Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

VERIFICATION REPORT FOR PROJECT ACTIVITIES (STANDALONE PROJECTS)

Publication Date **dd/mm/yyyy**

Version **1.0**

Next Planned Update **12/12/2025**

Contact Details

The Gold Standard Foundation
International Environment House 2
Chemin de Balexert 7-9
1219 Châtelaine
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 788 70 80
Email: standards@goldstandard.org

SUMMARY

This document contains the following sections:

Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

KEY PROJECT INFORMATION

GS ID	GS576	
Title of Project	Kuyucak 25.6 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey	
Version number of the Verification Report	1.2	
Completion Date of Verification Report	25/07/2025	
Version number and completion date of the MR to which this report applies	Version 0.4, 15/05/2025	
Date of listing	15/04/2011	
Project Developer	Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.	
Project Representative	Rüzgar Karbon ve Enerji Danışmanlık Sanayi Ticaret Limited Şirketi	
Project Participants and any communities involved	Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.- Rüzgar Karbon ve Enerji Danışmanlık Sanayi Ticaret Limited Şirketi	
Host Country (ies)	Turkey	
Activity Requirements applied	☒ Renewable Energy Activity Requirements ☐ Community Services Activity Requirements ☐ Land-Use & Forests Activity Requirements ☐ New project types ☐ Others (*rules and requirements available in Principles and Requirements apply*)	
Scale of the project activity	☐ Microscale ☐ Small scale ☒ Large scale ☐ Others	
Methodology (ies) applied and version number	☒ Gold Standard approved methodology, including any specific Gold Standard applicability criteria. ☐ A project-specific methodology (Applicable to Microscale Project only)	
	Title(s) of methodology (ies)	ACM0002, Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources
	The version number of the methodology (ies)	Version 20.0

Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

Product Requirements applied	☒ *GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration* ☐ *Renewable Energy Label* ☐ Others / *For all other Certification Statements, Certified SDG Impact Statements or Products.* Please specify: ☐ N/A
Project cycle	☒ Regular ☐ Retroactive
Deviation applicable to the project (accepted and rejected both)	Deviation ID: NA Applicable section of validation report: NA

VVB information

Name of the VVB	KBS Certification Services Ltd.
GS accreditation expiry date	19/03/2027
Is the VVB accredited for the applicable sectoral scope?	Yes
Name, position of the approver of the validation report	Mr. Praveen N Urs Director of Climate Change and Sustainability
Signature (Final version only)	

Table 1 – Verified Sustainable Development Contributions

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS TARGETED	SDG IMPACT	ACHIEVED AMOUNT	UNITS OR PRODUCTS
13 Climate Action	Emission reductions	34,125	tCO2e GS VERs
7 Affordable and Clean Energy	MWh of renewable energy generated	52,597.351	MWh
8 Decent Work and Economic Growth	Number of employment generation	8 employees	number
8 Decent Work and Economic Growth	Health and Safety Training Records	8 people trained	number

Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

1| PART I – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

>>

KBS Certification Services Ltd. has been contracted by "Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş." to perform first verification for the second crediting period of the GS registered project "Kuyucak 25.6 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey" with Gold Standard Ref. Number GS576.

The scope of verification includes confirming the implementation of the monitoring plan of the registered version of GS4GG PDD and the application of the monitoring methodology as per CDM Methodology "ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 20.0 /13/. An Onsite assessment was conducted to check the implementation of registered monitoring plan and verify the data submitted in the monitoring report /11/. KBS confirms the following has been reviewed;

- The registered version of GS4GG PDD and the monitoring plan and the corresponding validation opinion,
- The validation report,
- The applied monitoring methodology(ies),
- The monitoring report to verify that it is as per the standardized format (01/03/2024 to 10/11/2024 both dates are included),
- Any other information and references relevant to the project activity's emission reductions (e.g. IPCC reports, data on electricity generation in the national grid, electricity meter's information and national regulations);
- VER calculations sheets and all supporting documents;

The project activity aims to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions in Turkey by replacing fossil fuel power generation and contribute to the development of the wind energy sector in Turkey, as well as aims to support the local economy by creating local employment.

KBS Certification Services Ltd. confirms that the monitoring system is in place and the emission reductions are calculated without material misstatements during the first monitoring period of the second crediting period.

Based on the information seen and evaluation onsite, we confirm that the implementation of the project has resulted in 34,125 tCO2e emission reductions during the monitoring period 01/03/2024 to 10/11/2024 (both days are included) in accordance with GS4GG.

Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

2| PART II – VERIFICATION TEAM, TECHNICAL REVIEWER AND APPROVER

2.1 | Verification team member(s)

S.NO.	FULL NAME	ROLE(S)	TYPE OF RESOURCE	TYPE OF ACTIVITY(IES) CARRIED OUT
1	Tuğçe Kıratlı	Team Leader, Verifier, Technical and Local Expert	IR	Desk/Document Review, Onsite Inspection, Interviews, Verification Findings

2.2 | Technical Reviewer(s) and approver(s) of the verification report

S.NO.	FULL NAME	ROLE(S)	TYPE OF RESOURCE	TYPE OF ACTIVITY(IES) CARRIED OUT
1	Ashish Yadav	Technical reviewer	IR	Technical Review of Documents
2	Rishabh Madan	Manager Technical & Certification	IR	Technical Certification
3	Praveen N Urs	Director of Climate Change and Sustainability	IR	Approver

Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

3| PART III – MEANS OF VERIFICATION

3.1 | Desk review/Planning

A desk review is undertaken, involving but not limited to,

- A review of the data and information presented to verify the completeness of MR according to PDD;
- A review of the monitoring plan and monitoring methodology, paying particular attention to the frequency of surveys and methodology;
- An evaluation of data management and the quality assurance and quality control system in the context of their influence on the generation and reporting of emission reductions and also the review of the applicable approved methodological and relevant tools, guidance and GS4GG requirements in conjunction with applicable CDM requirements.

The monitoring report version 0.4 of 15/05/2025 /11/ and previous versions, the emission reduction calculations provided in the form of a spreadsheet "ER calculations_Kuyucak WPP" version 0.3 submitted on 17/05/2025 /12/, the approved baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 version 20.0.0 of 28/11/2019 /13/ and all the documentation provided to support the monitoring period /1 – 41/, was assessed as part of the verification. In addition, the Project Design Document (PDD) version 0.8 of 06/06/2023 /8/, the Validation Report version 0.3 of 24/04/2024 /9/ and the Previous Verification Report, version 0.3 of 22/07/2024 /10/ for the project, were reviewed.

The list of all documents reviewed is included in the section 'Appendix 3' below.

3.2 | On-site inspection

The site-visit was performed on 26/12/2024. The project employees were interviewed about the implementation status of the project, monitoring equipment and operation, generated electricity of the project activity, monitoring of GS indicators.
During on site visit, it was confirmed that no negative feedback or comments were received related to project activity during grievance mechanism and continuous inputs for the monitoring period. In addition to this, the VVB assessed that whether a comment book available at the most appropriate and publicly accessible location (Demirtaş Village where is the nearest location of the project activity) so that stakeholders can provide feedback on the project. The continuous input/grievance mechanism has been verified through interview with the headman of village and the logbook dated 12/03/2024 /36/ has been checked. There isn't any positive or negative comment written on it. The stakeholders also indicated that if they need, they can communicate directly and easily with the operating manager of the project activity. Good relationship between the PP and stakeholders (Demirtaş Villages) is observed.
In addition to this during interviews, it is asked to the stakeholders and project employees if any legal contests or disputes have arisen during the monitoring period, and they confirmed that there is no legal contest, or disputes have arisen.

DURATION OF ON-SITE INSPECTION: 26/12/2024

NAME	ROLE	LOCATION OF VISIT	ACTIVITY PERFORMED ON-SITE

Gold Standard for the Global Goals

TEMPLATE

Tuğçe Kıratlı	Verifier/Technical Expert/Local Expert	Manisa/Turkey	To assess specific processes, functions, sites, areas and/or activities according to the Audit plan and Assessment schedule

S. NO	INTERVIEWEE		DATE	SUBJECT	TEAM MEMBER INVOLVED
	Name	Affiliation			
1	Ç. B. E.	Rüzgar Danışmanlık/ Consultancy	26/12/2024	Project design, start date, project implementation & execution, organizational structure, monitoring equipment and operation, quality check & control, Generated Electricity, Monitoring of Gold Standard for Global Goal Parameters	Tuğçe Kıratlı
2	A. E.	Alize Enerji/ Project Responsible	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
3	M. A.	Alize Enerji/ High Voltage Operator	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
4	V. K.	Alize Enerji/ Advisory-Guard	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
5	Y. A.	Alize Enerji/ Advisory-Guard	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
6	İ. B.	Alize Enerji/ Advisory-Guard	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
7	M. S.	Alize Enerji/ Advisory-Guard	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı

8	Z. A.	Demirtaş Village / Mukhtar	26/12/2024	Benefit of the project to the village, Receiving General Opinion of the local stakeholder about the project, Local Employment, Grievance Process	Tuğçe Kıratlı
9	N. K.	Demirtaş Village / Housewife	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
10	N. A.	Demirtaş Village / Housewife	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
11	A. A. K.	Demirtaş Village / Stakeholder	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
12	F. K.	Demirtaş Village / Stakeholder	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı
13	R. U.	Demirtaş Village / Stakeholder	26/12/2024		Tuğçe Kıratlı

3.3 | Remote audit (if applicable)

~~DURATION OF REMOTE INSPECTION: DD/MM/YYYY TO DD/MM/YYYY~~

~~NAME~~	~~ROLE~~	~~REMOTE AUDITING MEANS/METHODS~~	~~TOPICS COVERED~~
–	–	–	–
–	–	–	–

3.4 | Sampling approach

No sampling approach is used.

TEMPLATE

A. OPINION:

a) In the opinion of the assessment team, the implementation and operation of the project activity is in compliance with the description in the recent version of GS4GG PDD.

b) The actual emission reductions for the current monitoring period are 34,125 tCO_2e which are higher than the estimated ERs (tCO2e) for the comparable period which was estimated to be 33,545 tCO_2e.

c) The verification team along with Onsite observations, objective evidence collections, data generation and recording analysis also considered the views obtained in these interviews while arriving at Verification Opinion.

3.5 | Application of materiality

>>

Consideration of materiality in planning the verification

No.	Risk that could lead to material errors, omissions or misstatements	Assessment of the risk		Response to the risk in the verification plan and/or sampling plan
		Risk level	Justification	
1	Omissions and misstatements in data recording.	Low	Ineffective quality control of data transfer due to human errors	During the site visit, the verification team will interview the staff of the project team and check all records to confirm whether the monitoring plan has been well implemented. The major parameters used for determining the project's baseline emissions are the measurement of net electricity generation according to the monitoring plan which is recorded monthly. The team will review the whole data set of the monthly report, and cross check invoices raised. The verification team will check the relevant records to confirm whether the data collection procedure and QA/QC procedure have been well implemented.
2	Missing data/Mismatch in data due to inefficient monitoring by monitoring team/ double counting/nonfunctioning of SCADA	Low	The data can be monitored remotely by two separate institutions and invoicing is done based on this data. The monitoring team also monitors data on an hourly basis. All data presented in Excel is subject to checking and cross-referencing of a sample of the raw data by the PP and the consultant.	

4| PART IV – VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT

4.1 | General

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Did the audit team corroborate the relevance of the people interviewed as a legitimate stakeholder?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The audit team corroborated he relevance of the people interviewed as a legitimate stakeholder.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	We met with many stakeholders in the field, including the village headman. Since the project workers were from the same village, we all discussed both the project and the villagers' approach.
2. Did the audit team confirm that the anonymity of the person interviewed does not introduce a bias to the information provided (if applicable)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The interviewees declared that there was no need to keep their identities secret.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team held on-site interviews with Kuyucak WPP and Alize Enerji employees and project beneficiaries to check the implementation of the monitoring plan, current situation, evaluation of data management, QA/QC system. Cross-checks were made between information provided by interviewed staff (e.g. by checking sources) to ensure that no relevant information was omitted.

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
The audit team interviewed a sufficient number of stakeholders. The names and surnames of the people interviewed during the on-site visit were shared in the report with their consent.

4.2 | Key Project Information

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the key project information of the project accurate, complete, and consistent with the applicable PDD? Including but not limited to: • Title of the project • PDD applicable version • Project scale • Project Developer • Project Participant (if any) • Methodology(ies) and version(s) • Activity and Product requirements • SDGs ex-ante values	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirms that key project information of the project is accurate, complete, and consistent with the applicable PDD /8/ via desk review. Also, as part of the onsite visit, the verification team was able to confirm that the project implementation is in accordance with the project description contained in the registered GS4GG PDD, the verification team checked the key information of the project activity as per PDD.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The Monitoring Report for the project activity "Kuyucak WPP", version 0.4 of 15/05/2025 /11/ and previous versions submitted by the Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. has been the basis for the verification process. KBS confirms that the Monitoring report is based on the currently valid MR template /14/. The project applies the approved methodologies ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 20.0 of 28/11/2019 /13/. The following tools are also applicable to the project activity: "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system version 07.0" /15/; "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality version 07.0" /16/, "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality version 07.0" /31/, "Tool to calculate project or leakage CO_2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion version 03.0" /32/, "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment version 01.0" /17/. The project is a large-scale wind power plant with total capacity of 25.6 MWe as confirmed through amended license /18/.
2. Does *Table 1 of the Monitoring Report – "Sustainable Development Contributions Achieved"* clearly summarize what GS Products and Certified Impact Statements are requested for issuance as per the monitoring plan in the design certified PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team checked the sustainable development indicator parameters via approved PDD /8/ and confirmed with calculation spreadsheet /12/, employment record /28/ and training records /33/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team checked the values for the SD contributions achieved by cross checking invoices of the electricity generation during onsite visit. According to these data, emission reduction is calculated correctly. In addition, the employment records and training records were checked to verify the number of the employees and the trainings given to the employees during this monitoring period. The additional parameters that are monitored are in accordance with the monitoring plan for sustainability indicators as referred in the revised Gold Standard monitoring report.

3. Does *Table 2 of the Monitoring Report – "Product Vintages"* clearly divide the monitoring period into calendar years and calculate the number of Products generated in each calendar year?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	KBS confirmed that the product vintages of the emission reductions, electricity generations, number of employees and trainings are clearly divided in the monitoring report as per the regarding with the monitoring period.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The emission reductions, electricity generations data are checked from the ER sheet /12/. Number of employees and trainings are checked with the Social Security Insurance records /28/ and training records /33/ and confirmed that all data are transferred and calculated correctly.

4. For micro and small-scale projects when emission reductions in a calendar year or in a monitoring year exceed the cap based on the scale. Are emission reductions claimed capped according to the scale of the project?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

5. Does the project activity demonstrate no double counting and no overlaps with that of another Gold Standard or other voluntary or compliance standard programme? Please refer to section 14 of the GHG Emissions Reductions & Sequestration Product Requirements	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The project has cross checked with registries of other carbon scheme like ICR, GCC, Verra to confirm that this project is not registered with any other registries and hence confirming that there are no overlaps with that of another gold standard or other voluntary programme. The same has also been confirmed during Onsite interview.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The double counting issue has been assessed and the verification team has checked the VCS project database /19/, ICR project database /20/, GCC project database /21/, and CerCarbono Database /22/ were checked. The GHG benefit of the project activity was only accounted under Gold Standard Registry (GS4GG). There are not any other RECs were being issued for the project activity. Furthermore, as a host country in Turkey such any program like a government-regulated system or program for the constraint and monetization of GHG emissions (such as emissions trading scheme, cap and trade or carbon tax mechanisms) has not been implemented.

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The project description of the project activity is accurate and provides clear understanding to confirm its eligibility following the GS principle and requirements and community service activity requirements. The project description in the GS-PDD is consistent regarding the intended SDG impacts. The project is having no overlap with other GHG activities/ voluntary or compliance programs.

4.3 | Description of Project

4.3.1 | *General description of project*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the general description of the project include a summary of the location of the project, the technologies/measures implemented, the project boundary, the baseline scenario; and aligns to the information presented in the applicable PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The summary of the location of the project, the technologies/measures implemented, the project boundary, the baseline scenario are in line with the approved PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The project is located at Demirtaş Village and Kırkağaç-Kuyucak district of Manisa province of Turkey. The project activity is a wind power plant consisting of 12 wind turbines with a unit capacity of 2 MW each and 2 wind turbines with a unit capacity of 800 kW. Total capacity of the project is 25.6 MWe as confirmed through the Generation License /18/. In 2017, the project capacity was increased to 50.1 MW by adding 24.5 MW through the installation of 9 additional turbines—5 with a capacity of 2.3 MW and 4 with a capacity of 2.35 MW. However, this capacity expansion could not be included under the Gold Standard due to the one-year rule limiting retroactive registration. As a result, the Project Participant is permitted to use only electricity generation from the original 25.6 MW capacity for emission reduction calculations. To determine this, the ratio between the electricity generated by the initial 25.6 MW capacity and the total 50.1 MW capacity was calculated based on SCADA data. Technical data of Enercon E44- E70 is presented clearly in the monitoring report and confirmed with the previous verification report /10/. The project boundary in the registered PDD /8/ is in line with the actual project boundary. The generated electricity is supplied to the National Electricity Transmission Grid of Turkey. The baseline scenario in the approved methodology is defined as "Electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity that would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources" and in line with the PDD /8/.

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The monitoring report correctly describes the geographic and physical location aligns to the information presented in the applicable PDD Also, the baseline scenario of proposed project activity is stated accurately and in line with registered PDD.

4.3.2 | *Location of project*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are details of the physical/geographical location of the project activity provided (physical address, map ,GPS coordinates if necessary)?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The physical/geographical location of the project activity is clearly presented in the monitoring report and the given information is in line with the approved PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The project is located at Kırkağaç-Kuyucak district of Manisa province, Turkey. The nearest residential area is Demirtaş village. The coordinates of the wind turbines are presented and confirmed though the Generation License /18/.

WEC No.	Longitude (N)	Latitude (E)
1	39° 18′ 35″	27° 56′ 02″
2	39° 18′ 29″	27° 56′ 06″
3	39° 18′ 09″	27° 57′ 02″
4	39° 19′ 02″	27° 57′ 05″
5	39° 18′ 56″	27° 57′ 12″
6	39° 18′ 49″	27° 57′ 17″
7	39° 18′ 54″	27° 57′ 23″
8	39° 16′ 17″	27° 52′ 38″
9	39° 18′ 04″	27° 55′ 06″
10	39° 18′ 03″	27° 54′ 59″
11	39° 18′ 03″	27° 54′ 53″
12	39° 16′ 21″	27° 52′ 33″
13	39° 16′ 26″	27° 52′ 28″
14	39° 16′ 28″	27° 52′ 20″

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The monitoring report correctly describes the geographic and physical location of implemented Project activity and in line with the registered PDD.

4.3.3 | *Reference of applied methodology*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the project demonstrate compliance with all the applicable methodology(ies), tool(s), and guideline(s)?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The monitoring plan in the registered revised PDD /8/ is in accordance with the monitoring methodology ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 20.0 of 28/11/2019 /13/ and the applied tools /15/ /16/ /17/ /31/ /32/ and guidelines as confirmed through the desk review.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The project applies the approved methodologies ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 20.0 of 28/11/2019 /13/. The following tools are also applicable to the project activity: - "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system version 04.0" /15/, - "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality version 07.0" /16/, - "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment" version 1.0" /17/. - "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality" version 06.0" /31/. - "Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion" version 02.0" /32/. - Tool 11 "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 /42/
2. Does the project provide justification of the applicable tool(s) or guideline(s) that are not used?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
3. Does the project meet the requirements of micro, small or large scale, according to the methodologies or other rules specified in the Gold Standard?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The project meets the requirements of large scale, according to the methodologies and other rules specified in the Gold Standard. The verification team confirmed that by desk review of the monitoring report /11/ and PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	This project is developed as a large-scale Gold Standard project since the capacity of the project is above 15 Mwe. The project also applies large-scale methodology of ACM0002 "Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 20.0 of 28/11/2019 /13/.

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The monitoring report correctly describes the applied methodology and large scale of implemented Project activity. This issue is in line with the registered PDD.

4.3.4 | *Crediting period of project*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the start date, end date, and length of the crediting period similar to that given in the PDD and specified in DD/MM/YYYY format?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The crediting periods' dates are clearly mentioned with the correct format in the section A.4 of the Monitoring Report /11/. This is the second crediting period, and the duration is 11/11/2017 to 10/11/2024. This issue is verified during site-visit via PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team has verified the crediting period dates from the monitoring report Version 0.2 /11/ and cross checked via GS PDD /8/.
2. If not, does the update complies with the standard requirements and includes evidence when necessary?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The monitoring report correctly describes the crediting period of the project activity. This issue is in line with the registered PDD.

4.4 | Implementation of Project

4.4.1 | *Description of implemented project*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the information on the project implementation and actual operation accurate, complete, and consistent (including relevant dates of construction, commissioning, and start of operation)?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team has verified that the information regarding project implementation and actual operation is accurate, complete and consistent and also in line with the registered PDD.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The Monitoring Report for the project activity "Kuyucak WPP", version 0.4 of 15/05/2025 /11/ submitted by the Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. has been the basis for the verification process. It was verified during the site visit that the proposed project activity has been implemented and it is in operation in accordance with the project activity described in the registered revised PDD /8/. The starting date of operation and crediting period is consistent with the registered revised PDD /8/. The dates specified in the approved PDD have been transferred to the monitoring report accurately and completely.

2. Does the project clearly state any change(s) to the project design from the approved Design Certified PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There is no request for deviation applied during this monitoring period.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	There is no request for deviation applied during this monitoring period.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Assertion Statement

There is no request for deviation applied during this monitoring period.

4.4.2 | *Forward Action Requests*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. If any, were FARs from the Design Certification or previous performance certification addressed by project developer?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Since it is the last monitoring period of the second crediting period, GS Review documents for re-validation /29/ and verification for last monitoring period /27/ was taken into account.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	There was no FAR from the previous verification process.

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
KBS affirms that no FAR issued from the previous verification.

4.5 | Post-Design Certification changes – IF APPLICABLE

Summary of design change history of the project
There is no design change.

Design change submitted in issuance track
There is no design change.

4.5.1 | *Temporary deviations from the approved monitoring & reporting plan, methodology or standardized baseline*

There are no temporary deviations from the approved monitoring & reporting plan, methodology or standardized baseline.

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the explanation on temporary deviation describe the nature, extent, and its applicable duration?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
2. Are there conservative assumptions or discount factors applied to the calculations ensuring SDG Impacts will not be overestimated?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirmed that no assumption or discount factor is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	While calculating the emission reduction value from the selected SDG indicators, the value calculated on an annual basis is only rounded down for a conservative approach.

Temporary deviation history of the project and deviation submitted in issuance track
NA

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
The project activity has no temporary deviations.

4.5.2 | *Corrections*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are there any corrections to project information or parameters fixed at validation; and are these properly justified and described?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No corrections applied in this monitoring period.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	N/A

Corrections history of the project and changes submitted in issuance track
N/A

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
The project activity has no corrections during this monitoring period.

4.5.3 | *Changes to start date of crediting period*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is there a change to the start date of the crediting period that is relevant for this monitoring period?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Changes to the start date of crediting period history of the project
There is no change related to the start date of crediting period.

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
NA

4.5.4 | *Permanent changes from the Design Certified monitoring plan, applied methodology or applied standardized baseline.*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are any material and permanent change to the design of the project properly indicated and supporting documentation been provided (e.g., version number and completion date of the revised design certified PDD for each, copy of the approved Deviation Request Form or Design Change approval form)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
2. If this is the first submission/request for Design Change approval to include new technology/measures, has this been done within one year of the Design Change start date?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Permanent change history of the project and changes submitted in issuance track	
N/A	
Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.
Means of verification and assertion statement	
NA	

4.5.5 | *Changes to project design of approved project*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are the project design changes reported appropriately and completely?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
Project design change history of the project	
N/A	
Findings	

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
N/A

4.6 | Description of monitoring system applied by the project

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the description provided about the monitoring system aligned with the monitoring plan in the design certified PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	KBS confirmed that the description provided about the monitoring system aligned with the monitoring plan in the design certified PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring plan presented in the monitoring report is in line with the registered PDD. The net electricity generation will be monitored via two electricity meters. All data collected as part of monitoring will be archived electronically by the project owner and be kept at least for 2 years after the end of the last crediting period.
2. Does monitoring systems used ensure data integrity and reliability?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The Verification team confirms that the monitoring systems used ensure data integrity and reliability. The monitoring plan includes details about the organization responsible for monitoring, the specific parameters to be observed, quality assurance measures, quality control procedures, and arrangements for data storage and archiving. Both the project owner and EPIAS, the provider of the infrastructure connecting to the national grid, have mutually decided to collect monitoring data. Electricity production is read remotely by EPIAS and is the basis for invoicing. In case of any incorrect reading on the meter, a reading can be obtained from a spare meter and comparison can be made. The number of employees can be followed from the records of the Social Security Institution. The number of trainings can be followed by the training records.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	As per the monitoring report and also accessed during onsite visit, the project activity has proper data collection and QA/QC procedure &describes the diagrams can clearly illustrate the whole processes as mentioned in the registered PDD.
3. Are monitoring procedures well documented/stablished?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The Verification team confirms the monitoring procedures were well documented in the monitoring report and in line with the registered PDD.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Monitoring procedures are clearly defined in the monitoring report and in line with the registered PDD. For the electricity generation and emission reduction of the project activity is monitored by "Quantity of electricity generated and supplied by the project power plant to the grid in year y ($EG_{PJ,grid,y}$)" as per the registered monitoring plan presented in the registered PDD /8/. The parameter is monitored continuously as "MWh/yr" by two electricity meters that are located at the project area. The main meter is EMH LZQJ-XC-P2FB with serial number 8923676 and the backup meter is EMH LZQJ-XC-P2FB with serial number 8923677. The meters have an accuracy of 0.2s as confirmed through on-site visit. The accuracy class of the meters complies with the "Communiqué for Measurement Devices used in the Electricity Market" /25/. The electricity meters are sealed by TEIAS as confirmed during the site visit. This parameter is read out daily through remote access system and also electronically archived by a software system and then the value of net electricity generation is calculated for this monitoring period.
4. Are monitoring procedures paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Monitoring procedures are paying particular attention to the frequency of measurements, the quality of metering equipment including calibration requirements, and the quality assurance and quality control procedures.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The meters have the accuracy of 0.2s as confirmed through on-site visit. The accuracy class of the meters complies with the "Communiqué for Measurement Devices used in the Electricity Market" /25/. The electricity meters are sealed by TEIAS as confirmed during the site visit. TEAIS is responsible for calibration and maintenance of the devices as per the registered revised PDD /8/. The project owner has no control on the meters since the meters are sealed by the TEIAS. If any major discrepancy occurs between the two meters, TEIAS performs necessary calibration. The calibration of the electricity meters was made on 20/08/2019 /24/ and will be valid till 19/08/2029. Also, TEIAS performed test of the electricity meters on 23/04/2023 /41/. All these issues also were confirmed via previous verification report /10/. Recalibration of these meters will be done in line with the equipment requirements and through the period defined by national metrology institutes country by country and for Turkey this period is defined as 10 years. The calibration of meters is deemed appropriate and in compliance with the national regulation /23/. Since all commissioned turbines could not be included within the scope of the GS standard, data can be obtained from the SCADA system. The SCADA system allows to monitor the electricity generated by each turbine individually. However, due to a hard disk failure in the SCADA system, data for the five-day period from 30/10/2023 to 3/11/2023 could not be retrieved. To estimate the most accurate possible values for this missing data, the following calculations and approaches have been applied. $EG_{PJ,y}$ is calculated as follows: $EG_{PJ,y}=EG_{facility,y}\times EG_{RATIO,y}$ Where: $EG_{PJ,y}$ = Net electricity supplied to the grid by the project facility/units within the scope of the 25.6 MW project activity in year y (MWh/year). $EG_{facility,y}$ = Total net electricity supplied to the grid by the facility in year y, including the existing capacity of the project activity (50.1 MW) and the capacity addition (24.5 MW), as measured by TEİAŞ meters (MWh/year). $EG_{RATIO,y}$ = The percentage ratio of electricity production from the 25.6 MW project activity to the total gross electricity production of the 50.1 MW facility in year y, as calculated using SCADA data. This ratio has been verified and deemed appropriate by the verification team.

	The ratio values were calculated monthly and transparently presented for each monitoring period. A statistical analysis was conducted to assess any significant deviations. The net electricity supplied by the wind power plant (including both existing and additional capacity) to the national grid was measured using TEİAŞ metering devices. Additionally, electricity generation from each wind turbine within the scope of the Kuyucak 25.6 MW Wind Power Plant Project was continuously monitored via the SCADA system. Using SCADA data, the total electricity generation from the existing and additional capacity within the project activity was measured on a monthly basis and utilized for calculating the electricity production ratio. However, due to a hard disk failure in the SCADA system, data from 30/10/2023 to 3/11/2023 could not be retrieved. To address this data gap, the average ratio from the previous months of 2024 was applied to the Kuyucak RES calculations, an approach validated and accepted by the verification team. Furthermore, for the 11 days included in the November monitoring period, hourly data from both the SCADA and TEİAŞ systems were incorporated into the calculations, eliminating the need for any monthly estimations. All relevant monthly and hourly data were thoroughly verified by the verification team during the field visit.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The monitoring report correctly describes the monitoring procedure, data integrity and calibration/QA etc. This issue is in line with the registered PDD.

4.7 | Data and parameters

4.7.1 | *Data and parameters fixed ex ante or at renewal of crediting period*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the table used for each parameter includes all the rows and columns required as per the monitoring report template?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirmed that the table used for each parameter includes all the rows and columns required as per the monitoring report template version 1.1 of 14/10/2020 /14/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring report template contains; - Data/parameter, - Unit, - Description, - Source of data, - Value(s) applied, - Choice of data or Measurement methods and procedures, - Purpose of data, - Additional comment. The monitoring report version 0.4 of 15/05/2025 for the project activity "Kuyucak 25.6 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey" for the period 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024 are fairly stated the correct table content.
2. Is value applied consistent with the one described in the design certified PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The value applied in the monitoring report version 0.4 of 15/05/2025 /11/ is consistent with the design certified PDD /8/.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The only ex-ante value is the emission factor of the project activity as confirmed through the registered PDD. The value is consistent with the PDD and is correctly used in ER sheet for the calculations. **Data/ Parameter** | **Source of data** | **Reported value for the project period** $EF_{CO2,grid,y}$ Combined Margin Emission Factor | Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources | 0.6488 As per the approved methodology ACM0002 version 20.0, the combined emission factor has been determined using the ex-ante option and so it is not requested to monitor and re-calculate the emission factors during the crediting period. The combined emission factor is determined to be 0.6488 tCO_2/MWh in the registered PDD /8/ and validation report /9/. The verification team confirms that ex-ante value is used from official sources. The value of the ex-ante fixed parameter used for emission reduction calculation has been determined conservatively. The verification team considers that the monitoring plan has complied with the requirements in the approved methodology.

3. Do all fixed parameters match with the ones described in the PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Fix parameter match with the one described in the PDD. This issue was confirmed through desk review of MR and PDD.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The relevant ex-ante parameter is consistent with used registered PDD and the source of the data has been cross verified to check the relevance by the Verification team.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The relevant ex-ante parameters are consistent with registered PDD /8/ and the source of the data has been cross verified to check the relevance by the Verification team.

4.7.2 | *Data and parameters monitored*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the table used for each parameter include all the rows required as per the monitoring report template?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirmed that the table used for each parameter includes all the rows and columns required as per the monitoring report template version 1.1 of 14/10/2020 /14/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring report template contains; - Data/parameter, - Unit, - Description, - Source of data, - Value(s) applied, - Measurement methods and procedures, - Monitoring frequency, - QA/QC procedures, - Purpose of data, - Additional comment. The monitoring report version 0.4 of 15/05/2025 for the project activity "Kuyucak 25.6 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey" for the period 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024 are fairly stated the correct table content.
2. Is the heading for each SDG included correctly and grouped the respective parameters accurately?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The heading for each SDG is included correctly and the respective parameters are grouped accurately. This issue was confirmed through the desk review of MR and registered PDD.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The following parameters are selected as SDG and monitored in accordance with the registered PDD /8/. - **SDG 13** Climate Action: Emission reduction, - **SDG 7** Affordable and Clean Energy: Quantity of electricity generated, - **SDG 8** Decent Work and Economic Growth: Number of employees and Health and Safety Training
3. Is the source of data indicated with a sufficient level of detail?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The source of data is indicated with a sufficient level of detail and in line with the registered PDD /8/.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The source of data for the monitoring parameters are presented clearly and crosschecked through the registered PDD. - **SDG 13** Climate Action: Emission reductions is calculated as considering the EPİAŞ records for the net electricity generated and the emission factor for the grid, 0.6488 tCO_2/MWh, published by the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources. - **SDG 7** Affordable and Clean Energy: Monthly electricity meter readings is used. - **SDG 8** Decent Work and Economic Growth: Social Security System (SGK) Records, Training Records or Certificates is used.

4. Are the QA/QC procedures described with sufficient level of detail?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The QA/QC procedures given in monitoring report are in line with the registered PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The QA/QC procedures for the monitoring parameters are presented clearly and crosschecked through the registered PDD. - **SDG 13** Climate Action: In the calculation, "Republic of Turkey Ministry of Energy in Emission Factor 2020 /30/" is used. - **SDG 7** Affordable and Clean Energy: Measurements are made using energy meters. The project participant must comply with the relevant national legislation regarding the accuracy of the measurement system. The project must ensure that the measuring devices comply with the technical conditions specified in the Communiqué on Measuring Devices /25/ to be Used in the Project. Maintenance and calibration of electricity meters will be carried out in accordance with the System Usage Agreement. Since the meters are sealed by TEIAS, the project owner cannot intervene in the devices. Net electricity exports/supplied to a grid is the difference between the measured amounts of grid electricity exports and imports. Data measured by the meter will be cross-checked with EPİAŞ records. - **SDG 8** Decent Work and Economic Growth: Employee social insurance registries have been submitted on an annual basis. Records or certificates of training have been submitted.

5. Are the measurement methods and procedures described with sufficient level of detail, and calculations provided (where relevant)?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The measurement methods and procedures given in monitoring report are in line with the registered PDD /8/.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The measurement methods and procedures for the monitoring parameters are presented clearly and crosschecked through the registered PDD. - **SDG 13** Climate Action: This parameter is calculated with electricity generation and emission factor of "Republic of Turkey Ministry of Energy in Emission Factor 2020 /30/". - **SDG 7** Affordable and Clean Energy: The net electricity generation supplied to the grid will be measured continuously by TEIAS meters (both main and spare) and recorded monthly. - **SDG 8** Decent Work and Economic Growth: The total number of person and Health and Safety trainings have been counted.
6. Does monitoring frequency align with the monitoring plan?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The monitoring frequency given in monitoring report are in line with the registered PDD /8/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring frequency for the monitoring parameters are presented clearly and crosschecked through the registered PDD. - **SDG 13** Climate Action: The parameter was monitored "Once for each monitoring period". - **SDG 7** Affordable and Clean Energy: The parameter was monitored "Continuous measurement and at least monthly recording. (Automatic meter reading system-OSOS)". - **SDG 8** Decent Work and Economic Growth: The parameters were monitored "Once for each monitoring period".
7. Is the equipment correctly calibrated?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	TEAIS is responsible for calibration and maintenance of the devices as per the registered revised PDD /8/. The project owner has no control on the meters since the meters are sealed by the TEIAS. If any major discrepancy occurs between the two meters, TEIAS performs necessary calibration.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	During this monitoring period no discrepancy was occurred. Recalibration of these meters will be done in line with the equipment requirements and through the period defined by national metrology institutes country by country and for Turkey this period is defined as 10 years. The calibration of meters is deemed appropriate and in compliance with the national regulation /23/. During the monitoring period, no brake down has been recorded. It is confirmed during on site visit that there is no re-calibration is required for this monitoring period. In addition, the calibration reports given by EMH on 20/08/2019 for the electricity meters /24/ have been provided to the Verification team. The calibration of meters is deemed appropriate and in compliance with the national regulation /23/.

8. Does calibration align with manufacturer specification?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirmed that the calibration aligns with Turkish regulations.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Recalibration of these meters will be done in line with the equipment requirements and through the period defined by national metrology institutes country by country and for Turkey this period is defined as 10 years. The calibration of meters is deemed appropriate and in compliance with the national regulation /23/. It is confirmed during on site visit that there is no re-calibration is required for this monitoring period.

9. Is the serial number of equipment consistent with calibration certificates and previous equipment records?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The serial number of the equipment is consistent with calibration certificates.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The electricity generation is monitored continuously as "MWh" by two electricity meters that are located at the project area. The main meter is EMH LZQJ-XC-P2FB with serial number 8923676 and the backup meter is EMH LZQJ-XC-P2FB with serial number 8923677. The meters have an accuracy of 0.2s as confirmed through on-site visit. The accuracy class of the meters complies with the "Communiqué for Measurement Devices used in the Electricity Market" /25/. The electricity meters are sealed by TEIAS as confirmed during the site visit. This parameter is read out daily through remote access system.

10. Is the data compilation traceable e.g., raw data from measurement device to the emission reduction sheet?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The data compilation is traceable. This issue was confirmed via desk review of MR /11/, registered PDD /8/, ER sheet /12/, and supportive for source of data.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	- **SDG 13** Climate Action: The emission reduction is calculated via electricity generation. - **SDG 7** Affordable and Clean Energy: The parameter is monitored TEIAS data /39/ and crosscheck with EPIAS data /35/. - **SDG 8** Decent Work and Economic Growth: The parameters are monitored via Social Security System (SGK) Records /28/ and Health and Safety Training Records /33/.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

Calibration aligns with Turkish regulation and also in line with monitoring plan stated in registered GS PDD. The verification team confirms that:
All the values used from official sources and the authenticity of sources has been verified by the verification team and confirms that all relevant parameters to calculate the SDG impacts of the project have been sufficiently considered and the value of the parameter used for emission reduction calculation has been determined conservatively and are reasonable. Verification team considers that the monitoring plan has complied with the requirements in the approved methodology.

4.7.3 | *Comparison of monitored parameters with previous monitoring period*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the table used for comparing "Values obtained in this monitoring period" against "Value obtained last monitoring period" complete?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Since this is the renewable energy project, no comparison of monitored parameters is necessary.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
2. Is an explanation for any values that have increased/ or are less conservative provided and is it justified? *Question applicable for Community Service Activities*	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Since this is the renewable energy project, no comparison of monitored parameters is necessary.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

Since this is the renewable energy project, no comparison of monitored parameters is necessary.

4.7.4 | *Implementation of sampling plan*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is the description of how the sampling was implemented in accordance with the sampling plan in the design certified PDD?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No sampling is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
2. Is sampling approach aligned with the CDM's "Standard: Sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities"?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No sampling is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
3. Is the sampling approach followed (simple, stratified, multi-stage, etc.) clearly explained and justified?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No sampling is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
4. Were the samples randomly selected by the project developer and are representative of the population?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No sampling is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
5. Is sample size clearly explained and justified (especially when the methodology applied indicates minimum sample size)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No sampling is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
6. Are emission reduction spreadsheets provided with full set of traceable information?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	KBS confirmed that the emission reduction spreadsheet is provided with full set of traceable information.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The spreadsheet includes information of the project activity, emission reduction calculation, vintage ERs, estimated ERs, SDG worksheet, electricity generation and crosscheck data for each month of the monitoring period.

7. Is data collection traceable and ensures data integrity?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	KBS confirmed that data collection is traceable and ensures data integrity.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Electricity generation is monitored with invoices sent via remote readings every month. Emission reduction is calculated based on the data in these invoices. The number of employees can be monitored from the service list submitted by Social Security Institution (SGK) as a result of the payments made to the SGK every month. Health and Safety trainings can be monitored by training records or certificates.

8. Are the confidence/precision levels met (including traceable analysis)?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	No sampling is used.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings	
☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement
No sampling is used.

4.8 | Calculation of SDG Impacts

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does SDGs impact demonstrate a positive contribution from the project?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team evaluated all the sustainable development indicators such as invoices / employment records assess during onsite visit & Interviewed with the stakeholders directly.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team checked the sustainable development indicator parameters during the onsite assessment and interview. The additional parameters that are monitored are in accordance with the monitoring plan for sustainability indicators as referred in the revised GS4GG monitoring report.

2. Does achieved SDGs in the monitoring report align to each SDG impact from the applicable PDD?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team checked the sustainable development indicator parameters during the onsite assessment and interview. The parameters that are monitored are in accordance with the monitoring plan for sustainability indicators as referred to in the revised GS4GG monitoring report.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	As per the sustainability monitoring plan in the revised GS4GG MR, verification team evaluated all the sustainable development indicators such as; - **SDG 13 Climate Action:** - **SDG 7 Affordable and Clean Energy:** - **SDG 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth:**

3. Have the monitoring values for each of the achieved SDGs been defined, and are they appropriately identifiable throughout the document? The annual average should be used to calculate the values.	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team checked the sustainable development indicator parameters during the onsite assessment and interview. In addition to that in MR, the values are being consistent throughout the document.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring values of each SDGs are being defined, and are they appropriately identified throughout the document & calculated annually. - **SDG 13 Climate Action:** The emission reduction is calculated as; 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024: 34,125 tCO2 - **SDG 7 Affordable and Clean Energy:** The net electricity generation is calculated as; 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024: 52,597.351 MWh - **SDG 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth:** The number of employees is defined as 8 per year and the project has provided health and safety training to 8 employees during this monitoring period

4. Are the values reported for the SDG impact coherent with the SDG Impact Tool submitted?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	As per the "Kuyucak SDG Impact Tool_v0.2" /38/, all the parameters (SDG1, SDG7, SDG13 Indicators) was clearly described.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring values of each SDGs are being defined, and are they appropriately identified throughout the document & calculated annually. - **SDG 13 Climate Action:** The emission reduction is calculated as; 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024: 34,125 tCO2 - **SDG 7 Affordable and Clean Energy:** The net electricity generation is calculated as; 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024: 52,597.351 MWh - **SDG 8 Decent Work and Economic Growth:** The number of employees is defined as 8 per year and the project has provided health and safety training to 8 employees during this monitoring period

5. Are the opinions and recommendations from expert stakeholders provided for SDGs that defined these requirements?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The Registered GS PDD and Revised MR version 0.2 / ER Calculation Sheet Version 0.2 / SDG Impact Tool correctly describes the SDG Indicators.

4.8.1 | *Calculation of baseline value or estimation of baseline situation of each SDG Impact*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are the calculations of each estimated SDG baseline value provided in a clear and transparent manner? Sample calculations for all formulae used applying actual values, references to spreadsheets, and supporting evidence shall be listed and provided.	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The calculations of each estimated SDG baseline value are provided in a clear and transparent manner. All formulas used to apply actual values, references to spreadsheets and supporting evidence are provided to the verification team.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	- **SDG 7:** The project site currently lacks any form of clean energy generation in its baseline condition. - **SDG 8:** In the baseline situation, the project does not generate any employment opportunities within the project area or the neighbouring settlements and no trainings provided. - **SDG 13:** There is no similar activity to combat with climate change on project site and nearby area for baseline situation. Therefore, all CO2 would be emitted for the whole monitoring period. The ex-ante emission reductions (ERy) are calculated as follows: ERy= BEy- PEy- LEy Where: - ERy = Emission reductions in year y (tCO2) - BEy = Baseline emissions in year y (tCO2) - PEy = Project Emissions in year y (tCO2) - LEy = Leakage emissions in year y (tCO2)

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The calculations of each estimated SDG baseline value are calculated in spreadsheet and presented in MR correctly. These issues are also in line with the registered PDD.

4.8.2 | *Calculation of project value or estimation of project situation of each SDG Impact*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are the calculations of each achieved SDG project value provided in a clear and transparent manner? Sample calculations for all formulae used applying actual values, references to spreadsheets, and supporting evidence shall be listed and provided.	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The calculations of each estimated SDG project value are provided in a clear and transparent manner. All formulas used to apply actual values, references to spreadsheets and supporting evidence are provided to the verification team.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	- **SDG 7:** The project has been generated net 52,597.351 MWh clean electricity for the whole monitoring period while it is calculated as MWh per annum. - **SDG 8:** The project has created 8 employment opportunities and provide Health and Safety Trainings to the 8 employees. - **SDG 13:** The project has mitigated 34,125 tCO_2 in the whole monitoring period. Baseline emission is calculated according to the formula; $BEy = EGy \times EF_{CO2,i,y}$ Where: - EGy = Net electricity delivered to the grid by the project activity in year y excluding transmission losses of the grid - $EF_{CO2,i,y}$ = Emission factor calculated according to selected methodology (Emission factor has been calculated ex-ante in PDD which is also used in calculating the baseline emissions. EF value used is 0.6488 tCO2/MWh. Project and leakage emissions are "0" since this is renewable energy plant. Thus; - PEy = 0 - Ley = 0 Therefore: EGy = 52,597.351 MWh $EF_{CO2,i,y}$ = 0.6488 tCO2/MWh BEy = (52,597.351 MWh) x (0.6488 tCO_2/MWh) = 34,125 tCO_2e

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The calculations of each estimated SDG project value are calculated in spreadsheet and presented in MR correctly. These issues are also in line with the registered PDD.

4.8.3 | *Calculation of leakage*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Only for SDG 13 – Are the calculations of leakage provided in a clear and transparent manner? Sample calculations for all formulae used applying actual values, references to spreadsheets, and supporting evidence shall be listed and provided.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The leakage emissions are assumed to be zero as per the ACM0002 /13/ as defined in the registered PDD /8/. Since the project and leakage emissions are zero, the emission reduction equals to baseline emissions.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The leakage emissions are assumed to be zero as per the ACM0002 /13/ as defined in the registered PDD /8/.

4.8.4 | *Calculation of net benefits or direct calculation for each SDG Impact*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are Baseline, Project, and Net benefit values listed for each estimated SDG impact, starting with SDG 13? Values should be based on annual average.	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirmed that Baseline, Project, and Net benefit values listed for each estimated SDG impact in the monitoring report.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The monitoring SDGs are SDG 7 & SDG 13 and SDG 8 for the project activity. These SDGs are in line with the registered PDD /8/. The monitoring report /11/ includes all SDGs selected during validation. - **SDG 7:** Access to affordable and clean energy services - **SDG 8:** Quantitative Employment and Income Generation - **SDG 13:** Emission reduction
2. Are the net benefit values also presented in Table 1 of the monitoring report – "Sustainable Development Contribution Achieved"? Values shall match.	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirmed that the net benefit values are also presented in Table 1 of the monitoring report matches with the "Sustainable Development Contribution Achieved".
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team evaluated the calculation of each SDG impacts given below.

SDG Impact	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
SDG 13: Emission reduction	34,125 tCO2e	0 tCO2e	34,125 tCO2e
SDG 7: Access to affordable and clean energy services	0 MWh/yr	52,597.351 MWh	52,597.351 MWh
SDG 8: Quantitative Employment and Income Generation	0 employees	8 employees	8 employees
SDG 8: Quantitative Employment and Income Generation	0 training	8 certificates	8 certificates

Hence Sustainable Development Contribution Achieved, and values are match with ER Calculation Sheet /12/.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

The verification team confirms that the baseline, project value or net benefit of each SDG impact has been correctly described and is based on annual average.

4.8.5 | *Comparison of actual SDG Impacts with estimates in approved PDD*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does the comparison between SDGs impacts achieved during the monitoring period and the validated estimated ex-ante SDG impacts provide a like for like comparison?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team has checked whether the actual values of SDG impact for the monitoring period with the estimations in the GS4GG Transition request form and PDD.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The emission reductions from the project for the monitoring period as reported in the monitoring report /11/ is equivalent to 34,125 tCO2. The reported emission reductions are approximately 1.7% higher than the estimated emission reduction of 33,545 tCO2 for the period 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024 as per the registered PDD /8/ due to high wind power than expected. The generated electricity for the monitoring period is equivalent to 52,597.351 MWh. The reported generated electricity is approximately 1.7% higher than the estimated generated electricity of 51,703.509 MWh for this monitoring period. The number of employees and number of trainings meets the estimated values given in the PDD.
2. If emission reductions are capped, are both (original and capped) values reported? Original values must be reported in brackets.	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	N/A
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	N/A

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

In accordance with revised MR version 0.2, section E describes 4.8.5 |Comparison of actual SDG Impacts with estimates in approved PDD.

4.8.6 | *Explanation of calculation of value estimated ex ante calculation of approved PDD for this monitoring period*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is there an explanation provided for the calculation of ex-ante SDG impacts? Is the explanation appropriate and justifiable?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Desk review of MR version 0.2, Section E.5.1 explanation provided for the calculation of ex-ante SDG impacts are appropriate and justifiable.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The emission reductions from the project for the monitoring period as reported in the monitoring report /11/ is equivalent to 34,125 tCO2. The reported emission reductions are approximately 1.7% higher than the estimated emission reduction of 33,545 tCO2 for the period 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024 as per the registered PDD /8/ due to high wind power than expected. The generated electricity for the monitoring period is equivalent to 52,597.351 MWh. The reported generated electricity is approximately 1.7% higher than the estimated generated electricity of 51,703.509 MWh for this monitoring period. The number of employees and number of trainings meets the estimated values given in the PDD.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

KBS confirms that the actual emission reduction is higher than the estimated reduction given in the registered PDD and found it acceptable.

4.8.7 | *Remarks on increase in achieved SDG Impacts from estimated value in approved PDD*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. When achieved SDG impacts are greater than the ex-ante estimated, is there a clear explanation provided in the Monitoring Report? This does not apply to afforestation and reforestation (A/R) projects.	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The actual ERs are higher than the estimated ERs, also the quantification of electricity generation is higher than the estimated electricity generation.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The emission reductions from the project for the monitoring period as reported in the monitoring report /11/ is equivalent to 34,125 tCO2. The reported emission reductions are approximately 1.7% higher than the estimated emission reduction of 33,545 tCO2 for the period 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024 as per the registered PDD /8/ due to high wind power than expected. The generated electricity for the monitoring period is equivalent to 52,597.351 MWh. The reported generated electricity is approximately 1.7% higher than the estimated generated electricity of 51,703.509 MWh for this monitoring period. The number of employees and number of trainings meets the estimated values given in the PDD.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

It can be confirmed that SDG Impacts achieved are lower than the amount based on the ex-ante estimation in the Design Certified PDD, and a clear explanation provided in the Monitoring Report.

4.9 | Safeguarding Principles Reporting

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Has information on the implementation of improvements to proposed mitigation measures been included?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	Information on the implementation of improvements to proposed mitigation measures. Two parameters have been evaluated according to the approved PDD.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Safeguarding Principle 9.10 High Conservation Value Areas and Critical Habitats + Safeguarding Principle 9.4: Release of pollutants have been evaluated.
2. Does progress on the mitigation measures proposed be considered adequate??	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirms that the progress on the mitigation measures proposed was considered adequate.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Safeguarding Principle 9.10 High Conservation Value Areas and Critical Habitats: This parameter was monitored once for each monitoring period with regular site vetting for bird/bat nests and carcasses and recording on logbook by appointed personnel Safeguarding Principle 9.4: Release of pollutants: This parameter was monitored once for each monitoring period with wastewater transfer records.
3. Is evidence provided for mitigation measures considered adequate and complete?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirms that all evidence are provided for mitigation measures.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Safeguarding Principle 9.10 High Conservation Value Areas and Critical Habitats: This parameter was confirmed with the provided Weekly Dead/Injured Bird Observation Chart /26/. Safeguarding Principle 9.4: Release of pollutants: This parameter was confirmed with the sewage truck invoice /37/.
4. Is information on monitoring and reporting on any key indicators identified, including against pre-set values?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The verification team confirms that the information on monitoring and reporting on any key indicators is identified, including against pre-set values.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	Safeguarding Principle 9.10 High Conservation Value Areas and Critical Habitats: During this monitoring period, no bird/bat carcasses were observed. Safeguarding Principle 9.4: Release of pollutants: During this monitoring period, wastewater was discharged only once.

5. Is information on any assessment questions answered 'Potentially' or where requirements call for regular re-assessment included?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	The information on all assessment questions answered 'Potentially' is included.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	All principles were evaluated, and explanations have been made for all issues where the project may have a negative impact.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

KBS affirms that information on all assessment questions answered 'Potentially' is included. Necessary explanations have been made for all issues where the project may have a negative impact, and relevant records have been provided for all parameters that need to be monitored.

4.10 | Stakeholder inputs and legal disputes

4.10.1 | *List all inputs and grievances which have been received via the continuous input and grievance mechanism together with their respective responses/mitigations.*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is outcome of continuous inputs and grievance mechanisms provided?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There is a continuous input/grievance mechanism in place for beneficiaries to be able to give feedback on the project. A logbook is kept in Mukhtar's office which is checked on a regular basis by the field staff; beneficiaries are also given a contact number for the field staff so that they can contact them directly. Field staffs are based close-by the project area and visit regularly so face-to-face feedback is also possible. It was confirmed that no feedback was received during the monitoring period.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team has verified with close interaction with stakeholders & field staffs regarding the continuous input/grievance mechanism in place for beneficiaries to be able to give feedback on the project and confirming that no feedback was received during present monitoring period.
2. Are the procedures for continuous inputs and grievance mechanisms considered adequate?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	A logbook is kept in the Mukhtar's office which is checked on a regular basis by the field staff; beneficiaries are also given a contact number for the field staff so that they can contact them directly.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The verification team confirms that the logbook is kept in Mukhtar's office to mention stakeholders concerns regarding product working status checked by field staffs on regular basis. Hence it is considered as adequate.
3. Is the evidence provided as part of the inputs and grievance mechanisms considered reliable?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There are No Inputs and Grievances received as confirmed via logbook /36/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	The Verification team confirm that while onsite visit interviewed with stakeholders & field staff regarding grievance mechanism process& the supporting document ie logbook. Hence the process is considered as reliable.
4. Are responses to comments received considered adequate?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There are No Inputs and Grievances received as confirmed via logbook /36/.

Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

5. Does information include disputes raised against the project?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There are No Inputs and Grievances received as confirmed via logbook /36/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
6. Is the progress on solving disputes considered appropriate and transparent?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There are No Inputs and Grievances received as confirmed via logbook /36/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
7. Does items (responses/mitigation/disputes) not fully addressed include a detail on required follow up action?	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There are No Inputs and Grievances received as confirmed via logbook /36/.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

As per the logbook, during this monitoring period, no inputs and grievances are received.

4.10.2 | *Report on any stakeholder mitigations that were agreed to be monitored.*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Are updates provided to stakeholders on mitigations proposed and accepted to be monitored?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

NA

4.10.3 | *Provide details of any legal contest that has arisen with the project during the monitoring period.*

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Is project still in compliance with Host's Country's legal, environmental, ecological, and social regulations? *Projects should transparently declare any legal challenge arisen*	☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	There is no legal contest or disputes have arisen with the project during the monitoring period.
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	There is no legal contest or disputes have arisen with the project during the monitoring period.

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

There is no legal contest or disputes have arisen with the project during the monitoring period.

4.11 | Annual Reports

ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

1. Does date when annual report has submitted is provided?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
2. Does the annual report include the complete content of the template?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA
3. Is the status of implementation/operation described in the annual report consistent with the status of the project?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A
Means of verification (MOV) *Mention the means of verification (MoV) used to validate this information*	NA
Justification of the MOV *Justify how the used MoV was appropriate for the aspect validated.*	NA

Findings

☐ CL	No CL was raised for this section.
☐ CAR	No CAR was raised for this section.
☐ FAR	No FAR was raised for this section.

Means of verification and assertion statement

NA

5| PART V – VERIFICATION OPINION AND REPORT

>>

Final opinion ☒Positive ☐Negative

KBS Certification Services Ltd. has been contracted by "Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş." to undertake independent verification and certification for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions reported from the "Kuyucak 25.6 MW Wind Farm Project, Turkey" in Turkey, GS ID:GS 576 for the monitoring period from 01/03/2024 to 10/11/2024 in the Monitoring Report, version 0.4 dated 15/05/2025.

The verification is based on the review of registered PDD and the Monitoring report for this project. Our verification approach was based on the requirements as defined under the Kyoto Protocol, as well as those defined by the GS4GG Board.
The management of the "Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş." is responsible for the preparation of the GHG emissions data and the reported GHG emissions reductions on the basis set out within the project Final Monitoring Report, 0.4 dated 15/05/2025. The calculation and determination of GHG emission reductions from the project is the responsibility of the management of "Alize Enerji Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.". The development and maintenance of records and reporting procedures are in accordance with the Monitoring Report, version 0.4 dated 15/05/2025.
It is our responsibility to express an independent GHG verification opinion on the GHG emissions and on the calculation of GHG emission reductions from the project for the monitoring period 01/03/2024 to 10/11/2024 based on the reported emission reductions in the Final Monitoring Report Version 0.4 dated 15/05/2025 for the same period.
Based on an understanding of the risks associated with reporting GHG emissions data and the controls in place to mitigate these, KBS planned and performed our work to obtain the information and explanations that we considered necessary to provide sufficient evidence for us to give reasonable assurance that this reported amount of GHG emission reductions for the period is fairly stated.

KBS confirms the following;
Reporting period: From 01/03/2024 to 10/11/2024
Verified and certified emission in the above reporting period:
Gold Standard Voluntary Emission Reductions (GS VERs): 34,125 tCO2

GHG emissions reductions and removals verified according to the design document (PDD):

SDG	SDG Impact	Baseline estimate	Project estimate	Net benefit
SDG 13	Climate Action (tCO_2e)	34,125 tCO2e	0 tCO2e	34,125 tCO2e
SDG 7	Affordable and Clean Energy (MWh)	0 MWh/yr	52,597.351 MWh/yr	52,597.351 MWh/yr
SDG 8	Decent Work and Economic Growth	0 employee	8 employees	8 employees

SDG 8	Decent Work and Economic Growth	0 employee attend to the training	8 employees attend to the training	8 employees attend to the training

APPENDIX 1: ABBREVIATIONS

S.NO	ABBREVIATIONS	FULL TEXTS
1.	BE	Baseline Emissions
2.	CAR	Corrective Action Request
3.	CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
4.	CER	Certified Emission Reduction
5.	CL	Clarification request
6.	CME	Coordinating/Managing Entity
7.	CO_2	Carbon dioxide
8.	EF	Emission Factor
9.	EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
10.	ER	Emission Reduction
11.	FAR	Forward Action Request
12.	GHG	Greenhouse gas(es)
13.	GS4GG	Gold standard for Global Goals
14.	KBS	KBS Certification Services Ltd.
15.	LSC	Local stakeholder consultation
16.	PE	Project Emissions
17.	QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
18.	tCO_2e	Tonnes of CO_2 equivalents
19.	T&C	Technical & Certification
20.	UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
21.	VVS	Validation & Verification Standard
22.	VVB	Gold Standard Validation and Verification Body

APPENDIX 2: COMPETENCE OF TEAM MEMBERS AND TECHNICAL REVIEWERS

Personnel Name	Tuğçe Kıratlı				
Schemes	☒ CDM	☒ GCC	☒ GS	☒ VCS	☒Cercarbono
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader	☒	Technical Expert	☒		
Validator/Verifier	☒	Financial Expert	☐		
Technical Reviewer	☒	Local Expert (Turkey)	☒		
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope	**Technical Area**				
SS: 01: Energy industries (renewable/non-renewable sources)	TA 1.2: Energy generation from renewable energy sources				
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1. Solid waste and wastewater				
	TA 13.2. Manure				
Approved by (Manager Competence & Training)	Dushyant Parashar				
Approval date	25-03-2024				

Personnel Name	Mr. Ashish Yadav				
Schemes	☒ CDM	☒ GCC	☒ GS	☒ VCS	☒Other GHG Schemes (Cercarbono, SDvista, VCS CCB)
Qualified to work as					
Team Leader	☒	Technical Expert	☒		
Validator/Verifier	☒	Financial Expert	☐		
Technical Reviewer	☒	Local Expert (India)	☒		
Area(s) of Technical Expertise					
Sectoral Scope	**Technical Area**				
SS: 1 Energy Industries (Renewable/non- renewable)	TA 1.2. Renewables				
SS: 3 Energy demand	TA 3.1 Energy demand				
SS 13: Waste handling and disposal	TA 13.1. Solid waste and wastewater				
Approved by (Manager C&T)	Mr. Dushyant Parashar				
Approval date	28-10-2024				

APPENDIX 3: DOCUMENTS/EVIDENCE REVIEWED OR REFERENCED

S.NO	AUTHOR	TITLE	REFERENCE TO THE DOCUMENT	PROVIDER
1.	Gold Standard	Principles and Requirements	version 2.0 of 12/11/2024	Publicly Available
2.	Gold Standard	Stakeholder consultation and engagement requirements	version 2.1 of 14/06/2022	Publicly Available
3.	Gold Standard	Safeguarding principles & requirements	version 2.1 of 29/06/2023	Publicly Available
4.	Gold Standard	Validation and verification standard	version 2.0 of 12/11/2024	Publicly Available
5.	Gold Standard	Site visit and remote audit requirements and procedures	version 2.0 of 30/05/2023	Publicly Available
6.	Gold Standard	Validation & verification body requirements	version 3.0 of 12/11/2024	Publicly Available
7.	Gold Standard	Renewable energy activity requirements	Version 1.4 of 16/08/2021	Publicly Available
8.	Kuyucak WPP	Project Design Document	version 0.8 of 06/06/2023	Project Participant
9.	Kuyucak WPP	Validation Report	version 0.3 of 24/04/2024	Project Participant
10.	Kuyucak WPP	Previous Verification Report	version 0.3 of 22/07/2024	Project Participant
11.	Kuyucak WPP	Monitoring Report	version 0.1 of 30/11/2024 version 0.2 of 26/12/2024 version 0.3 of 18/03/2025 version 0.4 of 15/05/2025	Project Participant
12.	Kuyucak WPP	ER calculations_Kuyucak WPP	Version 0.1 submitted on 17/12/2024 Version 0.2 submitted on 26/12/2024 Version 0.3 submitted on 17/05/2025	Project Participant
13.	CDM Executive Board	ACM0002: Grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources	Version 20.0 of 28/11/2019	Publicly Available
14.	Gold Standard	Monitoring Report Template	Version 1.1 of 14/10/2020	Publicly Available

15.	CDM Executive Board	Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system version	Version 07.0 of 31/08/2018	Publicly Available
16.	CDM Executive Board	Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality	Version 07.0 of 23/11/2012	Publicly Available
17.	CDM Executive Board	Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment	Version 1.0 of 16/10/2009	Publicly Available
18.	Energy Market Regulatory Authority	Generation License	date of last amendment 30/07/2016	Project participant
19.	Verra	Website : http://vcsprojectdatabase.org/#/home Argument: Verra Database Language: English	Retrieved on: 20/01/2025	Publicly Available
20.	ICR	Website : https://www.carbonregistry.com/explore/projects Argument: ICR Database Language: English	Retrieved on: 20/01/2025	Publicly Available
21.	GCC	Website : https://projects.globalcarboncouncil.com/pages/submitted_projects Argument: GCC Database Language: English	Retrieved on: 20/01/2025	Publicly Available
22.	CerCarbono	Website : https://www.ecoregistry.io/projects-list/cercarbono-co2 Argument: CerCarbono Database Language: English	Retrieved on: 20/01/2025	Publicly Available
23.	The Ministry of Trade and Industry	Regulation of Metering and Testing of Metering Systems	date of 24/07/1994	Publicly available
24.	EMH	Calibration Certificates for the Electricity Meters	Date of 20/08/2019	Publicly available
25.	Energy Market Regulatory Authority	Communiqué for Measurement Devices used in the Electricity Market	date of 22/03/2003	Publicly available
26.	Alize Enerji	Weekly Dead/Injured Bird Observation Chart	For the period of 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024	Project Participant
27.	GS4GG	Performance Review	Date of 30/09/2024	Project Participant

28.	Social Security Insurance	Employment Records	For the period of 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024	Project Participant
29.	GS4GG	Design Renewal Review	Date of 16/06/2023	Project Participant
30.	Republic of Turkey Ministry of Energy	Emission Factor 2020	Date of 20/09/2022	Publicly Available
31.	CDM Executive Board	Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality	Version 07.0 of 22/09/2017	Publicly Available
32.	CDM Executive Board	Tool to calculate project or leakage CO2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion	Version 03.0 of 22/09/2017	Publicly Available
33.	HÜLYAM ÖZEL SAĞLIK VE İŞ GÜVENLİĞİ	Health and Safety Training Certificates for 8 employees	Date of 16-17/09/2024	Project Participant
34.	Alize Enerji	Scada Data for Kuyucak WPP	For the period of 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024	Project Participant
35.	EPIAS	Electricity Generation Data	For the period of 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024	Project Participant
36.	Kuyucak WPP	Logbook	Date of 12/03/2024	Project Participant
37.	Manisa Water and Sewerage Administration General Directorate	Sewage Truck Invoice	Date of 07/03/2024	Project Participant
38.	Alize Enerji	Kuyucak SDG Impact Tool_v0.3	Submitted on 27/12/2024 Submitted on 17/05/2025 Submitted on 24/07/2025	Project Participant
39.	TEIAS	Electricity Generation Data	For the period of 01/03/2024 - 10/11/2024	Project Participant
40.	TEIAS	First Index Protocol for the Main Electricity Meter First Index Protocol for the Backup Electricity Meter	Date of 27/10/2019 Date of 14/12/2019	Project Participant
41.	Nano Enerji	Test Reports of the Electricity Meters	Date of 23/04/2023	Project Participant

42.	CDM Executive Board	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 of 02/03/2012	Publicly Available

APPENDIX 4: FINDINGS

Section 1: CLs from the verification

CL ID	1
Section no.	Whole Report
Date	26/12/2024
Status	☐ Open ☒ Closed ☐ Turned to a FAR
Description of CL	Please clarify/revise the listed issues: - - *Please revise the net electricity generation and emission reduction value after November data is provided.* - *The web-link given in Footnote 2 is not working.* - *GS Review document is not provided to monitor if there was a FAR or not.* - *The organization schema contains 9 people; however, the information given is there is 8 people are employed. Please correct.* - *Please provide the calibration and installation documents for electricity meters.* - *For data and parameters monitored, please provide number of people who attended the training.* - *In Section E.2, on the given table, please check the monitoring period dates.* - *The records of bird observation did not cover the whole monitoring period.*
Project developer response	- *The net electricity generation and emission reduction value are revised in MR.* - *Link is corrected.* - *GS review documents are provided.* - *The organization schema is revised* - *Calibration and installation documents are provided.* - *The number of people who attended the training courses is now given.* - *Monitoring period dates are revised* - *Bird observation records are provided.*
Documentation provided by PD	revised MR and ER sheet
VVB assessment	- *The net electricity generation and emission reduction value are now revised after November data is provided.* - *The web-link given in Footnote 2 is now working.* - *GS Review document is now provided to monitor if there was a FAR or not.* - *The organization schema is now revised.* - *The calibration and installation documents for electricity meters are now provided.* - *For data and parameters monitored, number of people who attended the training is now provided.* - *In Section E.2, on the given table, the monitoring period dates are now revised.* - *The records of bird observation now cover the whole monitoring period.* **Hence, CL 01 is closed.**

Section 2: CARs from the verification

CAR ID	>>
Section no.	>>
Date	>>
Status	☐ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Turned to a FAR
Description of CAR	>>
Project developer response	>>
Documentation provided by PD	>>
VVB assessment	>>

Section 3: FARs from the verification

FAR ID	>>
Section no.	>>
Date	>>
Status	☐ Open ☐ Closed ☐ Turned to a FAR
Description of FAR	>>
Project developer response	>>
Documentation provided by PD	>>
VVB assessment	>>

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Description
1.0	DD/MM/YYYY	Initial adoption