. project site and the equipment associated with the project) and/or video recordings, Satellite images, where possible, Checking relevant documents and/or other publicly available information.

3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents

The basis for the crediting period renewal validation activity is the PDD version 01, dated 22/03/2023 which was submitted to the validation team on 03/05/2023. This PDD was revised several times due to the raised CARs and CLs, version 04 dated 06/02/2024 being the final version. The PDD was assessed against;

- ACM0002: Grid connected electricity generation from renewable electricity generation - Version 21.0
- the Host Country criteria
- CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0,
- CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0
- GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements
  and other relevant documents, rules and regulations listed in section 2.1 of this report

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

3.3. Site Visits

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

Table 3-4: Site visit details

Date	03/05/2023	
Location	Online (Remote)	
Participant	**Company Name**	**Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit**
Ece KANBUR	GTE Consultancy	Consultant
İrem TAŞKIRAN	Re-carbon	VV Trainee
Sandeep KANDA	Re-carbon	Team Leader
Şahin GÜNBAY	Ütopya Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	Business Manager
Mitat ÖZDEMİR	Aşağıkırıklar Village	Resident-Male
Necla KÖŞE	Aşağıkırıklar Village	Resident-Female
Mehmet AROL	Aşağıkırıklar Village	Resident-Male
Cengiz KAYOL	Aşağıkırıklar Village	Resident-Male
Vedat AKGÜREN	Aşağıkırıklar Village	Resident-Male
Levent KAVUNCU	Fiba Enerji	HSE Manager
Ataberk KERPİÇÇİ	Fiba Enerji	Carbon Project Manager
Esra ÖZ	Fiba Enerji	Business Development Specialist

Points Verified	**Source of Information**
Implementation and operation of the proposed GS project activity as per the registered PDD	Document review, online (remote)-site visit and interviews with PP (Ütopya Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.) representatives and consultant
Review of information flows for generating, aggregating and reporting the monitoring parameters	Document review, online (remote)-site visit and interviews with PP representatives and consultant
Interviews with relevant personnel to confirm that the operational and data collection procedures are implemented in accordance with the monitoring plan in the PDD including sustainable development goal (SDG) parameters	Interviews with PP representatives and local stakeholders during online site visit
Cross-check between information provided in the monitoring report and data from other sources such as plant log	Document review and online-site visit

books, inventories, purchase records or similar data sources	
Check of the monitoring equipment including calibration performance and observations of monitoring practices against the requirements of the PDD and the selected methodology	Document review, online (remote)-site visit and interviews with the PP representatives, consultant and local stakeholders
Review of calculations and assumptions made in determining the GHG data and emission reductions	Document review
Identification of quality control and quality assurance procedures in place to prevent or identify and correct any errors or omissions in the reported monitoring parameters	Document review and interviews with PP representatives and consultant during online (remote)-site visit.
Implementation and operation of the proposed GS project activity as per the registered PDD	Document review, online (remote)-site visit and interviews with PP (Ütopya Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.) representatives and consultant

During the online (remote) site visit, the headman of the Aşağıkırıklar Village was interviewed and it was stated that there were no complaints from the local stakeholders. The signed declaration that there are no complaints has been received by mukhtar has been provided to VVB.

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 28 CARs, 02 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 remote 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	3.05.2023	7.08.2023	97
Review of the PDD version 01	3.05.2023	31.05.2023	29
Site Visit	3.05.2023	3.05.2023	1
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Protocol version 01	31.05.2023	19.06.2023	20
Review of PDs Initial Set of Responses	19.06.2023	24.07.2023	36
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Protocol version 02	24.07.2023	26.07.2023	3
Review of PDs Second Loop Responses	26.07.2023	1.08.2023	7
Closing of all the CARs and CLs	26.07.2023	1.08.2023	7
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Report version 01	7.08.2023	7.08.2023	1
ITR Process	7.08.2023	9.08.2023	3
Issuance of the Renewal of Crediting Period Validation Report version 02	8.08.2023	9.08.2023	2
Submission for Final Approval	9.08.2023	10.08.2023	2
Submission to the PD	10.08.2023	10.08.2023	1
Revisions based on GS review comments round 1	6.02.2024	8.02.2024	3

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 Project Developer along with the relevant documents.

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS

4.1. Baseline Scenario

The project activity was earlier registered using the methodology ACM0002, Version 17.0 for the second crediting period. The PD has been updated using the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002 version 21.0. All the applicability conditions of the methodology have been justified appropriately in the revised PD, version 04 and dated as 06/02/2024.

There has been no significant change in the relevant policies and circumstances which would impact the baseline scenario since 02/051/2016 (date of second crediting period's final registered PDD) 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 07; "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system"".

Further, the emission coefficient 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 emission coefficient in the earlier PDD was 0.5612 tCO2/MWh with 0.75 and 0.25 weightage factor given to 'operating margin' and 'build margin' respectively. The emission coefficient in the updated PDD is 0.6376 tCO2/MWh[2] with 0.75 and 0.25 weightage factor given to 'operating margin' and 'build margin' respectively. The data for calculation of emission coefficient has been taken from the Turkish Electricity Transmission Company (TEIAS). TEIAS is the national electricity transmission company, which makes available the official data of all power plants in Turkey. The decrease in the emission coefficient is an indicative that more renewable based power is getting added to the grid.

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

The project activity was earlier registered using the methodology ACM0002 version 17.0. The PDD has been updated using the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002 version 21.0. The PPs 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 second renewal of the crediting period.

2

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

The methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources is applicable to grid-connected renewable power generation project activities that;

a) install a Greenfield power plant,
b) involve a capacity addition to (an) existing plant(s),
c) involve a retrofit of (an) existing operating plants/units,
d) involve a rehabilitation of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s),
e) involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s)/unit(s).

The project activity installs a grid- connected greenfield power plant, ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources is applicable. The choice of methodology ACM0002, Version 21.0 is justified as the proposed project activity meets relevant applicability criteria.

The project activity applies approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology "ACM0002 version 21.0: "Grid connected electricity generation from renewable electricity generation" and the associated tools:

- Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 07.0
- Tool 07: Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, Version 07.0
- 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

According to ACM0002 version 21.0, the latest approved tools shall be referenced in the PDD like, "Tool 01: Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" (version 07.0), "Tool 07: Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (Version 07), and "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" which are the latest versions of the mentioned tools valid at the starting time and the above tools are applied to the GS-PDD. Therefore, it could be concluded that the title, version, and reference of the methodology including the associated tools are correct and valid.

4.3. Monitoring

The monitoring plan has been revised in the updated PDD as per the applied methodology ACM0002, Version 21.0. The emission coefficient of the grid has been fixed ex-ante and will not be updated during the 1st renewable crediting period.

The only monitoring parameter is the amount of electricity fed into the grid by Düzova Wind Power Plant. This value will be monitored continuously by redundant metering devices, one of them being the main one Bergama-Ayvalık transmission line substation, with double circuit 795MCM overhead transmission line and the generated electricity will be supplied to Turkey's national electricity grid which provides the data for the monthly invoicing to EPİAŞ.

SDG13: Climate Action and SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy: According to ACM0002 version 21.0, one of the parameters required to be monitored is "net electricity supplied by the proposed project to the grid in year y, $EG_{pj,facility,y}$ 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. The meter reading records provided to the company by EPİAŞ (which is one of the TEIAS association) will be used as the main source for the quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid, and it has been cross checked with TEİAŞ (OSF forms) records.

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

There are four electricity meters, two main meter and two back up meter. 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 meter reading records provided to the company by EPİAŞ will be used as the main source for the quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid, and it has been cross checked with TEİAŞ (OSF forms) records. NOx and SO2 emission data from GHG inventory of Turkey will be used as reference in calculation of the emission reduction. The details about the currently available electricity meter details are as follow as in the table below:

First metering point (A)

Model	Serial Number	Accuracy Class
EMH-LZQJ-XC	Main Meter: 11590286	C (0.2 S)
EMH-LZQJ-XC	Back-up Meter: 8088829	C (0.2 S)

Second metering point (B)

Model	Serial Number	Accuracy Class
EMH-LZQJ-XC	Main Meter: 11590287	C (0.2 S)
EMH-LZQJ-XC	Back-up Meter: 8088830	C (0.2 S)

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. When the meters complete their 10 years after installation, they need to change according to the Regulation of Metering and Testing of Metering Systems”.

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. Expected total emission reduction for the 3rd crediting period is 682,367 tCO2. For NOx, reduction is 1,119.08 tons and for SO_2, reduction is 5.195,45 tons.

SDG 6: Clean Water and Sanitation: Wastewater will be collected in the cesspool and then will be transferred with sewage trucks. The target will be monitored by the disposal records (records of transfer of wastewater from power plant by sewage truck). Also, the project contributes to the following principle:

- **Principle 9.4: Release of pollutants - Water Quality and Quantity:** Disposal, domestic wastewater and solid waste records will be provided to show that all wastes have been collected and disposed properly.

SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth: The project contributes to the following indicator: SDG 8.8. "Protect labor rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment". The target will be monitored by the number of full-time employees with the SGK records and Training (including H&S) & Other Certification during the verification process. The project has created around 8 job opportunities and one of the employees is local. Also, the project contributes to the following principle:

- **Principle 3: Labour Rights - Quantitative employment and income generation/Quality of Employment**: Number of locally recruited staff, number of certificates issued/trainings and their social security records will be monitored.

- **Principle 4.1: Sites of Cultural and Historical Heritage:** Project site is close to the 3rd degree archeological site, near the turbines. Inputs/grievances from the stakeholders and the logbook placed at the village head's office will be monitored.

- **Principle 4.3: Land Tenure and Other Rights:** Expropriation works are continuing for the project site. Many lands have been finalized and some lands have been purchased by the project owner. Deed of consent documents and compensation documents will be monitored.

- **Principle 9.5: Hazardous and Non-hazardous Waste –Other Pollutants:** Waste oil disposal records will be monitored.

- **Principle 9.9: Animal Welfare – Biodiversity:** Assigned personnel will record their observations and report. Site observations and ornithology reports will be monitored.

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 ACM0002 version 21.0. According to the submitted documents to VVB and documents from GS sustainCERT, there are no FARs issued. All related safeguarding principles have been included in the assessment.

By document review and remote 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.

Ongoing Financial Need:

Past VERs have supported the project's ongoing financial sustainability. The Project Owner did not profit as anticipated from carbon revenue because to both poor demand for VERs and a significant drop in pricing. Even though the sales prices were much lower than those anticipated at the time of investment, the VERs that were sold contributed to the project's ongoing financial viability. The project's VER revenue is mostly utilized to pay the project activity's operating expenses. In 2026, the YEK-DEM mechanism was expired, which provides fixed electricity selling tariff for the first 10 years of operation. Therefore, during the second crediting period, the project will need revenue from GS VERs more than ever. With the end of YEK-DEM mechanism, the electricity tariff will not be fixed therefore, the revenue from the electricity selling will be determined by the fluctuating market conditions.

The project is not financially attractive. Therefore, carbon revenues are crucial for the project. The income of the GS VER is very important for the financial performance of the project and GSVERs price has been increased. So, the results of the financial analysis still same for the project, with the decision to go ahead was made 7 years ago, both with and without VER financing. This therefore indicates that in comparison to alternative investments, the Project was still financially unattractive in the absence of VER financing. VVB approves that PP currently needs credits to financially support the project.

Double Counting:

VVB has checked the I-REC Registry (https://register.evident.global/device-register), wherein 442 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.

It is confirmed that project activity shall not be double counted, not included in any other voluntary or compliance standards program and the relevant sealed-signed declaration is provided from the project owner.

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 v1.5 template dated 29.06.2023 and approved version of the methodology ACM0002 version 21.0, and "Tool 07: Tool to calculate the emission factor of an electricity system" Version 07.0.0. The baseline emissions are calculated based on the combined emission factor multiplied by the expected net electricity generation (152,900 MW/year), which amounts to 97,481 ton CO_2 per annum.

Emission factor had been calculated in line with the selected methodology, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources document named as "Turkey's National Electricity Network Emission Factor Factsheet, EF of wind and solar plants"[3] and Tool 07. As per the Tool 07 "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system", for the third crediting period, the build margin emission factor calculated for the second crediting period should be used. Operational margin value was taken from the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources 2020 calculations (most recent value). Build margin has been calculated according to the weighing factors stated in the methodology and Tool 07. As conclusion combined margin calculated as 0.6376.

EFgrid,CM,y = 0.7424 x 0.75 + 0.3230 x 0.25 = 0.6376 tCO2/MWh

BEy = 152,900 MWh × 0.6376 tCO2e/MWh = 97,481 tCO2e

As the proposed project activity is a new grid-connected Wind power plant. For this reason, PE_y is considered as "0" in line with ACM0002 Version 21.0

There are no project emissions or leakage emissions associated with the wind power project. Thus, the emission reductions correspond to the baseline emissions and the project is expected to result in an annual average emission reduction of 97,481 tCO_2e/year during the third crediting period. Total estimated emission reduction for the crediting period is 682,367 tCO2.

$ER_y = BE_y – PE_y – LE_y$

$LE_y = 0$, $PE_y = 0$

$ER_y = BE_y = 682,367$ tCO2

3

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

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[4]	Full Name	Title	Organization
I01	SV	Ataberk KERPİÇÇİ	Carbon Project Manager	Fiba Enerji
I02	SV	Esra ÖZ	Business Development Specialist	Fiba Enerji
I03	SV	Ece KANBUR	Consultant	GTE Consultancy
I04	SV	Levent KAVUNCU	HSE Manager	Fiba Enerji
I05	SV	Şahin GÜNBAY	Business Manager	Ütopya Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.
I06	SV	Mitat ÖZDEMİR	Resident-Male	Aşağıkırıklar Village
I07	SV	Necla KÖŞE	Resident-Female	Aşağıkırıklar Village
I08	SV	Mehmet AROL	Resident-Male	Aşağıkırıklar Village
I09	SV	Cengiz KAYOL	Resident-Male	Aşağıkırıklar Village
I10	SV	Vedat AKGÜREN	Resident-Male	Aşağıkırıklar Village

[4] 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	ACM0002	21.0	02/11/2022
D02	Düzova WPP PDD	V01	22/03/2023
D03	Emission Reduction Excel Sheet	V1	03/05/2023
D04	SDG Impact Tool	V1	03/05/2023
D05	Training Records	-	13/12/2021 24/12/2021 27/12/2021
D06	Generation License	-	03/05/2007
D07	One-Line Diagram	-	03/05/2023
D08	Provisional Acceptance (T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6)	-	11/08/2009
D09	Provisional Acceptance (T7, T8, T9, T10, T11, T12, T13, T14, T15, T16)	-	03/09/2010
D10	Provisional Acceptance (T17, T18, T19, T20)	-	21/03/2014
D11	Capacity increase of turbines (T7, T9, T10, T15, T16)	-	12/02/2013
D12	Capacity increase of turbines (T13, T14, T17, T18, T19, T20)	-	06/11/2015
D13	Meter Change/First Index Protocol	-	08/12/2019 28/08/2022
D14	Calibration of Meters	-	08/12/2019 28/08/2022
D15	Meter Tests	-	28/08/2022 24/10/2020
D16	Social Security Records	-	19/06/2023
D17	Connection Agreement	-	12/11/2015
D18	System Usage Agreement	-	10/03/2016
D19	EIA Approval	-	02/12/2014
D20	Social Security Records	-	2023
D21	Logbook	-	31/03/2023
D22	Düzova WPP PDD	V02	19/06/2023
D23	Emission Reduction Excel Sheet	V2	19/06/2023

Document Number	Document Name	Version	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)
D24	Düzova WPP PDD	V03	26/07/2023
D25	Emission Reduction Excel Sheet	V3	26/07/2023
D26	Declaration Letter	-	19/06/2023
D27	Design Certification	-	22/11/2010
D28	Waste records	-	25/02/2019 24/12/2021 04/01/2022 04/03/2022
D29	Düzova WPP PDD	V03	06/02/2024
D30	3-week Issuance Review Period of 2nd Monitoring Period of 1st CP	-	12/02/2021
D31	SDG Impact Tool	V2	06/02/2024

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK holds B.Sc. degree in "Chemical Engineering" and a M.Sc. degree in "Energy Science and Technology". She is a lead auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and since 2004 has been working in the fields of "Management systems", "ISO 14064" and "Energy Management in Industry". She has been involved in more than 100 GS and VCS projects as an ITR, Team Leader, Validator and Verifier. With re-carbon, Seda is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and a TA 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 & 3.1. expert. Seda is also a Regional Expert for Türkiye and China.

Mr. Sandeep KANDA holds a bachelor's degree in "Mechanical Engineering", a Master's degree in "Energy Systems Engineering" from the Indian Institute of Technology/Bombay and a Post Graduate Diploma in "Industrial Safety & Environmental Management" from the National Institute of Industrial Engineering in India. He has over 20 years of professional experience working in the area of energy and environmental management, capacity building, climate change adaptation and mitigation activities, sustainability, auditing and product development. Sandeep has been involved in various capacities in the development and impact assessment of more than 500 climate change mitigation projects and programmatic activities worldwide, covering a range of sectoral scopes, such as Energy industries (renewable-/non-renewable), Energy distribution, Energy demand, Manufacturing industries, Chemical industries, Transport, Metal production, Waste handling & disposal and Agriculture. With re-carbon, Sandeep is a free-lance Team Leader, ITR and a TA 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 9.1, 9.2, 13.1, 13.2 & 15.1 expert. Sandeep is also a Regional Expert for China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nepal, Philippines, Tanzania, Thailand, Türkiye and Vietnam.

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

7.1. Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

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

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

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

This Appointment Certificate is granted on the date of **26.07.2023** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mrs. Fikriye Seda Atabek

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

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation	26.07.2023	26.07.2023			26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023
	TA 1.2: Renewables	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	08.02.2022	08.02.2022			08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023	26.07.2023										
	TA 1.2: Renewables	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022	07.07.2022										
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye,China

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

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 **08.03.2023** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Sandeep Kanda

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

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
	TA 13.2: Manure	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022	08.02.2022

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

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nepal, Philippines, Tanzania, Thailand, Türkiye and Vietnam

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

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 **28.02.2023** by:

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Ms. İrem Taşkıran

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

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

SECTORAL SCOPE	TECHNICAL AREA	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT	VERIFIER	VALIDATOR	TEAM LEADER	ITR	EXPERT
SS 01: Energy industries	TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
	TA 1.2: Renewables					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 02: Energy distribution	TA 2.1: Energy distribution					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 03: Energy demand	TA 3.1: Energy demand					09.11.2022					09.11.2022					09.11.2022
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1: Solid waste and wastewater															
	TA 13.2: Manure															
SS 16: Agriculture	TA 16.1: Agriculture															

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Türkiye (28.02.2023)

F-C-044 / 23.01.2023 - 00

8. VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. performed the 3rd crediting period validation of the "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey" in "Turkey" between 03/05/2023 and 09/08/2023. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation was performed by a validation team consisting of "Sandeep KANDA as team leader, İrem TAŞKIRAN as Trainee Validator and Fikriye Seda ATABEK as ITR", and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0 and GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

Re Carbon Ltd. hereby confirms that the proposed project activity "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey" in "Turkey", has applied all relevant EB-guidance as the selected baseline and monitoring methodologies and the associated methodological tools have been applied correctly. The total emission reductions from the project are estimated to be around 97,481.00 tCO_2e per annum over the 3rd crediting period. 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 "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey" in "Turkey", as described in the PDD 04, dated 06/02/2024.

- meets all relevant Host Country criteria;
- meets all relevant requirements of the GS4GG, UNFCCC for CDM project activities [including Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the Modalities and Procedures for CDM (Marrakesh Accords) and the subsequent decisions and guidance by the COP/MOP and the CDM Executive Board];
- applies correctly the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 21.0;
- is likely to achieve estimated emission reductions;

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

Sandeep KANDA	Fikriye Seda ATABEK	Esin TUNALI
Team Leader	ITR	Certification Manager
09/08/2023	09/08/2023	08/02/2024

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

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

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
Cover Page-Key Project Information					
1. Has the following information been indicated in the cover page of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please correct the layout of the KPI table on the cover page. b) Please correct the upper header of the monitoring report. c) Please correct any statements from "Uluborlu" project since this PDD belongs to Düzova WPP project (footnotes, milestone table-2, section D.1). d) Please revise all "Türkiye" statements to "Turkey".	CAR-1	**OK**
1.1. GS ID of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	The GS ID of the project is available as "GS672".	OK	OK
1.2. Title of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey".	OK	OK
1.3. Time of first submission date	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please indicate the time of first submission date in KPI section.	CAR-2	**OK**
1.4. Date of design certification	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide the design certification document dated 22/11/2010.	CL-1	**OK**
1.5. Version number of the PDD	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Version of the PDD is 01.	OK	OK
1.6. Completion date of version	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as "22/03/2023".	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
1.7. Project developer	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Project developer is indicated as "GTE KARBON SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR ENERJİ EĞİTİM DANIŞMANLIK VE TİC. AŞ (Project Developer)".	OK	OK
1.8. Project representative	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Project representative indicated as "Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. (Project Owner)".	OK	OK
1.9. Project developers and any communities involved	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as "1-Ütopya Elektrik Üretim Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş. (Project Owner), 2-GTE KARBON SÜRDÜRÜLEBİLİR ENERJİ EĞİTİM DANIŞMANLIK VE TİC. AŞ (Project Developer)".	OK	OK
1.10. Host country (ies)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Host country is Turkey.	OK	OK
1.11. Activity requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Activity requirements applied is "Renewable Energy Activities".	OK	OK
1.12. Scale of the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Scale of the project activity is large.	OK	OK
1.13. Other requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.14. Methodology (ies) applied and version number	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Applied methodology is "ACM0002, "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 21.0".	OK	OK
1.15. Product requirements applied	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available as "GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration".	OK	OK
1.16. Project cycle	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please mark the "Project cycle" of the project activity in KPI section.	CAR-3	**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	a) Please re-evaluate the SDG 6, since the requirements for SDG 6 also available in safeguarding principles. b) Please correct the employee number according to the interview remote site visit. c) Please check the NO_x and SO_2 values and indicate them in ER Excel Sheet.	CAR-4	**OK**
A. Description of Project					
A.1. Purpose and general description of project					
1. Is the scenario existing prior to the implementation of the project activity including, where applicable, the type of facility where the project activity will take place or replace, described in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please correct the "…through 7 years of first crediting period in total" statement in section A.1 since this is the 3rd crediting period. b) Please specify the turbine numbers according to their commissioned dates in milestone table in section A.1. c) Please provide the validation reports for the 1st and 2nd crediting period. d) Please indicate the EIA approval date in milestone table in section A.1 and provide the evidence document. e) Please identify the baseline scenario with more detail. f) Please briefly describe the design changes in milestone tables, if it is not related with GS design change, please rename the situation. g) Please clarify and correct the Table 2 title cited as Uluborlu WPP.	CAR-5	**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,	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-5.	CAR-5	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
then no need to repeat the description, but it shall be stated in the PDD that both scenarios are the same.)					
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	Estimated annual average and total GHG emission reductions are indicated.	OK	OK
4. Is the purpose of the project activity described including how it contributes to the sustainable development of the Host Party?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Purpose of the project activity is indicated.	OK	OK
A.1.1. Eligibility of the project under Gold Standard		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
		DR	a) Please correct the "Project is a renewable energy (hydro power) installation activity" statement since the project activity is not hydro power. b) Please briefly describe the indicated principles in section A.1.1. c) Please provide the signed and sealed letter from the project owner about double counting for the current monitoring period.	CAR-6	**OK**
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	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide a signed and sealed letter that project activity is not included in any other voluntary or compliance standards program.	CL-2	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
legal rights concerning changes in use of resources required to service the Project for e.g water rights, where applicable?					
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.**			
		DR	Please provide the KMZ document of the project activity.	CAR-7	**OK**
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	a) Please indicate the one-line diagram in section A.3. b) Please indicate the meter technical properties for 2 main and 2 back up meters in tabular format and please indicate the first index date, calibration dates, and meter change dates in section A.3. c) Please provide the first index protocol, calibration protocol and meter tests for current meters. Also please provide the meter change protocols for main meters.	CAR-8	**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	Project activity is large scale.	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	Installed capacity of the project activity is 51.5 Mwe and the generation license of the project activity is provided.	OK	OK
A.5. Funding source of project		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
		DR	a) Please delete the blank page. b) Please provide a signed and sealed letter from the head of the project activity that there is no public founding was used.	CAR-9	**OK**
B. Application of Approved Gold Standard Methodology (ies) and/or Demonstration of SDG Contributions					
B.1. Reference of approved methodology(ies)					
B.1.1. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of the selected methodology(ies) given in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please indicate reference links for applied tools in section B.1. b) Please indicate the tools number in section B.1. c) Please use the latest published versions of tools. d) Please delete the repeated tool.	CAR-10	**OK**
B.1.2. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology(ies) refers to given in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §54	DR	Please refer CAR-10.	CAR-10	**OK**
B.2. Applicability of methodology(ies)					
B.2.1. Has the PDs justified the choice of the selected methodology(ies), if applicable, by showing that the project activity meets each applicability condition of the methodology(ies)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §54 CDM validation and verification standard for	DR	Please indicate all applicability conditions and the relevant justifications for Tool 01 and Tool 11 in Section B.2.	CAR-11	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	project activities §67				
B.2.2. Does the project activity meet each of the applicability conditions of the tools or other methodology components referred to in the applied methodology?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67	DR	Please refer CAR-11.	CAR-11	**OK**
B.2.3. Has the PDs explained the documentation that has been used and provided the references to applicability of methodology?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-11.	CAR-11	**OK**
ACM 0002					
B.2.4. Is the type of proposed project activity defined?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please correct the "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey WPP is a large-scale..." statement.	CAR-12	**OK**
B.2.5. If the proposed project activity is a hydro power plant project, does one of the following conditions conform to the proposed project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.1. Is the proposed project activity implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, with no change in the volume of any of the reservoirs?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.2. Is the project activity implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of the reservoir(s) is increased and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m2?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.3. Is the project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m2?					
B.2.5.4. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PDs demonstrated that water flow from upstream power plants/units spill directly to the downstream reservoir and that collectively constitute to the generation capacity of the integrated hydro power project?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.5.5. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PDs provided an analysis of the water balance covering the water fed to power units, with all possible combinations of reservoirs and without the construction of reservoirs?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project involving multiple reservoirs, where the power density for any of the reservoirs calculated using equation (3) is lower than or equal to 4 W/m2, do all the following conditions conform the project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.1. The power density calculated using the total installed capacity of the integrated project, as per equation (4), is greater than 4 W/m2;	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.2.6.2. Water flow between reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity;	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3. Installed capacity of the power plant(s) with power density lower than or equal to 4 W/m2 shall be:	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3.1. Lower than or equal to 15 MW; and	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.2.6.3.2. Less than 10 per cent of the total installed capacity of integrated hydro power project.	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.3. Project boundary					
B.3.1. Has the PD described the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project emissions and baseline emissions, in the tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please remove the geothermal power plants part of the project boundary table since this is a wind project.	CAR-13	**OK**
B.3.2. Has the PD presented a flow diagram of the project boundary, physically delineating the project activity, based on the description provided in section A.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Flow diagram is available.	OK	OK
B.3.3. Has the PD included in the flow diagram the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described in section A.3 of the PDD, and indicated in the diagram the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary and the data and parameters to be monitored?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
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	The project activity is wind power plant connected to the Turkish national grid.	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	The project activity is wind power plant.	OK	OK
B.3.6. Have all sources and GHGs necessary for the calculation of emissions been included within the project boundary?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §69	DR	Please refer to CAR-13.	CAR-13	**OK**
B.3.7. Does the PDD correctly describe the project boundary and the physical delineation of the proposed project activity?	CDM project standard for project activities §57	DR	It is correctly described.	OK	OK
B.3.8. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to project boundary?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63a	DR	The methodology is correctly applied.	OK	OK
ACM 0002					
B.3.9. Is the spatial extent of the project boundary identified correctly?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	It is correctly described.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.3.10. Are the greenhouse gases and emission sources included in or excluded from the project boundary given in the tabular form as per the guidance given in Table-2 of ACM 0002?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-13.	CAR-13	**OK**
B.4. Establishment and description of the baseline scenario					
B.4.1. Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed GS project prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required? •	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §94 CDM project standard for project activities §59	DR	The baseline scenario is indicated correctly in Section B.4.	OK	OK
B.4.2. Does the PDD identify the baseline for the proposed GS project, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed GS project?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §75 CDM project standard for project activities §61	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.3. If the methodology requires use of the tools to identify the baseline scenario, have all those been applied?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §77	DR	Required tool is applied.	OK	OK
B.4.4. Are there relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario?	CDM validation and verification standard for	DR	Relevant national policies are not identifying the baseline scenario.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	project activities §81 CDM project standard for project activities §64				
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
B.4.9. If the proposed project activity includes several different facilities, technologies,	CDM TOOL01	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
outputs or services, do the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately?	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality				
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	Please see below.		
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	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.11.3. Comply with all applicable and enforced legislation	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93c	DR	It complies with applicable legislation.	OK	OK
B.4.12. Has the PD explained how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Project activities §59				
B.4.13. Where the procedure in the selected methodology(ies) involves several steps, has the PDs described how each step is applied and transparently documented the outcome of each step?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Each step is available in Section B.4.	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	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.15. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonably supported by correct and verifiable references, assumptions, calculations and ratinonales?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.4.16. Has a transparent description of the baseline scenario been provided including the technology(ies) that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §80	DR	Transparent description is available.	OK	OK
B.4.17. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to baseline identification?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63b	DR	The selected methodology is correctly applied.	OK	OK
ACM 0002					
B.4.18. If the project activity involves the installation of a greenfield power plant, is the baseline scenario identified	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Baseline scenario identified correctly.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
appropriately in accordance with the ACM 0002?					
B.4.19. If the project activity involves capacity addition to existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM0002?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A (project activity does not involves capacity addition)	OK	OK
B.4.20. If the proposed project activity is a capacity addtion, retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement, have the existing plant/unit started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion, retrofit or rehabilitation of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A (project activity does not involves capacity addition)	OK	OK
B.4.21. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the point of time at which the generation facility would likely be replaced or retrofitted ($DATE_{Baseline\ Retrofit}$) defined?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A (project activity is not retrofit)	OK	OK
B.4.22. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified following the step-wise	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A (project activity is not retrofit)	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
procedure in accordance with the ACM0002?					
B.4.23. Are the realistic and credible alternative baseline scenarios for power generation appropriately identified following the Step 1 of the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality"?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.24. Is "the proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity" listed as one of the alternatives?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.25. Has "other realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) to the proposed CDM project activity scenario that deliver outputs services or services with comparable quality, properties and application areas" been listed as an alternative?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93b ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.26. Has "continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken" been listed as an alternative?	CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration	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
	and assessment of additionality ACM 0002 Version 20.0				
B.4.27. If the barrier analysis is used, is the Step 2 of the latest applicable version of "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" applied appropriately?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.28. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2 and if the remaining alternatives include scenarios P1 and P3, is the Investment Comparison as per step 3 of the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" applied appropriately?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.4.29. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2 and if the remaining alternatives include scenarios P1 and P2, is the Benchmark Analysis as per step 2b of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" applied appropriately?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.5. Demonstration of additionality		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
		DR	a) Please indicate whether the production is annual or total in the "…to generate about 162,000 MWh electricity and reduce about 105,105 tCO2 emissions through..." statement in section B.5. b) Please include how the three basic parameters in the sensitivity analysis and carbon sales have changed in the first crediting period in Section B.5 with indicating evidence documents. And please	CAR-14	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
			discuss how the Equity IRR has been affected by these changes in Section B.5. c) Please indicate the dates of the first crediting period. d) Please correct the footnote 30.		
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	Please correct the "This is the second crediting period." statement since this is the 3rd crediting period.	CAR-15	**OK**
B.5.2. Ongoing financial need					
B.5.2.1. Has a short narrative that demonstrates how the revenue from Gold Standard certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the project been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide the "Ongoing Financial Need" calculation excel sheet and related evidence document.	CAR-16	**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	Please refer CAR-4.	CAR-4	**OK**
B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG outcome					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.1.1. Has the PDs explained how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology(ies), for calculating baseline and project outcomes are applied?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please correct the "EFgrid,CM,y = 0.424 x 0.75 + 0.3680 x 0.25 = 0.6488 tCO2/MWh" statement. Further, as per para 72c of the TOOL07, for the third crediting period, the build margin emission factor calculated for the second crediting period should be used. b) Please indicate relevant SDG targets and explain in section B.6.1. c) Please transfer the relevant SDG targets and their explanations in section B.6.3 to section B.6.1 since section B.6.1 is related to approaches for estimating the SDG outcome.	CAR-17	**OK**
B.6.1.1.1. Baseline	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-17.	CAR-17	**OK**
B.6.1.1.2. Project	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-17.	CAR-17	**OK**
B.6.1.1.3. Leakage	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-17.	CAR-17	**OK**
B.6.1.1.4. Net benefit	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-17.	CAR-17	**OK**
B.6.1.2. Has the PDs clearly stated which equations will be used in calculating net benefit?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-17.	CAR-17	**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	DR	Please see below.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	Project activities §72				
B.6.1.3.1. Where the methodology(ies) include different scenarios or cases, indicate and justify which scenario or case applies to the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.1.3.2. Where the methodology(ies) provide different options to choose from , indicate and justify which option is chosen for the project activity	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72	DR	N/A	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	N/A	OK	OK
B.6.2. Data and parameters fixed ex ante					
B.6.2.1. Have the PDs included a compilation of information on the data and parameters that are **not monitored** during the crediting period but are determined before the registration and remain fixed throughout the crediting period under section B.6.3 of the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Parameters are available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.2.2. 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	This is available.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3. Is the following information regarding the data and parameters specified correctly?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below.		
B.6.2.3.1. Relevant SDG indicator	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please indicate the relevant SDG indicator for the EF parameter in section B.6.2.	CAR-18	**OK**
B.6.2.3.2. Data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.3. Data/parameter unit	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.4. Description of the data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.5. Source of data	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.3.6. Values applied to data/parameter	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	It is specified correctly.	OK	OK
B.6.2.4. Where applied values have been measured, are the following included in the PDD?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	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	Please see below.		
B.6.2.5.1. Calculation of baseline;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.6.2.5.2. Calculation of project;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.2.5.3. Calculation of leakage.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	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	a) Please indicate the calculations for baseline, project and net outcome in section B.3. b) Please transfer the calculations made in section B.6.1 to section B.6.3 since this section should contain baseline, project and net outcome calculations.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.1.1. project outcome	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.1.2. baseline outcome	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.6.3.1.3. leakage	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.1.4. Net outcomes	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.2. Where the methodology allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, has adequate justification been provided in the PDD?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §111	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**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	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**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	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**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	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question		Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
	accordance with the "Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities"?					
B.6.3.6.	Has the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.7.	Have the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used, substituting the values used in the equations?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.8.	Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology or standardized baseline(s) to calculate emissions like project emissions, baseline emissions and leakages are applied by the PDs?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §112	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**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	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
	ACM 0002					
B.6.3.10.	Are baseline emissions calculated using equation (11) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.11.	Is the quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the project activity in year y ($EG_{PJ,y}$) calculated using equations (12), (13), (14), (15) or (16) given in the	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
methodology depending on the project type and relevant requirements? ➢					
B.6.3.12. When the methodology offers options for approaches in calculations, is it documented in the PDD which option is applied?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.13. In the case of retrofits or replacements, has the point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced/retrofitted in the absence of the project chosen in a conservative manner?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.14. In the case of capacity additions, retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects)	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.14.1. Is it ensured that the existing plant started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.14.2. Is it defined in the baseline emission section that no capacity addition, retrofit or rehabilitation of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
period and the implementation of the project activity?					
B.6.3.15. Are the project emissions calculated properly using equations (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) or (10) given in the methodology depending on the project type and the power density value?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.16. Where project emissions are taken as "0", has the PD made proper justification?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**OK**
B.6.3.17. Are the emission reductions calculated using equation (17) given in the methodology?	ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-19.	CAR-19	**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 Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please correct the "Annual average over the crediting period" row for SDG 13. b) Please correct the number of employees for SDG 8according to the remote site visit interview.	CAR-20	**OK**
B.7. Monitoring Plan					
B.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored					
B.7.1.1. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each relevant SDG indicator been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	a) Please specify the expected emission reduction is annually in "...an expected amount of 105,105 tonnes of CO2e..." for this statement for Emissions Reductions in tCO2 parameter. b) Please specify that EPİAŞ records are the main source of the EGPJ,facility,y parameter.	CAR-21	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
			c) Please check the meter details for EGPJ,facility,y parameter and provide the all meter documents for each main and back-up meters. d) Please indicate QA/QC procedures for "Emissions Reductions in tCO2" parameter. e) In section B.7, principle 3.1- Compensation for expropriation and principle 4.1- Sites of Cultural and Historical Heritage -Archaeological Site Control is indicated. But in section D.1 these principles are not indicated. Please correct the contradiction. f) In section D.1 principle 9.4-Noise is indicated but in section B.7 this principle is not indicated. Please correct the contradiction. g) In Appendix-1, Principle 7.1 is identified as "No mitigation measure is required for this indicator." But in section B.7.1, Principle 7.1-Air Quality parameter is indicated. Please correct the contradiction. h) Please indicate QA/QC procedures for "Quantitative employment and income generation" parameter. i) Please provide the social security records, training records. j) Please revise the "Justification of Relevance" section in Appendix 1 of the parameters to be monitored. k) Please only indicate the principles that in the "Safeguarding Principles that will be monitored" section into the "Monitoring plan" section. l) Please indicate the QA/QC procedures for "Water Quality and Quantity" parameter. m) Please indicate the QA/QC procedures for" Proper management of waste oil" parameter.		

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
			n) Please revise the "Justification of Relevance" section in Appendix 1 of the principles indicated in section D.1.		
B.7.1.2. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Data and parameters are available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.3. Has the unit of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Descriptions are available	OK	OK
B.7.1.4. Has the description of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.5. Has the source of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	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 Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.7. Has the applied value of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.8. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included?)	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.9. Has the PDs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.1.10. Have the PDs included description of calibration procedures for the monitoring equipment including the following?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.1. Frequency of the calibration	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §81c ACM 0002 Version 20	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.2. Accuracy of the calibration	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.3. Uncertainty of the calibration	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.4. Calibrating agency/person	CDM project standard for project activities §81c	DR	This is available in Section B.7.3.	OK	OK
B.7.1.10.5. The relevant national/international standards	CDM project standard for project activities §81c	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.11. Has the accuracy level of the measurement method included?	CDM project standard for project activities §81b	DR	Accuracy level is indicated.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.1.12. Has the responsible person/entity for the measurements included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.13. Has the interval for the measurements included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Measurements are indicated.	OK	OK
B.7.1.14. Has the monitoring frequency for each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Frequency level is indicated	OK	OK
B.7.1.15. Has the QA/QC procedures of each data/parameter been included?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §81a ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	Please refer CAR-21.	CAR-21	**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	Please refer CAR-21.	CAR-21	**OK**
B.7.1.16.1. Calculation of baseline outcome;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Baseline is indicated.	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.2. Calculation of project outcome;	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
B.7.1.16.3. Calculation of leakage.	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Leakage is indicated.	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
B.7.1.17. Have the PDs developed and described the monitoring plan for the proposed project activity in accordance with the selected methodology(ies) and all other applicable rules and requirements?	CDM project standard for project activities §78 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §117	DR	This is the line with methodology.	OK	OK
B.7.1.18. Does the monitoring plan include all data, parameters and related information required by the selected methodology(ies)?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118a-ii ACM 0002 Version 20.0	DR	This is the line with methodology.	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	This is feasible.	OK	OK
B.7.2. Sampling plan					
B.7.2.1. Are the data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 of the PDD determined by a sampling approach?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §29e CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project	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				
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 activities §40a-i	DR	N/A	OK	Ok
B.7.2.5. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, do the requirements specified agree with those stated in the appropriate standards?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of	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.7.2.6. 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
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	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
	programmes of activities §40d				
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 activities and programmes of activities §40f-i	DR	N/A	OK	Ok
B.7.2.14. If the sampling approach is used by the PDs, are the procedures for the data measurements defined appropriately and clearly?	CDM Guideline: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programmes of activities §40g	DR	N/A	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	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
	programmes of activities §40g				
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 activities §40h-i	DR	N/A	OK	Ok
B.7.3. Other elements of monitoring plan					
B.7.3.1. Has the operational and management structure been given in the monitoring plan to monitor emission reductions and any leakage generated by the project activity?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82a	DR	a) Please correct the date of first installation of meters. b) Please briefly describe the meter changes in section B.7.3 and provide all evidence documents. c) Please indicate the old meter details.	CAR-22	**OK**
B.7.3.2. Has the PD clearly indicated the responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82c	DR	Please refer CAR-22.	CAR-22	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
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	Please explain why "17/02/2009" date is chosen for the start date and provide the previous validation reports and evidence document for this date.	CAR-23	**OK**
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.**			
		DR	Operational lifetime of the project is 49 years.	OK	OK
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	a) Please correct the crediting period dates (11/08/2023 and the end date is 11/08/2033) since this crediting period's length is 7 years. b) Please specify which crediting period this project activity is. c) Please indicate the previous crediting periods with the dates.	CAR-24	**OK**
C.2.1.2. Have the PDs determined only one start date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation of the proposed project activity?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §89	DR	N/A	OK	OK
C.2.1.3. Has the PDs used any qualifications to the start date, such as "expected"?	CDM Project Standard for Project activities §90	DR	N/A	OK	OK

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
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	Please refer CAR-24.	CAR-24	**OK**
D. Summary of Safeguarding Principles and Gender Sensitive Assessment					
D.1. Safeguarding principles that will be monitored					
D.1.1. Has the safeguarding principles that will be monitored been summarized including the mitigation measures added to the monitoring plan? Have the PDs carried out an analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts following the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please revise the "Justification of Relevance" section in Appendix 1 of the principles according to safeguard principles indicated in section D.1. Please also refer CAR-21.	CAR-25	**OK**
D.1.2. Are all the safeguarding principles stated?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-25.	CAR-25	**OK**
D.1.3. Are all the relevant assessment questions included pertaining to the safeguarding principles?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-25.	CAR-25	**OK**
D.1.4. Is the relevance of the principle cited correctly (Yes/potentially/no)?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-25.	CAR-25	**OK**
D.1.5. Is proper justification for the safeguarding principle indicated?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-25.	CAR-25	**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	This is available as "… Turkey has ratified ILO convention 100 and 11140 and discrimination based on gender is illegal in Turkey."	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	This is available.	OK	OK
D.2.3. Has it been explained how the project align with existing country policies, strategies and best practices?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
D.2.4. Has an expert been involved for the Gender Safeguarding Principles & Requirements, where required?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	No, it is not required.	OK	OK
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	This is available.	OK	OK
D.2.6. Does the project apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
E. Summary of Local Stakeholder Consultation		**This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period.**			
E.1. Summary of stakeholder mitigation measures					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
		DR	This is available.	OK	OK
E.2. Final continuous input / grievance mechanism					
E.2.1. Has the relevant methods and all details of chosen methods been provided in the related tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please provide a signed and sealed letter that there are no complaints.	CAR-26	**OK**
E.2.2. Has the following been provided as the mandatory methods as part of the final continuous input / grievance mechanism	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please see below.		
E.2.2.1. Continuous input / grievance expression process book	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
E.2.2.2. GS contact	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	This is available.	OK	OK
F. Other Requirements					
F.1. Forward action requests (FARs) identified during previous verification and/or design change review					
F.1.1. Are there any FARs from the previous verification and/or design change review, if applicable, stages?	CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §36	DR	This is the CP Renewal Process of the project activity.	OK	OK
Appendix-1 Safeguarding principles assessment					

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

Question	Reference	Means of Validation*	Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources	Draft Opinion	Final Opinion
1. Has the safeguarding principles assessment been completed for each principle using the relevant tabular format?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Tabular format used.	OK	OK
2. Has the justification of relevance for the related safeguarding principles assessment been provided?	GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2	DR	Please refer CAR-21.	CAR-21	**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	Please refer CAR-21.	CAR-21	**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	Please refer CAR-21.	CAR-21	**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	Contact information of PDs provided.	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	Please do not remove the Appendix 3 and state it as not applicable.	CAR-27	**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	Please delete the instruction part in Appendix 4 and indicate the section as N/A.	CAR-28	**OK**

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CAR-1 a) Please correct the layout of the KPI table on the cover page b) Please correct the upper header of the monitoring report. c) Please correct any statements from "Uluborlu" project since this PDD belongs to Düzova WPP project (footnotes, milestone table-2, section D.1). d) Please revise all "Türkiye" statements to "Turkey".	1	a) Corrected. b) How? c) Revised. d) Revised to Turkey.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) Indication of sections on the cover page is indicated, closed. c) OK, closed. d) OK, closed.
CAR-2 Please indicate the time of first submission date in KPI section.	1.3	Indicated.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CAR-3 Please mark the "Project cycle" of the project activity in KPI section.	1.16	Initial Stakeholder Consultation in Aşağıkırıklar Village 13/02/2009 Electromechanical Contract Signature with GE 17/02/2009 Therefore it is regular cycle as per para 4.1.42 of Principles and Requirements.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CAR-4 a) Please re-evaluate the SDG 6, since the requirements for SDG 6 also available in safeguarding principles. b) Please correct the employee number according to the interview remote site visit.	2	a) Since the project has transitioned and has done verifications including SDG 6, SustainCERT will ask why it has been removed. Therefore we have to keep it as it is. If SustainCERT would recommend otherwise, we could remove it, if it is okay with the VVB. b) Employee number is revised.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed. c) Please correct the NO_x and SO_2 values in Table-1 according to the ER Excel Shett.

* 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
c) Please check the NO_x and SO_2 values and indicate them in ER Excel Sheet.		c) NOx and SO2 values have been checked. Review-1: c)Annual values and values for the crediting period are provided.	Review-2: c) OK, closed.
CAR-5 a) Please correct the "…through 7 years of first crediting period in total" statement in section A.1 since this is the 3rd crediting period. b) Please specify the turbine numbers according to their commissioned dates in milestone table in section A.1. c) Please provide the validation reports for the 1st and 2nd crediting period. d) Please indicate the EIA approval date in milestone table in section A.1 and provide the evidence document. e) Please identify the baseline scenario with more detail. f) Please briefly describe the design changes in milestone tables, if it is not related with GS design change, please rename the situation. g) Please clarify and correct the Table 2 title cited as Uluborlu WPP.	A.1	a) Corrected. b) Specified. c) Provided. d) Indicated. e) Please advise. Tool 11 steps are listed and explained. Methodology has been referenced in para. 1 of Section 6.4. f) Briefly described in Table 2 and Table 3 in the PDD. g) Clarified. Review-1: b) According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the renewal of the crediting period as well. e) Indicated showing reference to methodology. f) Renamed.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) Please correct the electricity generation value according to the generation license.. c) OK, closed. d) OK, closed. e) Please indicate the baseline scenario in section A.1 with showing reference to the applied methodology. f) Please rename the "design change" situation as "capacity increase in generation license" since "design change" statement can be miscible with gold standard design change procedure. g) OK, closed. Review-2: b) OK, closed. e) OK, closed. f) OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CAR-6 a) Please correct the "Project is a renewable energy (hydro power) installation activity" statement since the project activity is not hydro power. b) Please briefly describe the indicated principles in section A.1.1. c) Please provide the signed and sealed letter from the project owner about double counting for the current monitoring period.	A.1.1	a) Corrected. b) Described. c) Provided. Review-1: b)Principles are futher explained.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) Primciples are indicated but please also briefly describe the principles. c) OK, closed. Review-2: b) OK, closed.
CAR-7 Please provide the KMZ document of the project activity.	A.2	KMZ document is provided.	Review-1: Ok, closed.
CAR-8 a) Please indicate the one-line diagram in section A.3. b) Please indicate the meter technical properties for 2 main and 2 back up meters in tabular format and please indicate the first index date, calibration dates, and meter change dates in section A.3. c) Please provide the first index protocol, calibration protocol and meter tests for current meters. Also please provide the meter change protocols for main meters.	A.3	a) Indicated. b) Incidcated. c) Provided. Review-1: Meter properties as indicated in tabular format in A.3.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) Please indicate the meter technical properties for 2 main and 2 back up meters in tabular format. c) OK, closed. Review-2: b) OK, closed.
CAR-9 a) Please delete the blank page. b) Please provide a signed and sealed letter from the head of the project activity that there is no public founding was used.	A.5	a) Deleted. b) No-ODA declaration provided.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
CAR-10 a) Please indicate reference links for applied tools in section B.1. b) Please indicate the tools number in section B.1. c) Please use the latest published versions of tools. d) Please delete the repeated tool.	B.1.1	a) Reference links are provided. b) Tools number are provided. c) Latest published versions are used. d) Repeated tool is removed.	Review-1: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed. c) OK, closed. d) OK, closed.
CAR-11 Please indicate all applicability conditions and the relevant justifications for Tool 01 and Tool 11 in Section B.2.	B.2.1	Applicability conditions are indicated in Section B.2.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CAR-12 Please correct the "Düzova Wind Power Project, Turkey WPP is a large-scale..." statement.	B.2.4	What is wrong with the statement? Please advise. Review-1: First sentence of A.1 indicates that the project will be referred as "Düzova WPP" from then on.	Review-1: Please correct the project's name. (i.e. the WPP statement is not compatible) Review-2: OK, closed.
CAR-13 Please remove the geothermal power plants part of the project boundary table since this is a wind project.	B.3.1	Geothermal power plants part of the project boundary table is removed.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CAR-14 a) Please indicate whether the production is annual or total in the "…to generate about 162,000 MWh electricity and reduce about 105,105 tCO2 emissions through..." statement in section B.5. b) Please include how the three basic parameters in the sensitivity analysis and carbon sales have	B.5	a) Statement is revised. b) A calculation sheet is not required or demanded by GS as the template guide suggests "Please provide a short narrative that demonstrates how the revenue from Gold Standard certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the project." Therefore, a short narrative is provided.	Review-1: a) Please correct the annually electricity generation value according to the generation license. Also please revise the ER Excel Sheet values according to these changes. b) OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
changed in the first crediting period in Section B.5 with indicating evidence documents. And please discuss how the Equity IRR has been affected by these changes in Section B.5. c) Please indicate the dates of the first crediting period. d) Please correct the footnote 30.		c) Indicated. d) Removed as it just a reference to additionality figures of the first CP as per SustainCERT's request. Review-1: According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the renewal of the crediting period as well.	c) OK, closed. d) OK, closed. Review-2: a) OK, closed.
CAR-15 Please correct the "This is the second crediting period." statement since this is the 3rd crediting period.	B.5.1	Revised as third crediting period.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CAR-16 Please provide the "Ongoing Financial Need" calculation excel sheet and related evidence document.	B.5.2.1	A calculation sheet is not required or demanded by GS as the template guide suggests "*Please provide a short narrative that demonstrates how the revenue from Gold Standard certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the project.*" Therefore, a short narrative is provided. Review-1: Indicated.	Review-1: Please indicate the issued GS-VER for the first and the second crediting period. Review-2: OK, closed.
CAR-17 a) Please correct the "EFgrid,CM,y = 0.424 x 0.75 + 0.3680 x 0.25 = 0.6488 tCO2/MWh" statement. Further, as per para 72c of the TOOL07, for the third crediting period, the build	B.6.1.1	a) Corrected. b) Indicated. c) Transferred to B.6.1. Review-1:	Review-1: a) Please correct the annual electricity generation value of the project activity according to the generation license. Also please

* 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
margin emission factor calculated for the second crediting period should be used. b) Please indicate relevant SDG targets and explain in section B.6.1. c) Please transfer the relevant SDG targets and their explanations in section B.6.3 to section B.6.1 since section B.6.1 is related to approaches for estimating the SDG outcome.		a) According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the renewal of the crediting period as well. b) According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the renewal of the crediting period as well. Annual generation value is indicated.	revise the emission values according to these changes. b) Please correct the electricity generation value for SDG 7 according to the generation license and please state annually if the electricity generation value is for a per year. c) OK, closed. Review-2: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed.
CAR-18 Please indicate the relevant SDG indicator for the EF parameter in section B.6.2.	B.6.2.3.1	Indicated.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CAR-19 a) Please indicate the calculations for baseline, project, and net outcome in section B.3. b) Please transfer the calculations made in section B.6.1 to section B.6.3 since this section should contain baseline, project and net outcome calculations.	B.6.3.1	a) Indicated. b) Transferred to B.6.3. Review-1: a) Leakage is indicated in ER sheet. b) According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the	Review-1: a) Please indicate leakage values to the emission reduction table in ER Excel Sheet. b) Please re-evaluate the SDG 7 and SDG 13 values according to the electricity generation value in generation license. Review-2: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
		renewal of the crediting period as well. Therefore, SDG 7 and SDG 13 are correct.	
CAR-20 a) Please correct the "Annual average over the crediting period" row for SDG 13. b) Please correct the number of employees for SDG 8according to the remote site visit interview.	B.6.4.1	a) Annual average over the crediting period" row for SDG 13 is revised. b) Number of employees is revised. Review-1: a) According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the renewal of the crediting period as well.	Review-1: a) Please correct the electricity generation value in ER Excel Sheet and throughout the PDD according to the generation license. b) OK, closed. Review-2: a) OK, closed.
CAR-21 a) Please specify the expected emission reduction is annually in "...an expected amount of 105,105 tonnes of CO2e..." for this statement for Emissions Reductions in tCO2 parameter. b) Please specify that EPİAŞ records are the main source of the EGPJ,facility,y parameter. c) Please check the meter details for EGPJ,facility,y parameter and provide the all meter documents for each main and back-up meters. d) Please indicate QA/QC procedures for "Emissions Reductions in tCO2" parameter. e) In section B.7, principle 3.1- Compensation for expropriation and principle 4.1- Sites of	B.7.1.1	a) Speficied annual ER. b) Specified. c) Meter details have been corrected. d) Indicated. e) Sections B.7.1, D.1 and Appendix-1 are made consistent. f) Noise parameter has been included in D.1. by accident. It has been verified in the previous verification and in the transition annex that the noise parameter does not need a mitigation measure, therefore, a monitoring parameter. g) Since Principle 7 contribution is positive in nature, it has been excluded from section D.1. and Appendix-1 and has been renamed.	Review-1: a) Please specify the expected emission reduction is annually in "...an expected amount of 97,481 tonnes of CO2e..." for this statement for "Emissions Reductions in tCO2" parameter. b) Please correct the electricity generation value according to the generation license. c) Please indicate the meter dates for main meters, even if the first index dates and meter test dates are the same. Also please indicate the old

* 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
Cultural and Historical Heritage -Archaeological Site Control is indicated. But in section D.1 these principles are not indicated. Please correct the contradiction. f) In section D.1 principle 9.4-Noise is indicated but in section B.7 this principle is not indicated. Please correct the contradiction. g) In Appendix-1, Principle 7.1 is identified as "No mitigation measure is required for this indicator." But in section B.7.1, Principle 7.1-Air Quality parameter is indicated. Please correct the contradiction. h) Please indicate QA/QC procedures for "Quantitative employment and income generation" parameter. i) Please provide the social security records, training records. j) Please revise the "Justification of Relevance" section in Appendix 1 of the parameters to be monitored. k) Please only indicate the principles that in the "Safeguarding Principles that will be monitored" section into the "Monitoring plan" section. l) Please indicate the QA/QC procedures for "Water Quality and Quantity" parameter. m) Please indicate the QA/QC procedures for" Proper management of waste oil" parameter. n) Please revise the "Justification of Relevance" section in Appendix 1 of the principles indicated in section D.1.		h) QA/QC included. i) Social security records and training records are provided. j) Sections B.7.1, D.1 and Appendix-1 are made consistent. k) Sections B.7.1, D.1 and Appendix-1 are made consistent. l) QA/QC included. m) QA/QC included. n) Justification of relevance are revised. Review-1: a) Specified. b) According to the energy yield study of GL Garrad Hassan on 19 July 2013 annual energy generation for 51.5 MW capacity is estimated to be 152,900 MWh/yr. This generation value has been considered in the design change therefore for consistency it is applied for the renewal of the crediting period as well. c) Meter details are provided. d) X e) Principle 6.1- Compensation for expropriation is indicated in B.7, D.1 and Appendix-1 f) x g) x h) x i) x j) Indicated. k) Re-evaluated. l) Provided.	meter details and meter change dates as well. d) OK, closed. e) In section B.7, principle 6.1-Compensation for expropriation is indicated. But in section D.1 these principle is not indicated. Please correct the contradiction. f) OK, closed. g) OK, closed. h) OK, closed. i) OK, closed. j) Please indicate the "Mitigation Measures added to the Monitoring Plan" row for Principle 9.5. k) Please re-evaluate the "Principle 6.1 Labour Rights - Compensation for expropriation" parameter in section B.7.1 since this parameter is not indicated in section D.1 and Appendix 1. l) Please provide the waste records for waste water and wase oil. m) OK, closed. n) OK, closed. Review-2: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed. c) OK, closed. e) OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
			j) OK, closed. k) OK, closed. l) OK, closed.
CAR-22 a) Please correct the date of first installation of meters. b) Please briefly describe the meter changes in section B.7.3 and provide all evidence documents. c) Please indicate the old meter details.	B.7.3.1	a) Dates are corrected. b) Meter changes have been described. c) The old meters are not active in the new crediting period which starts on 11/08/2023. Therefore, the old meters are not present after this date. This information should not be included in the PDD. Review-1: a) Indicated. b) Old meter details are indicated. c) Removed.	Review-1: a) Please indicate change dates of the spare meters as well. Also please indicate the meter test dates for main meters even if the dates are same with the first index. b) Please indicate the old meter details as well even they are not present after this date. Because GS has to see the difference between the meters for the past crediting period and the current crediting period . c) Please remove yellow highlights. Review-2: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed. c) OK, closed.
CAR-23 Please explain why "17/02/2009" date is chosen for the start date and provide the previous validation reports and evidence document for this date.	C.1.1	It has been written in the registered PDD and Transition Annex as well. Added to milestones table. Review-1:	Review-1: Please briefly describe on what basis the start date was chosen in section C.1.1 as well.

* 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
		Described.	Review-2: OK, closed.
CAR-24 a) Please correct the crediting period dates (11/08/2023 and the end date is 11/08/2033) since this crediting period's length is 7 years. b) Please specify which crediting period this project activity is. c) Please indicate the previous crediting periods with the dates.	C.2.1.1	a) 11/08/2023 - 11/08/2033 is 10 years. The correct CP is 11/08/2023 - 10/08/2030 which adds up to 7 years. b) Specified. c) Indicated. Review-1: a) Corrected. Revised in ER sheet as well. b) Specified.	Review-1: a) Please correct the end date of the crediting period in section C.2.1. (11/08/2023-11/08/2030 is 7 years and 1 day) b) Please specify which crediting period this project activity is in section C.2.1. c) OK, closed. Review-2: a) OK, closed. b) OK, closed.
CAR-25 Please revise the "Justification of Relevance" section in Appendix 1 of the principles according to safeguard principles indicated in section D.1.	D.1.1	Section B.7.1, D.1. and Appendix-1 are checked to be consistent. Review-1: Added for Principle 9.5.	Review-1: Please indicate the "Mitigation Measures added to the Monitoring Plan" row for Principle 9.5. Review-2: OK, closed.
CAR-26	E.2.1	Provided.	Review-1: OK, closed.

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

Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team	Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1	Summary of Project developers' Response	Validation Team Conclusion
Please provide a signed and sealed letter that there are no complaints.			
CAR-27 Please do not remove the Appendix 3 and state it as not applicable.	Appendix-3	Appendix-3 is not removed and indicated N/A. Review-1: Deleted.	Review-1: Please delete the table in Appendix 3 since there are no information in the table. Review-2: OK, closed.
CAR-28 Please delete the instruction part in Appendix 4 and indicate the section as N/A.	Appendix-4	Instruction part is removed. Past design changes are indicated in Appendix-4. Review-1: The project had 3 design change procedures with Gold Standard. However, as per template guide, Appendix-4 is not applicable since the project has no "proposed" design changes at the moment.	Review-1: Please re-evaluate the table in Appendix 4 since stated design changes are not related with Gold Standard design change procedures, they are just capacity increases in generation license. So please change the state of the Appendix 4. Review-2: OK, closed.
CL-1 Please provide the design certification document dated 22/11/2010.	1.4	Provided.	Review-1: OK, closed.
CL-2 Please provide a signed and sealed letter that project activity is not included in any other voluntary or compliance standards program.	A.1.2.1	Provided.	Review-1: OK, closed.

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