



RE-VALIDATION REPORT GALATA WIND ENERJİ A.Ş.

RE-VALIDATION OF THE ŞAH WIND POWER PLANT

REPORT No.BVI/TURKEY-VD/
CER.TR.2496915.C45.16.REV2

REVISION No. 04

BUREAU VERITAS (INDIA) PVT LTD
72 BUSINESS PARK, 9TH FLOOR, MAROL INDUSTRIAL AREA,
MIDC CROSS ROAD 'C', ANDHERI (EAST), MUMBAI-400093 INDIA

Date of first issue: 28/06/2018		Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas (India) Pvt Ltd	
Client: Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş		Client ref.: Mr. Cem Cagri LEVENT	
Summary: Bureau Veritas Certification has conducted the validation of the renewal crediting period of Şah Wind Power Plant, Market ID= 103000000002024, operated and owned by Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. which is located in Bandırma district of Balıkesir province and Karacabey district of Bursa province, Turkey, on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, as well as GS4GG and old versions of GS, GS Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period and criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol, the CDM rules and modalities and the subsequent decisions by the CDM Executive Board, as well as the host country criteria. The re-validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study, monitoring plan and other relevant documents, and consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design document and additional background documents; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final re-validation report and opinion. The overall re-validation, from Contract Review to Re-Validation Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures. The first output of the re-validation process is a list of Clarification Requests, Corrective Actions Requests, and Forward Actions Requests (CLs, CARs and FARs), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document. In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that the project correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 18 and meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM and the relevant host country criteria. Bureau Veritas Certification thus requests the registration of the project as a GS-VER project activity. The second crediting period type is renewable (7 years) which is planned to be start & end date of crediting period is 15/11/2018 – 14/11/2025. During the seven years of its second renewable crediting period, the project is likely to achieve the estimated annual emission reductions of 171,828 tCO₂e.			
Report No.: BVC/TURKEY-VD/ CER.TR.2496915.C45.16.REV2		Subject Group: GS4GG GS-VER	
Project title: Şah Wind Power Plant		Work approved by: Ms. Sapana PEDNEKAR	
Work carried out by: Mr. Furkan SADIKOĞLU		☒ No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit ☐ Limited distribution ☐ Unrestricted distribution	
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Ms. Seda YÜCEL			
Date of this revision: 24/10/2018	Rev. No.: 04	Number of pages: 69	



Abbreviations

BVCH	Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO2	Carbon Dioxide
CO2e	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
FAR	Forward Action Request
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
MoV	Means of Verification
MP	Monitoring Plan
PDD	Project Design Document
PLF	Plant Load Factor
PP	Project Participant
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VVS	Validation and Verification Standard



Table of Contents	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Objective	5
1.2. Scope	5
1.3. Re-Validation Team	5
2. METHODOLOGY	6
2.1. Review of Documents	6
2.2. Follow-up Interviews	6
2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests	7
2.4. Internal Technical Review	7
3. RE-VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS	8
3.1. Approval (43-44)	8
3.2. Authorization (49)	8
3.3. Sustainable Development (52)	8
3.4. Modalities of Communications (58,61)	9
3.5. Project Design Document (63)	9
3.6. Changes in the Project Activity (17)	9
3.7. Project Description (69)	9
3.8. Baseline and Monitoring Methodology	10
3.8.1. Applicability of the selected Methodology (77)	11
3.8.2. Project Boundary (86-87)	12
3.8.3. Baseline Identification (94-95)	13
3.8.4. Algorithms and/or Formulae used to determine Emission Reductions (99-100)	14
3.9. Additionality (104)	16
3.10. Monitoring Plan (133)	18
3.11. Environmental Impacts (137)	18
3.12. Local Stakeholder Consultation (140)	18
4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS	19
5. RE-VALIDATION OPINION	20
6. REFERENCES	21
7. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS	23
APPENDIX A: LARGE SCALE PROJECT ACTIVITIES RE-VALIDATION PROTOCOL.....	24

1. INTRODUCTION

Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to re-validate renewal of crediting period for its GS-VER project Şah Wind Power Plant (hereafter called “the Project”) at Bandırma district of Balıkesir and Karacabey district of Bursa, Turkey .

This report summarizes the findings of the re-validation of the Project, performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria, as well as GS4GG and old versions, GS Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period and criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

1.1. Objective

The objective of a validation of renewal of crediting period is to provide a through and independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan, and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC, GS4GG and old versions, GS Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period and host country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the applicable GS-VER requirements and the identified criteria. Re-validation is a requirement for all GS-VER projects and is seen as necessary to provide assurance to stakeholders of the quality of the project and its intended generation of voluntary emission reductions (VERs).

1.2. Scope

The re-validation scope is defined as an independent and objective review of the project design document, the project's baseline study and monitoring plan and other relevant documents. The information in these documents is reviewed against the requirements of paragraph 37 of the CDM M&Ps, the applicability conditions of the selected methodology and guidance issued by the Board.

The re-validation is not meant to provide any consulting towards the project participants. However, stated requests for clarifications and/or corrective actions may provide input for improvement of the project design.

1.3. Re-Validation Team

The assessment team and internal technical reviewer team consist of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	TA 1.2	TASK PERFORMED*
Team Leader	Mr. Furkan SADIKOĞLU	☒	☒ DR ☒ SV ☐ RI ☐ TR
Internal Technical Reviewer (ITR)	Ms. Seda YÜCEL	☒	☐ DR ☐ SV ☐ RI ☒ TR
Report Issuance	Ms. Sapana Pednekar	☒	☐ DR ☐ SV ☒ RI ☐ TR

*DR = Document Review; SV = Site Visit; RI = Report issuance; TR = Internal Technical Review



2. METHODOLOGY

The overall re-validation, from Contract Review to re-Validation Report & Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.

In order to ensure transparency, a re-validation protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 09.0 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, issued by CDM Executive Board after its 4/CMP.10 on 15/02/2015 (Ref-08). The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The re-validation protocol serves the following purposes:

- It organizes, details and clarifies the requirements a GS-VER project is expected to meet;
- It ensures a transparent re-validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the re-validation.

The completed re-validation protocol is enclosed in Appendix A to this report.

2.1. Review of Documents

The Project Design Document (GS-VER-PDD) submitted by Rüzgar Danışmanlık and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline were reviewed.

Furthermore, cross checks were made between information provided in the GS-VER-PDD and information from sources other than those used, the DOE's sectorial or local expertise and, independent background investigations.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, Rüzgar Danışmanlık revised the GS-VER-PDD and resubmitted it on 24/09/2018.

The re-validation conclusions presented in this report relate to the project as described in the GS-VER-PDD version 0.4.

2.2. Follow-up Interviews

On 04/06/2018, Bureau Veritas Certification performed a site visit and interviews with project stakeholders to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. and Rüzgar Danışmanlık and local stakeholders were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Interview topics

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.(the Project Owner)	➤ Project approval and implementation status. ➤ Project management and monitoring plan. ➤ Stakeholder consultation process. ➤ Government policies related to the project activity.
Local Stakeholder	➤ Project background in details ➤ Stakeholder comments ➤ Social and environmental impact of the project ➤ GS Sustainability matrix
Rüzgar Danuşmanlık (the Consultant)	➤ Applicability of selected methodology. ➤ Baseline determination. ➤ Revised emission reductions calculation. ➤ Emission reduction monitoring plan.

2.3. Resolution of Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests

The objective of this phase of the re-validation is to resolve issues that require further elaboration, research or expansion prior to Bureau Veritas Certification's positive conclusion on the project design.

A Corrective Action Request (CAR) is raised, if one of the following situations occurs:

- (a) The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable, verifiable and additional emission reductions;
- (b) The applicable GS-VER requirements have not been met;
- (c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

A Clarification Request (CL) is raised, if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable GS-VER requirements have been met.

A Forward Action Request (FAR) may also be raised during re-validation, to identify issues related to project implementation that require review during the first verification of the project activity.

To guarantee the transparency of the re-validation process, the issues raised, the responses provided by the project participants, the means of re-validation of such responses and references to any resulting changes in the GS-VER-PDD or supporting annexes are documented in the Re-Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

2.4. Internal Technical Review

The re-validation report underwent an Internal Technical Review (ITR) before requesting registration of the project activity.

The ITR is an independent process performed to examine thoroughly that the process of re-validation has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the re-validation scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas Certification procedures.

The Team Leader provides a copy of the re-validation report to the reviewer, including any necessary re-validation documentation. The reviewer reviews the submitted documentation for conformance with the re-validation scheme. This will be a comprehensive review of all documentation generated during the re-validation process.

When performing an Internal Technical Review, the reviewer ensures that:

- The re-validation activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the CDM and GS rules and requirements.
- The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans and emission reduction calculations, internal quality assurance systems of the project participant as well as the project activity, review of the stakeholder comments and responses, closure of CARs and CLs during the re-validation exercise, review of sample documents.

The reviewer may raise Clarification Requests to the re-validation team and will discuss these matters with the Team Leader.

After the agreement of the responses to the Clarification Requests from the re-validation team as well as the PP(s), the finalized re-validation report is accepted for further processing such as uploading via the UNFCCC interface.

3. RE-VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS

In the following sections, the conclusions of the re-validation are stated.

The findings from the desk review of the original project design documents and the findings from interviews during the follow up visit are described in the Re-Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

The Clarification, Corrective and Forward Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Re-Validation Protocol in Appendix A. The re-validation of the Project resulted in 10CAR(s), 02 CL(s) and 0 FAR(s).

The CARs and CLs were closed out based on adequate responses from the Project Participant(s) which meet the applicable requirements. They have been reassessed before their formal acceptance and closure.

The number between brackets at the end of each section corresponds to the VVS paragraph.

3.1. Approval (43-44)

Approval is not applicable as the project is developed as a Gold Standard VER project.



3.2. Authorization (49)

Authorization is not applicable as the project is developed as a Gold Standard VER project.

3.3. Sustainable Development (52)

As the project is a GS-VER project it is not applicable for the host Part's DNA to confirm the contribution of the Project to the sustainable development of the host party. Please refer to section 3.1 of this report.

However, according to GS requirements as a sustainability monitoring plan is applicable and related parameters are available in detail in the project GS-VER-PDD (Ref-03). These parameters can also be seen in the monitoring plan, section 3.10 of this report.

3.4. Modalities of Communications (58,61)

N/A as the project is GS-VER.

3.5. Project Design Document (63)

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the GS-VER-PDD complies with the latest forms of the guidance documents for completion of GS-VER-PDD. Project Design Document Form for CDM Project Activities (CDM-SSC-PDD) Version 01 is used for the first crediting period, for the second crediting period track changes are applied on the GS-VER-PDD according to GS4GG Principles and Requirements (Ref-12).

3.6. Changes in the Project Activity (17)

Webhosting is not applicable as the project is GS-VER.

3.7. Project Description (69)

Şah Wind Power Plant consists 35 Wind Turbines with 3 MW for each capacity and 105 MWm / 105 MWe for total capacity. In the beginning 31 turbines are commissioned. Additional 4 turbines are added to project and capacity increased. The project was taken over by Doğan Enerji Yatırımları San. ve Tic. A.Ş. in June 2012. The annual production estimated as 306,566 MWh through last three year average production. The project specifications are confirmed through first crediting period GS-VER-PDD dd. 18/03/2013 Version 11.

EIA is not Required Certificate dd. 21/03/2008 and commissioning records are provided to validation team. All milestones of the project activity has been confirmed during the first crediting period. The turbines commissioning dates are confirmed as below during first crediting period;

- Commissioning date of first phase (21 x 3 = 63 MW) – 19/05/2011
- Commissioning date of second phase (9 x 3 = 27 MW) – 03/06/2011
- Commissioning date of last phase (1 x 3 = 3 MW) – 29/07/2011

- Commissioning date of first phase (21 x 3 = 63 MW) – 24/05/2013

Table 2 Geographical coordinates of the 35 wind turbines of the project activity

Turbine #	East	North
T1	601446	4469492
T2	601695	4469465
T3	601926	4469480
T4	601743	4470297
T5	602108	4470241
T6	602333	4470018
T7	602874	4470631
T8	603224	4470533
T9	603444	4470612
T10	603343	4470097
T11	603636	4470090
T12	603976	4470085
T13	604164	4469983
T14	604329	4469736
T15	604562	4469683
T16	604850	4469820
T17	604592	4469322
T18	604616	4469042
T19	603447	4469092
T20	603741	4468904
T21	604059	4468715
T22	604243	4468577
T23	604367	4468170
T24	604528	4468006
T25	604974	4468277
T26	605165	4468800
T27	604791	4468934
T28	605437	4469378
T29	605164	4469847
T30	605619	4470422
T31	605910	4470168
T32	605403	4469825
T33	605127	4469094
T34	602472	4469783
T35	601498	4470370

Coordinates are confirmed through revised electricity generation license dd. 10/04/2008.

In the case of turbines at Şah WPP, project boundaries do not change, no new stakeholders add, no negative affect such as noise, access of local stakeholders to the project site and etc.

The annual expected electricity supplied to Turkish National Grid is 306,566 MWh/year according to the last three year production values (Ref-17) and the annual estimated emission reductions are 171,828 tCO₂e/year which total of reduction of 1,202,795 tCO₂e over the 7 year second crediting period.

The first 7-year renewable crediting period was from 15/11/2011 to 14/11/2018. The PP is applying for a second crediting period started from 15/11/2018 till 14/11/2025.

The project is located in Bandırma district of Balıkesir province and Karacabey district of Bursa province, Turkey.

During the first crediting period the estimated electricity generation is confirmed through the Deutsche WindGuard GmbH, Energy Yield Assessment Report dated December 2008 as 341,275 MWh/year. During the second crediting period estimated annual generation value revised as 306,566 MWh/year through last three-year production values.

The project will result in annual emission reductions of 171,828 tCO₂e during the seven years of its second renewable crediting period which is expected to start on 15/11/2018.

The validation team confirms that the PLF of 33.33 % is sourced from the realized annual average electricity generation by the project activity during the next 7 years.

The PLF is calculated as;

$$PLF = 306,566 / (105,000 * 8760) * 100 = \underline{\underline{\% 33.33}}$$

(PLF = Annual Gen / Installed Cap. x Working Hours) which is complying with the Paragraph 3 (b) of "Guidelines for the Reporting and Validation of Plant Load Factors" version 01.

The re-validation did not reveal any information indicating that the Project can be seen as a diversion of official development assistance (ODA) funding towards the host country.

The processes undertaken by the re-validation team to validate the accuracy and completeness of the project description include conducting a physical site inspection, sampling, reviewing available designs and feasibility studies, conducting comparison analysis with equivalent projects.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the project description in the final GS-VER-PDD is accurate and complete in all respects.

3.8. Baseline and Monitoring Methodology

3.8.1. Applicability of the selected Methodology (77)

At the time of registration, project participant had used the methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources", Version 17.

The revised GS-VER-PDD applies the latest available version of the same methodology “Large scale Consolidated baseline methodology for grid - connected electricity generation from renewable sources”, ACM0002 Version 18. Therefore, it meets the condition that for renewal of the crediting period, the methodology shall not change. The project consists of a wind power electricity capacity addition and is grid-connected electricity generation project and the installed capacity of the proposed project activity is 105 MW, hence above the 15 MW limit for a large scale project activity. This applicability conditions are confirmed through the EMRA Generation license during the second crediting period re-validation process.

The applicability of the methodology was re-assessed based on the knowledge of the project from the initial validation, subsequent verifications and the confirmation from the project participant.

The project meets each of the applicability conditions of methodology. It also meets all the other stipulations and limitations mentioned in the other sections of the methodology.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology, tool and other methodology component is previously approved by the CDM Executive Board, and is applicable to the Project, which, complies with all the applicability conditions therein.

As per the requirements of ACM0002 Version 18, the continued validity of the baseline is assessed and the emissions which would result from the baseline scenario are updated at the start of the second and third crediting period.

3.8.2.Project Boundary (86-87)

The re-validation team has validated the project boundary by:

- (a) Assessing the relevant documents including EMRA Generation License (Ref-04) and EIA not required certificate (Ref-05).
- (b) Observing the physical site and equipment used in the process.

The spatial extent of the project boundary is clearly defined in line with ACM0002 Version 18 as the project power plant and all power plants connected physically to the electricity system that the CDM (GS-VER) project power plant is connected to.

During the second crediting period, amendments on the project boundary have been observed and confirmed during the site visit by the validation team.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity.

The re-validation team did not identify any emission sources that will be affected by the implementation of the proposed project activity and which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reductions, and are not addressed by the selected approved methodology.

3.8.3. Baseline Identification (94-95)

During the first crediting period, the baseline is confirmed through the ACM0002 Version 17 in the registered GS-VER-PDD. For the second crediting period baseline is re-calculated through the ACM0002 Version 18 and "Tool to calculate the emission factor of an electricity system" Version 06.0.0.

The procedure contained in the methodology to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario has been correctly applied.

In line with the requirements of the applied tool, the Simple Operating Margin Emission Factor ($EF_{grid,OM,y}$) has been calculated ex-ante, using TEIAS data for 2014-2016 period which is actual data during the investment decision date. The operating margin is calculated as **0.6486 tCO₂/MWh**. The operating margin calculation is checked and accepted by the re-validation team through the actual references for the project activity.

The Build Margin emission factor $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ is calculated as the generation-weighted average emission factor of a sample of power plants. The values are checked and confirmed through the TEIAS Statistics. The Build Margin Emission Factor ($EF_{grid,BM,y}$) has been determined as **0.2961 tCO₂/MWh** and has been found appropriate by the re-validation team.

In accordance with the methodology of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" v.05.0.0, Project participant determined the Combined Margin Emission Factor as **0.5605 tCO₂/MWh** and this have been confirmed by the re-validation team with reviewing all baseline calculation sheet equations and confirming the parameters used for the calculations and their relevant sources.

$$EF_{grid, CM, y} = 0.75 * 0.6486 + 0.25 * 0.2961 = \mathbf{0.5605 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh}}.$$

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that:

- (a) All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the GS-VER-PDD, including their references and sources;
- (b) All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the GS-VER-PDD;
- (c) Assumptions and data used in the identification of the baseline scenario are justified appropriately, supported by evidence and can be deemed reasonable;
- (d) Relevant national and/or sectorial policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the GS-VER-PDD;
- (e) The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most plausible baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed project activity.

3.8.4. Algorithms and/or Formulae used to determine Emission Reductions (99-100)

During the first crediting period, estimated emission reduction is calculated and confirmed through the ACM0002 Version 12.1.0 in the registered GS-VER-PDD. For the second crediting period estimated emission reduction is revised through the ACM0002 Version 18 and “Tool to calculate the emission factor of an electricity system” Version 06.0.0 by most current data.

Project installed validated and confirmed as 105 MW through the EMRA Generation License (Ref-04).

Technical lifetime of the project was determined as 25 years and 0 months in line with the guidance of “Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment”, Version 01 for onshore wind turbines. This has also been assumed as the project lifetime.

Emission reduction calculations are re-calculated for the second crediting period according to the requirements of the applied methodology, ACM0002 Version 18, Methodological tool “Assessment of the validity of the original/current baseline and update of the baseline at the renewal crediting period version 03.0.1 EB66 Annex 47 and most recent tool “Tool to calculate the emission factor of an electricity system” Version 06.0.0 and confirmed as follows;

Project emissions of the project have been evaluated as:

As per the proposed project activity is a new grid-connected wind power plant. For this reason, PE_y is considered as “0” in line with ACM0002 Version 18.

PE_y=0

Leakage Emission for the project has not been considered, in line with the applied methodology ACM0002 Version 18.

Baseline Emissions of the project has been evaluated as:

$$BE_y = EG_{PJ,y} \times EF_{grid,CM,y}$$

Where:

BE_y = Baseline Emissions in year y (tCO₂)

EG_{PJ,y} = Quantity of net electricity supplied to the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh)

EF_{grid,CM,y}=CO₂ emission factor of the grid in year y (tCO₂/MWh)

The calculation of EG_{PJ,y} is different for (a) greenfield plants; (b) retrofits and replacement and; (c) capacity additions. Since the proposed project activity falls under the description Greenfield plants, the following method has been adopted.

$$EG_{PJ,y} = EG_{facility,y}$$

Where:

$EG_{PJ,y}$ = Quantity of net electricity generation that is produced and fed into the grid as a result of the implementation of the CDM project activity in year y (MWh/yr)

$EG_{facility,y}$ = Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant/unit to the grid in year y (MWh/yr)

Emission reductions are calculated as follows:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$$

Where:

ER_y = Emission reductions in year y (tCO₂/y)

BE_y = Baseline Emissions in year y (tCO₂/y)

PE_y = Project emissions in year y (tCO₂/y)

LE_y = Leakage emissions in year y (tCO₂/y)

Project involves the installation of a Greenfield plant and therefore $EG_{baseline}$ is assumed zero, and baseline emission for a year of operation is:

BE_y = 306,566 MWh/year X 0.5605 tCO₂/MWh= 171,828 tCO₂e and since no project emissions are considered,

$$ER_y = BE_y = 171,828 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that:

- (a) All assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the GS-VER-PDD, including their references and sources;
- (b) All documentation used by project participants as the basis for assumptions and source of data is correctly quoted and interpreted in the GS-VER-PDD;
- (c) All values used in the GS-VER-PDD are considered reasonable in the context of the proposed project activity;
- (d) The baseline methodology and corresponding tool(s) have been applied correctly to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions;
- (e) All estimates of the baseline emissions can be replicated using the data and parameter values provided in the GS-VER-PDD.

3.9. Additionality (104)

During the first crediting period additionality has been demonstrated through use of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” version 5.2. According to Annex Z of the Gold Standard there is no need a revision on additionality section of the project activity. The IRR is recalculated during the second crediting period, The first crediting period additionality has been eligible for the second crediting period.

Installed Capacity	105 MWm / 105 MWe
Annual Electricity Production	341,275MWh/year
Electricity Sales Price	5.5 Euro cent
Income tax rate	% 20
Project lifetime – (years)	25.0
Turbine Repair, Maintenance & Spare Parts	2,170,000 Euro
Personnel	240,000 Euro
Energy Transfer Fee (System usage fee)	344,299 Euro
Insurance	0.1 % of total investment
Project Development Costs	14,415,000
Costs for Turbines	82,080,000
Construction	7,571,186
Electromechanical Installments	5,000,000
Loan Amount	65% of total investment
Interest	8%

Tenor	10
-------	----

Project IRR has been calculated and confirmed as %15.43 for the first crediting period where the benchmark has been calculated and confirmed as %19.97 as below;

Parameter	Value	Source
Risk Free Rate	%7,883	http://www.ziraat.com.tr/tr/bankamiz/faiz-ve-ucretler/asp/eurobond.aspx
BETA	0,939	Istanbul Stock Exchange (ISE).
Market Risk Premium	%12.88	Aswath Damodaran – Stern School of Business (New York University)

The sensitivity analysis also provides that the project IRR is still under the benchmark rate.

Sensitivity Parameter & Exchange rate	-%10	-%5	%0	%5	%10
Investment cost	17,79%	16,52%	15,43%	14,48%	13,64%
Energy Production	12,67%	14,04%	15,43%	16,84%	18,28%
Electricity Sales Price	12,67%	11,68%	15,43%	16,84%	18,28%
O&M Cost	13,58%	13,42%	15,43%	13,09%	12,92%

Ongoing financial need has been determined and confirmed by DOE. Sales income, operational costs and carbon certification expenses are determined. The net income percentages are confirmed as below;

For Crediting Period (15 November 2011 to 15 November 2018)	% to Net Income
Income	622.86
Costs	562.86
Net Income	100.00
Carbon Income	0.09
Carbon Costs	0.23
Net Carbon Income	-0.15

Investment analysis and sensitivity analysis shows the financial need of the project activity. The emission reduction was confirmed as 207,188 tCO₂e during the first crediting period and 171,828 tCO₂e during the second crediting period. The carbon credit selling prices depends on the market status and changes for each purchase agreement. This market status can vary, and carbon credits are in a key position for the project activity.

The validation team considers that the range of variations is reasonable in the project context. The analysis provided a cross-check on the suitability of the assumptions used in the development of the investment analysis. The conclusion that the project activity is unlikely to be financially/economically attractive is robust to reasonable variations in the critical assumptions.

Barrier Analysis is not applied for the project activity. During the first crediting period common practice analysis applied and project activity confirmed as not common practice.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the underlying assumptions regarding investment analysis are appropriate and the financial calculations are correct.

3.10. Monitoring Plan (133)

The Project uses the approved consolidated monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 18.

Data and Parameters Monitored

EG_{facility,y} (SDG 13: Climate Action, SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy)

Quantity of net electricity generation supplied by the project plant to the grid:

Quantity of the net electricity generation supplied by the project to the grid will be used for the emission reduction calculations in all monitoring periods. For the project activity there will be two metering points and each of them has two electricity meters at the substation where one is called the main meter and the other one secondary.

Rules for meter accuracy are laid down in the TEIAS connection agreement. The net electricity generation supplied to the grid will be measure continuously by TEIAS meters and recorded monthly. The main source of the parameter will be the EPIAS records which are sealed by TEIAS and since it is subject to monthly invoicing high reliability. The project participants also archived a hardcopy of meter reading protocols, scanned them and stored them. The invoices are kept by the Project owner as hardcopies. The cross check of the parameter will be done with the meter reading records or OSF forms .

According to Communiqué of Meters in Electricity Sector (Ref-28); the meters to be used in the electricity market shall be compliant with the standard of Turkish Standards Institute or IEC and have obtained "Type and System Approval" certificate from the Ministry of Trade Industry.

The meters have been calibrated by Turkish Standard Institute and they will be recalibrated after 10 years under the responsibility of TEIAS. The necessary regulations regarding to electricity generation and metering are checked by the re-validation team. The monitoring plan of the EG_{facility,y} parameter is line with the necessary regulations.

The project contributes to the following indicators 13.3.2 “Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions” and following target 13.3 “Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning”

The project contributes to the following indicators 7.2.1 “Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption” and following target: 7.2 “By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix.”

SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth:

The project contributes to the following indicators 8.5.2 “Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities” and following target: “8.5 By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value”

Number of employment will be monitored by project participants through SGK records. It is estimated that the project activity employee number will be between 20 and 25. After first verification, only changes in employees will be reported.

ERy: (SDG 13: Climate Action):

The project contributes to the following indicators 13.3.2 “Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions” and following target 13.3 “Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning”

Emission reduction will be monitored during each monitoring period through ACM0002 Version 18.0. The estimated emission reduction value has been confirmed as 171,828 tCO₂e according to net generation values.

Sustainable Development Goals has been confirmed as below;

1. SDG 7: Affordable and Clean Energy

Target: 7.2 By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix

Indicator: 7.2.1 “Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption”

2. SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth

Target: 8.5 By 2030 achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men

Indicator: 8.5.2 Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities

3. SDG13: Climate Action

Target: 13.3. Improve education, awareness-raising and human and institutional capacity on climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning

Indicator: 13.3.2 Number of countries that have communicated the strengthening of institutional, systemic and individual capacity-building to implement adaptation, mitigation and technology transfer, and development actions

Implementation of the Monitoring Plan

The amount of electricity generated by the project and fed to the national grid have been monitored continuously by two metering devices. The collected data have been kept by both Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. and TEİAŞ during the crediting period, and stored at least two years after the last issuance of VER credits for the Şah Wind Power Plant project activity in the concerning crediting period.

Monitoring data is collected in accordance with the agreement done between the project owner and Turkish Electricity Distribution Company (TEDAS) which provides the infrastructure for the connection to the national grid. The metering system is defined in the agreement as two groups; main meter and spare meter. The meters are placed at the point the electricity is fed to the grid and sealed on behalf of the both parties.

Two group's electricity meters (each have main meter and spare meter) which are continuously measuring the electricity generated, are installed at Şah Wind Power Plant.

All requirements and specifications of the meters are done according to Communiqué on the counter to be used in the Electricity Market by Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EMRA) on 22/04/2011 (Ref-27).

The company is not responsible for the calibration of the meters. Maintenance and calibration of the metering devices are made by TEİAŞ when inconsistency between two devices using a fixed template or upon request by either project owner or TEİAŞ System Usage Agreement, Art 3, B./2./b (Ref-06). The calibrations of the meters are done every 10 years according to 'Regulation of Metering and Testing of Metering Systems' (Ref-25).

The meters-ELSTER is used in the power house and is in line with the EMRA requirements for electricity meters. Serial numbers of first metering points are 419695 and 419696 which have 0.2s accuracy level (ELSTER). Serial numbers of second metering points are 419697 and 419698 which have 0.2s accuracy level (ELSTER). The accuracy class of the meters has been confirmed by the validation team during the site visit. The meters serial numbers and specifications are confirmed as below;

The accuracy class of the meters is 0.2S.

Calibration Frequency: 10 years

Initial calibration: 28/04/2011

Last calibration: 04/10/2017

The re-validation team considers that the means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, are sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the proposed project activity can be reported ex post and verified.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the monitoring plan complies with the requirements of the methodology including applicable tool(s), the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan are feasible within the project design and the project participants are able to implement the described monitoring plan.

SAFEGUARDING PRINCIPLES

Social & Economic Safeguarding Principles

Principle 1 – Human Rights: It is confirmed that the project aspects internationally proclaimed human rights including dignity, cultural property and uniqueness of indigenous people. The project activities are not complicit in Human Rights abuses. Turkey is a member of United Nations and part of UN Agreement on Human Rights. (<http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/arsiv/7217.pdf>)

Principle 2 – Gender Equality and Women’s Rights : It is confirmed that the project has no negative effect on GS4GG gender assessment questions. Sah Wind Power Plant project does not involve in any form discrimination in any kind of form. Turkey ratified ILO 100 Equal Remuneration Convention and 111 Discrimination. (http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:11200:0::NO::P11200_COUNTRY_ID:102893)

Principle 3 – Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions : The project is a WPP, so the project during its entire life-cycle does not have any adverse health and safety effect on any local or remote community. It is confirmed that The project owner is committed to the safe and healthy working conditions during all phases of the project. All employees will attend trainings health & safety. This issue is protected by Labor Law and regulations. (<http://www.mevzuat.adalet.gov.tr/html/1243.html>)

Principle 4 – Cultural Heritage, Indigenous Peoples, Displacement and Resettlement : During the construction and operation of the project will not be any damage, alteration or removal to the critical cultural heritage. Because the project location isn’t involve to any critical cultural heritage. Cultural and environmental heritage is also protected against alteration, damage or removal by the law. All official permit had realized by Forestry Directorate of Bursa and Balikesir provinces.

Principle 5 – Corruption : The project does not involve and is not complicit in any form of forced or compulsory labor. It is confirmed through ILO 29 Forced Labour Convention.

(http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?mtdsq_no=XVIII-14&chapter=18&lang=en)

Principle 6 – Economic Impacts : According to Worst form of child labor the project does not employ and is not complicit in any form of child labor. Turkey has ratified ILO 138 Minimum Age Conventions and 182 Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention. Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. and appointed subcontractors does not involve in any form forced or compulsory labour Turkey has ratified ILO 29 Forced Labour Convention.

It is confirmed that the project has financial sustainability through its lifecycle. The project produces electricity from wind energy during its lifetime, so it preserves its financial sustainability after certification period. The project does not have negative impact on local economy or any local group.

(http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:11200:0::NO::P11200_COUNTRY_ID:102893)

Environmental & Ecological Safeguarding Principles

Principle 1 – Climate and Energy: The project does not increase greenhouse has emission over the baseline scenario. The project activity is renewable energy project and reduces the greenhouse gas emissions. On the other hand, it is confirmed that the project activity generates renewable energy and supplies to the grid.

Principle 2 – Water: The project activity has no negative effect on water resources. This is also confirmed through PIF.

Principle 3 – Environment, ecology and land use: The land for the project has been approved by the all relevant local Authorities. This is also confirmed during the first verification period. The project is susceptible to decreased vulnerability to wind, earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding, drought or other extreme conditions. Wind power project systems not affects the herbal life negatively. It is confirmed that the project owner also follows necessary procedures for environmental safety at the project site at international standard (such as Bern Convention) as explained in the PIF. The all wastes are disposed of according to related regulations. This is confirmed during site visit observations and PIF. It is confirmed that waste oil produced have been collected in an oil-proof container and disposed via accredited abatement companies. The project not involve the application of pesticides and/or fertilizers because the project activity is wind power plant.

Assessments regarding Safeguarding Principles and Requirements paragraph 4.3.7 to 4.3.11 has been determined and confirmed by DOE through EIA report and Turkish law and regulations. It is confirmed that the project does not involve the harvesting of forests, does not negative impact to access and availability of food for people, does not involve any animal husbandry. The project does not affect or alter High Conservation value (HCV) ecosystems, critical habitats, landscapes, key biodiversity areas or cultural sites. On the other site, it is confirmed that there are no endangered species identified as potentially being present within the project boundary.

3.11. Environmental Impacts (137)

The project participants conducted an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed project activity, including trans-boundary impacts as a part of the national EIA procedures.

However the project is EIA exempt as it is not included in activities determined in the Annex-2 of the EIA Regulations. This was made official and was validated through the decision of the Balıkesir Provincial Environment and Urbanism Directorate (Ref-05).

Aspects of the project's possible environmental impacts were also assessed by GS procedures as detailed in the GS-VER-PDD (Ref-03).

Due to project size and location almost no impact is expected which is found acceptable by BVC after on-site observations and assessment of the project characteristics.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that the project participants have undertaken an analysis of environmental impacts.

3.12. Local Stakeholder Consultation (140)

As required by the Gold Standard complementary stakeholder consultation process has to be undertaken by the project owners in order to involve stakeholders' participation to the project for a renewal crediting period of Sah Wind Power Plant.

Non-technical project summary for renewal crediting period and the Environmental and Social Impact questionnaire related with the Sustainable Development Indicators (SD Assessment) (according to GS4GG requirements) have been delivered to the stakeholders who have been selected as stakeholders to the project activity. The communication done through e-mails and delivery of hard copies. The announcements has been seen during the site visit. Hard copies has given to Dedeoba and Sahmelek villages. The general outcome of the stakeholder consultation interview was positive verbally and headman of the 2 villages have given their comment with a letter.

The feedback request for renewal crediting period has started on 04/05/2018. The beginning of Complementary Stakeholder Feedback Round had been announced from the headman of the Dedeoba and Sahmelek villages . No negative impact has been received by stakeholders. The feedback book has been seen during site visit. The book has delivered by Dedeoba and Şahmelek village Headman.



BVC conducted live interviews Dedeoba village's residents as well as community leaders during the site visit dd. 04/06/2018. During the site visit informed stakeholder are selected by the re-validation team on Complementary Stakeholder Consultation.

Headman of the Dedeoba village, Mr. Ali AYDIN and Stakeholder of Dedeoba village, Mr. Şenol KÖSE declared positive opinions for the project activity. They declared that generally stakeholders have no negative opinions for the project activity.

The re-validation team observed that the stakeholders have generally positive opinions for the project activity. On the other hand, the announcement for complementary stakeholder consultation has been seen by the re-validation team.

It is confirmed that there is no negative comments have been received during the complementary stakeholders' process for renewal crediting period of Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.

Bureau Veritas Certification hereby confirms that comments that are relevant for the proposed project activity have been invited from local stakeholders, the summary of the comments received as provided in the GS-VER-PDD is complete, the project participants have taken due account of all comments received and have described this process in the GS-VER-PDD.

4. COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS

Webhosting is not applicable since the project is GS-VER.

5. RE-VALIDATION OPINION

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a validation of renewal of the crediting period for registered Sah Wind Power Plant, which is located in Bandirma district of Balıkesir province and Karacabey district of Bursa province, Turkey . The re-validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, and host country criteria, as well as GS4GG Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period and criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The re-validation consisted of the following three phases: i) desk review of the project design document and additional background documents; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final re-validation report and opinion.

The project correctly applies the approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 18.0.0

By displacing fossil fuel powered generation sources in the national interconnected grid, the project is likely to result in reductions of GHG emissions that are real, measurable and give long-term benefits to the mitigation of climate change. It is demonstrated that the project is not a likely baseline scenario. Emission reductions attributable to the project are hence additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project activity.

Given that the project is implemented and maintained as designed, the project is likely to achieve the estimated annual emission reductions of 171,828 tCO₂e during the seven years of its second renewable crediting period.

The review of the project design documentation and the subsequent follow-up interviews have provided Bureau Veritas Certification with sufficient evidence to determine the fulfillment of stated criteria. In our opinion, the project meets all relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM, GS Procedures for the Renewal of a Crediting Period (Annex Z) and the relevant host country criteria. Bureau Veritas Certification thus requests registration of the project as a GS-VER project activity.



Ms. SEDA YÜCEL
Internal Technical Reviewer
24/10/2018



Mr. Furkan SADIKOĞLU
Team Leader
24/10/2018

6. REFERENCES

Category 1 Documents:

Documents provided by project participants that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

/1/ Sah WPP PDD Ver11 – 18/03/2018 (First Crediting Period)

/2/ Sah WPP PDD Ver0.1 – 31/05/2018
Baseline Study v0.1_31052018_Sah

/3/ Sah WPP PDD Ver0.2 – 13/06/2018
Sah WPP PDD Ver0.3 – 25/07/2018
Sah WPP PDD Ver0.4 – 24/09/2018
Sah WPP PDD Ver0.5 – 24/10/2018
Ongoing Financial Excel
Baseline Study v0.2_13062018_Sah

Category 2 Documents:

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents used for cross-check.

- /4/ EMRA Generation License_10/04/2008
- /5/ EIA Not Required Certificate21/03/2008
- /6/ TEIAS System Usage Agreement – 17/01/2011
- /7/ TEIAS System Connection Agreement
- Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Standard, Ver.09
- /8/
- /9/ UNFCCC Approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 Version 18 – “Grid Connected Electricity Generation from Renewable Sources”
- /10/ UNFCCC’s Methodological Tool: “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” Version 07.0.0
- /11/ UNFFFC’s Methodological Tool: “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” Version 06.0.0
- /12/ <https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/100-gs4gg-principles-requirements/>
- /13/ Commissioning date of First Phase (63 MW), Second Phase (27 MW) and Last Phase – 19/05/2011 – 03/06/2011 – 29/07/2011
- /14/ License Amendment – 04/04/2012 and 11/06/2012
- /15/ Commissioning date of additional 4 turbines – 24/05/2013
- /16/ License Amendment (Change of capacity to 105 MWe/105 MWm) – 26/09/2013
- /17/ Sah WPP 2015-2016-2017 Electricity Production Values
- /18/ Local Stakeholder Consultation Meeting – 18/06/2010
- /19/ Gold Standard Project Registration – 06/11/2013
- http://www.gepower.com/prod_serv/products/wind_turbines/en/downloads/ge_25mw_brochure.pdf
- /20/ http://www.epdk.org.tr/documents/elektrik/mevzuat/kanun/Elk_Kanun_Yek_Kanun.doc
- /21/

- /22/ <http://www.teias.gov.tr/YayinRapor/APK/projeksiyon/KAPASITEPROJEKSIYONU2013.pdf>
- /23/ http://www.epdk.gov.tr/documents/elektrik/mevzuat/kanun/Elk_Kanun_6446.doc
- /24/ <http://www2.cevreorman.gov.tr/yasa/k/2872.doc> (Enactment Date: 1983)
- /25/ http://www.epdk.gov.tr/documents/elektrik/mevzuat/teblig/elektrik/sayaclar_hakkinda/Elk_Tblg_Say
- /26/ [aclar.doc](http://www.epdk.gov.tr/documents/elektrik/mevzuat/teblig/elektrik/sayaclar_hakkinda/Elk_Tblg_Say)
- /27/ <http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/Metin.Asp?MevzuatKod=7.5.6381&MevzuatIliski=0&sourceXmlSearch>
- /28/ http://epdk.org.tr/documents/elektrik/mevzuat/yonetmelik/elektrik/dengeleme_uzlastirma/DUYson.d
- /29/ [oc](http://www.epdk.org.tr/english/regulations/electric/meters.doc)
- /30/ <http://www.epdk.org.tr/english/regulations/electric/meters.doc>, page 1
- http://www.sanayi.gov.tr/download/osgm/olcu_alemleri_muayene_yonetmelik.zip, page 2
- <http://www.teias.gov.tr/sistemkullanim1.doc>, page 3, 2-b)

Persons interviewed:

Persons interviewed during the validation or persons that contributed with other information that are not included in the documents listed above.

Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|---------------------------|
| /1/ | Cem Çağrı LEVENT | Ass. General Menager |
| /2/ | Aziz KAYMAKÇI | Operation Manager |
| /3/ | Yasin USUĞ | Administrative work staff |

Rüzgar Danışmanlık

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|----------------------------------|
| /4/ | Çağla Balcı ERİŞ | Consultant - +90 (554) 388 59 49 |
|-----|------------------|----------------------------------|

Local Stakeholders

- | | | |
|-----|------------|---|
| /5/ | Ali YAĞDI | Headman of Dedeoba Village -+90 (0532) 496 22 89 |
| /6/ | Şenol KÖSE | Stakeholder of Dedeoba Village- +90 (537) 942 62 86 |

7. CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S RE-VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS

Mr. Furkan SADIKOĞLU	Bureau Veritas Certification, Turkey	Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier. Furkan Sadıkoğlu is an Electrical & Electronics Engineer. His M.Sc. degree in Necmettin Erbakan University in Energy Systems Engineering. He has an experience in renewable energy and LED lightning sectors and he has over 5 years' experience in energy sectors. He has participated online seminars in the Gold Standard Academy in 2012 ,2013,2015 and 2017 and is a lead verifier for GHG emission reduction projects. He completed more than 75 GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier. He is also MRV Lead verifier. He has been working with Bureau Veritas as a subcontractor lead auditor since September 2014.
Ms. SEDA YÜCEL	Bureau Veritas Certification, Turkey	Technical Reviewer, Climate Change Lead Verifier, Fikriye Seda YÜCEL, B.Sc. in Chemical Engineering has completed her M.Sc. degree in Istanbul Technical University in Energy Science and Technology. She is auditor and trainer for ISO 50001 and auditor for ISO 14001 and has about 2 years of experience in management systems and 7 years of experience in energy management in industry. She has been involved in more than 80 GS and VCS projects as a team leader/validator/verifier especially in the energy sector. She has been working as Gold Standard team leader/validator/verifier and CDM trainee validator/verifier.

Appendix A: LARGE SCALE PROJECT ACTIVITIES VALIDATION PROTOCOL (rev 10.4)

Table 1 Validation requirements based on VVS version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 14), PS version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 13), PCP version 09.0 (EB 82 Annex 15), GS4GG Principles & Requirements, and Guidelines for completing the PDD form version 01.0 (EB 66 Annex 9)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Part I Cover Page (KEY PROJECT INFORMATION)					
(a) Is the title of the project activity provided?	PDD		Title of the project is given as Sah Wind Power Plant	OK	OK
(b) Is a brief description of the project activity provided, including a summary of the scope of activities/ measures that are to be implemented within the project activity?	PDD		A brief description of the project activity is provided on cover page of PDD.	OK	OK
(c) Is implementation date of the project activity provided?	PDD		19/05/2011 25 Years and 00 Months	OK	OK
(d) Is project developer(s) indicated?	PDD		Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş.	OK	OK
(e) Is project representative(s) indicated?	PDD		Rüzgar Danışmanlık-Çağla Balcı Eriş	OK	OK
(f) Is the version number of the PDD indicated?	PDD		Version number of the PDD is given as 01	OK	OK
(g) Is the completion date of the PDD provided in DD/MM/YYYY format?	PDD		Completion date of the PDD is given as 31/05/2018.	OK	OK
(h) Are project participants indicated?	PDD		Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. is the operating company of the project activity.	OK	OK
(i) Is the host party(ies) indicated?	PDD		Host party is given as Turkey	OK	OK
(j) Is certification pathway provided?	PDD		Pathway is given as Project Certification	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
(k) Is activity requirements applied provided?	PDD		It is provided as GS4GG	OK	OK
(l) Is the sectoral scope and selected methodology(ies) indicated?	PDD		ACM0002 Version 18.0.0 has been used and the sectoral scope is 1 (Energy industries (renewable - / non-renewable sources)	OK	OK
(m) Is the project type is provided?	PDD		Project type is given as regular.	OK	OK
(n) Are minimum 3 SDG impacts indicated?	PDD		SDG 7, SDG 8 and SDG 13 is provided.	OK	OK
(o) Is estimated amount of SDG Impact certified provided?	PDD		171,987 tonnes CO ₂ e	OK	OK
Part II PDD					
Description of project					
A.1 Purpose and general description of project					
A.1.1 Is a brief description of the project activity provided, including a summary of the scope of activities/ measures that are to be implemented within the project activity?	PDD PS	31(b)	A brief description of the project activity is provided under section A.1 of the GS-VER-PDD according to references transparently.	OK	OK
A.1.2 Are the scenario existing prior to the start of project and baseline scenario indicated?	PDD		The scenario existing prior to the start of project and baseline scenario are indicated.	OK	OK
A.1.3 Does it explain how the project activity will reduce GHG emissions or increase GHG removals?	PS	31(c)	Project leads to reduction in GHGs and achieve sustainable development of the host country	OK	OK
A.1.4 Is the estimated of annual average and total GHG emission reductions for the chosen crediting period	PDD		Estimated total emission reduction over the 7 year crediting period is not provided under	CAR01	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
provided?			section A.1.		
A.1.5 Is a brief description of how the project activity contributes to sustainable development provided?	PDD		Sustainable development specific goals are provided under section A.1 of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
A.1.6 In order to determine whether the description of the proposed project activity in the PDD is accurate, complete, and provides an understanding of the proposed CDM project activity, does the DOE conducted a physical site visit to assess the Project? If not, please justify.	VVS	65	The physical site visit was conducted on 01/06/2018 by the validation team to validate the description of the project activity provided in the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
A.1.7 For all other proposed CDM project activities not referred to in VVS paragraphs 65-66, does the DOE undertaken the validation of project description by reviewing available designs and feasibility studies and should conduct comparison analysis with equivalent projects, as appropriate.	VVS	67	The project activity is a large scale project and hence the DOE has undertaken a physical site visit to validate the project description. Hence this clause is not applicable.	OK	OK
A.1.8 If the proposed CDM project activity involves the alteration of an existing installation or process, does the project description state the differences resulting from the project activity compared to the pre-project situation?	VVS	68	Not applicable as the project activity is a Greenfield project.	OK	OK
A.2 Eligibility of the project under Gold Standard					
A.2.1 Does the project meets the eligibility criteria as per section 3.1.1 of GS4GG Principles & Requirements document	PDD		The eligibility criteria is provided under section A.2.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.3 Is Legal ownership of products generated by the project and legal rights to alter use of resources required to service the project provided?	PDD		The project participant Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. is the legal owner of the project and has the legal rights for the credits. Galata Wind Enerji A.Ş. belongs to Dogan Enerji Yatırımları San. ve Tic. A.Ş.	OK	OK
A.4 Location of project					
A.4.1 Is the host party(ies) indicated?	PDD		Turkey has ratified the Kyoto Protocol however not set any emission reduction target; hence, it is not listed as an Annex B country of the Kyoto Protocol and will not be a host for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) or Joint Implementation (JI) projects until the end of 2012, because of its particular situation. There is no DNA in Turkey. Hence, the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
A.4.2 Is region/state/province etc. indicated?	PDD		Marmara Region, Balıkesir ve Bursa province	OK	OK
A.4.3 Is City/Town/Community etc. indicated?	PDD		The project site is located at Bandırma district of Balıkesir province and Karacabey district of Bursa province. The nearest small village are Sahmelek Village and Dedeoba Village.	OK	OK
A.4.4 Are the details of physical location of the project activity, including information allowing the unique identification of this project activity and a map,	PDD		The detail of the project location is provided under section A.4.4 of the GS-VER-PDD.	CAR02	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
provided?			Under table 1 the coordinates reference is not provided.		
A.5 Technologies and/or measures					
A.5.1 Are there a list and the arrangement of the main manufacturing/ production technologies, systems and equipment involved?	PDD		The wind turbines are the main components for WPP. The details are provided under section A.5.	OK	OK
A.5.1.1 Is the information about the age and average lifetime of the equipment based on manufacturer's specifications and industry standards, and existing and forecast installed capacities, load factors and efficiencies included in the description?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
A.5.1.2 Are the monitoring equipments and their location in the systems included in the description?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
A.5.2 Are energy and mass flows and balances of the systems and equipment included in the project activity provided?	PDD		Energy and mass flows and balances of the systems and equipment are described in GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
A.5.3 Are the types and levels of services provided by the systems and equipment that are being modified and/or installed under the project activity and their relation, if any, to other manufacturing/ production equipment and systems outside the project boundary provided?	PDD		Not applicable as it is a green field project.	OK	OK
A.5.4 Does the description clearly explain how the same	PDD		Please provide under section A.5 how the	CAR03	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
types and levels of services provided by the project activity would have been provided in the baseline scenario?			same type and levels of services provided by the project activity would have been provided in the baseline scenario?		
A.5.5 Is a list of facilities, systems and equipment in operation under the existing scenario prior to the implementation of the project activity provided?	PDD		The baseline is not described under section A.5.	CAR04	OK
A.5.6 Is a list of facilities, systems and equipment in the baseline scenario provided?	PDD		The baseline is not described under section A.5.	CAR04	OK
A.5.7 Is a description of how technologies and measures and know-how to be used are transferred to the Host Party (ies) included?	PDD		Under section A.5 how technologies and measures and know-how are transferred to the Host Party.	CAR05	OK
A.6 Scale of the Project	PDD		The scale of the project is provided as Large Scale.	OK	OK
A.7 Funding Sources of Project	PDD		The project activity does not have any public funding or Official Development Assistance (ODA) funding.	OK	OK
A.7.1 Is it indicated whether the project activity receives public funding from Annex I Parties?	PDD		Under section A.7 of the GS-VER-PDD mentions that "The proposed project is not using any ODA funding".	OK	OK
A.7.2 In case where public funding from Annex I Parties is involved, are followings provided? (a) Information on Parties providing public funding (b) Attached in Appendix 2: the affirmation obtained from such Parties that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance, is separate	PS	34	N.A.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
from, and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties					
A.8 Assessment that project complies with 'gender sensitive' requirements					
A.8.1 Does the project reflect the key issues and requirements of Gender Sensitive design and implementation as outlined in the Gender Policy?	PDD	GS4GG Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines	The project being a renewable energy project is not gender sensitive project. The project does not adversely impact women or men.	OK	OK
A.8.2 Does the project align with existing country policies, strategies and best practices?	PDD	GS4GG Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines	The project does not involve and is not complicit in any form of discrimination based on gender, race, religion, sexual orientation or any other basis.	OK	OK
A.8.3 Does the project address the questions raised in the Gold Standard Safeguarding Principles & Requirements document?	PDD	GS4GG Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines	The questions are answered correctly through references.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
A.8.4 Does the project apply the Gold Standard Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Procedure Requirements	PDD	GS4GG Gender Equality Requirements & Guidelines	The GS continuous input mechanism was explained and discussed that whenever they have a complaint or a request, they can be able to fill in the grievance book which can be located at a convenient place.	OK	OK
SECTION B. Application of selected approved baseline and monitoring methodology					
B.1. Reference of methodology					
Is the selected methodology (ies) indicated with exact reference (number, title and version)?	PDD		The selected methodology is provided as ACM0002 Version 18.	OK	OK
Are the baseline and monitoring methodologies selected by the project participants the valid versions of those approved by the Board?	VVS	70	The selected baseline and monitoring methodologies are the valid versions.	OK	OK
Are there any tools and other methodologies to which the selected methodology indicated?	PDD		1. Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system (Version 06.0.0); 2. Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality (Version 07.0.0); 3. Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality (Version 06.0.0) 4. Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of the equipment Version 01	OK	OK
Has specific guidance and/or clarifications provided by the	VVS	71			

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Board with respect to the approved methodology and any applicable tools been applied?			N.A.	OK	OK
Is there any deviation or clarification requested for the approved methodology?	VVS	78-81	N.A.	OK	OK
B.2. Applicability of methodology					
Is the selected baseline and monitoring methodology applicable to the project activity and that the selected version valid at the time of submission of the proposed project activity for registration?	VVS	73-75	Project activity is renewable and large scale project so the valid version of ACM0002 methodology is used at the time of submission of the proposed project activity for registration.	OK	OK
Is the choice of the selected methodology(ies) justified by showing that the project activity meets each applicability conditions of the selected methodology(ies)?	PDD VVS	76	All applicability criteria listed In ACM0002 are met by the proposed GS VER project activity. As it is a grid connected power plant, the applicability criteria of the EF Tool are also met.	OK	OK
Is it demonstrated that the project activity qualifies as Type I, II, and/or III during every year of the crediting period in accordance with applicable provisions for project activity eligibility in the Project standard?	PDD		N.A.	OK	OK
Is it determined that the project activity conforms to one or more of the approved small-scale methodologies applied in conjunction with the general guidelines to SSC CDM methodologies?	VVS	152	N.A.	OK	OK
Do the project participants explain the documentation that has been used as a basis for justification and	PDD		References are indicated in Annex 1, Annex 2 and Annex 3 of the GS-VER-PDD. And	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
provide the references, or include the documentation in Appendix 3 of the PDD?			also detailed emission factor calculations are indicated.		
B.3 Project boundary					
Is the project boundary of the project activity defined based on the guidance of the selected methodology(ies)?	PDD		The project boundary includes the project site and all power plants connected physically to the Turkish National Grid. The emission sources are the emissions associated with the electricity that is displaced from the grid. These are calculated as the electricity supplied to the grid multiplied by an emission factor for the grid.	OK	OK
Is a flow diagram of the project boundary presented, physically delineating the project activity?	PDD		Project Boundary figure has been provided.	OK	OK
Does the flow diagram include the equipment, systems and flows of mass and energy described? In particular, is the emission sources and GHGs included in the project boundary and the data parameters to be monitored indicated in the diagram?	PDD VVS	82	Single Line Diagram has been provided.	OK	OK
B.4 Establishment and description of baseline scenario					
Is an explanation how the baseline scenario is established in accordance with the selected baseline methodology provided?	PDD VVS	89	The project applied CDM-EB approved "ACM0002: Grid connected renewable electricity generation from renewable sources – Version 18.0.0."	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
When establishing the baseline scenario, and where “future anthropogenic emissions by sources are projected to rise above current levels due to the specific circumstances of the host Party”, do the project participants follow the “Guidelines on the consideration of suppressed demand in CDM methodologies”?	PS	42	N.A.	OK	OK
Does the PDD explain and justify the key assumptions and rationale, provide and explain all data used to establish the baseline scenario (variables, parameters, data sources etc.) preferably in a tabular form, and provide all relevant documentation and/or references?	PDD		PDD explain and justify the key assumptions and rationale, provide and explain all data used to establish the baseline scenario.	OK	OK
To determine the performance of equipment used in the proposed small-scale CDM project activity, do project participants use:	PS	91			
The appropriate value specified in the selected methodology;	PS	91(a)	N.A.	OK	OK
The national standard for the performance of the equipment type (project participants shall identify the standard used) if the value specified in is not available;	PS	91(b)	N.A.	OK	OK
An international standard for the performance of the equipment type, such as International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and International Electrotechnical Commission	PS	91(c)	N.A.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
(IEC) standards (project participants shall identify the standard used) if the value specified in is not available;					
The manufacturer's specifications, provided that they are tested and certified by national or international certifiers, if the value specified in is not available;	PS	91(d)	N.A.	OK	OK
Performance data from test results conducted by an independent entity for equipment installed under the project activity if the value specified in is not available.	PS	91(e)	N.A.	OK	OK
Are the documents and sources referred to in the PDD correctly quoted and interpreted and are they crosschecked with other verifiable and credible sources, such as local expert opinion, if available?	VVS	91	References are correctly provided.	OK	OK
Does the PDD provide a description of the identified baseline scenario, including a description of the technology that would be employed and/or the activities that would take place in the absence of the proposed project activity?	VVS	92	The baseline scenario is identified according to the "Baseline Methodology Procedure" of ACM0002 Version 18.0.0	OK	OK
Have all applicable CDM requirements been taken into account in the identification of the baseline scenario for the proposed project activity?	VVS	93	The baseline scenario is identified according to the "Baseline Methodology Procedure" of ACM0002 Version 18.0.0	OK	OK
Has relevant national and/or sectoral policies and circumstances (type E+ or E-), such as sectoral reform initiatives, local fuel availability, power	VVS	93	N.A.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
sector expansion plans, and the economic situation in the project sector been taken into account?					
Does the PDD provide a transparent description of the baseline scenario?	PDD		Transparent description of the baseline scenario is provided.	OK	OK
B.5 Demonstration of additionality					
Is the project activity demonstrated additional in accordance with one of options below?	PDD				
Attachment A of Appendix B: In such cases, project participants should also follow the “Non-binding practice examples to demonstrate additionality for SSC project activities”.	PS VVS	96(a) 159	N.A.	OK	OK
Any applicable additionality tool;	PS	96(b)	The project activity demonstrated additional in accordance with the selected methodology through Investment analysis.	OK	OK
Guidelines for demonstrating additionality of microscale project activities”? if the proposed project activity meets one of the following criteria: a) Type I: Project activities up to 5 MW that employ renewable energy as their primary technology; b) Type II: Energy efficiency project activities that aim to achieve energy savings at a scale of no more than 20 GWh per year; or c) Type III: Other project activities not included in Type I or Type II that aim to achieve GHG	PS VVS	96(c) 160	N.A.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
emissions reductions at a scale of no more than 20 ktCO ₂ e per year.					
Step 2: If investment analysis is used:					
Are all relevant assumptions and parameters used in the analysis listed?	PDD		Options are described according to “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” Version 05.2 used for re-validation. During Re-validation a new investment analysis is not needed.	OK	OK
Is the latest version of the “Guidelines on the assessment of investment analysis” applied?	VVS	118	Investment analysis is applied for the project activity.	OK	OK
Is project activity one of the following cases in regards to investment analysis:	VVS	119			
The proposed project activity would produce no financial or economic benefits other than CDM-related income;	VVS	119(a)	The project activity not produces any financial or economic benefits other than GS income.	OK	OK
The proposed project activity is less economically or financially attractive than at least one other credible and realistic alternative;	VVS	119(b)	There is no alternative project activity for a comparison of the attractiveness of an investment.	OK	OK
The financial returns of the proposed project activity would be insufficient to justify the required investment.	VVS	119(c)	Investments analyze shows that the project is not economically feasible without GS VER credit income.	OK	OK
Has the accuracy of financial calculations carried out for investment analysis been verified as follows:	VVS	120			
Determine the suitability of the financial indicator	VVS	120(a)			

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
selected by the project participants and conduct a thorough assessment of all parameters and assumptions used in calculating such financial indicators, and determine the accuracy and suitability of these parameters using available evidence and applying its expertise in relevant accounting practices			IRR calculation sheet is provided to the validation team. During validation process total investment is already validated.	OK	OK
Cross-check the parameters against third-party or publicly available sources, such as invoices or price indices	VVS	120(b)	Parameters are validated during validation.	OK	OK
Review, as appropriate, feasibility reports, public announcements and annual financial reports related to the proposed project activity and the project participants	VVS	120(c)	Parameters are validated during validation.	OK	OK
Assess the correctness of computations carried out and documented by the project participants; and	VVS	120(d)	Parameters are validated during validation.	OK	OK
Assess, where applicable, the sensitivity analysis by the project participants to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur, and the likelihood of these conditions	VVS	120(e)	Sensitivity analysis are determined in PDD.	OK	OK
If benchmark analysis is used:					
Is the benchmark clearly indicated?	PDD		Under sub-step 2b benchmark analysis is applied. Required/expected returns on equity	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			are used for the benchmark analysis.		
Is the type of benchmark applied suitable for the type of financial indicator presented?	VVS	121(a)	Equity IRR is selected as the financial indicator for the demonstration of the additionality of the project as permitted in the additionality tool.	OK	OK
Does the risk premiums applied in determining the benchmark reflect the risks associated with the project type or activity?	VVS	121(b)	Equity IRR is 15.43 %,	OK	OK
Is it reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of return lower than the benchmark?	VVS	121(c)	Benchmark has been calculated as below; $7.88\% + 12.88\% \times 0.939 = 19.97\%$	OK	OK
If cost comparison is used:					
Are the scenarios compared described?	PDD		N.A.	OK	OK
If PPs rely on values from FSR:	VVS	122			
Has the FSR been the basis of the decision to proceed with the investment in the project?	VVS	122(a)	Under table-4 the investment inputs references needs to be added.	CAR06	OK
Are the values used in the PDD and associated annexes fully consistent with the FSR? If inconsistencies occur, was the appropriateness of the values validated?	VVS	122(b)	All investment items are validated during first crediting period.	OK	OK
On the basis of its specific local and sectoral expertise, is confirmation provided, by cross-checking or other appropriate manner, that the input values from the FSR are valid and applicable	VVS	122(c)	All investment items are validated during first crediting period.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
at the time of the investment decision?					
If barriers analysis is used:					
Is the “Guidelines for objective demonstration and assessment of barriers” followed?	PS	48	Please clarify why Step-3: Benchmark Analysis section is not determined in PDD.	CL01	OK
Is it ensured that only the most relevant barriers selected?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
Is the credibility of the barriers justified with key facts and/or assumptions and the rationale?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
Is it ensured that issues that have a direct impact on the financial returns of the project activity are not considered as barriers but assessed by investment analysis? This does not refer to either: (a) Risk related barriers (b) Barriers related to the unavailability of sources of finance for the project activity	VVS	125	N/A	OK	OK
Were the barriers determined as real?	VVS	126(a)	N/A	OK	OK
Were the barriers determined as preventing the implementation of the project activity but not the implementation of at least one of the possible alternatives?	VVS	126(b)	N/A	OK	OK
Common Practice Analysis					
If the project type is first-of-its kind, do the project participants consider “Guidelines on	VVS	128	Please clarify why Step-4: Common Practice	CL02	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
additionality of first-of-its-kind project activities”?	PS	49(a)	Anaylsis section is not determined in PDD.		
If the project type is not first-of-its kind, has common practice analysis been conducted considering “Guidelines on common practice”?	VVS PS	128 49(b)	Please see CL02.	CL02	OK
Was it assessed whether the geographical scope of the common practice analysis is appropriate for the assessment related to the project activity’s technology or industry type?	VVS	129(a)	N/A	OK	OK
Was it determined to what extent similar and operational projects, other than CDM project activities, and have been undertaken in the defined region?	VVS	129(b)	N/A	OK	OK
Are similar and operational projects, other than CDM project activities, already “widely observed and commonly carried out” in the defined region? Is it assessed whether there are essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and the other similar activities?	VVS	129(c)	N/A	OK	OK
Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism					
If the project activity start date prior to the date of publication of the PDD for stakeholder comments, were the CDM benefits considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity?	PDD VVS	105	The prior consideration has been confirmed as 14/10/2008 during first crediting period.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is the start date of the project activity, reported in the PDD, the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins?	VVS	106	The prior consideration has been confirmed as 14/10/2008 during first crediting period.	OK	OK
If the project activity requires construction, retrofit or other modifications, is it ensured that the date of commissioning not considered as the project activity start date?	VVS	106	The prior consideration has been confirmed as 14/10/2008 during first crediting period.	OK	OK
Is it a project activity with a start date on or after 02 August 2008, or before 02 August 2008?	VVS	106	The prior consideration has been confirmed as 14/10/2008 during first crediting period.	OK	OK
For a project activity with a start date on or after 02 August 2008, are the following provisions to be satisfied:					
Has the PP informed the Host Party DNA and the UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and of their intention to seek CDM status within 180days of the project activity start date?	PS VVS	27 107	N.A.	OK	OK
Do the project participants inform the secretariat of the progress of the project activity every subsequent two years after the initial notification, until the PDD regarding the project activity has been published for global stakeholder consultation or, a new baseline and monitoring methodology is proposed or a revision of an approved baseline and	PCP	9	N.A.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring methodology is requested for the project activity before the start date?					
For a project activity with a start date before 02 August 2008, are the following elements to be satisfied:	VVS	108			
Is evidence of their awareness of the CDM prior to the project activity start date, and that the benefits of the CDM were a decisive factor in the decision to proceed with the project provided?	PS VVS	28(a) 108	N.A.	OK	OK
Are evidence that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation provided?	PS VVS	28(b) 108-110	N.A.	OK	OK
Is an implementation timeline of the proposed CDM project activity provided?	PS	28(c)	N.A.	OK	OK
B.6 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) outcomes					
Is the relevant target for each of the three SDGs provided under section B.6.1?	PDD		SDG 13, SDG 7 and SDG 8 targets are provided under section B.6.1.	OK	OK
Is Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG outcome indicated?	PDD		Explanation of methodological choices/approaches for estimating the SDG outcome is provided through GS4GG	OK	OK
Emission reductions					
Explanation of methodological choices					

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the PDD explain how the methods or methodological steps in the selected methodology, for calculating project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage emissions and emission reductions are applied?	PDD VVS	96	The SDG 13: Climate Action section of the GS-VER-PDD describes the steps for the calculation of emission reduction in accordance with ACM0002 Version 18.0.0.	OK	OK
In case the methodology(ies) provide different options to choose from, does the PDD indicate and justify which option is chosen for the project activity?	PDD VVS	97	The baseline emission cases are line with the methodology ACM0002 Version 18.0.0 and "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system Version 06.0.0".	OK	OK
In case the methodology(ies) allow different default values, does the PDD indicate and justify which of the default values have been chosen for the project activity?	PDD		The baseline emission cases are line with the methodology ACM0002 Version 18.0.0 and "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system Version 06.0.0".	OK	OK
			The OM calculation should be 3 year generation weighted average instead of simple averaging.	CAR07	OK
Data and parameters fixed ex ante					
If data and parameters will not be monitored throughout the crediting period of the proposed project activity but have already been determined and will remain fixed throughout the crediting period, are all data sources and assumptions: a) Appropriate and correct? b) Applicable to the proposed CDM project activity?	PDD VVS	98	The baseline emission cases are line with the methodology ACM0002 Version 18.0.0 and "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system Version 06.0.0".	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
c) Resulting in a conservative estimate of the emission reductions?					
For each piece of data or parameter, are tables provided in accordance with the instructions?	PDD		Tables for each piece of data and parameters are provided in accordance with the instructions.	OK	OK
Ex ante calculations of emission reductions					
Is a transparent ex ante calculation of project emissions, baseline emissions (or, where applicable, direct calculation of emission reductions) and leakage emissions expected during the crediting period, applying all relevant equations provided in the approved methodology provided?	PDD		The baseline emission cases are line with the methodology ACM0002 Version 18.0.0 and "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system Version 06.0.0".	OK	OK
Is the information how each equation is applied, in a manner that enables the reader to reproduce the calculation, provided?	PDD		The information how each equation is applied to reproduce the calculation is provided.	OK	OK
Is the information of additional background information and/or data provided in Appendix 4, including relevant electronic spreadsheets?	PDD		Baseline Study excel sheet is provided to the validation team. Please revise the excel sheet according revised OM calculation. Please also revise the PDD.	CAR08	OK
Is a sample calculation for each equation used provided, substituting the values used in the equations?	PDD		Sample calculations for each equation used are provided, substituting the values used in the equations.	OK	OK
If the proposed small-scale CDM project activity involves more than one component, does the	PDD PS	90			

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
project participants provide ex ante calculations of baseline, project and leakage GHG emissions as well as GHG emission reductions for each year of the crediting period and for each component separately?			N.A.	OK	OK
In cases where leakage is to be considered in the proposed small-scale CDM project activity; do project participants consider leakage only within the boundaries of non-Annex I Parties?	PS	92	N.A.	OK	OK
In case of replacement of existing equipments, do project participants estimate the point in time where the existing equipments would be replaced in the absence of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity in accordance with the "Tool to determine the remaining lifetime of equipment"? For household devices/appliances, project participants may disregard the remaining lifetime.	PS PS	93 94	N.A.	OK	OK
Do norms, specifications, standards and test procedures cited in the selected methodology refer to the latest version of the documentation available at the time of submission of the PDD to the DOE for validation?	PS	95	Norms, specifications, standards and test procedures are cited in the selected methodology refer to the latest version of the documentation.	OK	OK
B.6.3. Ex ante estimation of outcomes linked to each of the three SDGs					
Are the results of the ex-ante estimation of emission	PDD		The results of the ex-ante estimation of	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
reductions for all years of the crediting period, provided in a tabular format?			emission reductions for all years of the crediting period are provided in a tabular format.		
Is BM, OM and CM is correctly calculated through “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system”			Please see CAR07	CAR07	OK
If the project activity involves more than one component, does the PDD provide a separate table for each of the component or each of the selected methodology(ies), and whether the PDD provide a table showing the aggregate emission reductions of the project activity?	PDD		N.A.	OK	OK
B.6.4. Summary of ex ante estimates of each SDG outcome					
Is SDG outcomes provided in tabular format under section B.6.4..			SDG 7, SDG 8 and SDG 13 outcomes are provided in tabular format under section B.6.4.	OK	OK
B.7. Monitoring plan					
B.7.1. Data and parameters to be monitored					
Is specific information on how the data and parameters that need to be monitored would actually be collected during monitoring included?	PDD		EG _{facility,y} parameter is provided under the monitoring plan section of the GS-VER-PDD. All specific information on how data need to be monitored and collected during monitoring is provided. Please revised the generation value also please correctly provide the how	CAR09	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			will be the cross check process.		
For each data or parameter, is the information completed, in a tabular format:					
The source(s) of data that will be actually used for the proposed project activity (e.g. which exact national statistics). Where several sources may be used, explain and justify which data sources should be preferred.	PDD		Net electricity supplied by the project activity to the grid will be monitored continuously using a cumulative electricity meter. Data will be archived monthly. The main source is EPIAS Records. Values will be double checked against OSF Forms. The meters first index protocol, first calibration, brand and production year details are determined under section B.7.1 of GS-VER-PDD. The records are validated during first crediting period.	OK	OK
Is an estimate of the data/ parameter that will be monitored during the crediting period provided?	PDD		Yes, estimate for all parameters that will be monitored during the crediting period, has been tabulated in the B.7.1 of GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Is the estimate provided in the PDD for this monitored data or parameter reasonable?	VVS	98	Data and parameters are reasonable.	OK	OK
Where data or parameters are to be measured, does it specify the measurement methods and procedures, standards to be applied, accuracy of the measurements, person/entity responsible for the measurements, and, in case of periodic measurements, the measurement intervals?	PDD		The net electricity generation supplied to the grid will be measured continuously by TEIAS meters and recorded monthly.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is a description of the QA/QC procedures including the calibration procedures, where applicable, provided?	PDD		Calibration procedures of the meters are clearly described through the references under section B7.3 of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Is the purpose of data indicated?	PDD		There is a statement about the purpose of the monitoring data under section B.7.3 of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Is this monitoring plan based on the approved monitoring methodology applied to the proposed CDM project activity?	VVS	131	The monitoring plan is based on the ACM0002 Version 18.	OK	OK
Does the monitoring plan contain all necessary parameters?	VVS	132(a)	The B.7.3 section of the GS-VER-PDD contains all the parameters in accordance with the applied methodology ACM0002 Version 18.	OK	OK
Do the means of monitoring described in the plan comply with the requirements of the methodology including applicable tool(s)?	VVS	132(a)	The monitoring plan is based on the ACM0002 Version 18.	OK	OK
Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	VVS	132(b)	The monitoring plan is based on the ACM0002 Version 18.	OK	OK
Are the means of implementation of the monitoring plan, including the data management and quality assurance and quality control procedures, sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from	VVS	132(b)	The monitoring plan is based on the ACM0002 Version 18.	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified?					
B.7.2. Sampling plan					
Are there any data and parameters monitored in section B.7.1 above to be determined by a sampling approach?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
Is a description of the sampling plan provided in accordance with the recommended outline for a sampling plan in the “Standard for sampling and surveys for CDM project activities and programme of activities”?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
B.7.3. Other elements of monitoring plan					
Is the operational and management structure, that the project operator will implement in order to monitor emission reductions and any leakage generated by the project activity, described in the PDD?	PDD PS	56(a)	N/A	OK	OK
Are the responsibilities for and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly indicated?	PDD PS	56(c)	Yes, the responsibilities for and institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving clearly indicated under section B.7.3 of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Does the monitoring plan include provisions to ensure that data monitored and required for verification and issuance be kept and archived electronically for two years after the end of the	PS	56(b)	Yes, the monitoring plan described in the GS-VER-PDD states that data monitored and required for verification and issuance be kept and archived electronically for two years after	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
crediting period or the last issuance of CERs, whichever occurs later?			the end of the crediting period or the last issuance of VERs, whichever occurs later.		
Does the monitoring plan include uncertainty levels, methods and the associated accuracy level of measuring instruments to be used for various parameters and variables?	PS	56(e)	Monitoring plan includes uncertainty levels and the associated accuracy level of measuring instruments under section B.7.3 of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Does the monitoring plan include specifications of the calibration frequency for the measuring equipment's?	PS	56(f)	There is a statement about the calibration frequency for the measuring devices under section B.7.3 of GS-VER-PDD. The connection Agreement has been revised on 03/02/2017. Please provide the revised connection agreement.	CAR09	OK
SECTION C. Duration and crediting period					
C.1. Duration of project activity					
C.1.1. Start date of project activity					
Is the start date of the project activity stated, in the format of DD/MM/YYYY?	PDD		The start date of the project activity is stated as 15/05/2011 under section C.1.1 of GS-VER-PDD. The first crediting period start date has been given and confirmed as 15/11/2011. Starting date of the second crediting period is confirmed as 15/11/2018.	OK	OK
Does it describe how the start date has been determined and provide evidence to support this date?	PDD		The statement and evidence under section C.1.1 of GS-VER-PDD about how the start date has been determined.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
C.1.2 Expected operational lifetime of project activity					
Is the expected operational lifetime of the project activity stated in years and months?	PDD		The reference of the expected operational lifetime of the project activity is not available under section C.1.2 of GS-VER-PDD.	CAR10	OK
C.2. Crediting period of project activity					
C.2.1. Type of crediting period					
Is the type of crediting period chosen for the project activity stated?	PDD		Renewable crediting period is chosen.	OK	OK
In case a renewable crediting period was chosen, does it indicate whether it is the first, second or third?	PDD		It is provided that which crediting period is chosen (first, second, etc.) under section C.2.1 of the GS-VER-PDD. This is second crediting period.	OK	OK
C.2.2. Start date of crediting period					
Is the start date of crediting period stated in the format of DD/MM/YYYY?	PDD		Provided as 15/11/2018.	OK	OK
C.2.2. Total length of crediting period					
Is the length of crediting period stated in years and months?	PDD		The length of the second crediting period is 7 years, 0 months.	OK	OK
SECTION D. Safeguarding principles assessment					
D.1. Analysis of social, economic and environmental impacts		PDD & GS4GG	Ref: GS4GG Safeguarding Principles & Requirements		

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Are the principles divide for Social & Economic Safeguarding Principles, Environmental & Ecological Safeguarding Principles.		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Social & Economic Safeguarding Principles, Environmental & Ecological Safeguarding Principles are discussed under section D.1.	OK	OK
Social & Economic Safeguarding Principles					
Is Principle 1- Human Rights discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-1 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Is Principle 2- Gender Equality and Women's Rights discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-2 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Is Principle 3 - Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-3 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Is Principle 4-Cultural Heritage, Indigenous Peoples, Displacement and Resettlement discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-4 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Is Principle 5- Corruption discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-5 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Is Principle 6- Economic Impacts discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-6 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Environmental & Ecological Safeguarding Principles					
Is Principle 1-Climate and Energy discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-1 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK
Is Principle 2-Water discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-2 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK



CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Is Principle 3- Environment, ecology and land Use discussed through available references?		<i>PDD & GS4GG</i>	Principle-3 is discussed through available references.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Environmental impacts					
Analysis of the environmental impacts					
If required by the host Party, is an analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed small-scale CDM project activity carried out and a summary of the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity and references to all related documentation provided?	PDD PS	99	Reference for the EIA document is not provided.	OK	OK
SECTION E. Local stakeholder consultation					
E.1. Solicitation of comments from local stakeholders					
Did the project participants complete a local stakeholder consultation process and that due steps were taken to engage stakeholders and solicit comments for the proposed project activity?	VVS	138	A brief description of complementary stakeholder consultation process and feedback round are described under section E.1 of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Is the process by which comments from local stakeholders have been invited provided?	PDD		The process by which comments from stakeholder have been invited. Details are provided under section E.1.	OK	OK
E.2. Summary of comments received					
Are stakeholders that have made comments identified?	PDD		A brief summary of the comments received from the stakeholder is described under E.1 section of the GS-VER-PDD.	OK	OK
Have comments by local stakeholders that can reasonably be considered relevant for the proposed CDM	VVS	139 (a)	Comments by local stakeholders that can reasonably be considered by the project	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
project activity been invited?			activity.		
Is the summary of comments provided complete?	PDD VVS	139 (b)	The summary of comments are completely provided under section E.2. During the Complementary Stakeholder Consultation process for Renewal Crediting Period no negative comments have been received regarding the Sah Wind Power Project and no indicator in the sustainability matrix was scored negative, and no significant environmental impacts were identified.	OK	OK
E.3. Report on consideration of comments received					
Is information provided to demonstrate that all comments received have been considered?	PDD VVS	139 (c)	Considerations of comments received from the stakeholders are added to section E.3 of the GS-VER-PDD. Until the GS registration of the project activity on 2011, no comments from the invited stakeholders apart from the meeting have been received, neither by phone calls, by e-mail, by post nor by fax during the seven operational years.	OK	OK
Approval and authorization					
General					
Is it indicated whether the letter(s) of approval from	PDD				

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS		Draft Concl	Final Concl
Party(ies) available at the time of submitting the PDD to the validating DOE?			N.A.		OK	OK
Approval			COUNTRY A	COUNTRY B		
Has the DNA of each Party indicated as being involved in the proposed CDM project activity in section A.3 of the PDD provided a written letter of approval?	VVS	38	N.A.	N.A.	OK	OK
Does the letter of approval from DNA of each Party confirm that : (a) The Party is a Party of the Kyoto Protocol (b) The participation is voluntary (c) In the case of the host Party, the proposed CDM project activity contributes to the sustainable development of the country (d) Refers to the precise proposed CDM project activity title in the PDD being submitted for registration	VVS	39	N.A.	N.A.	OK	OK
Is(are) the letter(s) of approval unconditional with respect to above?	VVS	40	N.A.	N.A.	OK	OK
Has(ve) the letter(s) of approval been issued by the respective Party's DNA? If there is doubt with respect to above, was it verified with the DNA that the letter of approval is valid for the proposed CDM project activity under validation?	VVS	41,42	N.A.	N.A.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Does the letter of approval by the DNA of the host Party confirm the contribution of the proposed CDM project activity to the sustainable development of the host Party?	VVS	51	N.A.	OK	OK
Authorization					
Has each project participant been authorized by at least one Party involved in a letter of approval?	VVS	45	N.A.	OK	OK
Is the information in tabular form in the PDD consistent with the contact information for project participants provided?	VVS	46	N.A.	OK	OK
Are any entities other than those approved as project participants included in the PDD?	VVS	47	N.A.	OK	OK
Has the approval of participation issued from the relevant DNA? And if in doubt, was it verified with the DNA that the approval of participation is valid for the proposed CDM project participants?	VVS	48	N.A.	OK	OK
Part III Others					
A. Appendixes of PDD					
Appendix 1: Contact information of project participants	PDD				
For each organization listed in section A.4 of PDD, is the table in PDD completed, with the following mandatory fields: Organization, City, postcode,	PDD		Yes, the project participant's contact details have been tabulated in the PDD.	OK	OK

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Country, Telephone and Fax, e-mail and Name of contact person?					
Appendix 2: Affirmation regarding public funding					
If applicable, is the affirmation obtained from Parties providing public funding to the project Activity attached?	PDD		No public funding is involved in the project activity.	OK	OK
Appendix 3: Applicability of the selected methodology(ies)					
Is the background information on the applicability of the selected methodology provided?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
Appendix 4: Further background information on ex ante calculation of emission reductions					
Is the background information on the ex-ante calculation of emission reductions provided?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
Appendix 5: Further background information on monitoring plan					
Is the background information used in the development of the monitoring plan provided?	PDD		N/A	OK	OK
Appendix 6: Summary of post registration changes					
Is a summary of the post registration changes provided?	PDD		N.A.	OK	OK
Global Stakeholder Consultation					
Is there any comment on the PDD of the proposed project activity received during Global Stakeholder	VVS	34	A brief summary of the comments received from the stakeholder is described under	OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
Consultation process?			section E.1. of PDD.		
If yes, have all comments been taken into account during the validation of the proposed project activity?	VVS	35	There were no concerns on the impact of the of the project activity to sustainable development and environmental.	OK	OK
If comments indicate that the proposed project activity does not comply with the CDM requirements and are not substantiated, is there any further clarification from the entity providing the comment?	VVS	36	There were no concerns on the impact of the of the project activity to sustainable development and environmental.	OK	OK
If yes, how comments received have been taken due account?	VVS	36	N/A	OK	OK
If no, are the comments as originally provided proceeded to assess?	VVS	36	N/A	OK	OK
Modalities of Communications (MoC)					
Has the corporate identity of all project participants and focal points included in MoC statement, as well as the personal identities, including specimen signatures and employment status, of their authorized signatories been validated by:	VVS	53	N.A.	OK	OK
Directly checking evidence for corporate, personal identity and other relevant documentation; or	VVS	54(a)	N.A.	OK	OK
Notarized documentation; or	VVS	54(b)	N.A.	OK	OK
Written confirmation from the project participant or the coordinating/managing entity that all corporate and personal details, including specimen	VVS	54(c)		OK	OK

RE-VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
signatures, are valid and accurate.			N.A.		
If above was chosen, is it ensured that the MoC statement is received from a project participant with whom the DOE has a contractual relationship?	VVS	55	N.A.	OK	
If above was chosen, is it ensured that the official who submits the MoC statement to the DOE and the official who signed the written confirmation (if a different person) is/are duly authorized to do so on behalf of the respective project participant?	VVS	56	N.A.	OK	OK
If it is unable to validate the requirements by applying to above, are any further validation activities performed?	VVS	57	N.A.	OK	OK
Has the latest version of the form “Modalities of Communication statement” (F-CDM-MOC) been used?	VVS	60(a)	N.A.	OK	OK
Is the information required as per F-CDM-MOC, including its annex 1, correctly completed?	VVS	60(b)	N.A.	OK	OK
Do the project participant's authorized signatories signing the F-CDM-MOC correspond to the project participant's authorized signatories included in F-CDM-MOC, annex 1?	VVS	60(c)	N.A.	OK	OK

Table 3 Resolution of Corrective Action and Clarification Requests

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question in table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response	Validation team conclusion
<u>CAR01</u> Estimated total emission reduction over the 7 year crediting period is not provided under section A.1.	A.1.4	Expected total of reduction of 1,202,096 tCO ₂ -eq over the 7 year crediting period. Section A.1 of the Sah WPP's PDD has been revised accordingly.	<u>Review 1:</u> Total emission reduction has been presented under section A.1 of PDD. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
<u>CAR02</u> The detail of the project location is provided under section A.4.4 of the GS-VER-PDD. Under table 1 the coordinates reference is not provided.	A.4.4	The turbine coordinates reference is generation license. It has been added under Table 1 section 1.4.4. of the Sah WPP's PDD.	<u>Review 1:</u> The reference has been added under Table 1 of PDD. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
<u>CAR03</u> Please provide under section A.5 how the same type and levels of services provided by the project activity would have been provided in the baseline scenario?	A.5.4	In the absence of the project activity, the electrical energy would have been delivered to the grid through a mix of existing power generation resources, This explanation has been added in Section A.5 and already provided in more detail in section B.4 of the Sah WPP's PDD.	<u>Review 1:</u> Section A.5 has been revised accordingly. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>

CAR04 The baseline is not described under section A.5.	A.5.5	It has been revised accordingly.	Review 1: Section A.5 has been revised accordingly. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
CAR05 Under section A.5 how technologies and measures and know-how are transferred to the Host Party.	A.5.7	The Sah WPP provides production of pillar and other related equipment in Turkey indirectly cause the know-how transfer, empower the local industry. The project does not need extensive initial training and maintenance efforts in order to work as presumed during the first crediting period. Necessary trainings to the plant staff is delivered by the supplier in line with the agreement between the project owner and the supplier. Section A.5 of the Sah WPP's PDD has been revised accordingly.	Review 1: Section A.5 has been revised accordingly. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
CAR06 Under table-4 the investment inputs references needs to be added.	VVS 112(a)	These investment inputs and investmenty additionality analysis had been assessed during the first crediting period. The DOE can find these referencess in the first crediting period's validation report. The Annex Z of GS (renewal of crediting period requirements of GS) does not required the PP to re-assessment of investment analysis section.	Review 1: The investment inputs confirmed during the first crediting period. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>

CAR07 The OM calculation should be 3 year generation weighted average instead of simple averaging.	PDD	The OM calculation has been revised accordingly and all of them has been corrected through the Sah WPP's PDD and Baseline Study excel sheet.	Review 1: Calculations are revised accordingly. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
CAR08 Baseline Study excel sheet is provided to the validation team. Please revise the excel sheet according revised OM calculation. Please also revise the PDD.	PDD	The OM calculation has been revised accordingly in the Sah WPP's PDD and Baseline Study excel sheet.	Review 1: Calculations are revised accordingly. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
CAR09 EG _{facility,y} parameter is provided under the monitoring plan section of the GS-VER-PDD. All specific information on how data need to be monitored and collected during monitoring is provided. Please revised the generation value also please correctly provide the how will be the cross check process.	B.7.1	EPIAS records provides the exact electricity generation of the facility and the imports from the grid is main document for monitoring plan. This is crosschecked with the meter reading records (OSF forms-OSOS). This information has already provided in the Sah WPP's PDD.	Review 1: Descriptions are presented under section B.7.1 <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
CAR10 The reference of the expected operational lifetime of the project activity is not available under section C.1.2 of GS-VER-PDD.	C.1.2	The reference of expected operational lifetime of the project activity has been provided as footnote 49 in the Sah WPP PDD. https://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools/am-tool-10-v1.pdf	Review 1: The reference for the operational lifetime has been added. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>

<u>CL01</u> Please clarify why Step-3: Benchmark Analysis section is not determined in PDD.	PS 48	Step-3 is Barrier Analysis and it is not applied. This information has been added in the Sah WPP's PDD.	<u>Review 1:</u> Barrier Analysis section has been added to PDD. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>
<u>CL02</u> Please clarify why Step-4: Common Practice Analysis section is not determined in PDD.	VVS 128	Step-4: Common Practice Analysis section has been determined in Sah WPP's PDD.	<u>Review 1:</u> Common Practice Analysis section has been added to PDD. <u>The corrective action request has been closed.</u>