

GS PROJECT RENEWAL OF CREDITING PERIOD VALIDATION REPORT

Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.

Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey

IN

TURKEY

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Organizational Unit: | Re Carbon Ltd. | | |
| Project Title: | Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey | | |
| Project Number: | Client: | Current PDD Version: | |
| 437 | Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. | 0.5 | |
| Date of First Issue: | Date of Current Version: | Version Number: | Number of Pages: |
| 02/06/2023 | 18/10/2023 | 04 | 75 |
| Summary: | | | |
| Host Country: Turkey | | | |
| Project is Reviewed Against: | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kyoto Protocol <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNFCCC CDM Rules and Regulations and associated documents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gold Standard Rules and Regulations v1.2 <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please Specify) | | | |
| Methodology: ACM0002 | | Version: 21.0 | |
| Project Developers: Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. | | | |
| Average Annual Emission Reduction Estimate in the 3rd Crediting Period: 46,299 tCO ₂ e | | | |
| Project Size: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Large Scale <input type="checkbox"/> Small Scale <input type="checkbox"/> Micro Scale | | | |
| Registry Number: | Crediting Period Renewal No: | Crediting Period Start Date: | |
| GS437 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1st <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2nd | 10/07/2023 | |
| Validation Stages: | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Desk Review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Visit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Follow-up Interviews <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolution of Outstanding Issues | | | |
| <p>Validation Findings: During the validation 12 Corrective Action Requests, 00 Clarification Requests were raised, all of which were closed out before the issuance of this validation report. 00 Forward Action Requests were raised during the validation all of which shall be addressed during the initial verification of the proposed project activity.</p> <p>In summary, it is Re Carbon Ltd.'s opinion that the project activity "Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey" in Turkey, as described in the PDD version 0.5 dated 06/10/2023, 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.</p> | | | |
| Validation Team Leader: | Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK | Indexing Terms: | |
| Validation Team Members: | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No distribution without permission of the client or responsible organizational unit <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Unrestricted Distribution | |
| Approved By (Technical Reviewer): | Name: | Signature: | |
| | Mr. Anıl SÖYLER |  | |

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| BM | : Build Margin |
| CAR | : Corrective Action Request |
| CDM | : Clean Development Mechanism |
| CER | : Certified Emission Reduction(s) |
| CL | : Clarification request |
| CM | : Combined Margin |
| CO₂ | : Carbon dioxide |
| 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) |
| tCO_{2e} | : Tonnes of CO ₂ equivalents |
| UNFCCC | : United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION..... 6

2. INTRODUCTION 7

2.1. Objective..... 7

2.2. Scope 7

2.3. GHG Project Description 8

2.4. Parties Involved..... 8

3. METHODOLOGY 11

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

3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents 14

3.3. Site Visits..... 15

3.4. Reporting of Findings via the Validation Protocol 16

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews 18

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues..... 18

3.7. Internal Quality Control..... 19

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS 20

4.1. Baseline Scenario 20

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

4.3. Monitoring 22

4.4. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions..... 26

4.5. Sampling Plan..... 27

5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED 28

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED..... 29

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE 31

7.1. Appointment Certificates 32



8. VALIDATION OPINION 34

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL..... 35

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. has performed the third crediting period validation of the “Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey” in “Turkey” between 08/05/2023 and 02/06/2023. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

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

- The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Re Carbon Ltd. with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of all stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and Gold Standard for Global Goals. Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. 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. Has been appointed by “Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.” to perform the crediting period renewal validation of the “Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey” in Turkey with the contract dated 03/04/2023. The objective of this validation activity is to have an independent second 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 “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”, Version 07.0 and Tool: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period version 3.0.1
- the project’s monitoring plan is assessed against “ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources”, Version 21.0
- 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 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 the third crediting period. The PDD is reviewed against the relevant criteria (see Section 2.1) and decisions by the CDM Executive Board, including the approved baseline and monitoring methodology. The validation was based on the guidance given in the CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0, GS4GG and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

The validation team has employed a risk-based approach to assess the completeness and accuracy of the claims and conservativeness of the assumptions in the PDD. The main focus of the validation team is to determine if the identified baseline is still applicable to the project activity, if the estimated emission reductions for the third 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. Can't be held liable by any party for decisions made or not made based on the validation opinion, which will go beyond that purpose.

2.3. GHG Project Description

“The Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey” (hereafter referred to as the “project activity”) is operated by Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. The project activity has the installed capacity 20.7 MWm/ 20.7 Mwe. It is located in the Susurluk district of Balıkesir province, Turkey. Project is a “Renewable Energy Activities” project and “GHG Emissions Reduction & Sequestration” type project.

With a total installed power generation capacity of 20.7 MW, the project is estimated to supply grid as 72,232 MWh and 46,501 tCO₂-eq per annum and which total to reduction of 325,507 tCO₂-eq over these first 7-year crediting period according to registered first PDD for CP1. And the project is estimated to supply grid as 71,366.095 MWh and 46,302 tCO₂-eq per annum over the second 7-year crediting period according to registered second PDD for CP2. The project is estimated to supply grid as 71,361.946MWh¹ and expected annual emission reductions of the project is approximately 46,299 tCO₂/year during for this 3rd crediting period, based on the average value of the project activity's electricity generation between 2010 and 2022. The evidence showing annual generation data is provided to VVB. This is based on the published

emission factor which is 0.6488 tCO₂/MWh by Turkish Republic Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources in 2020.

The Project aims to generate electricity from wind energy and feed it to the national electricity grid.

The third crediting period start and end dates are 10/07/2023 and 09/07/2030. The length of the crediting period is 7 years 0 months renewable twice (total 21 years).

Below are the coordinates of the registered turbines:

| | E | N |
|-----|----------|-----------|
| T1 | 5 90 125 | 44 23 594 |
| T2 | 5 90 045 | 44 23 643 |
| T3 | 5 89 955 | 44 23 675 |
| T4 | 5 89 870 | 44 23 702 |
| T5 | 5 89 787 | 44 23 731 |
| T6 | 5 89 783 | 44 24 008 |
| T7 | 5 89 704 | 44 24 052 |
| T8 | 5 89 599 | 44 24 114 |
| T9 | 5 89 508 | 44 24 156 |
| T10 | 5 89 418 | 44 24 198 |
| T11 | 5 89 345 | 44 24 237 |
| T12 | 5 89 272 | 44 24 303 |

| | E | N |
|-----|----------|-----------|
| T13 | 5 89 212 | 44 24 388 |
| T14 | 5 89 133 | 44 24 439 |
| T15 | 5 89 053 | 44 24 489 |
| T16 | 5 88 974 | 44 24 539 |
| T17 | 5 88 885 | 44 24 575 |
| T18 | 5 88 814 | 44 24 639 |
| T19 | 5 88 735 | 44 24 689 |
| T20 | 5 88 663 | 44 24 741 |
| T21 | 5 88 590 | 44 24 794 |
| T22 | 5 88 518 | 44 24 848 |
| T23 | 5 88 445 | 44 24 903 |

Below are the coordinates of the unregistered turbines:

| | | |
|-----|----------|-----------|
| T24 | 5 89 589 | 44 23 264 |
| T25 | 5 90 545 | 44 23 489 |
| T26 | 5 90 312 | 44 23 536 |
| T27 | 5 90 083 | 44 23 127 |

Commissioning date of the T25, T26 and T27 wind turbines (Unregistered turbines for CP2 and CP3) is 18/12/2016 and Commissioning date of the T24 is 21/11/2014. Unregistered 4 turbines each have a capacity of 2.3 MW.

Technical specifications are:

| Parameter | Value |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| Rated Power | 900 kW |
| Rotor Diameter | 44 m |
| Number of blades | 3 |
| Swept Area | 1,521 m ² |
| Hub Height | 45/55m |
| Rotor Speed | 34.0 U/min |
| Generator Type | Synchronous |
| Cut in wind speed | 3 m/s |
| Cut out wind speed | 34 m/s |

2.4. Parties Involved

Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. is the project developer and host country is Turkey.

3. METHODOLOGY

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

- Assessment whether the baseline of the project activity is revised in the PDD to reflect the most recent situation for the project activity, via a desk review of the revised PDD between 08/05/2023 and 02/06/2023.
- Assessment whether the applied methodology ACM0002: Grid Connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 21.0, in the revised PDD has been applied correctly, including the baseline selection and monitoring plan.
- Assessment of data and calculation of greenhouse gas emission reductions.
- Issuance of the renewal of crediting period validation report
- Independent technical review (ITR)
- Approval of the validation report and request of renewal of crediting period

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

The Validation Protocol consists of two tables:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1. Validation Team and ITR Selection

The appointment process of the validation team takes into account the technical area(s), sectoral scope(s), and relevant host country experience required amongst team members for the accurate and thorough assessment of the project design. The relevant GS validation and previous ITR experiences are also assessed during the selection of the team members and Independent Technical Reviewer (ITR), respectively. The validation team and ITR are assigned to this validation activity on 27/03/2023 taking all the above factors into consideration and as a result of the contract review process.

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

Table 3-3: Validation team and ITR details

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

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

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

3.2. Desk Review of the PDD and Additional Documents

The basis for the crediting period renewal validation activity is the PDD version 0.1 dated 08/05/2023 which was submitted to the validation team on the same day. This PDD was revised several times due to the raised CARs and CLs, PDD version 0.5 dated 06/10/2023 being the final version. The PDD was assessed against;

- The project's baseline is assessed against ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, version 21.0
- Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 07.0.0
- Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, version 07.0
- Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment, Version 01
- Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality, Version 07.0
- Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion, Version 03.0
- 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 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 physical site visit was performed to the project activity site, details of which can be seen in the Table 3-4 below:

Table 3-4: Site visit details

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Date | 01/06/2023 | |
| Location | Susurluk | |
| Participant | Company Name | Role in the Organization / Role in the Site Visit |
| Aptullah Alkan | Alize Enerji | Driver for Demirer |
| Fatma Beyazıt | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| Gülten Ay | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| Halil Ay | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| Halil Demirel | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Muhtar |
| Yıldırım Beyazıt | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| Ahmet Muslu | Alize Enerji | Operator |
| Çağla Balcı Eriş | Rüzgar Danışmanlık | Consultant |
| Ömer Ergin | Alize Enerji | Electrical Engineer |
| Arif İnce | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| Nurettin Aydın | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| Uğur Elagöz | Kiraz Village | Religious Officer |
| Elmas Altın | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| Zülbiye Ay | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| Emre Acar | Alize Enerji | Administrative |
| Fehmi Bengi | Alize Enerji | Administrative |
| Fikriye Seda Atabek | Re-carbon | Team Leader |
| Points Verified | Source of Information | |
| To check the project development and operation | Document review and on-site visit | |
| To interview with the local stakeholders about the project and its impacts | On-site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Kiraz Village | |
| To confirm rightness of project description, as per PDD including project components and location | Document review, on-site visit and interviews with the local stakeholders from Kiraz Village | |

Stakeholders were interviewed and the selected auditing techniques are found appropriate and sufficient. No risks were identified about the efficiency of the site visit organization. No sampling was applied.

Besides a complimentary stakeholder consultation has been held from 25/04/2023 until 25/05/2023 and no comments have been received. The signed declaration that the comments logbook has been received by Kiraz Muhtar has been provided to VVB. Logbook is easily accessible by stakeholders at muhtars office .

During site visit, below points were interviewed with stakeholders:

- Villagers are working on husbandry and agriculture
- No major breakdowns in energy generation.
- Project is 6 km away from village and no expropriation done.
- No complaints from stakeholders.
- 5 employees from Kiraz village, 1 from nearby, 4 service personnel all locals
- Villagers work on husbandry and no negative effect on their job.
- Complimentary Stakeholder consultation logbook provided to muhtar on 25/04/2023, Halil Demirel the Kiraz village muhtar signed a declaration stating that there are no negative comments.

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 for project activities, the team reports the non-conformities in the forms of Corrective Action Requests (CARs), Clarification Requests (CLs) and Forward Action Requests (FARs). When and for which type of non-conformities CARs, CLs and FARs are raised are explained below:

- The Validation team raises a **CAR** if one of the following occurs:
 - The project developers have made mistakes that will influence 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 total of 12 CARs, 00 CLs and 00 FARs were raised all of which are listed in the Validation Protocol.

3.5. Follow-Up Interviews

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

3.6. Resolution of Outstanding Issues

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

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

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

Table 3-5: Validation Timeframe

| Activity | Timeline | | Total Days |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | From | To | |
| Desk Review | 5/8/2023 | 5/8/2023 | 1 |
| Review of the PDD version 01 | 5/9/2023 | 5/9/2023 | 1 |
| Site Visit | 6/1/2023 | 6/1/2023 | 1 |
| Issuance of the Validation Protocol version 01 | 5/26/2023 | 5/26/2023 | 1 |
| Review of PDs Initial Set of Responses | 5/30/2023 | 5/30/2023 | 1 |
| Closing of all the CARs and CLs | 6/2/2023 | 6/2/2023 | 1 |
| Issuance of the Validation Report version 01 | 6/2/2023 | 6/2/2023 | 1 |
| ITR Process | 6/5/2023 | 6/5/2023 | 1 |
| Issuance of the Validation Report version 02 | 6/8/2023 | 6/8/2023 | 1 |
| ITR Approval | 6/8/2023 | 6/9/2023 | 2 |
| Submission for Final Approval | 6/12/2023 | 6/13/2023 | 2 |
| Submission to the PD | 6/13/2023 | 6/13/2023 | 1 |

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

3.7. Internal Quality Control

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

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

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

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

4. VALIDATION FINDINGS

4.1. Baseline Scenario

The project activity was earlier registered using the methodology ACM0002 version 20. The PDD 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 PDD version 0.5 dated 06/10/2023.

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

There has been no significant change in the relevant policies and circumstances, which would impact the baseline scenario since 04/08/2009 (date of initial 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 to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”.

Further, the emission factor has been updated and fixed ex-ante for the 3rd renewable crediting period. The procedures as defined in the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”, version 07.0 have been followed. The grid emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) in the earlier registered PDD for CP1 was 0.635 tCO₂/MWh and 0.6488 tCO₂/MWh for CP2 and the grid emission factor ($EF_{grid,CM,y}$) in the updated PDD for CP3 is 0.6488 tCO₂/MWh as per the published emission factor by Turkish Republic Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources.

The same has been checked from the following link and the document available: [Bform2020.pdf \(enerji.gov.tr\)](#)

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

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

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

The project activity was earlier registered using the methodology ACM0002 version 20. The PDD has been updated using the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002 version 21.0. The PDs have used the most recent version of the same methodology as the original registered PDD, i.e., the version that is valid at the time of submission of the revised PDD for the renewal of the crediting period.

The project activity applies approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology “ACM0002 version 21.0: “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources” and the associated tools:

- Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality, version 07.0
- Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system, Version 07.0
- Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality, Version 07.0
- Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion, Version 03.0
- Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment, Version 01
- Tool 11: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period, Version 03.0.1

According to ACM0002 version 21.0, the latest approved tools shall be referenced in the PDD like, “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” (version 07.0), “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” (Version 07), “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” (Version 07.0), “Tool to calculate project or leakage CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel combustion” (Version 03.0), “Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment” (version 01), “Tool 11: Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal of the crediting period, Version 03.0.1” 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.

Double Counting:

VVB has checked the I-REC Registry (<https://v-1.evident.app/Public/ReportDevices/>), wherein 441 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.

Additionality: The capacity increase was not added in the GS project. PP has already submitted financial situation under ongoing financial need without capacity increase. So, the capacity increase has not negative or positive impact on the additionality of the project. And social and environmental impact of capacity increase has already assessed under Appendix 1 of the PDD. So there is no negative impact on these too.

Ongoing Financial Need:

The sole source of income for the project is electricity sales, excluding revenue from carbon. The income from electricity sales is 1.25 times the net income, while the total expenses, including depreciation costs, amount to 0.25 times the net income. Revenue from carbon credit sales contributes zero percent to the net income. The costs of carbon certification account for 0.20 percent of the net income, and the net income from carbon sales is -0.2 percent of the net income from electricity sales. The project is currently undergoing the verification process for

CP2 while simultaneously starting the CP3 renewal process. Consequently, the project will soon generate income from GSVERs. The financial attractiveness of the project is not favorable, as the income from GS VERs plays a crucial role in its financial performance.

Due to the economic situation and the costs associated with carbon credits, the verification process of the project has not been pursued. The project lacks financial appeal, and the income generated from GS VERs is crucial for its overall financial performance. Between 10/07/2016 and 30/04/2019, no VERs were issued during CP2 (2nd crediting period). However, PP (Presidential Permit) applied to the GS (Gold Standard) and received approval for credit issuance between 01/05/2019 and 30/04/2022. Subsequently, there will be another performance review for the period between 01/05/2022 and 10/07/2023 under CP2. As a result, the project will soon start generating income from GSVERs. VVB approves that PP currently needs credits to financially support the project.

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

4.3. Monitoring

SDG13: Climate Action and SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy: According to 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 , $EG_{\text{facility},y}$ which will be continuously measured and recorded at least monthly.

Net electricity generation will be based on measured value of electricity export and import and recorded via meters sealed by TEIAS (the distribution and grid company) for billing purposes therefore no new additional protocol will be needed for monitoring emission reduction. According to meter reading protocols, the internal consumption of the facility was subtracted from the gross generation.

Meter reading protocols (OSOS forms) provided to the company by TEIAS will be used as the main source for the quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid, and it will be cross checked with the EPIAS 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 two electricity meters, one main meter and one 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. Meter reading protocols (OSOS forms) provided to the company by TEIAS will be used as the main source for the quantity of net electricity delivered to the grid, and it will be cross checked with the EPIAS records. The details about the currently available electricity meter details are as follow as in the table below:

| Model | Serial Number | Accuracy Class |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| LANDIS-ZMD402CT44 | Main Meter: 51255646 | 0.2s active 0.5 re-active |
| ITRON-SL7000 | Back-up Meter: 65007629 | 0.2s active 0.5 re-active |

The installation date of the main meter is 28/12/2015 and back-up meter is 09/12/2013. Initial calibration date is 10/08/2015 for main meter and 12/09/2013 for back up meter. Dates are verified by VVB via evidences.

The project's capacity was increased to 29.2 MW in past crediting period. But PP can use GS credits for only 20.7 MW capacity's electricity generation. First 23 turbines has included in this GS project. Other turbines will not be added in CP2 and CP3. The project's has started to generate electricity on 23/07/2009 which was official first acceptance protocol date by Ministry of Energy with 21 turbines and then another 2 turbines has added on 28/04/2010 which was official second acceptance protocol date by Ministry of Energy for 20.7 MW capacity. After this registered GS, the project's capacity was increased to 29.9 MW by Ministry of Energy on 18/12/2016. But PP can use only 20.7 MW capacity's electricity generation. And monitoring of net energy generation (SDG7) and calculation of emission reduction (SDG13), PP will simply subtract the SCADA values of unregistered T25, T26 and T27 turbines from gross generation data of EPIAS. As the added capacity is not considered under GS, it has no effect on the additionality of the project.

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.

Calibration frequency: According to the Article 9 of the relevant regulation, periodical inspections of "gauges for electric, water, coal gas, natural gas and, current and voltage measuring transformers will be made once in 10 years". This is in line with the monitoring plan and national requirements. TEIAS is deciding when to carry out the next calibration. The Project owner has no control over or access to the measurement devices and is not entitled to perform any type of maintenance or calibration. The calibration of plant meters is valid until 10/08/2025 for main meter and 12/09/2023 for spare meter.

There has been no meter tests after 2015 because this is medium voltage transmission line and UEDAS cannot test before 10 years if there is no problem related with meter. Maintenance and calibration of UEDAS meters have been carried out according to the System Usage Agreement. Since UEDAS meters are sealed by UEDAS the project proponent cannot intervene with the device.

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

SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth: The project contributes to the following indicators 8.5.2 “Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities” and following target: “8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value” The target will be monitored by the number of full-time employees with the social security records during the verification process. The project provides employment to 7 people during the operation phase. The project will provide health and safety training to employees at each monitoring period and will be monitored by training records or certificates.

Monitored safeguarding principles:

Principle 9.4 Release of pollutants: The all wastes are disposed of according to related regulations. The methods are categorized for all materials. The employees produce the insignificant amount of waste waters during the operation of the proposed project activity. This wastewater has been collected in an impermeable septic tank and collected via vacuum trucks by Balikesir municipality and disposed according to Regulation on Control of Water Contamination.

Principle 9.11 Endangered Species: The appointed personnel will conduct regular site vetting to observe nests and carcass on project area and record the same.

Evaluation of safeguarding principles:

Principle 1. Human Rights: The Project does not cause any human rights abuse and respects internationally proclaimed human rights.

Principle 2. Gender Equality: The Project does not involve discrimination in any kind of form.

Principle 3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions: All the employees are trained about health and safety issues during operation phase of the project.

Principle 4.1 Sites of Cultural and Historical Heritage: The Project does not do any damage, alteration or removal to the critical cultural heritage.

Principle 4.2 Forced Eviction and Displacement: The project does not involve any settlement areas.

Principle 4.3 Land Tenure and Other Rights: The project does not require any changes to land tenure arrangements or other rights.

Principle 4.4 - Indigenous people: No cultural heritage/ indigenous people are displaced due to the project.

Principle 5. Corruption: The Project does not involve and is not complicit in any kind of corruption Turkey has ratified UN Convention against Corruption and the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions.

Principle 6.1 Labour Rights: PP complies with national labour occupational health and safety laws and with the principles and standards embodied in the ILO fundamental. All the employees are trained about health and safety issues during operation phase of the project.

Principle 6.2 Negative Economic Consequences: Other than providing clean energy to the nation, it has no negative impact on local economy during and after project implementation.

Principle 7.1 Emissions: The Project will reduce the emission as it replaces electricity generated from fossil fuel fired power plants with zero emissions electricity from the solar power plant.

Principle 7.2 Energy Supply: The Project's purpose is to supply clean energy from the solar power plant to the national grid.

Principle 8.1 Impact on Natural Water Patterns/Flows: The project has no impact of water resources, natural or pre-existing pattern of watercourses, groundwater and/or the watershed due to the project. Staffs produce the insignificant amount of waste waters, and this wastewater has been collected in an impermeable septic tank and collected via vacuum trucks by municipality and disposed according to Regulation on Control of Water Contamination.

Principle 8.2 Erosion and/or Water Body Instability: The Project directly or indirectly does not cause additional erosion and/or water body instability or disrupt the natural pattern of erosion.

Principle 9.1 Landscape Modification and Soil: Project does not involve the use of land and soil for production of crops or other products.

Principle 9.2 Vulnerability to Natural Disaster: The project is not susceptible to decreased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding, drought or other extreme conditions.

Principle 9.3 Genetic Resources: Project does not affect the herbal life negatively.

Principle 9.5 Hazardous and Non-hazardous Waste : The all wastes are disposed of according to related regulations. The methods are categorized for all materials.

Principle 9.6 Pesticides & Fertilisers: The Project does not involve the application of pesticides and/or fertilizers.

Principle 9.7 Harvesting of Forests: The project does not involve harvesting of forest.

Principle 9.8 Food: The Project does not modify the quantity or nutritional quality of food available such as through crop regime alteration or export or economic incentives.

Principle 9.9 Animal husbandry: The Project does not modify the involve animal husbandry.

Principle 9.10 High Conservation Value Areas and Critical Habitats: The project area is not a protected area related with the biodiversity, there are no sensitive genes, species and/or habitats existing within the project projects impact boundaries.

Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. Can confirm that the list of parameters that need to be monitored ex post for the third crediting period is complete and consistent with the relevant applied methodology which is ACM0002 version 21.0. Besides, safeguarding principles are evaluated correctly and all relevant principles are stated with mitigation measures.

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

CP Renewal report (v4, 17/12/2022) of second crediting period did not state any FARs. The related Design Renewal Review dated 10/03/2023 by Gold Standard states FARs which are being evaluated under 4th verification process held at the same period during this CP renewal validation period. 4th verification process has not ended as of date of this report.

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

Therefore, Re Carbon Ltd. Can confirm that the list of parameters that need to be monitored ex post for the third crediting period is complete and consistent with the relevant applied methodology which is ACM0002 version 21.0.

4.4. Calculation of Emission Factor and Emission Reductions

The emission reduction calculation estimations have been included in the PDD in line with the latest approved version of the methodology ACM0002 version 21.0. The baseline emissions are calculated based on the combined emission factor multiplied by the expected net electricity generation, which amounts to 46,299 ton CO₂ per annum.

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

$Bey = 71,361.946 \text{ MWh/yr} * 0.6488 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh} = 46,299 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e/year}$

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 average emission reduction of 46,299 tCO₂e/year during the third crediting period.

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$$

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

$$ER_y = BE_y = 46,299 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

4.5. Sampling Plan

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

5. LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

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

Table 5-1: List of individuals interviewed

| Reference Number | Means of Interview ¹ | Full Name | Organization | Title |
|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | SV | Aptullah Alkan | Alize Enerji | Driver for Demirer |
| 2 | SV | Fatma Beyazıt | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| 3 | SV | Gülten Ay | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| 4 | SV | Halil Ay | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| 5 | SV | Halil Demirel | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Muhtar |
| 6 | SV | Yıldırım Beyazıt | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| 7 | SV | Ahmet Muslu | Alize Enerji | Operator |
| 8 | SV | Çağla Balcı Eriş | Rüzgar Danışmanlık | Consultant |
| 9 | SV | Ömer Ergin | Alize Enerji | Electrical Engineer |
| 10 | SV | Arif İnce | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| 11 | SV | Nurettin Aydın | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident |
| 12 | SV | Uğur Elagöz | Kiraz Village | Religious Officer |
| 13 | SV | Elmas Altın | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| 14 | SV | Zülbiye Ay | Kiraz Village | Kiraz Village Resident-Female |
| 15 | SV | Emre Acar | Alize Enerji | Administrative |
| 16 | SV | Fehmi Bengi | Alize Enerji | Administrative |

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

6. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

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

Table 6-1: List of documents reviewed

| Document Number | Document Name | Version | Date (dd/mm/yyyy) |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------|
| D01 | PDD for the 3rd Crediting Period | 01 | 08/05/2023 |
| D02 | Registered PDD for CP2 | 4 | 18/11/2022 |
| D03 | ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet | 01 | 08/05/2023 |
| D04 | ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources | 21.0 | 02/11/2022 |
| D05 | CDM Validation and Verification Standard version | 3.0 | 09/09/2021 |
| D06 | CDM Project Standard | 3.0 | 09/09/2021 |
| D07 | GS4GG V1.2 Standard | - | - |
| D08 | National Emission factor of Turkey | - | 20/09/2022 |
| D09 | Acceptances | - | 2009, 2010, additional turbines: 18/12/2016 |
| D10 | Generation License | - | 18/04/2007 |
| D11 | Connection Agreement of the Project activity | - | 28/05/2009 |
| D12 | Initial Calibration and test documents of meters | - | 2013, 2015 |
| D13 | Project Introductory Document | - | 10/09/2007 |
| D14 | Ongoing Financial Need Excel spreadsheet | 1 | 08/05/2023 |
| D15 | SDG Impact Tool of the Project activity | 1 | 08/05/2023 |
| D16 | Annual Production & Averages | - | 2010-2022 |
| D17 | Verification Report_4th monitoring period | 3 | 25/05/2023 |
| D18 | ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet | 02 | 30/05/2023 |
| D19 | PDD for the 3rd Crediting Period | 02 | 30/05/2023 |

| Document Number | Document Name | Version | Date (dd/mm/yyyy) |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| D20 | Ornithology Reports | - | March 2013, June 2016 |
| D21 | Social Security Records of PP Site Staff | - | 2019-2022 |
| D22 | Complimentary Stakeholder Consultation and logbook | - | 25/04/2023 |
| D23 | Evidences of wastewater disposal | - | 2019-2022 |
| D24 | HSE training Records | - | 16/09/2021, 17/09/2021, 11/11/2019, 14/07/2020, 15/03/2019, 15/07/2019, 20/04/2019, 25/08/2020, 20/08/2019 |
| D25 | Ongoing Financial Need Excel spreadsheet | 2 | 30/05/2023 |
| D26 | Design Review for CP2 | - | 10/03/2023 |
| D27 | SDG Impact Tool of the Project activity | 2 | 30/05/2023 |
| D28 | ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet | 03 | 07/06/2023 |
| D29 | PDD for the 3rd Crediting Period | 03 | 07/06/2023 |
| D30 | PDD for the 3rd Crediting Period | 04 | 08/09/2023 |
| D31 | PDD for the 3rd Crediting Period | 05 | 06/10/2023 |

7. VALIDATION TEAM AND ITR COMPETENCE

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

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

7.1. Appointment Certificates

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT



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

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

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

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

Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mrs. Fikriye Seda Atabek

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

| SECTORIAL SCOPE | TECHNICAL AREA | Gold Standard | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|-----|------------|
| | | VERIFIER | VALIDATOR | TEAM LEADER | ITR | EXPERT |
| SS 01: Energy industries | TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation | | | | | |
| | TA 1.3: Biomass | 06.02.2022 | 06.02.2022 | | | 06.02.2022 |
| SS 02: Energy distribution | TA 2.1: Energy distribution | 06.02.2022 | 06.02.2022 | | | 06.02.2022 |
| | TA 2.2: Energy demand | 06.02.2022 | 06.02.2022 | | | 06.02.2022 |
| SS 10: Waste handling and disposal | TA 10.1: Solid waste and wastewater | 08.12.2021 | 08.12.2021 | | | 08.12.2021 |
| | TA 10.2: Manure | | | | | |
| SS 15: Agriculture | TA 15.1: Agriculture | | | | | |

| SECTORIAL SCOPE | TECHNICAL AREA | International Carbon Registry | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| | | VERIFIER | VALIDATOR | TEAM LEADER | ITR | EXPERT |
| SS 01: Energy industries | TA 1.1: Thermal energy generation | | | | | |
| | TA 1.3: Biomass | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 |
| SS 02: Energy distribution | TA 2.1: Energy distribution | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 |
| | TA 2.2: Energy demand | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 | 07.07.2022 |
| SS 10: Waste handling and disposal | TA 10.1: Solid waste and wastewater | | | | | |
| | TA 10.2: Manure | | | | | |
| SS 15: Agriculture | TA 15.1: Agriculture | | | | | |

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Turkey, China

F-01-003 v 13.04.2022-03

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT



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

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

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

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



Christian Johannes
(General Manager)

This Certificate of Appointment is given to

Mr. Anıl Söyler

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



Gold Standard
Climate Security & Sustainable Development



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



ICR International Carbon Registry

BioCarbon Registry

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

COUNTRY EXPERTISE: Turkey, China

8. VALIDATION OPINION

Re Carbon Ltd. Performed the 3rd crediting period validation of the “Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey” in “Turkey” between 08/05/2023 and dd/MM/YYYY. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, Gold Standard for Global Goals (GS4GG) v1.2 and Host Party criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation has been performed by a validation team consisting of “Fikriye Seda Atabek as team leader and Anıl Söyler as an ITR”, and the project activity was checked against the applicable rules and regulations of CDM including CDM Validation and Verification Standard for project activities version 3.0, CDM Project Standard for project activities version 3.0 and GS4GG version 1.2 and other relevant GS4GG requirements.

Re Carbon Ltd. Hereby confirms that the proposed project activity “Keltepe Wind Farm 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 46,299 tCO₂e per annum over the 3rd crediting period (GS-VERs). The emission reduction forecast was checked and it is deemed likely that the stated amount will be achieved given that the underlying assumptions do not change.

As a result, the validation team assigned by the Re Carbon Ltd. Concludes that the proposed Project Activity “Keltepe Wind Farm Project, Turkey” in Turkey, as described in the PDD (version 0.5 and 06/10/2023)

- 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.



Mrs. Fikriye Seda ATABEK
Team Leader
18/10/2023



Mr. Anıl SÖYLER
ITR
18/10/2023



Ms. Esin TUNALI
Certification Manager
18/10/2023

ANNEX 1: VALIDATION PROTOCOL

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

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Cover Page-Key Project Information | | | | | |
| 1. Has the following information been indicated in the cover page of the PDD? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.1. GS ID of the project activity | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.2. Title of the project activity | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.3. Time of first submission date | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.4. Date of design certification | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| 1.5. Version number of the PDD | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Why is pdd v0.4? | CAR-1 | OK |
| 1.6. Completion date of version | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.7. Project developer | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1.8. Project representative | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.9. Project developers and any communities involved | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.10. Host country (ies) | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.11. Activity requirements applied | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.12. Scale of the project activity | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.13. Other requirements applied | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.14. Methodology (ies) applied and version number | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.15. Product requirements applied | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 1.16. Project cycle | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 2. Has the estimated sustainable development contributions of the project activity been provided in the relevant tabular format? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| A. 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 | Please include the unregistered turbines info (number, capacity and coordinates) in PDD | CAR-2 | OK |
| 2. Is the baseline scenario described as identified in section B4 of the PDD? (If baseline scenario is the same with the scenario existing prior to the start of the project activity, then no need to repeat the description, but it shall be stated in the PDD that both scenarios are the same.) | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| 3. Has the PDs provided an estimation of annual average and total GHG emission reductions for the chosen crediting period? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | In B.6.3 of PDD, numbers 24,102 and 324,097 are not in line with excel and the impact tool | CAR-3 | 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 | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| A.1.1. Eligibility of the project under Gold Standard | | This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period. | | | |
| A.1.2. Legal ownership of products generated by the project and legal rights to alter use of resources required to service the project | | | | | |
| A.1.2.1. Is it justified that the project owner has full and uncontested legal ownership of the products that are generated under Gold Standard Certification and has legal rights concerning changes in use of resources required to service the Project for e.g water rights, where applicable? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| A.2. Location of the project activity | | This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period. | | | |
| A.3. Technologies and/or measures | | This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period. | | | |
| | | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| A.4. Scale of the project | | | | | |
| A.4.1. Has the scale of the project defined (micro scale, small scale or others)? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| A.4.2. Is the justification for the scale of the project provided referring to relevant activity requirement? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 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. | | | |
| 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 | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| B.1.2. Are the references including the number, title, and the version of any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology(ies) refers to given in the PDD? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §54 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | 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 project activities §67 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.2.2. Does the project activity meet each of the applicability conditions of the tools or other methodology components referred to in the applied methodology? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §67 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.2.3. Has the PDs explained the documentation that has been used and provided the references to applicability of methodology? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| ACM 0002 | | | | | |
| B.2.4. Is the type of proposed project activity defined? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes, stated correctly. | OK | OK |
| B.2.5. If the proposed project activity is a hydro power plant project, does one of the following conditions conform to the proposed project activity? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | 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 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.5.2. Is the project activity implemented in an existing single or multiple reservoirs, where the volume of the reservoir(s) is increased and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m ² ? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.5.3. Is the project activity results in new single or multiple reservoirs and the power density calculated using equation (3), is greater than 4 W/m ² ? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.2.5.4. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PDs demonstrated that water flow from upstream power plants/units spill directly to the downstream reservoir and that collectively constitute to the generation capacity of the integrated hydro power project? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.5.5. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project, has the PDs provided an analysis of the water balance covering the water fed to power units, with all possible combinations of reservoirs and without the construction of reservoirs? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.6. If the project activity is an integrated hydro power project involving multiple reservoirs, where the power density for any of the reservoirs calculated using equation (3) is lower than or equal to 4 W/m ² , do all the following conditions conform the project activity? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.6.1. The power density calculated using the total installed capacity of the integrated project, as per equation (4), is greater than 4 W/m ² ; | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.6.2. Water flow between reservoirs is not used by any other hydropower unit which is not a part of the project activity; | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.2.6.3. Installed capacity of the power plant(s) with power density lower than or equal to 4 W/m ² shall be: | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.6.3.1. Lower than or equal to 15 MW; and | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.2.6.3.2. Less than 10 per cent of the total installed capacity of integrated hydro power project. | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.3. Project boundary | | | | | |
| B.3.1. Has the PD described the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project emissions and baseline emissions, in the tabular format? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, given correctly | OK | OK |
| B.3.2. Has the PD presented a flow diagram of the project boundary, physically delineating the project activity, based on the description provided in section A.3 of the PDD? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, given correctly | OK | OK |
| B.3.3. Has the PD included in the flow diagram the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described in section A.3 of the PDD, and indicated in the diagram the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary and the data and parameters to be monitored? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes, given correctly | OK | OK |
| B.3.4. Does the selected methodology allow the PDs to choose whether a source or gas is to be included in the project boundary? | CDM project standard for project activities §58 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.3.5. If the selected methodology allows the project developers to choose whether a | CDM project standard for | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| source or gas is to be included in the project boundary, do the project developers explain and justify their choices? | project activities §58 | | | | |
| B.3.6. Have all sources and GHGs necessary for the calculation of emissions been included within the project boundary? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §69 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.3.7. Does the PDD correctly describe the project boundary and the physical delineation of the proposed project activity? | CDM project standard for project activities §57 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.3.8. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to project boundary? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63a | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| ACM 0002 | | | | | |
| B.3.9. Is the spatial extent of the project boundary identified correctly? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.3.10. Are the greenhouse gases and emission sources included in or excluded from the project boundary given in the tabular form as per the guidance given in Table-2 of ACM 0002? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.4. Establishment and description of the baseline scenario | | | | | |
| B.4.1. Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed GS project prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §94 CDM project standard for project activities §59 | DR | Yes, described | OK | OK |
| B.4.2. Does the PDD identify the baseline for the proposed GS project, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed GS project? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §75 CDM project standard for project activities §61 | DR | Yes, described | OK | OK |
| B.4.3. If the methodology requires use of the tools to identify the baseline scenario, have all those been applied? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §77 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.4.4. Are there relevant national and/or sectoral policies to identify the baseline scenario? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §81 CDM project standard for project activities §64 | DR | No | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 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, outputs or services, do the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately? | CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.10. If the alternative scenarios for each of them be identified separately, are the realistic combinations of these be considered as | 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 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| possible alternative scenarios to the proposed project activity? | and assessment of additionality | | | | |
| B.4.11. Does the list of alternative scenarios given in the PDD include the following? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.11.1. The project activity is undertaken without being registered as a GS project | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.11.2. All plausible alternatives | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93b | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.11.3. Comply with all applicable and enforced legislation | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93c | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.12. Has the PD explained how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected methodology(ies)? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §59 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.13. Where the procedure in the selected methodology(ies) involves several steps, has the PDs described how each step is applied and transparently documented the outcome of each step? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.4.14. Has the PD provided and explained all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources, etc.)? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.15. Is the identified baseline scenario reasonably supported by correct and verifiable references, assumptions, calculations and rationales? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.16. Has a transparent description of the baseline scenario been provided including the technology(ies) that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the project activity? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §80 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.17. Has the selected methodology been correctly applied with respect to baseline identification? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63b | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| ACM 0002 | | | | | |
| B.4.18. If the project activity involves the installation of a greenfield power plant, is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM 0002? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.4.19. If the project activity involves capacity addition to existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM0002? | | | | | |
| B.4.20. If the proposed project activity is a capacity addition, retrofit, rehabilitation or replacement, have the existing plant/unit started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions and defined in the baseline emission section, and no capacity expansion, retrofit or rehabilitation of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.21. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the point of time at which the generation facility would likely be replaced or retrofitted (DATE _{Baseline Retrofit}) defined? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.22. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified following the step-wise procedure in accordance with the ACM0002? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.23. Are the realistic and credible alternative baseline scenarios for power generation appropriately identified following the Step 1 of the “Combined tool to identify the | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”? | | | | | |
| B.4.24. Is “the proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity” listed as one of the alternatives? | CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93a ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.25. Has “other realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) to the proposed CDM project activity scenario that deliver outputs services or services with comparable quality, properties and application areas” been listed as an alternative? | CDM TOOL01 Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §93b ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | 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 and assessment of additionality ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.27. If the barrier analysis is used, is the Step 2 of the latest applicable version of “Combined | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate “additionality” applied appropriately? | | | | | |
| B.4.28. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2 and if the remaining alternatives include scenarios P1 and P3, is the Investment Comparison as per step 3 of the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” applied appropriately? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.4.29. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2 and if the remaining alternatives include scenarios P1 and P2, is the Benchmark Analysis as per step 2b of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” applied appropriately? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.5. Demonstration of additionality | | This section of the PDD is not reviewed as the project is under validation for renewal of crediting period. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| B.5.1. Prior consideration of CDM | | | | | |
| 1. In case of projects undergoing design changes, has the request for design change approval is within one year design change start date? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| B.5.2. Ongoing financial need | | | | | |
| B.5.2.1. Has a short narrative that demonstrates how the revenue from Gold Standard | GS-PDD-FORM | DR | Please explain the IRR provided in OFN excel in PDD | CAR-6 | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| certification is material to the ongoing sustainability of the project been provided? | Ver. 1.2 | | | | |
| B.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) outcomes | | | | | |
| B.5.1. Has the PDs specified the relevant SDG target for each of three SDGs addressed by the project? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1. Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG outcome | | | | | |
| B.6.1.1. Has the PDs explained how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology(ies), for calculating baseline and project outcomes are applied? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.1.1. Baseline | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.1.2. Project | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.1.3. Leakage | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.1.4. Net benefit | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.6.1.2. Has the PDs clearly stated which equations will be used in calculating net benefit? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.3. Has the PDs explained and justified all relevant methodological choices including the following? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.3.1. Where the methodology(ies) include different scenarios or cases, indicate and justify which scenario or case applies to the project activity | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM Project Standard for Project activities §72 | DR | Yes | 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 | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.1.3.3. Where the methodology(ies) allow different default values, indicate and justify which of the default values have been chosen for the project activity. | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| B.6.2. Data and parameters fixed ex ante | | | | | |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.6.2.1. Have the PDs included a compilation of information on the data and parameters that are not monitored during the crediting period but are determined before the registration and remain fixed throughout the crediting period under section B.6.3 of the PDD? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.2. Are the data that are calculated with the equations provided in the selected methodology(ies) or default values specified in the methodology(ies) included in the compilation? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.3. Is the following information regarding the data and parameters specified correctly? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.3.1. Relevant SDG indicator | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.3.2. Data/parameter | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.3.3. Data/parameter unit | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.3.4. Description of the data/parameter | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.3.5. Source of data | GS-PDD-FORM | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Ver. 1.2 | | | | |
| B.6.2.3.6. Values applied to data/parameter | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4. Where applied values have been measured, are the following included in the PDD? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4.1. The equipment used | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4.2. The standards used | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4.3. Responsible person/entity having undertaken the measurement | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4.4. The date of measurement(s) | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4.5. The frequency of measurement(s) | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.4.6. The measurement results | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.5. Has the purpose of data been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.6.2.5.1. Calculation of baseline; | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.5.2. Calculation of project; | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.2.5.3. Calculation of leakage. | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3. Ex ante estimation of SDG impact | | | | | |
| B.6.3.1. Do the steps taken and equations applied to calculate following comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology including applicable tool(s)? | CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.1.1. project outcome | CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.1.2. baseline outcome | CDM Project Standard for | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110 | | | | |
| B.6.3.1.3. leakage | CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.1.4. Net outcomes | CDM Project Standard for Project activities §71 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §110 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.2. Where the methodology allows for selection between options for equations or parameters, has adequate justification been provided in the PDD? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §111 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.3. Has the PDs used the values contained in the tables in section B.6.2 of the PDD for data and parameters available before registration? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.4. Has the PDs used the estimates contained in the table in section B.6 of the PDD for the data/parameters not | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| available before registration and monitored during the crediting period? | | | | | |
| B.6.3.5. If any of these estimates has been determined by a sampling approach, has the PD provided a description of the sampling efforts undertaken in accordance with the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.6. Has the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.7. Have the PDs provided a sample calculation for each equation used, substituting the values used in the equations? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.8. Is it explained and clearly stated how the procedures in the approved methodology or standardized baseline(s) to calculate emissions like project emissions, baseline emissions and leakages are applied by the PDs? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §112 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.9. Has the selected methodology or standardized baseline(s) been correctly and transparently applied with respect to algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §63c | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| ACM 0002 | | | | | |
| B.6.3.10. Are baseline emissions calculated using equation (11) given in the methodology? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.6.3.11. Is the quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the project activity in year y ($EG_{PJ,y}$) calculated using equations (12), (13), (14), (15) or (16) given in the methodology depending on the project type and relevant requirements? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.12. When the methodology offers options for approaches in calculations, is it documented in the PDD which option is applied? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.13. In the case of retrofits or replacements, has the point in time when the existing equipment would need to be replaced/retrofitted in the absence of the project chosen in a conservative manner? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.14. In the case of capacity additions, retrofits, rehabilitations or replacements (except for wind, solar, wave or tidal power capacity addition projects) | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.14.1. Is it ensured that the existing plant started commercial operation prior to the start of a minimum historical reference period of five years, used for the calculation of baseline emissions? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.6.3.14.2. Is it defined in the baseline emission section that no capacity addition, retrofit or rehabilitation of the plant has been undertaken between the start of this minimum historical reference period and the implementation of the project activity? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.15. Are the project emissions calculated properly using equations (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9) or (10) given in the methodology depending on the project type and the power density value? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.16. Where project emissions are taken as “0”, has the PD made proper justification? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.3.17. Are the emission reductions calculated using equation (17) given in the methodology? | ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.6.4. Summary of the ex-ante estimates of each SDG impact | | | | | |
| B.6.4.1. Have the PDs summarized the results of the ex-ante calculation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, using the tabular format? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| B.7. Monitoring Plan | | | | | |
| B.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored | | | | | |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| B.7.1.1. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each relevant SDG indicator been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.2. In the data/parameter tabular formats for monitoring, has the name of each data/parameter been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.3. Has the unit of each data/parameter been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.4. Has the description of each data/parameter been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.5. Has the source of each data/parameter been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.6. Where several sources of data/parameters are used, is the choice of data/parameter sources explained and justified? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.7. Has the applied value of each data/parameter been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Please add titles for G7-I8 in excel | CAR-4 | OK |
| B.7.1.8. Has the measurement methods and procedures been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.9. Has the PDs included which measurement equipment is used for monitoring? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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

*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 | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.13. Has the interval for the measurements included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.14. Has the monitoring frequency for each data/parameter been included? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| 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 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.16. Has the purpose of data/parameter been chosen as one of the following for each data/parameter? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.16.1. Calculation of baseline outcome; | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.16.2. Calculation of project outcome; | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.16.3. Calculation of leakage. | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*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 | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.18. Does the monitoring plan include all data, parameters and related information required by the selected methodology(ies)? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118a-ii ACM 0002 Version 21.0 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.1.19. Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §118b | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| B.7.2. Sampling plan | | | | | |
| B.7.2.1. Are the data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 of the PDD determined by a sampling approach? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §29e CDM Guideline: Sampling and 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 | Organization chart provided | OK | OK |
| B.7.3.2. Has the PD clearly indicated the responsibilities and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 CDM project standard for project activities §82c | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*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 | Yes | OK | 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. | | |
| C.2. Crediting period of project | | | | | |
| C.2.1. Start date of crediting period | | | | | |
| C.2.1.1. Is the start date of the crediting period of the project activity given in DD/MM/YYYY format? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| C.2.1.2. Have the PDs determined only one start date for the crediting period, even in cases of phased implementation of the proposed project activity? | CDM Project Standard for Project activities §89 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| C.2.1.3. Has the PDs used any qualifications to the start date, such as “expected”? | CDM Project Standard for Project activities §90 | DR | No | OK | OK |
| C.2.2. Total length of crediting period | | | | | |
| C.2.2.1. Is the length of the crediting period of the proposed project activity stated in years and months under section C.2.3 of the PDD? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| D. Summary of Safeguarding Principles and Gender Sensitive Assessment | | | | | |
| D.1. Safeguarding principles that will be monitored | | | | | |
| D.1.1. Has the safeguarding principles that will be monitored been summarized including the mitigation measures added to the monitoring plan? Have the PDs carried out an analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts following the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.1.2. Are all the safeguarding principles stated? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.1.3. Are all the relevant assessment questions included pertaining to the safeguarding principles? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.1.4. Is the relevance of the principle cited correctly (Yes/potentially/no)? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.1.5. Is proper justification for the safeguarding principle indicated? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.2. Assessment that project complies with 'gender sensitive' requirements | | | | | |
| D.2.1. Has the evidence been provided that the project concept and design cover the overall societal context from a gender perspective? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| D.2.2. Does the project reflect the key issues and requirements of Gender Sensitive design and implementation as outlined in the Gender Policy? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.2.3. Has it been explained how the project align with existing country policies, strategies and best practices? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.2.4. Has an expert been involved for the Gender Safeguarding Principles & Requirements, where required? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.2.5. Has it been explained how the project address the questions raised in the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| D.2.6. Does the project apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure, Requirements & Guidelines? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| 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 | | | | | |
| E.2. Final continuous input / grievance mechanism | | | | | |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

| Question | Reference | Means of Validation* | Findings, Comments, References and Document Sources | Draft Opinion | Final Opinion |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 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 update the statement “no feedback has been received 08/05/2023 but waiting until 25/05/2023” as the date is in the past Please mention CP3 SV by VVB in section E.2. | CAR-5 | OK |
| E.2.2. Has the following been provided as the mandatory methods as part of the final continuous input / grievance mechanism | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| E.2.2.1. Continuous input / grievance expression process book | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| E.2.2.2. GS contact | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| | | | | | |
| F. Other Requirements | | | | | |
| F.1. Forward action requests (FARs) identified during previous verification and/or design change review | | | | | |
| F.1.1. Are there any FARs from the previous verification and/or design change review, if applicable, stages? | CDM validation and verification standard for project activities §36 | DR | Please refer to FARs in Design Change Review in PDD | CAR-7 | OK |
| | DR | | | | |
| 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 | Yes | OK | OK |
| 2. Has the justification of relevance for the related safeguarding principles assessment been provided? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| 3. If the respond is yes for the justification of relevance, has all relevant requirements from the GS4GG Safeguarding Principles and Requirements document been included in the tabular format? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| 4. If the respond is no or potentially for the justification of relevance, has this been justified clearly and adequately? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| Appendix-2 Contact information of project developers | | | | | |
| 1. Is the contact information of PDs provided in Appendix 2? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | Yes | OK | OK |
| Appendix 3- LUF additional information | | | | | |
| 1. In case of land use and forest projects, has the additional information been provided in Appendix-3? | GS-PDD-FORM Ver. 1.2 | DR | N/A | OK | OK |

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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

*DR= Document Review, I= Interview

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

| Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team | Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 | Summary of Project developers' Response | Validation Team Conclusion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| CAR-1 Why is pdd v0.4? | 1.5 | It was typo mistake, it has been revised as 0.2 now. | Review 1 Ok Closed (Revised). |
| CAR-2 Please include the unregistered turbines info (number, capacity and coordinates) in PDD | A.1.1 | The unregistered 4 turbines info have been added in PDD. The capacities of 4 turbines have been already included in the Section A.3 of the PDD | Review 1 Ok Closed (Revised). |
| CAR-3 In B.6.3 of PDD, numbers 24,102 and 324,097 are not in line with excel and the impact tool | A.1.3 | It has been revised accordingly in the PDD and ER excel calculation sheet and SDG Impact Tool. | Review 1 Ok Closed (Revised). |
| CAR-4 Please add titles for G7-I8 in excel | B.7.1.7 | The titles for G7-I8 have been added in the excel | Review 1 Ok Closed (Revised). |

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

| Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team | Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 | Summary of Project developers' Response | Validation Team Conclusion |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <p>CAR-5</p> <p>Please update the statement “no feedback has been received 08/05/2023 but waiting until 25/05/2023” as the date is in the past</p> <p>Please mention CP3 SV by VVB in section E.2.</p> | <p>E.2.1</p> | <p>The statement has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>PP has mentioned CP3 on site visit details in the PDD.</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed (Revised).</p> |
| <p>CAR-6</p> <p>Please explain the IRR provided in OFN excel in PDD</p> | | <p>The related explanations have been already included in the PDD. The IRR assessment will not require by GS during CP renewal process according to GS4GG rules and requirements.</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed (Explained).</p> |
| <p>CAR-7</p> <p>Please refer to FARS in Design Change Review in PDD</p> | <p>F.1</p> | <p>There is no Design Change Review in this Project. There are 2 FARS for performance review after CP2 renewal process. And there are already added in MR and VR but this 4th performance review process has not finished. But these documents have been submitted to GS and provided same documents to the VVB.</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed (Explained).</p> |
| <p>CAR-8</p> <p>Please correct the header of the PDD in line with the relevant PDD template.</p> | <p>ITR</p> | <p>The header of the PDD has already corrected and in line with the relevant PDD template</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed.</p> |

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

| Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team | Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 | Summary of Project developers' Response | Validation Team Conclusion |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <p>CAR-9</p> <p>Please correct the monitoring dates and days terminology in the ER Calculation Excel spreadsheet.</p> <p>Please include round down function in E11-E18 cells of ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet.</p> <p>Please correct the round up function in E11 cell of ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet.</p> <p>Please correct the total value in the D20 cell of ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet.</p> | <p>ITR</p> | <p>The monitoring days and terminology have been corrected in the ER Calculation Excel Sheet.</p> <p>The round down function has included in E11-E18 cells of ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet.</p> <p>The round up function has changed to round down in E11 cell of ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet.</p> <p>The total value has been changed in the D20 cell of ER Calculation Excel Spreadsheet.</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed (Revised).</p> |
| <p>CAR-10</p> <p>Please check and correct the reference to the second crediting period in PDD</p> | <p>ITR</p> | <p>It has been checked and corrected in the PDD</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed (Revised).</p> |
| <p>CAR-11</p> <p>Please clarify why there is no verification after 2012 considering its impact on the ongoing financial need of the project.</p> | <p>ITR</p> | <p>The project has not continued the verification process because of the economic situation of cost and carbon credit's price. The income of the GS VER is very important for the financial performance of the project and PP has continued the verification process with approved deviation form by GS and Sustain Cert before start to the CP2 process. There are no VERs issuance for between 10/07/2016 and 30/04/2019 from CP2 (2nd crediting period) PP has applied to GS and</p> | <p>Review 1</p> <p>Ok Closed (Revised).</p> |

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

| Draft Report Clarifications, Forward Action and Corrective Action Requests by Validation Team | Ref. to Checklist Questions in Table-1 | Summary of Project developers' Response | Validation Team Conclusion |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>taken approval to issuance of credits for between 01/05/2019 and 30/04/2022 and then continue with another performance review for between 01/05/2022 and 10/07/2023 from CP2. So the Project will make income from GSVERs soon. But this PDD for CP3 and Ongoing Financial Need has been revised accordingly with these details.</p> | |
| <p>CAR-12</p> <p>Please include the training parameter under the SDG-8 parameter in the Table-1 of the PDD.</p> <p>Please include the estimated value for the training parameter in the Section B.7.2 of the PDD.</p> | <p>ITR</p> | <p>The training parameter has been added under the SDG-8 parameter in the Table-1 of the PDD.</p> <p>The project will provide one health and safety training to the 8 employees at each monitoring period. This has been revised for the training parameter in the Section B.7.2 of the PDD.</p> | <p>Review 1 Ok Closed (Revised).</p> |

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