



# VALIDATION REPORT JPMORGAN VENTURES ENERGY CORPORATION

## VALIDATION OF THE SOMA WIND POWER PLANT

REPORT No. TURKEY-VAL/800.08.C71-  
2008/20011

REVISION No. 04

### BUREAU VERITAS CERTIFICATION

Great Guildford House, 30 Great Guildford Street  
SE1 0ES - London – United Kingdom

VALIDATION REPORT

Date of first issue: 25/01/2011	Organizational unit: Bureau Veritas Certification Holding SAS
Client: JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation	Client ref.: Tom Morton
<p>Summary: Bureau Veritas Certification has made the validation of the Soma Wind Power Plant project of JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation located in Soma and Kirkagac, Manisa, on the basis of Gold Standard version 2.1 and UNFCCC criteria for the CDM, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting. UNFCCC criteria refer to Article 12 of the Kyoto Protocol as well as the country criteria.</p> <p>The 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 and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion. The overall validation, from Contract Review to Validation Report &amp; Opinion, was conducted using Bureau Veritas Certification internal procedures.</p> <p>The first output of the validation process is a list of Clarification and Corrective Actions Requests (CL and CAR), presented in Appendix A. Taking into account this output, the project proponent revised its project design document.</p> <p>In summary, it is Bureau Veritas Certification's opinion that regarding to the PDD Version 2.7 the project correctly applies the baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 12.1.0 and meets the relevant Gold Standard version 2.1 requirements for the CDM and the relevant country criteria.</p>	

Report No.: TURKEY- 800.08.C71.2008/2011	Subject Group: Gold Standard
Project title: Soma Wind Power Plant	
Work carried out by: Bade Cebeci – Lead Verifier Yıldız Arıkan-Baseline Specialist Murat Gencer-Financial Specialist	
Internal Technical Review carried out by: Burcu Mutman – Internal Technical Reviewer	
Date of this revision: 08/12/2011	Rev. No.: 04
Number of pages: 157	

**Indexing terms**

Work approved by: Mr. Flavio Gomes– Global Product Manager
---

- No distribution without permission from the Client or responsible organizational unit
- Limited distribution
- Unrestricted distribution

VALIDATION REPORT

---

CAR	Corrective Action Request
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CER	Certified Emission Reductions
CL	Clarification Request
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
CO <sub>2e</sub>	Carbon Dioxide Equivalent
DOE	Designated Operational Entity
EMRA	Energy Market Regulatory Authority (EPDK – Enerji Piyasasi Denetleme Kurulu)
FSR	Feedback Stakeholder Round
GHG	Green House Gas(es)
GS	Gold Standard
GS-VER-PDD	Project Design Document
I	Interview
LSC	Local Stakeholder Consultation
MoV	Means of Validation
NGO	Non-Government Organization
TEIAS	Turkish Electricity Transmission Company (Turkiye Elektrik Iletim A.S.)
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change
VER	Voluntary Emission Reductions
VVM	Validation and Verification Manual

<b>Table of Contents</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	INTRODUCTION .....	5
1.1	Objective	5
1.2	Scope	5
1.3	Validation team	5
2	METHODOLOGY .....	6
2.1	Review of Documents	6
2.2	Follow-up Interviews	6
2.3	Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests	7
2.4	Internal Technical Review	7
3	VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS .....	8
3.1	Project design document (57)	9
3.2	Changes in the Project Activity	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
3.3	Project description (64)	10
3.4	Baseline and monitoring methodology	10
3.4.1	General requirement (76-77)	9
3.4.2	Project boundary (80)	10
3.4.3	Baseline identification (87-88)	10
3.4.4	Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions (92-93)	11
3.5	Additionality of a project activity (97)	12
3.5.1	Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism (104)	12
3.5.1.1	Historical information on project timeline	13
3.5.2	Identification of alternatives (107)	13
3.5.3	Investment analysis (114)	14
3.5.4	Barrier analysis (118)	16
3.5.5	Common practice analysis (121)	16
3.6	Monitoring plan (124)	17
3.7	Sustainable development (127)	17
3.8	Local stakeholder consultation (130)	18
3.9	Environmental impacts (133)	20
4	COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS.....	20
5	VALIDATION OPINION .....	21
6	REFERENCES .....	21

Report No: TURKEY-val/800.08.C71-2008/2011.rev04

---

VALIDATION REPORT

---

7 CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS .....24

APPENDIX A: COMPANY GOLD STANDARD PROJECT VALIDATION PROTOCOL.....25

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation has commissioned Bureau Veritas Certification to validate its Gold Standard Version 2.1 project “Soma Wind Power Plant” (hereafter called “the project”) at Soma and Kirkagac, Manisa, Turkey.

This report summarizes the findings of the validation of the project, performed on the basis of Gold Standard version 2.1 and UNFCCC criteria, as well as criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

### **1.1 Objective**

The validation serves as project design verification and is a requirement of all projects. The validation is an independent third party assessment of the project design. In particular, the project's baseline, the monitoring plan (MP), and the project's compliance with relevant UNFCCC and country criteria are validated in order to confirm that the project design, as documented, is sound and reasonable, and meets the stated requirements and identified criteria. 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).

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 country criteria.

### **1.2 Scope**

The 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 Gold Standard requirements, UNFCCC rules and associated interpretations.

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

## VALIDATION REPORT

**1.3 Validation team**

The validation team consists of the following personnel:

FUNCTION	NAME	CODE HOLDER	TASK PERFORMED*
LEAD VERIFIER	<b>BADE CEBECI</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SV <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RI
TECHNICAL SPECIALIST	<b>YILDIZ ARIKAN</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DR <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input type="checkbox"/> RI
FINANCIAL SPECIALIST	<b>MURAT GENCER</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DR <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input type="checkbox"/> RI
INTERNAL TECHNICAL REVIEWER (ITR)	<b>BURCU MUTMAN</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> DR <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RI
SPECIALIST SUPPORTING ITR	<b>N.A.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> DR <input type="checkbox"/> SV <input type="checkbox"/> RI

\*DR = Document Review; SV = Site Visit; RI = Report issuance

**2 METHODOLOGY**

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

In order to ensure transparency, a validation protocol was customized for the project, according to the version 01.2 of the Clean Development Mechanism Validation and Verification Manual, issued by the Executive Board at its 55<sup>th</sup> meeting on 30/07/2010. The protocol shows, in a transparent manner, criteria (requirements), means of validation and the results from validating the identified criteria. The 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 validation process where the validator will document how a particular requirement has been validated and the result of the validation.

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

**2.1 Review of Documents**

The Project Design Document (PDD) submitted by JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation and additional background documents related to the project design and baseline, i.e. country Law, Guidelines for Completing the Project Design Document (PDD), Approved methodology, Kyoto

## VALIDATION REPORT

Protocol, Clarifications on Validation Requirements to be Checked by a Designated Operational Entity were reviewed.

To address Bureau Veritas Certification corrective action and clarification requests, JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation revised the PDD and resubmitted it on 06.12.2011

The validation findings presented in this report relate to the project as described in the PDD version 2.7

## 2.2 Follow-up Interviews

On 25/08/2009 Bureau Veritas Certification performed interviews with project stakeholders on the project site to confirm selected information and to resolve issues identified in the document review. Representatives of JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation were interviewed (see References). The main topics of the interviews are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1 Interview topics**

Interviewed organization	Interview topics
Bilgin RES Enerji Üretim A.Ş.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Design of the project activity</li> <li>➤ The planning and the construction phase of the project</li> <li>➤ Sustainable development in the region</li> <li>➤ Training of the employees</li> <li>➤ Noise pollution caused by the wind turbines</li> <li>➤ Planting of trees</li> <li>➤ Monitoring of bird deaths</li> <li>➤ Working conditions</li> </ul>
LOCAL Stakeholder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Sustainable development in the region</li> <li>➤ Local stakeholder consultation meeting</li> <li>➤ Bird migration routes</li> <li>➤ Noise pollution caused by the wind turbines</li> <li>➤ Project's impact on local economy</li> </ul>
JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation (Consultant)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Local stakeholder consultation meeting</li> <li>➤ Consideration of comments from the stakeholders</li> <li>➤ Sustainable development in the region</li> <li>➤ Additionality of the project activity</li> <li>➤ Investment analysis</li> <li>➤ Baseline determination</li> <li>➤ Emission reduction calculations</li> <li>➤ Planting of trees</li> <li>➤ Training of the employees</li> </ul>

## **2.3 Resolution of Clarification and Corrective Action Requests**

The objective of this phase of the validation is to raise the requests for corrective actions and clarification and any other outstanding issues that needed to be clarified for Bureau Veritas Certification positive conclusion on the project design.

Corrective Action Requests (CAR) is issued, where:

- (a) The project participants have made mistakes that will influence the ability of the project activity to achieve real, measurable additional emission reductions;
- (b) The GS-VER Project (Gold Standard Version 2.1) requirements have not been met;
- (c) There is a risk that emission reductions cannot be monitored or calculated.

The validation team may also use the term Clarification Request (CL), if information is insufficient or not clear enough to determine whether the applicable GS version 2.1. requirements have been met.

To guarantee the transparency of the verification process, the concerns raised are documented in more detail in the verification protocol in Appendix A.

## **2.4 Internal Technical Review**

The 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 validation has been carried out in conformance with the requirements of the validation scheme as well as internal Bureau Veritas Certification procedures.

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

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

VALIDATION REPORT

---

The validation activity has been performed by the team by exercising utmost diligence and complete adherence to the GS-VER rules and requirements.

The review encompasses all aspects related to the project which includes project design, baseline, additionality, monitoring plans, sustainable development 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, CLs and FARs during the validation exercise, review of sample documents.

The reviewer compiles clarification questions for the Lead Verifier and Validation Team and discusses these matters with Lead Verifier.

After the agreement of the responses on the 'Clarification Request' from the Lead Verifier as well as the PP(s) the finalized validation report is accepted for further processing such as uploading on the Gold Standard webpage.

### **3 VALIDATION CONCLUSIONS**

In the following sections, the conclusions of the 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 Validation Protocol in Appendix A.

The Clarification and Corrective Action Requests are stated, where applicable, in the following sections and are further documented in the Validation Protocol in Appendix A. The validation of the Project resulted in 8 Corrective Action Requests (CARs), 53 Clarification Requests (CLs)

The CARs and CLs were closed 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 correspond to the VVM paragraph

#### **3.1 Project design document (57)**

The validation team hereby confirms that the PDD version 2.7. complies with the latest forms of the guidance documents for completion of PDD.

## 3.2 Project description (64)

The project is the installation of 36 wind turbines of 2.5 MW each in Soma and Kirkagac, Manisa, Turkey. 12 of the turbines are located in Kirkagac on East of the province and 24 of them will be on West in Soma Town. The total installed capacity of the project is 90.0 MW and the expected annual electricity generation is 275,422 MWh. The project activity displaces electricity generation from grid connected fossil fuel based power plants and contributes to clean energy generation. The project is estimated to reduce approximately 163,556 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e/year that would otherwise have been released from the generation of equivalent amount of fossil fuel based electricity generation by National Grid of Turkey.

The turbines (3-Blades) of the project will be located on four hills namely; Davullu, Karadede, Ören and Şifa hills and will cover an area of 150 hectares. The towers will have 80 m height and 3 m diameter. The diameter of the blades is 90 m. The lifespan of the turbines are indicated to be 20 years by the manufacturer (in the Nordex N90 2.5 MW turbine catalogue). The site selection is based on detailed wind measurements, smoothness of the surface, availability of the topographical conditions for access and construction, the available area size and the distance to the national grid connection point: The connection point will be Soma B TM, 154 KV bara.

The project description has been validated through energy production license, the purchase agreements, site visit and the turbine manufacturer catalogue. The coordinates of the turbines have been verified by the GPRS.

CL 4 has been raised since the list of equipments has not been documented in the PDD.

The DOE hereby confirms that the project description in PDD version 2.7 is accurate and complete in all respects.

## 3.3 Baseline and monitoring methodology

### 3.3.1 General requirement (76-77)

The steps taken to assess the relevant information contained in the PDD against each applicability condition are described below.

Applicability condition (a) "The project is a grid connected power renewable power plant generation project that generates electricity form wind power" It was validated that the Soma Wind Power Plant Project is a grid-connected renewable power generation project that generates electricity from wind power through electricity generation license.

Applicability condition (b): "The project does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy at the site of the project activity, neither is it a biomass fired power plant nor a hydro power plant that result in new reservoirs or in the increase in existing

VALIDATION REPORT

---

reservoirs where the power density of the power plant is less than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>: During site visit, it was confirmed that the project does not involve switching from fossil fuel use to renewable energy at the site of the project activity.

Applicability condition (c): The geographic and system boundaries for the relevant electricity grid can be clearly identified and information on the characteristics of the grid is available from TEIAS. All used information has been checked through the official web page.

The DOE hereby confirms that the selected baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002 "Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources" version 12.1.0 is previously approved by the CDM Executive Board, and is applicable to the project activity, which, complies with all the applicability conditions therein.

The DOE hereby confirms that, as a result of the implementation of the proposed GS-VER project activity, there no greenhouse gas emissions occurring within the proposed GS-VER project activity boundary, which are expected to contribute more than 1% of the overall expected average annual emissions reductions, which are not addressed by the applied methodology.

### **3.3.2 Project boundary (80)**

The DOE validated the project boundary by:

- a) The generation license, turbine purchase agreement, area commissioning report, contracts for the purchase of equipments
- b) During the site visit, the locations of the turbines have been observed and the coordinates have been checked with the GPRS

CAR02 has been raised since the flow diagramme of the project boundary has not been included in the PDD.

Based on the above assessment, the DOE hereby confirms that the identified boundary and the selected sources and gases are justified for the project activity.

### **3.3.3 Baseline identification (87-88)**

The steps taken to assess the requirement given in paragraph 81 and 82 of the VVM are described below:

The project activity is the installation of a new grid-connected renewable power plant. There is only one applicable baseline scenario identified for the new grid-connected renewable power plant in the ACM0002 methodology as:

VALIDATION REPORT

---

*“Electricity delivered to the grid by the project would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid-connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the combined margin (CM) calculations described in the Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system.”*

The PDD includes the description of the baseline in line with the ACM002 version 12.1.0 and refers to the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system.” (v2.0). for calculating emission factor (EFy) as combined margin (CM).

Emission factor has been identified as 0.59384 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh which has been confirmed by the validation team with reviewing all the baseline calculation sheet equations and confirming the parameters used for the calculations.

Based on the above assessment, the DOE hereby confirms that:

- (a) All the assumptions and data used by the project participants are listed in the PDD, including their references and sources;
- (b) All documentation used is relevant for establishing the baseline scenario and correctly quoted and interpreted in the 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 sectoral policies and circumstances are considered and listed in the PDD;
- (e) The approved baseline methodology has been correctly applied to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario and the identified baseline scenario reasonably represents what would occur in the absence of the proposed GS-VER project activity.

### **3.3.4 Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions (92-93)**

The steps taken to assess the requirement outlined in paragraph 89 the VVM are described below:

The baseline calculation has been demonstrated through the baseline calculation excel sheet. The calculations and the parameters used have been checked by the validation team. The parameters are in line with the references.

Anthropogenic emission reduction is a function of the expected net amount of electricity produced, for the given project, which amounts to 275,422 MWh per annum. The annual emission reduction is 163,566 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. Over the period of seven years, the total amount of emission reduction will reach 1,144,892 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. For all calculations, the combined emission factor is 0.59384 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh.

Soma Wind Power Plant Project consists of 36 unit turbines. Each turbine has an output capacity of 2.5 MW. The project activity was implemented in 3 phases. The power plant started operation with 13 turbines on 13/08/2010, 11 turbines were commissioned

## VALIDATION REPORT

23/09/2010 and the remaining 12 turbines were commissioned on 11/11/2010. Each commissioning date was validated through the “Provisional Acceptance Certificate” approved by EMRA.

The amount of electricity the project is expected to produce; the estimated load factor/ the efficiency of the project are confirmed through the “Feasibility and micro siting report” prepared by Garrad Hassan and Partners Ltd.

The technical lifetime of the project has been accepted as 20 years as per the EB50 ANNEX 15 since the life time for the turbines has been supplied as 20 years by the manufacturer (in the Nordex N90 2.5 MW turbine catalogue). The crediting period is also selected as 20 years which is the same as the technical life time of the project.

The Project emissions have been calculated with the formula mentioned in ACM0002/Version 12.1.0. The following assumptions for the Project Emissions and Leakage made afterwards were found acceptable and suitable for the project activity by the validation team.

No leakage emissions have been considered. The main emissions potentially giving rise to leakage in the context of electric sector projects are emissions arising due to activities such as power plant construction, fuel handling and land inundation. These emissions sources are neglected.

The baseline emissions  $BE_y$  has been calculated as following:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$$

Where:

$ER_y$  = Emission reductions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr)

$BE_y$  = Baseline emissions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>e /yr)

$PE_y$  = Project emissions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>/yr)

$LE_y$  = Leakage emissions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>/yr)

The Project applied the combined margin (CM) calculations described in the “Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system” version 02 (EB50). As the share of “low cost/must run” resources are below 50% for the five most recent years (Table 10), therefore, in accordance with the Tool, (a) Simple OM method Option B was used in the calculations. For the calculation of the Simple OM, the Ex-Ante option has been selected, the data vintages that were most recent at the time of PDD submission, belongs to the years 2006, 2007 and 2008. The emission factors of fuels that are used in the calculations are taken from the IPCC default values at the lower limit of uncertainty at a 95% confidence interval as provided in table 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Vol.2 (Energy) of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories, as suggested by

## VALIDATION REPORT

the methodology. The formulas and factors used in the calculation of GHG emissions are found to be transparent and correct by the validation team.

For the BM, the set of capacity additions in the electricity system that comprise 20% of the system generation was used. For the first crediting period, the build margin emission factor was calculated ex-ante based on the most recent information available on units already built for sample group m at the time of CDM-PDD submission for validation. The efficiency factors of power plants were taken from Annex 1 of the "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system". The efficiency factors used are on the conservative side. The Build Margin Emission Factor of the grid was calculated as a generation weighted average for the years 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008.

The combined margin grid emission factor ( $EF_{grid,CM,y}$ ) is expressed as the weighted average of the Operating Margin emission factor ( $EF_{grid,OM,y}$ ) and the Build Margin emission factor ( $EF_{grid,BM,y}$ ) where weights  $w_{OM}$  and  $w_{BM}$  are by default 0.75 and 0.25 according to the selected methodology.

OM has been defined as 0,65750 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh, the BM has been defined as 0,40287 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh and the Emission factor has been identified as 0.59384 tCO<sub>2</sub>/MWh, which has been confirmed by the validation team with reviewing all the baseline calculation sheet equations and confirming the used parameters for the calculations.

The expected baseline emission for the full year production of the project is:  
 $BE_y = 275,422 \text{ MWh} * 0.59384 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{MWh} = 163,566 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$

Annual estimation of emissions reductions has been calculated as follows in line with the ACM0002/Version 12.0.1:

$$ER_y = BE_y - PE_y - LE_y$$

Where:

$ER_y$  = Emission reductions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr)

$BE_y$  = Baseline emissions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>e /yr)

$PE_y$  = Project emissions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>/yr)

$LE_y$  = Leakage emissions in year y (t CO<sub>2</sub>/yr)

The only assumption is the one about leakage emissions that is assumed to be zero as per the methodology.

Therefore, the annual emission reduction is estimated as:

$$ER_y = 163,566 - 0 - 0 = 163,566 \text{ tCO}_2\text{e}$$

VALIDATION REPORT

---

Based on the above assessment, the DOE 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 GS-VER Project activity;
- (d) The baseline methodology has 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.

### **3.4 Additionality of a project activity (97)**

The steps taken and sources of information used, to cross-check the information contained in the GS-VER-PDD on this matter are described below:

“Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality” Version 05.2 has been used to demonstrate additionally. Under demonstration of additionality first of all alternative projects has been identified and consistency with mandatory laws and regulations have been demonstrated. The investment Analysis and Common Practice Analysis have been applied for the project activity. The input values were confirmed through the feasibility of the project activity, purchase records, and other sectoral data’s were confirmed by the financial specialist through the sectoral knowledge. Common Practice analysis data’s were checked from TEIAS Statistics.

#### **3.4.1 Prior consideration of the GS-VER project (104)**

The DOE validated the project activity start date provided in the PDD as the start of construction which is 20.08.2009 from the social security records for construction.

The evidences for prior consideration of the GS that were assessed are listed below:

- a) The board decision for considering the carbon revenue is dated 03.06.2008
- b) The formal letter to the investment bank dated 20.06.2009 which indicates the carbon revenues

Based on the above assessment, the DOE hereby confirms that the proposed GS-VER has considered GS-VER project prior to start of the project.

### 3.4.1.1 Historical information on project timeline

The timeline of the project activity is given as following at the PDD. The dates were validated through the given documents (referred documents) at the below table below.

Major Event	Date	Means of Validation
Investment decision date	03/06/08	Board Decision
Licence date	17/07/08	Generation License
LSC Meeting	10/11/08	Site Visit
Last Modification to licence	07/04/09	Generation License
Turbine Supply and Installation Agreement	06/07/09	Supply and Installation Agreement
DOE Agreement	21/05/09	DOE Agreement
Construction/ Recruitment Start Date	20/08/09	Social Insurance Institution record
DOE Site visit	25/08/09	
LSC Report Uploaded to APX/GS Registry	22/01/09	
LSC Feedback report uploaded	18/09/09	
Partial Commissioning Date (first 32.5 MW –T1-T13)	13/08/10	Provisional Acceptance Certificates approved by EMRA
Partial Commissioning Date (next 27.5 MW T14-T24)	23/09/10	
Full Commissioning Date (next 30 MW T25-T36)	11/11/10	

### 3.4.2 Identification of alternatives (107)

Project activities that apply the tool in context of approved consolidated methodology ACM0002 only need to identify that there is at least one credible and feasible alternative that would be more attractive than the proposed project activity. The following two alternatives to the Project activity are considered here in detail:

Scenario (a): The proposed Project activity undertaken without being registered as a GS VER project activity, i.e. the construction of a new wind electricity generation plant with an installed capacity of 90 MW, connected to the local grid, and implemented without considering Carbon revenues.

Scenario (b): Continuation of the current situation, i.e. electricity will continue to be generated by the existing generation mix operating in the Turkey regional grid.

Outcome of Step 1a: Since the electricity demand of Turkey is increasing, and since there are no private sector wind farms constructed without VER revenue, the only realistic and credible alternative scenario to the project activity is Scenario (b) Supply of equal amount of electricity by the existing grid.

The alternative Scenario (b) is in compliance with all mandatory applicable and legal and regulatory requirements. New power generation capacity is regulated by Electricity

Market Regulation Authority (EMRA) who issues the licenses for electricity generation and is responsible for ensuring that new capacity applies with its rules and regulations.

### 3.4.3 Investment analysis (114)

The assessment and demonstration of additionality of the project is done by using UNFCCC Methodological Tool "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality", Version 05.2. In applying this tool under Step 2 investment analysis is applied.

Under sub-step 2a, Benchmark Analysis (Option III) is chosen and the other options are eliminated because, the proposed Project generates financial and economic benefits through the sales of electricity other than Voluntary Emissions Reduction (VERs) related income. Therefore the simple cost analysis (Option I) cannot be taken. Investment comparison analysis (Option II) is only applicable to projects where alternatives should be similar investment projects.

Under sub-step 2b, Project IRR (IRR on Capital Employed) is selected as a financial indicator. Since financial indicator is selected as IRR on capital employed; the benchmark indicator selected as Weighted average cost of capital ( WACC) is assessed to be applicable by the financial expert as per Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality", Version 05.2.

The WACC may be formulated as:

$$WACC=(Wd.Cd) +( We.Ce)$$

Where:

Wd = % of debt (71.5%)

Cd = Cost of Debt (9.75%)

We = % of Equity (28.5%)

Ce = Cost of Equity (15.80%)

Cost of equity( expected reurn on capiral asset) is calculated by the CAPM model as the following

Where, E(Ri) stands for the expected return on the capital asset

Rf stands for the risk-free rate of interest such as interest arising from government bonds

E(Rm) stands for the expected return of the market

E(Rm)-E(Rf) is also sometimes known as the market premium or risk premium (the difference between the expected market rate of return and the risk-free rate of return).

And,

Bi stands for the sensitivity of the expected excess asset returns to the expected excess market returns, formulated as :

## VALIDATION REPORT

Means of validation for the cost of equity is given below:

Parameter		Chosen Value	Source
Rf	Risk-free rate	7,16%	<a href="http://www.ziraat.com.tr/tr/bankamiz/faiz-ve-ucretler/asp/eurbond.aspx">http://www.ziraat.com.tr/tr/bankamiz/faiz-ve-ucretler/asp/eurbond.aspx</a> for June 2008 boxes.
$\beta_i$	The Beta Coefficient	1	Assumed as 1 as to conservative
E(Rm)-Rf	Market risk premium	8.64%	Turkish Equity Risk Prem. = U.S. ERP (5.0%) x Istanbul Stock Exchange Volatility[1] (37%) / Volatility of S&P500 22%[2] = 8.64%
E(Ri)	Expected return on the capital asset	15.80%	$E(R_i) = R_f + (\beta_i \times E(R_m - R_f))$ $15.80\% = 7.16\% + (1 \times 8.64\%)$
Wd	Debt to Equity ratio	71.5%	
Cd	Cost of debt	9.75%	Calculated in IRR analysis document
We	Cost of equity	28.5%	
WACC	Weighted Average Cost of Capital	11.48 %	$WACC = (W_d \cdot C_d) + (W_e \cdot C_e)$ $WACC = (71.5 \cdot 9.75) + (28.5 \cdot 15.80)$

The benchmark has been calculated using a globally accepted model and the data used for calculation is also applicable at the time of investment decision. Hence, the benchmark has been assessed to be appropriate by the validation team and the financial expert.

Under sub-step 2c, the project proponents have calculated the pre tax IRR on capital for 20 years. The IRR of the project activity is 7.64 % without the VER revenues.

Parameters	Validated Value	Means of validation

## VALIDATION REPORT

Grid connected output	275,422 MWh	Garrad Hassan Feasibility Report P90 Value
Electricity sales price	0.055 €/kWh	The maximum purchase guarantee of the State
Parity of USD/Euro	1.91 \$/€	The average value at the time of investment decision date ( <a href="http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/kurlar/200806/02062008.html">http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/kurlar/200806/02062008.html</a> In investment decision date)
Cost		
Total Investment including the loan premium	114,177,094 Euro	The details of verification for each item has been presented below
Electro-mechanical equipment (incl WTGs, towers, erection, commissioning and local transport)	€108652922	Total electro-mechanical equipment cost estimate taken from purchase of similar turbines shortly before the investment decision date as evidenced to DOE with Quotation no. NTR-MAZI-01 ( 04.03.2008) Soma Nordex Turbine Supply and Installation Agreement (06.07.2009)
Construction	€8250000	Alpike İnşaat Construction Quotation (10.04.2009)
Electrical works	€6703000	Areva Cabling and Switchyard Contract ,ABB Electric Transformer Contract 1 and 2 (17.11.2009 and 15.5.2009)
Energy Transmission line	€1744000	Kar-PA Transmission line Contract (21.01.2010)
Insurance during cost	€405550	Insurance quotation (05.07.2010)
Loan	81,590,000 Euro	ECA Loan Agreement and Commercial Loan Agreement (7/8/2009 and 12/8/2009)
Loan Period	12.5 years	ECA Loan Agreement and Commercial Loan Agreement (7/8/2009 and 12/8/2009)
Insurance during cost	€405550	Insurance quotation (05.07.2010)

Under Sub-step 2d, sensitivity analysis is applied to the following items:

Under Sub-step 2d, sensitivity analysis has been applied to the capital cost, electricity production, electricity price and operating cost for a decrease of 5% and 10% and for an increase of 5% and 10%.

According to this sensitivity analysis; when the investment costs decrease 10%, the IRR of the project activity rises up to 10.83% and IRR arrive at 9.54% when the operating costs decrease by 10%. The IRR value decreases with the rise of the investment costs down to 7.91 and down to 8.95 % when the operating costs increase by 10%.

When electricity production raises 10 %, the IRR of the project activity rises up to 11.07 % without VER revenues. The IRR value decreases with the decrease of the electricity production down to 7.33 % without VER revenues when the electricity production decreases by 10%

VALIDATION REPORT

---

When electricity price raises 10%, the IRR of the project activity rises up to 10.92 % without VER revenues The IRR value decreases with the decrease of the electricity price down to 7.5 % without VER revenues

The above benchmark and accompanying sensitivity analysis reveal the fact that no alternative scenario without VER revenue can make the project pass the benchmark IRR expectation. Therefore, the project is not financially attractive.

The DOE, based on the assessment result by the financial expert engaged, hereby confirms that the underlying assumptions are appropriate and the financial calculations are correct.

### **3.4.4 Barrier analysis (118)**

Barrier Analysis was applied at the PDD that was submitted first to the validation team. Since the barriers were not credible CL8 and CL9 and CL10 were raised by the validation team. The barriers were excluded from the PDD and CLs were closed.

Barrier Analysis is not carried out for the project activity.

### **3.4.5 Common practice analysis (121)**

Under the common practice analysis section, wind power projects with similar installed capacity in the same region have been compared to the proposed project activity.

The geographical boundary of common practice is selected as the whole country. The national grid in Turkey is not layered; the grid is interconnected. Hence the selection of the geographical scope of the common practice analysis as the whole grid is found appropriate by the validation team.

First, the activities similar to the proposed project activities are analyzed. This analysis is made on the basis of the installed capacity for the whole country. Secondly, activities that are comparable to the project activity in capacity have been assessed by the EMRA production licenses from the EMRA website. The similar Wind Power Plants that are under operation have been registered as either Gold Standard (GS) or Verified Emission Reduction (VER) projects.

Based on the assessments above, The DOE hereby confirms that the proposed GS project activity is not common practice.

### **3.5 Monitoring plan (124)**

The Project activity uses the approved consolidated monitoring methodology ACM 0002 Version 12.1.0. The steps taken to assess whether the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan in the PDD version 2.7 and Soma WPP Monitoring Manual version 01 are feasible within the project design are described below.

VALIDATION REPORT

---

Validation team considers the monitoring plan to be complying with the requirements of the methodology for the following reasons.

1. Net Electricity Generation: the net electricity supplied to the grid by the proposed Project Activity. According to the methodology, there is only one variable that a WPP needs to monitor.
2. EF<sub>grid,CM,y</sub>, the emission factor is fixed ex-ante. This is in line with the EF tool as required by the methodology.
3. Project participant has provided provision for monitoring these parameters and for electronic archiving of the monitored data.
4. Project participant has provided for archiving the data for 2 years.

The validation team hereby confirms that the monitoring plan described in the revised PDD complies with the requirements of the methodology and Gold Standard Version 2.1.

The steps taken to assess whether the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan and Gold Standard Monitoring Manual Version 2 are feasible within the project design are described below.

Two main meters will be installed for monitoring of electricity generation. The electricity read will be recorded monthly in the logbook. Every month, that reading from the total of the control meters TR-1 and TR-2 will be verified with main meter's reading (i.e. if one meter reads at +.2%, and one at -.2%, this is the limit of acceptance).

PDD version 2.7 and WPP Monitoring Manual version 01 includes requirements for calibration of the energy meters, used for monitoring the project activity variable, EG<sub>facility</sub>. The calibration will be carried out every ten years by the State Electricity Authority. The measuring device's specifications will be in accordance with the measurement communiqué of Turkey (Turkish Standards and International Electro technical Commission standards).

The validation team hereby confirms that the monitoring plan described in the revised PDD complies with the requirements of the methodology and Gold Standard Validation.

### **3.6 Sustainable development (127)**

The sustainable development assessment and do no harm assessment has been realised according to GS version 2.1. The sustainable development assessment has been documented in GS passport. The sustainable development matrix has been marked as +3. The positive indicators have been indicated air quality, quality of employment and quantity of employment. These three parameters have been also included into the sustainable monitoring plan.

The environmental indicators and the Environmental Impact Assessment Project file have been reviewed by the validation team. Endemic species are not present as stated in the Environmental Impact Assessment Project file. The project area is not on the

migration routes but near to the migration routes. The dead bird reports will be recorded by the hunters.

### **3.7 Local stakeholder consultation (130)**

The steps taken to assess the adequacy of the local stakeholder consultation are described below.

Two separate Stakeholder Consultation Meetings for Soma Wind Power Plant have been held on 10. November. 2008. The former was held at 10:30 in Gökçukur Village and the latter was at 15:30 in Hecizköy Village. . All the stakeholders including central and local governmental agencies, local NGOs and GS endorsed NGOs were invited by faxes and emails. The meeting date and place was announced in a local (Soma Kurtuluş, published on 7th of November, at year 4; issue 1120) and a nationwide newspaper (Posta, published on 6th of November 2008 all over Turkey).

The stakeholder comments were basically on transportation of the turbines to the site, confinement of the grazing grounds, possibility for temporary and permanent jobs for the locals, disturbance levels related to especially dust during the construction, effect on fauna, risk of fire, amount of tree cutting.

In the Gold Standard Passport version 2, the response to the comments have been documented as the following;

It has been stated the necessary improvements and renovations of the roads would be made for the proper transportation of the turbine components.

It has been stated that stakeholders were ensured that there will not be massive consignments but the turbines will be secured by individual fencing as verified during the site visit through the conversations with the stake holders.

It has been stated that minimal risk of fire due wind farm operation. However there will be an emergency action plan to be prepared for any kind of fire incidence.

It has been stated that during construction micro reservoirs can be built to help collect water precipitation during rainy days and save the water for dry times.

It has been stated that there will not be massive construction affairs but dust will be managed and controlled by regularly spraying the excavations and road construction sites.

It has been stated that during the construction stage the roads will be improved and renewed

VALIDATION REPORT

---

Also the noise pollution is assessed during the planning stage of the project and is shown in the Project Description Report submitted to the DOE and it has been accepted that noise pollution is not a threat to the nearest settlements.

No negative impact is expected for the fauna as there will be no significant habitat destructions and fragmentations.

It has been stated that some trees will be cut to clear the access roads and turbine footing. The exact number or volume of the biomass that will be removed will be determined by the report of the local forestry headquarters' report. The trees cut during construction will be remedied in coordination with Forestry Management, and the state of the soil and the replanted trees will be pictured only at the initial verification process.

CL 49 has been raised for the clarification of the responses of the project proponent to the issues raised on dust, new road construction/ rehabilitation and microreservoirs.

The DOE hereby confirms that the process of local stakeholder consultation is observed to be adequate.

### **3.8 Environmental impacts (133)**

The project participants have undertaken an analysis of environmental impacts and obtained an EIA-exemption letter from Ministry of Environment and Forest.

The environmental precautions have been presented in Environmental Monitoring Plan. The precautions are mainly to reduce dust, to reduce water pollution during the construction.

It has been stated in Gold Standard passport that the water for domestic uses will be supplied by tankers and wastewater will be collected in septic tanks and disposed regularly in accordance with Water Pollution Control Regulations. The waste oil will be collected and transferred to recycling centre in accordance with the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations and Waste Oil Control Regulations.

It has been stated the lubricants are going to be collected in impermeable containers and will be sent to the recycling facilities

CL 50 has been raised for the clarification of the responses of the project proponent to the issues raised on dust, new road construction/ rehabilitation and microreservoirs.

It has been concluded that the project will not result in significant environmental impacts.

## **4 COMMENTS BY PARTIES, STAKEHOLDERS AND NGOS**

The PDD using methodology ACM0002 Version 12.1 0 was webhosted on the website of JP Morgan for global stakeholder's comments. The project was webhosted from 11.10.2011.

## **5 VALIDATION OPINION**

Bureau Veritas Certification has performed a validation of the Soma Wind Power Plant Project in Soma and Kirkagac, Manisa, Turkey. The validation was performed on the basis of UNFCCC criteria and Gold Standard criteria and also on the criteria given to provide for consistent project operations, monitoring and reporting.

The validation consisted of the following three phases: i) a desk review of the project design and the baseline and monitoring plan; ii) follow-up interviews with project stakeholders; iii) the resolution of outstanding issues and the issuance of the final validation report and opinion.

Project participant/s used the latest tool for demonstration of the additionality. In line with this tool, the PDD provides analysis of investment determine that the project activity itself is not the baseline scenario.

By generating electricity from wind, the project is likely to result in reductions of GHG emissions partially. An analysis of the investment demonstrates that the proposed project activity 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 amount of emission reductions.

The review of the project design documentation (version 02.7.) 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 correctly applies and meets the relevant UNFCCC requirements for the CDM Methodology and the Gold Standard criteria. Bureau Veritas Certification thus requests registration of 'Soma Wind Power Plant' as GS-VER project activity.

## **6 REFERENCES**

### **Category 1 Documents:**

Documents provided by Type the name of the company that relate directly to the GHG components of the project.

VALIDATION REPORT

---

- /1/ Project Design Document v1
- /2/ Project Design Document v2.1
- /3/ Project Design Document v2.2
- /4/ Project Design Document v2.3
- /5/ Project Design Document v.2.4.
- /6/ Project Design Document v.2.5.
- /7/ Project Design Document v.2.6.
- /8/ Project Design Document v.2.7.
- /9/ Investment Analysis Excel Sheet- Soma Financials v9
- /10/ Investment Analysis Excel Sheet- Soma Financials v15
- /11/ EF calculation sheet- SomaCM2009 v2.1
- /12/ StakeHolder Consultation Resport v1
- /13/ StakeHolder Consultation Resport v3.1
- /14/ Gold Standard Passport v2.1.
- /15/ Gold Standard Passport v2.4.
- /16/ LSC Report

**Category 2 Documents:**

Background documents related to the design and/or methodologies employed in the design or other reference documents.

- /1/ Board Decision dated 03/06/08
- /2/ Generation License dated 17/07/08
- /3/ Supply and Installation Agreement dated 06/07/09
- /4/ Provisional Acceptance Certificates approved by EMRA dated 13/08/10
- /5/ Provisional Acceptance Certificates approved by EMRA dated 23/09/10
- /6/ Provisional Acceptance Certificates approved by EMRA dated 11/11/10
- /7/ Purchase Agreements of the turbines

VALIDATION REPORT

---

**Persons interviewed:**

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

- /1/ Asli Sezer Özcelik- JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation
- /2/ Recep Çoban – Gökçukur Village
- /3/ Halil Alan – Villager
- /4/ İlyas Albes- Villager
- /5/ Tolga Bilgin- Bilgin Rüzgar Enerjisi Santrali Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.
- /6/ Tom Morton - JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation

-

## **7 CURRICULA VITAE OF THE DOE'S VALIDATION TEAM MEMBERS**

### **Mrs. Burcu Mutman – Internal Technical Reviewer**

Burcu Mutman is an auditor for environment, safety and quality management systems. She is also lead verifier for GHG Emission Reduction Projects.

### **Ms. Bade Cebeci**

Bureau Veritas Certification Team Leader, Climate Change Lead Verifier  
Bade Cebeci has over 10 years experience in environmental sciences and auditing. She is an auditor in EMS&QMS&OHS. She is lead verifier for GHG Emission Reduction Projects.

### **Baseline Specialist: Mrs. Yildiz Arikan - Assoc. Professor Dr**

Sabancı University, Faculty of Management

Yildiz Arikan is an Electrical engineer and she is working at Sabancı University. She has supported thesis related with energy. In addition, she has been conducting research studies on energy including "CO<sub>2</sub> Emission Research" Studies. Academically, Yildiz Arikan is working also on GHG project since 2005.

### **Investment Analysis Specialists: Mr. Murat Gencer – Master of Economics**

RiskTürk Software Development and Consultancy – Head of Financial Analysis Team

Murat Gencer, consultant and a trainer, has over 11 years of experience in FMCG, software development and banking sectors. He is specialized in project finance, financial modelling, risk management and MS Excel applications.

1. o0o -

## VALIDATION REPORT

## APPENDIX A: COMPANY GS-VER PROJECT VALIDATION PROTOCOL

**Table 1** VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS BASED ON THE VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION MANUAL V 01.2 (EB55 ANNEX 1)

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS		Draft Concl	Final Concl
			COUNTRY A	COUNTRY B		
<b>1. Approval</b>						
1.1. 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? State the country.	VVM	45	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.		OK	OK
1.2. Does the letter of approval from DNA of each Party confirm that : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Party is a Party of the Kyoto Protocol</li> <li>- The participation is voluntary</li> <li>- In the case of the host Party, the proposed CDM project activity contributes to the sustainable development of the country</li> <li>- Refers to the precise proposed CDM project activity title in the PDD being submitted for registration</li> </ul>	VVM	45	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.		OK	OK
1.3. Is(are) the letter(s) of approval unconditional with respect to (1.2) above?	VVM	46	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.		OK	OK
1.4. Has(ve) the letter(s) of approval been issued by	VVM	47	The project is not developed under compliance		OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the respective Party's designated national authority (DNA)? If there is doubt with respect to (1.2) above, was verified with the DNA that the letter of approval is valid for the proposed CDM project activity under validation?			markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.		
<b>2. Participation</b>					
2.1. Have all project participants been listed in a consistent manner in the project documentation?	VVM	51	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
2.2. Is the information in tabular form of section A.3 consistent with the contact details provided in Annex 1 of the PDD?	VVM	52	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
2.3. Has the participation of each of the project participants been approved by at least one Party involved, either in a letter of approval or in a separate letter specifically to approve participation?	VVM	52	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
2.4. Are any entities other than those approved as project participants included in these sections of the PDD?	VVM	52	The project is not developed under compliance markets. Therefore the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
2.5. Has the approval of participation issued from the relevant DNA?	VVM	53	n.a.	OK	OK
<b>3. Project design document</b>					
3.1. Is the PDD used as a basis for validation prepared in accordance with the latest template and guidance from the CDM Executive Board available on the UNFCCC CDM website?	VVM	55	The PDD used as a basis for validation is prepared in accordance with the latest template and guidance from the CDM Executive Board available on the UNFCCC	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			website CDM-PDD Version 03 has been used as a template.		
3.2. Is the PDD in accordance with the applicable CDM requirements for completing the PDD?	VVM	56	The PDD is accordance with the applicable CDM requirements for completing the PDD.	OK	OK
3.3. In CDM-PDD section A.1 -Title of project -Current version number and date of document	EB 41	Ann 12	Title of the project is: Soma Wind Power Plant  The current version number of the Document is: Version 1.1. The date of the completion date of the document is: July 2009.	OK	OK
3.4. In CDM-PDD section A.2, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.4.1. A brief description of the project activity covering purpose which includes the scenario existing prior to the start of project, project scenario and baseline scenario	EB 41  VVM	Ann 12  58 59 60	The scenario before the implementation of the project activity is presented by stating that the electricity demand in Turkey is expected to increase by 8.1 % each year over the Period 2007-13 due to the expected developments in the industry, production and service sectors. The statement has been justified by presenting the link. The statement has also been validated from the website of Ministry of Energy.	OK	OK
			The project scenario has been defined as the following by the PP in section A.2. of the PDD version 1.1; Bilgin RES Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. plans to build a wind power plant in order to utilise renewable energy resources to generate electricity in	CL1	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>Manisa Province. A total of 36 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MW will be erected in Soma and Kirkagac Boroughs. 12 of the turbines will be located in Kirkagac on East of the province and 24 of them will be on West in Soma Borough. The project aims to supply a portion of country's electricity demand as well as to contribute Turkish economy. The total installed power will be <b>90 MW</b> and the annual electricity generation is calculated as <b>266,600 MWh</b>. The project will be accomplished in 32 months and the project life is expected to be 49 years."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please clearly state the investment decision date in the PDD.</li> <li>2. Please supply project schedule.</li> <li>3. Please supply production license and the purchase agreement for the verification of the scenario</li> </ol>		
			The brief description of the project given in section A.2. of the PDD ver 1.1. does not include the baseline scenario ( in case the baseline scenario is the same as the scenario existing prior to the prior to the start of the project activity, please state that both are the same	<b>CAR1</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.4.2. Does the proposed CDM project activity involve the alteration of an existing installation or	VVM	63	The proposed project activity is a Greenfield investment.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
process?					
3.4.3. Explanation on how the GHG emission reductions effected.	EB 41	Ann 12	<p>The way that the proposed project activity will reduce GHG emissions has been defined by the PP as the following in section A.2. of the PDD ver 1.1. as the following:</p> <p>‘Considering that the majority of the installed capacity for electricity generation is in form of fossil fuel power plants in the country; the project will contribute to clean energy generation. The project is estimated to reduce approximately 174,018 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e per annum which would have been released from the generation of same amount of electricity by grid-connected power plants. Turkey, being in a region with continuous and powerful wind resources, has great potential to utilise the renewable wind resources for electricity generation.’</p> <p>a. Means of validation about the above statement is given below:</p> <p>b. The statement that “the majority of the installed capacity of electricity generation is in form of fossil fuel power plants in the country” has been checked from EUAS 2008 report by the DOE from the official internet site of EUAS –Electricity Generation Co. Inc ( www.euas.gov.tr).Hence the statement has</p>	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>been accepted.( OK)</p> <p>c. The statement in Section A.2. of the PDD ver 1.1. that; "Turkey is a region having great potential to utilize the renewable wind resources for electricity generation" has been verified form the reference given. (OK).</p>		
3.4.4. The PP's views on the contribution of project activity to sustainable development	EB 41	Ann 12	<p>The view of the project participants on the contribution of the project activity has been presented in section A.2. of the PDD rev 01 in relation with the Millennium Development Goal – No:9 of Turkey as the following:</p> <p><i>"The project will utilise local resources for electricity production. This will stimulate the economic development as wind power, being an infinite and natural resource, is more ecologically and financially sustainable than other choices.</i></p> <p><i>From a local perspective, the project will provide job opportunities for local people and create household income for them. Associated works such as wiring will be done by local companies and this will increase their technological capacity in renewable energy projects and will stimulate the local economy as well."</i></p> <p>Means of validation has been given below:</p>	<b>CL2</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>a. Since the proposed project is an energy production project from renewable sources and that the project results in no GHG emissions; it is also agreed by the DOE that the project will contribute to sustainable development ( <i>OK</i>).</p> <p>b. It has been stated in section A.2. of the PDD that “..procurement of wiring will stimulate the technological capacity in renewable energy sector”. The contract for the wiring has been reviewed and the statement has been agreed.</p> <p>c. It has been agreed that local purchasing of the wiring service will create house hold income. Please supply purchase agreement etc. to the DOE to prove that that the wiring will be done by local firms(<i>CL requested</i>).</p> <p>d. It has been stated that the local workforce will be employed. Please clarify the number of persons to be employed and job descriptions of the potential local recruitments (<i>CL requested</i>)..</p>		
<p>3.5. In CDM-PDD section A.3, are following provided in the tabular format?</p> <p>- List of project participants and parties</p>	EB 41	Ann 12	<p>The project participants are given in a tabular format in the PDD version 01 under section A.3.</p> <p>Means of validation on listing of project</p>	<b>CL3</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of Host Party</li> <li>- Indication whether the Party wishes to be considered as project participant</li> </ul>	VVM	51,52	<p>participants are given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bilgin RES Enerji Üretim A.Ş , JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation are the parties involved in the project. (OK)</li> <li>2. The parties involved are listed in the A.3. of the PDD using the tabular format. ( OK)</li> <li>3. The contact information has been provided in Annex 1 of the PDD. (OK)</li> </ol> <p>Please clarify if host Party wishes to be a project participant. ( It s stated as yes in the tabular format )</p>		
3.6. In CDM-PDD section A.4.1, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.6.1. Physical description, location, host party(ies) and address as required	EB 41	Ann 12	<p>Technical description, location, host party(ies) and address have been given in section A.4.1. of the PDD ver 1.1. means of validation during the site tour have been given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project will be in Soma, Manisa, Turkey</li> <li>2. Host country is Republic of Turkey and she does not have a quantitative reduction target under the Kyoto Protocol. Therefore the project is eligible for the VER application.</li> <li>3. The project will be located in Aegean region, Province of Manisa and in Soma and Kırkağaç Boroughs</li> </ol>	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.6.2. Detailed physical location with unique	EB	Ann	Detailed physical location with unique	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
identification of the project activity (e.g. Longitude/latitude)	41	12	identification of the project activity has been given section A.4.1. of the PDD ver 1.1. . Means of validation have been given below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The name of the hills and the name of the villages have been checked during the site visit and from the Google map internet site by the DOE.</li> <li>The coordinates of the turbines have been given in the PDD A.4.1. rev 1.1. The coordinates given in the PDD have been checked by the DOE via GPS during site visit.</li> </ul>		
3.7. In CDM-PDD section A.4.2, is the list of categories of project activities provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	The project category is identified as Sectoral Scope 1: Energy industries in section A.4.1. of the PDD rev 1.1. (renewable /non-renewable sources)	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.8. In CDM-PDD section A.4.3, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.8.1. A description of how environmentally safe and sound technology, and know-how, is transferred to the Host Party(ies)	EB 41	Ann 12	A description of how environmentally safe and sound technology, and know-how, is transferred to the Host Party(ies) have been given in section A.4.3. of PDD ver 1.1. means of validation have been given below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In section A.4.2. of the PDD version 1.1., it is stated that the wind power projects are environmentally safe in comparison with the fossil fuel fired plants ( OK)</li> </ol>	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>2. In section A.4.2. of the PDD version 1.1., it has been stated that the turbine blades have the ability to change angles according to wind direction. It has been agreed by the DOE that ability of changing the angles to the wind direction will increase the generation efficiency. The technical specifications have been validated through the catalogues</p> <p>3. In the PDD, it has been stated that high speed, 3 blade wind turbines will be used for the project. It is also concluded that those turbines are lighter and cheaper than low speed turbines, operating with a low torque and a low rate of rotation. The technical specifications have been validated <a href="http://www.nordex-online.com/en/produkte-service/wind-turbines/n90-25-mw.html?no_cache=1">http://www.nordex-online.com/en/produkte-service/wind-turbines/n90-25-mw.html?no_cache=1</a>)</p>		
3.8.2. Further explanation of purpose of project activity with scenario existing prior to the start of project, scope or present activities and the baseline scenario	EB 41	Ann 12	The brief description of the project given in section A.2. of the PDD ver 1.1. does not include the baseline scenario ( in case the baseline scenario is the same as the scenario existing prior to the prior to the start of the project activity, please state that both are the same )	<b>CAR01</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.8.3. List and arrangement of the main manufacturing/production technologies, systems and equipments involved	EB 41	Ann 12	List and arrangement of the main manufacturing/ production technologies, systems and equipments involved have been	<b>CL4</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>given in section A.4 of the PDD ver 1.1. Means of validation (in addition to those given in Table 1.1.d ( of this protocol) have been given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project comprises 36 wind turbines, each having 2.5MW capacity.</li> <li>2. The installed capacity of the project is 90 MW as stated in the generation license.</li> <li>3. ) Please give present the avarege lifetime of equipments, load factors and efficiency for the turbines in the PDD. Please justify the data that will be presented.</li> <li>4. Please include a list of equipments (including the monitoring equipments) that will be installed.</li> </ol>		
3.8.4. The emissions sources and GHGs involved	EB 41	Ann 12	Since the project is the installation of a new wind power plant; there is no GHG emissions form the project.	OK	OK
3.9. In CDM-PDD section A.4.4, is the estimation of emission reductions provided as requested in a tabular format?	EB 41	Ann 12	<p>The PDD version 01 includes the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Estimation of emission reductions is provided as requested in a tabular format</li> <li>2. The chosen crediting period is seven years and it is indicated in section A.4.4 of the PDD version 1.1.</li> <li>3. The total amount of emission reduction is given as <b>1,108,052.8 tCO<sub>2</sub></b> tCO<sub>2</sub> over the crediting period of seven years in section A.4.4 of the PDD version 1.1.</li> <li>4. Yearly CO2 reduction is given as : <b>158,293.3 tCO<sub>2</sub></b> in section A.4.4 of the PDD version</li> </ol>	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			1.1. The final validation opinion of this section will be presented in the validation report after the emission reductions have been validated ( PDD section B.6.3.)		
3.10. In CDM-PDD section A.4.5, is information regarding public funding provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	In section A.4.5. it has been stated that No public funding from an Annex 1 party is involved in the project activity	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.11. In CDM-PDD section (Baseline identification)	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.11.1. The approved methodology and version number	EB 41  VVM	Ann 12  70	Approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology selected is; ACM0002 (Version 8) for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources ( <a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools">http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools</a> ) Please clarify the revision of the selected methodology.	<b>CL5</b>	<b>OK</b>
			The tools that the methodology is used in conjunction with are given in section B.1. of the PDD version 1.1. The methodology is used in conjunction with the following tools; (a) Version 8 of ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources ” The above methodology is hereafter referred to as the “Baseline Methodology”. The Baseline	<b>CL6</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>Methodology will be used in conjunction with the approved monitoring methodology Version 8 of ACM0002 ("Monitoring Methodology").</p> <p>(b) Version 5.2 of "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality"</p> <p>Please clarify the tool used for the calculation of emission factor.</p>		
3.11.2. Are the following applicability conditions of the methodology ACM0002 v12 met?	VVM	71		OK	OK
3.11.2.1. This methodology is applicable to grid-connected renewable power generation project activities that (a) install a new power plant at a site where no renewable power plant was operated prior to the implementation of the project activity (greenfield plants); (b) involve a capacity addition; (c) involve a retrofit of (an) existing plant(s); or (d) involve a replacement of (an) existing plant(s).	2		1. The project is grid connected electricity generation. The grid in Turkey is not layered. So the electricity generated will feed the national grid and there will be no switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity. As a result; the first justification for the first non applicability criteria given above has been validated by the DOE also (The justification given in section B.2. of the PDD version 1.1 is that the project does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy at the site of the project activity).	OK	OK
3.11.2.2. The project activity is the installation, capacity addition, retrofit or replacement of a power plant/unit of one of the following types:	2		It is stated in the PDD version 01 as follows: The Soma Wind Power Plant Project is a grid-	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
hydro power plant/unit (either with a run-of-river reservoir or an accumulation reservoir), wind power plant/unit, geothermal power plant/unit, solar power plant/unit, wave power plant/unit or tidal power plant/unit			connected renewable power generation project that generates electricity from wind power This statement was verified during the site visit.		
3.11.2.3. In case of hydro power plants, one of the following conditions must apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project activity is implemented in an existing reservoir, with no change in the volume of reservoir; or</li> <li>- The project activity is implemented in an existing reservoir, where the volume of reservoir is increased and the power density of the project activity, as per definitions given in the Project Emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>; or</li> <li>- The project activity results in new reservoirs and the power density of the power plant, as per definitions given in the Project Emissions section, is greater than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>	2		The project is a Wind Power Plant Project hence the checklist question is N/A	OK	OK
3.11.2.4. In the case of retrofits, replacements, or capacity additions, this methodology is only applicable if the most plausible baseline scenario, as a result of the identification of baseline scenario, is "the continuation of the current situation, i.e. to use the power generation equipment that was already in use prior to the implementation of the project activity	2		The project activity does not involve any retrofits, replacements or capacity additions, which was also verified during the site visit; hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
and undertaking business as usual maintenance”.					
3.11.2.5. The methodology is not applicable to the following conditions. Please confirm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project activities that involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources at the site of the project activity</li> <li>Biomass fired power plants;</li> <li>Hydro power plants that result in new reservoirs or in the increase in existing reservoirs where the power density of the power plant is less than 4 W/m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>	2		In the PD version 1.1. it is stated as follows: “The project does not involve switching from fossil fuels to renewable energy at the site of the project activity, neither is it a biomass fired power plant nor a hydro power plant that result in new reservoirs or in the increase in existing reservoirs where the power density of the power plant is less than 4 W/m <sup>2</sup> ”	OK	OK
3.12. Does the PDD correctly describe the project boundary, including the physical delineation of the proposed CDM project activity included within the project boundary for the purpose of calculating project and baseline emissions for the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	78 79	Please include the project boundary pictorially	CAR2	OK
3.13. In CDM-PDD section B.3, are following provided? (a) Description of all sources and gases included in the project boundary in the table (b) A flow diagram of the project boundary physically delineating the project activity with all equipments, systems and flows of mass and energy etc	VVM EB 41	80 Ann 12	CO <sub>2</sub> has been defined as main emission source for the baseline and CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O has been excluded for simplification in reference to ACM 002 ver 10 . The explanation has been presented in the table in section B.3 of the PDD version 1.1. In the table; CO <sub>2</sub> & CH <sub>4</sub> & N <sub>2</sub> O has not been included as emission sources since the WPP do not generate emissions. Please revise the wording according to the ACM version 002	CL38	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			The flow diagram in Figure 4 in section B.3 of the PDD rev 1.1 includes wind power plant, main transformer, substation as validated through the site visit.	OK	OK
3.14. Is an explanation how the most plausible baseline scenario is identified in accordance with the selected baseline methodology is provided in CDM-PDD section B.4?	EB 41	Ann 12	The selected baseline scenario is the only option for the project activity. The baseline scenario is given under section B.4 of the PDD version 1.1.	OK	OK
3.14.1. If the project activity is the install a new grid-connected renewable power plant/unit (greenfield plant), is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM0002 Ver.12.1.0?	2		The baseline scenario is identified as follows: <i>“Electricity delivered to the grid by the project would have otherwise been generated by the operation of grid connected power plants and by the addition of new generation sources, as reflected in the Combined Margin calculations.”</i> The identified baseline scenario is in line with the methodology.	OK	OK
3.14.2. If the project activity is a capacity addition to existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified appropriately in accordance with the ACM0002 Ver.12.1.0 and the point of time at which the generation facility would likely be replaced or retrofitted (DATE Baseline Retrofit) defined reasonably?	2		The project activity is a Greenfield power plant, hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
3.14.3. If the project activity is the retrofit or replacement of existing grid-connected renewable power plant/unit, is the baseline scenario identified	2		The project activity is a Greenfield power plant, hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
following step-wise procedure in accordance with the ACM0002 Ver.10?					
3.14.3.1. Are the realistic and credible alternative baseline scenarios for power generation appropriately identified following the Step 1 of the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”? (Step 1)	2,8		The project activity is a Greenfield power plant, hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
3.14.3.2. Are the realistic and credible alternative baseline scenarios i.e. P1, P2 and P3 appropriately applied <i>Barrier analysis</i> following the Step 2 of the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality”? (Step 2)	2,8		The project activity is a Greenfield power plant, hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
3.14.3.3. If more than one alternative is remaining after Step 2, is <i>Investment analysis</i> appropriately applied (apply an Investment Comparison as per step 3 of the “Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality” or a Benchmark Analysis as per step 2b of the “Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality”)? (Step 3)	2,3,8		The project activity is a Greenfield power plant, hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
3.15. Does the PDD identify the baseline for the proposed CDM project activity, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the proposed CDM	VVM	81	The PDD identifies the baseline for the proposed GS VER project activity, defined as the scenario that reasonably represents the anthropogenic emissions by sources of GHGs that would occur in the absence of the	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
project activity?			proposed GS VER project activity, please also see checklist question 3.14.1 for the baseline scenario.		
3.16. Has any procedure contained in the methodology to identify the most reasonable baseline scenario, been correctly applied?	VVM	82	The procedures have been applied correctly, as the project activity is a Greenfield Power Plant; there is only one applicable baseline scenario.	OK	OK
3.17. Does the selected methodology require use of tools (such as the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" and the "Combined tool to identify the baseline scenario and demonstrate additionality") to establish the baseline scenario?	VVM	82	The selected methodology requires the use of tools "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" and "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system"	OK	OK
3.18. Does the methodology require several alternative scenarios to be considered in the identification of the most reasonable baseline scenario?	VVM	83	The project activity is a Greenfield Power Plant; there is only one applicable baseline scenario which is also identified by the project proponents under section B.4 of the PDD version 1.1.	OK	OK
3.19. Are the documents and sources referred to in the PDD correctly quoted and interpreted And are they cross checked with other verifiable and credible sources, such as local expert opinion, if available? (identify the sources)	VVM	84	1. The reference sources given in the footnotes are reviewed by the validation team.	OK	OK
3.20. Have all applicable CDM requirements been taken into account in the identification of the baseline scenario for the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	85	All the applicable CDM requirements have been taken into account in the identification of the baseline scenario for the proposed GS VER project activity.	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.21. Have all relevant policies and circumstances been identified and correctly considered in the PDD, in accordance with the guidance by the CDM Executive Board?	VVM	85	All relevant policies and circumstances been identified and correctly considered in the PDD, in accordance with the guidance by the CDM Executive Board	OK	OK
3.22. Does the PDD provide a verifiable 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 CDM project activity?	VVM	86	The technology to be employed in the absence of the project has been given in section B4 of the PDD as: "In accordance with ACM002 and the identified baseline, in the absence of the project activity, the corresponding amount of electricity will be supplied by the grid which is dominated by fossil power plants."	OK	OK
3.23. In CDM-PDD section B.5, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.23.1. Explanation and Justification of how and why this project activity is additional and therefore not the baseline scenario in accordance with the selected baseline methodology	EB 41	Ann 12	In Section B.5 of the PDD ver 1.1; it has been stated that the project is additional since the project will contribute to emission reductions by replacing the likely thermal (fossil-fuel based) sources of energy with a renewable source (wind energy) for electricity generation.	OK	OK
3.23.2. Has the latest version of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" been used?	2		The latest version (v05.2) of the "Tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality" is used in the PDD version 1.1.	OK	OK
3.23.3. Evidence that the incentive from the CDM was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity, if the starting date of the project activity is before the date of validation	EB 41	Ann 12	It was stated that VER revenue was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. 03.06.2008 dated board decision has been seen by the validation team. Please supply the proof for the start of the	CL11	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			project..		
3.24. In CDM-PDD section B.6.1, are following provided? (Algorithms and/or formulae used to determine emission reductions)	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.24.1. Explanation how the procedures, in the approved methodology to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage emissions and emission reductions are applied to the proposed project activity	EB 41	Ann 12	A compilation of information on the data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period but that are determined only once and thus remains fixed throughout the crediting period and that are available when validation is undertaken is given in the tabular format in section B.6.2. of the PDD VER 1.1.	OK	OK
3.24.2. Do the steps taken and equations applied to calculate project emissions, baseline emissions, leakage and emission reductions comply with the requirements of the selected baseline and monitoring methodology?	VVM	89	The formulae for The Build Margin emission factor EFBM and Operating Margin emission factor EFQM has been given in the section B.6.2. of the PDD version 1.1.	OK	OK
3.24.2.1. Are the Project emissions appropriately calculated?	2		The project emissions are appropriately calculated as validated by the baseline specialist.	OK	OK
3.24.2.2. Are the Baseline emissions appropriately calculated specifically for (a) greenfield plants or (b) retrofit and replacements or (c) capacity additions?	2,4		The baseline emissions are appropriately calculated for the project activity taking into consideration that it is a Greenfield investment.	OK	OK
3.24.2.3. Are the Leakage appropriately calculated?	2		Leakage is considered negligible by the methodology.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.24.2.4. Are the Emission reductions appropriately calculated?	2		The emission reductions are appropriately calculated. The data vintages available at the time of PDD submission to DOE for validation.	OK	OK
3.24.3. Have the equations and parameters in the PDD been correctly applied with respect those in the select approved methodology?	VVM	90	The equations and parameters are applied correctly with respect to the Methodology ACM0002 and "Tool to calculate emission factor for an electricity grid"	OK	OK
3.24.4. Does the methodology provide for selection between different options for equations or parameters?	VVM	90	Yes, the methodology and the referred tool "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" provides a selection between different options for equations or parameters.	OK	OK
3.24.5. If yes, has adequate justification been provided and correct equations and parameters been used in accordance with the methodology selected?	VVM	90	Adequate justification has been provided in the PDD version 01.1 about the equations and parameters used for calculation.	OK	OK
3.24.6. If yes, have correct equations and parameters been used, in accordance with the methodology selected?	VVM	90	The correct equations and parameters have been used in the emission reduction calculations.	OK	OK
3.24.7. Appropriate and correct?	VVM	91	All of the equations and parameters used in the calculations are appropriate and correct, taking into consideration the available data on the Turkish grid.	OK	OK
3.24.8. Applicable to the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	91	The PP has chosen to use the equations and parameters applicable to the proposed project activity taking into consideration the available data on the Turkish grid.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.24.9. Resulting in a conservative estimate of the emission reductions?	VVM	91	The default efficiency values for new units (built after 2000) given in the TOOL has been employed.	OK	OK
			<i>"IPCC default values at the lower limit of the uncertainty at a 95% confidence interval as provided in table 1.4 of Chapter1 of Vol. 2 (Energy) of the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National GHG Inventories" has been used.</i>	OK	OK
3.24.10. A compilation of information on the data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period but that are determined only once and thus remains fixed throughout the crediting period and that are available when validation is undertaken	EB 41	Ann 12	In the PDD version 1.1, a compilation of information on the data and parameters that are not monitored throughout the crediting period but that are determined only once and thus remains fixed throughout the crediting period and that are available when validation is undertaken is given under section B.6.2.	OK	OK
3.24.11. Explanation and justification for the choice of the source of data	EB 41	Ann 12	The source of the data is given in the data/parameter tables under section B.6.2 of the PDD version 1.1.	OK	OK
3.24.12. Clear and transparent references or additional documentation in Annex 3	EB 41	Ann 12	Clear and transparent references have been presented in the tabular format or additional information have been presented in Annex 3 for the parameters used in the calculation of CM emission factor.  However the references are not given for the tables in Annex 3 . However the references are given in the PDD	CL12	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.24.13. Where values have been measured, a description of the measurement methods and procedures (e.g. which standards have been used), indicated the responsible person/entity having undertaken the measurement, the date of measurement(s) and the measurement results	EB 41	Ann 12	The values used in the calculations are not measured.	OK	OK
3.25. In CDM-PDD section B.6.3, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.25.1.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	EB 41	Ann 12	The equations used for exante calculations are documented in section B.6.1 of the PDD version 01. A specific issue is outlined below: In the PDD, it is written that the calculations are based on version 1.1. of "Tool to calculate the emission factor for an electricity system" (TOOL), referred by ACM0002.	OK	OK
			Relevant equations presented in the tool have been used for calculation of OM. 1. The Simple OM Option C has method been used. This requires application of the following formula: $EF_{\text{grid,OMsimple},y} = \frac{\sum_i FC_{i,y} \times NCV_{i,y} \times EF_{\text{CO2},i,y}}{EG_y}$	OK	OK


## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			2. Also the OM has been calculated as a generation weighted average as requested by the tool (		
			<p>Relevant equations presented in the tool have been used for calculation of BM.</p> <p>The BM formula is as follows:</p> $EF_{grid,BM,y} = \frac{\sum_m EG_{m,y} \times EF_{EL,m,y}}{\sum_m EG_{m,y}}$ <p>Also the BM has been calculated as a generation weighted average.</p>	OK	OK
			It has been stated in version 1.1. of the PDD that The lists of most recent capacity additions to the grid by year and their average and firm generation capacities are available at the TEİAŞ web page for the years 2004* and 2005†. However, for the years 2008, 2007 and 2006, the annual generation capacity data for	OK	OK

\* Generation Units Put Into Operation and Out of Operation in 2006, ( <http://www.teias.gov.tr/istat2004/7.xls> )

† Generation Units Put Into Operation and Out of Operation in 2005, ( <http://www.teias.gov.tr/istatistik2005/7.xls> )

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			each plant is not available on the statistics page of TEIAS. The data for the years 2006 <sup>*</sup> , 2007 <sup>†</sup> and 2008 <sup>‡</sup> are taken from the TEIAS Capacity Projection Reports which are also available in another section of the TEIAS website. For the capacity additions, the firm generation capacities of the power plants are used. All the data used for calculations have also been presented in Annex.3. The assumption has been accepted by the validation team		
3.25.2. Documentation how each equation is applied, in a manner that enables the reader to reproduce the calculation	EB 41	Ann 12	The equations are documented in a manner so that each equation is applied, in a manner that enables the reader to reproduce the calculation.	OK	OK
3.25.3. Additional background information and or data in Annex 3, including relevant electronic files (i.e. spreadsheets)	EB 41	Ann 12	Excel sheet (Soma_CM_2009v.2.1xlsx) has been provided as requested in the tool.  Soma_CM_2009-v2.1.xlsx	OK	OK
3.26. In CDM-PDD section B.6.4 are, the results of the ex ante estimation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, provided in a tabular format?	EB 41	Ann 12	The results of the <i>ex ante</i> estimation of emission reductions for all years of the crediting period, provided in a tabular format in section B.6.4. of the PDD rev 1.1.	OK	OK

\* TEIAS Capacity Projection Report 2007-2016 (<http://www.teias.gov.tr/projeksiyon/KAPASITE%20PROJEKSIYONU%202007.pdf>)

† TEIAS Capacity Projection Report 2008-2017 (<http://www.teias.gov.tr/projeksiyon/KAPASITEPROJEKSIYONU2008.pdf>)

‡ TEIAS Capacity Projection Report 2009-2018 (<http://www.teias.gov.tr/projeksiyon/KAPASITEPROJEKSIYONU2009.pdf>)

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.27. In CDM-PDD section B.7.1, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.27.1. Specific information on how the data and parameters that need to be monitored would actually be collected during monitoring for the project activity	EB 41	Ann 12	The data to be monitored has been defined as EGy. It has been stated that data will be monitored continuously by redundant metering devices, which will provide the data for the monthly invoicing to TEİAŞ.	OK	OK
3.27.2. For each parameter the following below information, using the table provided:	EB 41	Ann 12			
(a) 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.	EB 41	Ann 12	The parameter EGy has been defined as amount of net electricity supplied to the grid by the proposed project according to ACM002 . Please clarify "the source of data" in line with the requirements of the ACM0002	CL13	OK
(b) Where data or parameters are supposed to be measured, specify the measurement methods and procedures, how the measurement is undertaken: (i) A description of the QA/QC procedures (if any) that should be applied; (ii) Where relevant: any further comment.	EB 41	Ann 12	It has been stated that "EGy will be will be monitored continuously by redundant metering devices, which will provide the data for the monthly invoicing to TEİAŞ" in section B.7.1. of the PDD rev 1.1. In Section B.7.2. of the PDD rev 1.1, it has been stated that the readings will be realised by TEİAŞ. Additionally, it has been stated that calibration and maintenance of the meterings will be the responsibility of TEİAŞ. The statements about the calibration and the readings have also been agreed by the DOE considering the regulation in Turkey.	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.28. In CDM-PDD section B.7.2, is a detailed description of the monitoring plan provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	The detailed description of the monitoring plan has been provided in section B.7.2. of the PDD version 1.1.	OK	OK
3.29. Are all data monitored as per monitoring methodology?	2		All the data and parameters are monitored as per the monitoring methodology.	OK	OK
			It has been stated that in section B.7.2 in PDD ver 1.1. that the sustainable development indicators will not be monitored. However the sustainability monitoring plan has been included in the passport. Please clarify.	CL14	OK
3.30. Are all data collected as part of monitoring archived electronically and kept at least for 2 years after the end of the last crediting period?	2		The responsibilities for institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving have been given in section B.7.2. of the PDD REV 1.  However, please clarify the responsibility within the company for reading the records and comparing with the invoices The PMUM (TEIAS) Market Balancing Center pricing and monitoring system has been changed as of 1.12.2009. Please clarify if there will be any changes in the QA/QC plans. Please clarify how the electronic and the hardy copy files/ protocols will be kept.	CL15	OK
3.31. In CDM-PDD section B.8, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.31.1.Date of completion of the application of the methodology to the project activity study in	EB 41	Ann 12	Date of completion has been given in section B.8 of the PDD ver 1.1. Date of completion is given as 16.01.2009	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
DD/MM/YYYY					
3.31.2. Contact information of the person(s)/entity(ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology to the project activity	EB 41	Ann 12	Contact information of the people; Aslı Sezer Özçelik ( representing JP Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation) and Tolga Bilgin ( representing BİLGİN RES Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.) are given in Annex 1.  Please clarify the specific responsibilities Aslı Sezer Özçelik and Tolga Bilgin considering the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology to the project activity.	CL16	OK
3.31.3. Contact information of the person(s)/entity(ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology to the project activity	EB 41	Ann 12	The contact information of the person(s)/entity(ies) responsible for the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology to the project activity is given under section B.8 of the PDD version 01.  GAIA Carbon Finance is given as the responsible entity.	OK	OK
2. Indication if the person/entity is also a project participant listed in Annex 1	EB 41	Ann 12	Contact information of the people; Aslı Sezer Özçelik ( representing JP Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation) and Tolga Bilgin ( representing Bergama Rüzgar Enerjisi Santrali Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.) are given in Annex 1.	OK	OK
3.32. In CDM-PDD section C.1.1, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.32.1. Is the project's starting date clearly defined and evidenced?	EB 41	Ann 12	Under section C.1.1 of the PDD version 01, it is stated as follows:  <i>"Starting date of the project activity is the</i>	CL17	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p><i>construction start date which is June 2008.</i>"</p> <p>According to the Glossary of CDM Terms, "The starting date of a CDM project activity is the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins"</p> <p>Please send objective evidence showing that construction start date was the date of first real action of the project activity, and if so, please also send objective evidence showing that the construction start date is June 2008.</p>		
			<p>The expected operational lifetime of the project activity has been given as 25 years in section C.1.2 of the PDD version 01.</p> <p>Please state operational lifetime of the project activity in years and months.</p> <p>Please justify the technical life time of the project.</p>	<b>CL18</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.33. In CDM-PDD section D., are the conclusions and all references to support documentation of an environmental impact assessment undertaken in accordance with the procedures as required by the Host Party, if environmental impacts are considered significant by the project participants or the Host, provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is not mandatory for wind power plants according to the national legislations.</p> <p>It has been stated in section D.1 of the PDD that EIA is not required for the project activity after reviewing the project documents for the</p>	<b>CL19</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>Soma WPP project by the Ministry of Environment.</p> <p>Please supply the EIA exemption document and Annex 5 as referred in the PDD.</p> <p>Please clarify if there is endemic species in the project area.</p> <p>Please clarify the possible of the project on the birds.</p>		
3.34. In CDM-PDD section E.1, are the following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.34.1. The process by which comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled. An invitation for comments by local stakeholders shall be made in an open and transparent manner, in a way that facilitates comments to be received from local stakeholders and allows for a reasonable time for comments to be submitted.	EB 41	Ann 12	Invitations have been done by visiting, fax, e-mail, newspapers and announcement in public places. The invitation and the announcements have been realised Please clarify the time that the announcements have been for the stakeholders invitations.	<b>CL20</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.34.2. The project activity is described in a manner, which allows the local stakeholders to understand the project activity, taking into account confidentiality provisions of the CDM modalities and procedures.	EB 41	Ann 12	It has been stated in section E.1. of the PDD version 01.1. that non technical summary have been handed to the participants. The non technical summary have been presented in the LSC report.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
3.34.3. The local stakeholder process has been, completed before submitting the proposed project activity to the DOE for validation.	EB 41	Ann 12		<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.35. In CDM-PDD section E.2, are following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.35.1. The process by which comments by local stakeholders have been invited and compiled. An invitation for comments by local stakeholders shall be made in an open and transparent manner, in a way that facilitates comments to be received from local stakeholders and allows for a reasonable time for comments to be submitted.	EB 41	Ann 12	Seven comments have been received during the stakeholder consultation meeting. The comments received have been documented.	OK	OK
3.35.2. A summary of these comments.	EB 41	Ann 12	A summary of comments have been documented in the PDD as fire risk, effect of the change of the direction of the turbines, number trees cut, lubricants se and possible effects ,change in the ecology.	OK	OK
3.36. In CDM-PDD section E.3 is the explanation of how due account have been taken of comments received from local stakeholders provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	In section E.3 it has been stated that the comments noted during the LSC have been reviewed. It was concluded that there were no significant effect that would require a revision in the project design. Please clarify if there is any study carried out related to the fire risk that has been raised as a concern from the stakeholders.	CL21	OK
3.37. In CDM-PDD Annex 1, are the following provided?	EB 41	Ann 12			
3.37.1. Contact information of project participants	EB 41	Ann 12	The contact information of the project participants is given under Annex 1 of the PDD.	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
3.37.2. For each organization listed in section A.3 the following mandatory fields: Organization, Name of contact person, Street, City, Postfix/ZIP, Country, Telephone and Fax or e-mail	EB 41	Ann 12	Organization, Name of contact person, Street, City, Postfix/ZIP, Country, Telephone and Fax or e-mail have been provided for each participant given in section A.3.	OK	OK
3.38. In CDM-PDD Annex 2, is information from Parties included in Annex I on sources of public funding for the project activity which shall provide an affirmation that such funding does not result in a diversion of official development assistance and is separate from and is not counted towards the financial obligations of those Parties provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	The project activity is developed under Gold Standard, therefore the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
3.39. In CDM-PDD Annex 3, is the background information used in the application of the baseline methodology provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	The information to be given in Annex 3 have been included in Section B.6	OK	OK
3.40. In CDM-PDD Annex 4, is the background information used in the application of the monitoring methodology provided?	EB 41	Ann 12	In Annex 4 of the PDD version 1.1.; additional information on internal monitoring of electricity produced have been provided. It has been stated that there will be two measurement instruments connected to SCADA system.	OK	OK
<b>4. Additionality of a project activity</b>					
<b>4.1. General checklist for additionality</b>					
4.1.1. Does the CDM-PDD state the latest version of the additionality tool being used?	VVM	95	Tool to for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality; Version 5.2 has been used as stated in the PDD version 01.	OK	OK
4.1.2. Were the steps taken of the "Tool for the Demonstration and Assessment of Additionality"	EB 39	Ann 10	All of the steps defined in the additionality tool are used in PD version 01.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
to assess additionality used:					
4.1.3. Have the following alternatives been included while defining alternatives as per sub-step 1a?	EB 39	Ann 10			
4.1.3.1. The proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity;	EB 39	Ann 10	The proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity has been considered as an alternative. It has been stated that the scenario is line with the mandatory requirements however faces barriers and is not a feasible alternative.	OK	OK
4.1.3.2. Other realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) to the proposed CDM project activity scenario that deliver outputs services or services with comparable quality, properties and application areas, taking into account, where relevant, examples of scenarios identified in the underlying methodology;	EB 39	Ann 10	<i>In PDD version 1.1.; three alternatives have been defined.</i> 1. In PDD version 1.1., three alternatives have been defined Proposed project activity not undertaken as a VER project activity 2. Supply of equal amount of electricity by the existing grid 3. No project activity  Please clarify the if the alternative investment from a renewable energy is credible or not.	CL7	OK
4.1.3.3. If applicable, continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken).	EB 39	Ann 10	Continuation of the current situation is considered as an alternative to the project.	OK	OK
4.1.3.4. If applicable, continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken).	EB 39	Ann 10	It has been stated in step 1 that the only realistic and credible alternative scenario to the project activity is the continuation of the current	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			situation.		
4.1.4. Is the alternative(s) in compliance with all mandatory applicable legal and regulatory requirements, even if these laws and regulations have objectives other than GHG reductions, e.g. to mitigate local air pollution, and outcome of Step 1.b is thus concluded?	EB 39	Ann 10	Under sub-step 1b, the relevant laws are identified. All of the alternatives are in compliance of the identified laws as these alternatives are the widely operational in the country.	OK	OK
4.1.5. If an alternative does not comply with all mandatory applicable legislation and regulations, has it been shown that, based on an examination of current practice in the country or region in which the law or regulation applies, those applicable legal or regulatory requirements are systematically not enforced and that noncompliance with those requirements is widespread in the country?	EB 39	Ann 10	N/A	OK	OK
4.1.6. Has PP selected Step 2 (Investment analysis) or Step 3 (Barrier analysis) or both Steps 2 and 3?	EB 39	Ann 10	The PP has selected Step 2 Investment Analysis and Step 3 Barrier Analysis.	OK	OK
4.1.7. In step 2, have all the sub-steps as below been followed?	EB 39	Ann 10	All the sub-steps of Step 2 have been followed.	OK	OK
4.1.8. In sub-step 2a has the determination of appropriate method of analysis done as per the guidance as below?	EB 39	Ann 10	The Benchmark Analysis is assessed to be appropriate under Sub-Step 2a.	OK	OK
4.1.8.1. Simple cost analysis if the CDM project activity and the alternatives identified in Step 1 generate no financial or economic benefits other than	EB 39	Ann 10	N/A	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
CDM related income (Option I).					
4.1.8.2. Otherwise, use the investment comparison analysis (Option II) or the benchmark analysis (Option III). Specify option used with justification.	EB 39	Ann 10	Option III: Benchmark Analysis is selected under Sub-Step 2a. It is stated as follows: <i>“Since the proposed project generates financial and economic benefits via the sales of electricity other than carbon revenues, Option I cannot be used.</i> <i>Option II is only applicable to projects where alternatives should be similar investment projects in terms of generation capacity.”</i> As a result Option III is selected by the project proponents.	OK	OK
4.1.9. Has the below guideline followed for sub-step 2b Option I. Apply simple cost analysis? Document the costs associated with the CDM project activity and the alternatives identified in Step1 and demonstrate that there is at least one alternative, which is less costly than the project activity.	EB 39	Ann 10	Simple cost analysis is not used, hence the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
4.1.10. Has the below guideline followed for sub-step 2b Option II. Apply investment comparison analysis? Identify the financial indicator, such as IRR, NPV, cost benefit ratio, or unit cost of service most suitable for the project type and decision-making context. Please specify	EB 39	Ann 10	The financial indicator is identified under Sub-Step 2b as Project IRR.	OK	OK
4.1.11. Has the most suitable benchmark for the project been determined in Sub-step 2b?	EB 39	Ann 10	In the financial analysis Project IRR is calculated. In PDD, it this figure is compared	CAR15	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			by Eurobond rate but in fact WACC should be calculated and compared by the Project IRR. Please clarify / correct		
			In PDD Eurobond rate is compared by the Capital on employed. On the other hand, it is stated that expected IRR for renewable projects is 10%.  First of all, WACC result must be used to compare the Project IRR result. Or, equity IRR can be compared by the figure that is calculated by CAPM.  10% of expectation is not a verified statement.	<b>CL42</b>	<b>OK</b>
			In subsection 2.c.-Section B.5 of PDD version 1.1., it has been stated that acceptable IRR values for similar projects in Turkey are announced as at least 10% for renewable projects which will benefit from the loans by World Bank. The reference given ( <a href="http://www.temev.org.tr/duyurularS">http://www.temev.org.tr/duyurularS</a> ) could not be reached.	<b>CL8</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.1.12. Has the below guideline followed for Sub-step 2c: Calculation and comparison of financial indicators (only applicable to Options II and III)?	EB 39	Ann 10			
4.1.12.1. Calculate the suitable financial indicator for the proposed CDM project activity and, in the case of Option II above, for the other	EB 39	Ann 10	The IRR value which has been considered as as the suitable financial indicator has been calculated by the main financial parameters	<b>CL39</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
alternatives. Include all relevant costs (including, for example, the investment cost, the operations and maintenance costs), and revenues (excluding CER revenues, but possibly including inter alia subsidies/fiscal incentives, ODA, etc, where applicable), and, as appropriate, non-market cost and benefits in the case of public investors if this is standard practice for the selection of public investments in the host country.			given in Table 5 of the PD form04_v03_2_v2(16072010). Please check whether the sum of Interest in "Loans Summary" sheet is the sum of the Interest figures in "Commercial Loan" and "ECA Loan" sheets.		
4.1.12.2. Present the investment analysis in a transparent manner and provide all the relevant assumptions, preferably in the CDM-PDD, or in separate annexes to the CDM-PDD.	EB 39	Ann 10	In general, the investment analysis is presented in a transparent manner.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.1.12.3. Justify and/or cite assumptions.	EB 39	Ann 10	Please justify the costs in the investment analysis table.	<b>CL44</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.1.12.4. In calculating the financial/economic indicator, the project's risks can be included through the cash flow pattern, subject to project-specific expectations and assumptions.	EB 39	Ann 10	There is no project risk specific to this project that may be applied to the cash flow pattern.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.1.12.5. Assumptions and input data for the investment analysis shall not differ across the project activity and its alternatives, unless differences can be well substantiated.	EB 39	Ann 10	The project uses benchmark analysis, hence the checklist question is N/A.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.1.12.6. Present in the CDM-PDD a clear comparison of the financial indicator for the proposed CDM activity. Please specify details	EB 39	Ann 10	The PDD includes a table showing the calculated Equity IRR of the proposed project activity with VER and without VER revenues.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
for above.			After the table, a clear comparison is made between the calculated IRR and the benchmark value. The Project IRR is lower than the benchmark rate.		
4.1.12.7. Is the period of assessment limited to the proposed crediting period of the CDM project activity?	EB 41	Ann 45	In the IRR calculation sheet the period of assessment is taken as 20 years as per the guidance given in the methodology.	OK	OK
4.1.12.8. Does the project IRR and equity IRR calculations reflect the period of expected operation of the underlying project activity (technical lifetime), or - if a shorter period is chosen - include the fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period?	EB 41	Ann 45	Analysis period is chosen as 20 year and since depreciation period is taken as 10 years and there is no asset to be depreciated that means, fair value of assets is "0". 10 year is used to find the depreciation amounts for the investment as a whole. However, depreciation periods should be different in different asset classes. Please apply the Turkish Accounting Rules for the depreciation calculations. After this is applied, asset wouldn't be totally depreciated so fair value would be required	CL40	OK
4.1.12.9. Does the IRR calculation include the cost of major maintenance and/or rehabilitation if these are expected to be incurred during the period of assessment?	EB 41	Ann 45	The period of assessment is 20 years, there is no major rehabilitation and maintenance required during the period of assessment. The periodic maintenance expenses are included in the operating expenses.	OK	OK
4.1.12.10. Do the project participants justify the appropriateness of the period of assessment in	EB 41	Ann 45	20 years is acceptable since the technical life time of the project is also presented as 20	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the context of the underlying project activity, without reference to the proposed CDM crediting period?			years as supplied by the turbine manufacturer.		
4.1.12.11. Does the cash flow in the final year include a fair value of the project activity assets at the end of the assessment period?	EB 41	Ann 45	Analysis period is chosen as 20 year and since depreciation period is taken as 10 years and there is no asset to be depreciated that means, fair value of assets is "0". 10 year is used to find the depreciation amounts for the investment as a whole. However, depreciation periods should be different in different asset classes. Please apply the Turkish Accounting Rules for the depreciation calculations. After this is applied, asset wouldn't be totally depreciated so fair value would be required.	<b>CL40</b>	<b>OK</b>
			Depreciation should be added back to the cash flow in the IRR on capital employed as well.	<b>CL41</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.1.13. Has the below guideline followed for Sub-step 2d: Sensitivity analysis (only applicable to Options II and III)? Include a sensitivity analysis that shows whether the conclusion regarding the financial/economic attractiveness is robust to reasonable variations in the critical assumptions.	EB 39	Ann 10	Investment cost, electricity prices and production amount are taken into consideration in the sensitivity analysis. Moreover, Carbon price is also considered. There are significant changes in the equity IRR results among the scenarios.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
			-10% - +10% change in the parameters are enough to show the significant variations. Sensitivity analysis should be run for the carbon excluded scenario as well.	<b>CL43</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.1.14. Has the outcome of Step 2 clearly mentioned with justification?	EB 39	Ann 10	In the PDD the outcome of Step 2 is given as follows: <i>"Hence, the above figures have demonstrated that the project activity is not the most economically or financially attractive alternative."</i>	OK	OK
4.1.15. Have the barrier analysis been conducted?	EB 39	Ann 10	Yes, the barrier analysis has been conducted. Please see checklist question 4.5.2 for the details.	OK	OK
4.1.16. In step 4: Common practice analysis has all the sub-steps as below followed?	EB 39	Ann 10			
4.1.16.1. Has the below guideline followed for Sub-step 4a: Analyze other activities similar to the proposed project activity? Provide an analysis of any other activities that are operational and that are similar to the proposed project activity. Other CDM project activities are not to be included in this analysis. Provide documented evidence and, where relevant, quantitative information. On the basis of that analysis, describe whether and to which extent similar activities have already diffused in the relevant region.	EB 39	Ann 10	Other activities that are similar to the project activity have been discussed in the PDD version 1.1. The data used has been referred to governmental statistics ( TEIAS); hence the approach has been accepted by the validation team.	OK	OK
4.1.16.2. Has the below guideline followed for Sub-step 4b: Discuss any similar Options that are	EB 39	Ann 10	It has been stated that the majority of energy investment is done by the Government and the private the sector prefers to invest in the	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
occurring?			thermal power plants. It has also been stated that the increase in the share of wind power plants are due to the Voluntary Carbon Market.		
4.1.17. Has the outcome from Step 4 clearly mentioned in PDD?	EB 39	Ann 10	Under sub-step 4b, it is stated as follows: "Following the guidelines in <i>"The tool for the demonstration and assessment of additionality"</i> , there are no "similar" activities that are occurring as all projects are not comparable to the project activity in terms of scale. Further, the project under operation being closest the project capacity amongst those listed are 7, 9 and 10 have all been implemented after taking Carbon Revenues into consideration. Thus the project activity is not a common practice in the region._	OK	OK
4.2. Prior consideration of the clean development mechanism					
4.2.1. Is the project activity start date prior to the date of publication of the PDD for stakeholder comments?	VVM	98	It was stated that VER revenue was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. 03.06.2008 dated board decision has been seen by the validation team Please clarify the date for the main stakeholder consultation and the start date of the project	CL23	OK
4.2.2. If yes, were the CDM benefits considered necessary in the decision to undertake the project as a proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	98	It was stated that VER revenue was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. 03.06.2008 dated board decision has been seen by the validation team Please clarify the date for the main stakeholder	CL23	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			consultation and the start date of the project		
4.2.3. Is the start date of the project activity, reported in the PDD, in accordance with the "Glossary of CDM terms", which states that "The starting date of a CDM project activity is the earliest date at which either the implementation or construction or real action of a project activity begins"?	VVM	99	It was stated that VER revenue was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. 03.06.2008 dated board decision has been seen by the validation team Please clarify the date for the main stakeholder consultation and the start date of the project	<b>CL23</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.2.4. Does the project activity require construction, retrofit or other modifications?	VVM	99	The project activity requires construction of a WPP	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.2.5. Is it ensured that the date of commissioning cannot be considered as the project activity start date?	VVM	99	As the project activity requires construction, the date of commissioning can not be considered as the project activity start date.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.2.6. Is it a new project activity (project activities with starting date on or after 02 August 2008) or an existing project activity (project activities with a start date before 02 August 2008)?	VVM	100	The project activity is a new project activity with start date after August 2008.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.2.7. For a new project, for which PDD has not been published for global stakeholder consultation or a new methodology proposed to the Executive Board before the project activity start date, had the PP informed the Host Party DNA and/or the UNFCCC secretariat in writing of the commencement of the project activity and of their intention to seek CDM status?	VVM	101	The PDD of the proposed project activity is published for stakeholder consultation however	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.2.8. For an existing project activity, for which the start date is prior to the date of publication of the PDD for global stakeholder consultation, are the	VVM	102			

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
following evidences provided:					
4.2.8.1. Evidence that must indicate that 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,	VVM	102	Since the project is the installation of a new WPP this checklist question is N/A	OK	OK
4.2.8.2. Reliable evidence from project participants that must indicate that continuing and real actions were taken to secure CDM status for the project in parallel with its implementation	VVM	102	Since the project is the installation of a new WPP this checklist question is N/A	OK	OK
<b>4.3. Identification of alternatives</b>					
4.3.1. Does the approved methodology that is selected by the proposed CDM project activity prescribe the baseline scenario and hence no further analysis is required?	VVM	105	The applied methodology prescribes the baseline scenario; hence no further analysis is required.	OK	OK
4.3.2. If no, does the PDD identify credible alternatives to the project activity in order to determine the most realistic baseline scenario?	VVM	105	N/A	OK	OK
4.3.3. Does the list of alternatives given in the PDD ensure that: - One of the options that the project activity is undertaken without being registered as a proposed CDM project activity - The list contains all plausible alternatives - The alternatives comply with all applicable and enforced legislation	VVM	106	N/A	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>4.4. Investment analysis</b>					
4.4.1. If investment analysis has been used to demonstrate the additionality of the proposed CDM project activity, does the PDD provide evidence that the proposed CDM project activity would not be:	VVM	108			
4.4.1.1. The most economically or financially attractive alternative?	VVM	108	The project uses benchmark analysis, therefore the checklist question is N/A.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.4.1.2. Economically or financially feasible, without the revenue from the sale of certified emission reductions (CERs)?	VVM	108	The PDD provides evidence that the proposed project activity is not economically feasible without the VER revenues through the use of benchmark comparison analysis.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.4.2. Was this shown by one of the following approaches?	VVM	109			
4.4.2.1. Demonstrate that the proposed CDM project activity would produce no financial or economic benefits other than CDM-related income.	VVM	109	The project uses benchmark analysis, therefore the checklist question is N/A.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.4.2.2.			<b>The investment decision date has been indicated as 03.06.08. However all the proofs for the investment costs are purchase agreements which are later than the investment decision date. However the proofs supplied should be basic to the investment decision. Please calfiy and revise if needed.</b>	<b>CL46</b>	

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
4.4.2.3. The proposed CDM project activity is less economically or financially attractive than at least one other credible and realistic alternative.	VVM	109	The project uses benchmark analysis, therefore the checklist question is N/A.	OK	OK
4.4.2.4. The financial returns of the proposed CDM project activity would be insufficient to justify the required investment.	VVM	109	It is shown in the PDD version 1.1 that the financial returns of the proposed GS project activity would be insufficient to justify the required investment.	OK	OK
4.4.3. Was a thorough assessment of all parameters and assumptions used in calculating the relevant financial indicator, and determine the accuracy and suitability of these parameters using the available evidence and expertise in relevant accounting practices conducted?	VVM	111	Analysis period is chosen as 20 year and since depreciation period is taken as 10 years and there is no asset to be depreciated that means, fair value of assets is "0".  10 year is used to find the depreciation amounts for the investment as a whole. However, depreciation periods should be different in different asset classes. Please apply the Turkish Accounting Rules for the depreciation calculations. After this is applied, asset wouldn't be totally depreciated so fair value would be required	CL40	OK
4.4.4. Was the sensitivity analysis by the project participants to determine under what conditions variations in the result would occur and the likelihood of these conditions assessed?	VVM	111	A sensitivity analysis is applied to determine under which conditions variations in the results would occur and the likelihood of the occurrence of these conditions are assessed.	OK	OK
			Sensitivity analysis should be run for the carbon excluded scenario as well.	CL43	OK
4.4.5. To determine this, was it assessed whether it is reasonable to assume that no investment would	VVM	112	Please clarify it is reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of	CL45	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>be made at a rate of return lower than the benchmark by:</p> <p>a. Assessing previous investment decisions by the project participants involved, and</p> <p>b. Determining whether the same benchmark has been applied, or</p> <p>c. Determining if there are verifiable circumstances that have led to a change in the benchmark</p>			return lower than the benchmark by assessing the previous investment decisions.		
4.4.6. Did the project participants rely on values from Feasibility Study Reports (FSR) that are approved by national authorities for proposed project activities?	VVM	113	The project participants did not rely on values from the Feasibility Study Report that are approved by national authorities for proposed project activities.	OK	OK
<b>4.4.7. If yes: (EB38 para.54)</b>	VVM	113			
4.4.7.1. Has the FSR been the basis of the decision to proceed with the investment in the project, i.e. that the period of time between the finalization of the FSR and the investment decision is sufficiently short for the DOE to confirm that it is unlikely in the context of the underlying project activity that the input values would have materially changed?	VVM	113	N/A	OK	OK
4.4.7.2. Are the values used in the PDD and associated annexes fully consistent with the FSR? If not, was the appropriateness of the values validated?	VVM	113	N/A	OK	OK
4.4.7.3. On the basis of its specific local and sectoral	VVM	113	N/A	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
expertise, is confirmation provided, by cross-checking or other appropriate manner, that the input values from the FSR are valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision?					
<b>4.5. Barrier analysis</b>					
4.5.1. Has barrier analysis been used to demonstrate the additionality of the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	115	Barrier analysis has been used to demonstrate the additionality of the proposed project activity.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.5.2. If yes, does the PDD demonstrate that the proposed CDM project activity faces barriers that: a. Prevent the implementation of this type of proposed CDM project activity? b. Do not prevent the implementation of at least one of the alternatives?	VVM	115	In clause (b) Lack of infrastructure - Technological Barriers of Substep 3-b/Step 3 /section B.5. of the PDD rev 1.1.; it has been stated that TEİAŞ has limited the capacity of the wind power to 5% of the short circuit capacity of the high voltage transmission line into which wind power is fed. Also it has been stated that many projects with high potential capacity (and therefore lower costs per installed MW) cannot be realised as the capacity is limited by the capacity of transmission line to the grid. Please justify the assumption. Please supply an appropriate proof that the barrier is strong enough to prevent the project from occurring. Please also justify how the carbon credit will benefit the barrier.	<b>CL10</b>	<b>OK</b>
			In PDD version 1.1. -Section B.5 Subsection 3. a.; the investment barriers are;	<b>CL9</b>	<b>OK</b>

VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p>“Payback Period and Usage: In general, wind farm investment costs are about 40% higher than those of a comparable coal-fired power plant, in terms of cost per unit of installed capacity (\$/MWh). Furthermore, the utilisation hours of wind farms are about one third of those of a coal-fired power plant. Therefore, the high initial investment cost leads to a longer payback period and a higher investment risk on project financing compared to more conventional fossil-fired power plants that constitute the majority of the baseline.</p> <p>Higher Proportional Interconnection Fees: The annual fee for the usage of the interconnection line is determined in accordance with the established capacity of the power plant by TEİAŞ. However, conventional power plants tend to utilise 80-85% of their established capacity whereas wind power plants only utilise 30-45%. This means a thermal power plant and wind power plant with the same established capacity will pay the same annual fee but the wind power plant will produce significantly less electricity and therefore the</p>		

\* [www.bwea.com/energy/rely.html](http://www.bwea.com/energy/rely.html)

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			fee will be a higher proportion of annual revenues.” <u>The given barriers above are related with finance. Please clarify.</u>		
			In outcome step 3b; it has been stated that the barriers analysed don't prevent the baseline alternative from implementation because government policies support nuclear energy development and and private investment is minimal. Please provide documented evidence that alternatives ( one of the alternative) are prevented or nor prevented by the barriers	<b>CL22</b>	<b>OK</b>
<b>4.6. Common practice analysis</b>					
4.6.1. Is this a large-scale or first-of-its kind small-scale project activity?	VVM	119	The proposed project activity is a large scale project activity.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.6.2. Was common practice analysis carried out as a credibility check of the other available evidence used by the project participants to demonstrate additionality?	VVM	119	Common practice analysis was carried out as a credibility check of the other available evidence used by the project participants to demonstrate additionality.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
4.6.3. Was it assessed whether the geographical scope (e.g. defined region) of the common practice analysis is appropriate for the assessment of common practice related to the project activity's technology or industry type? (For certain	VVM	120	The geographical scope of the common practice analysis is assessed to be appropriate by the validation team.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>

\* The speech of Mr. Ü. Tolga Bilgin, chairman of RESSIAD, in 6<sup>th</sup> Energy Arena on March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2007 in İstanbul Continental Hotel about the Problems of Renewable Energy (<http://www.ressiad.org.tr/makaleler.php?ID=62>)

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
technologies the relevant region for assessment will be local and for others it may be trans-national /global.)					
4.6.4. Was a region other than the entire host country chosen?	VVM	120	The common practice analysis is applied both for the region and for the entire host country.	OK	OK
4.6.5. If yes, was the explanation why this region is more appropriate assessed?	VVM	120	The analysis is applied both for the region and the entire host country.	OK	OK
4.6.6. Using official sources and local and industry expertise, was it determined to what extent similar and operational projects (e.g., using similar technology or practice), other than CDM project activities, and have been undertaken in the defined region?	VVM	120	To what extent similar and operational projects have been undertaken in the region is determined using the official data from the websites of TEIAS and EPDK which are the only reliable sources in the host country. These data was also cross checked from these websites.	OK	OK
4.6.7. Are similar and operational projects, other than CDM project activities, already "widely observed and commonly carried out" in the defined region?	VVM	120	There are no similar and operational projects other than CDM project activities, already observed and commonly carried out in the region s stated in the PDD.	OK	OK
4.6.8. If yes, was it assessed whether there are essential distinctions between the proposed CDM project activity and the other similar activities?	VVM	120	N/A	OK	OK
<b>5. Monitoring plan</b>					
5.1. Is this monitoring plan based on the approved monitoring methodology applied to the proposed CDM project activity?	VVM	122	The monitoring plan is based on the "Approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology ACM0002"	OK	OK
5.2. Does the monitoring plan contain all necessary	VVM	123	The monitoring plan requires monitoring of	OK	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
parameters?			increased electricity generation from proposed project activity Ex-ante option has been used for the calculations. In accordance; the methodology does not require monitoring of data needed to recalculate the operating margin emission factor		
5.3. Are the monitoring arrangements described in the monitoring plan feasible within the project design?	VVM	123	The parameter EGy has been defined as amount of net electricity supplied to the grid by the proposed project according to ACM002 version 8. Please clarify "the source of data" in line with the requirements of the ACM002 version 8.	<b>CL13</b>	<b>OK</b>
			It has been stated that in section B.7.2 in PDD ver 1.1. that the sustainable development indicators will not be monitored. However the sustainability monitoring plan has been included in the passport. Please clarify.	<b>CL14</b>	<b>OK</b>
			The responsibilities for institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving have been given in section B.7.2. of the PDD REV 1. However, please clarify the responsibility within the company for reading the records and comparing with the invoices The PMUM (TEIAS) Market Balancing Center pricing and monitoring system has been changed as of 1.12.2009. Please clarify if there	<b>CL15</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			will be any changes in the QA/QC plans. Please clarify how the electronic and the hardy copy files/ protocols will be kept.		
5.4.			The QA QC procedures such as accuracy of the meters, the back up meters, archiving of the documents are not given in PDD version 2.6. It is stated that incompletely that “The data collection, preparation of the monitoring report, and the QA/QC procedures that are going to be applied are detailed in”. Please clarify.	<b>CL47</b>	
5.5. Are the means of implementation of the monitoring plan sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by/resulting from the proposed CDM project activity can be reported ex post and verified?	VVM	123	The means of implementation of the monitoring plan is sufficient to ensure that the emission reductions achieved by the proposed VER project activity can be reported and verified.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
<b>6. Sustainable development</b>					
6.1. Does the CDM project activity assists Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention in achieving sustainable development?	VVM	125	The project activity is a voluntary emission reduction project which is developed under Gold Standard, hence the checklist question is N/A.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
6.2. 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?	VVM	126	The project activity is a voluntary emission reduction project which is developed under Gold Standard, hence the checklist question is N/A.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
<b>7. Local stakeholder consultation</b>					

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
7.1. Were local stakeholders (public, including individuals, groups or communities affected, of likely to be affected, by the proposed CDM project activity or actions leading to the implementation of such an activity) invited by the PPs to comment on the proposed CDM project activity prior to the publication of the PDD on the UNFCCC website?	VVM	128	Two separate Stakeholder Consultation Meetings for Soma Wind Power Plant have been held on 10. November. 2008 at 10:30 in Gökçukur Village and at 15:30 in Hecizköy Village. All the stakeholders including central and local governmental agencies, local NGOs and GS endorsed NGOs were invited by faxes and emails. The mukhtars of the villages (Gökçukur and Hamidiye in Kırkağaç; Kızılören, Kozluören, Hecizköy, Beyçe and Göктаş in Soma) effected were visited and invited to the meeting before. The meeting date and place was announced in a local (Soma Kurtuluş, published on 7 <sup>th</sup> of November, at year 4;issue1120) and a nationwide newspaper (Posta, published on 6 <sup>th</sup> of November 2008 all over Turkey).	OK	OK
7.2. Have comments by local stakeholders that can reasonably be considered relevant for the proposed CDM project activity been invited?	VVM	129	Please clarify how the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation have been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round ( especially for those who do not have internet access)	CL34	OK
7.3. Is the summary of the comments received as provided in the PDD complete?	VVM	129	The summary of comments has been included in the PDD.	OK	OK
7.4. Have the project participants taken due account of any comments received and described this process in the PDD?	VVM	129	It is stated under section E.3 of the PDD as follows: <i>"The outcome of the meeting and the postings on the internet were evaluated by the Ministry</i>	CL17	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			<p><i>of Environment and Forestry between April 20 and April 27, 2009. The EIA and the related stakeholders meeting were approved and the subject approval was announced in the project area through postings in official buildings. The announcement for the project EIA approval is attached.”</i></p> <p>However, the above statement does not give information on how due account is taken of comments received and also does not give any information about the comments received. Please clarify.</p>		
<b>8. Environmental impacts</b>					
8.1. Have the project participants submitted documentation on the analysis of the environmental impacts of the project activity?	VVM	131	<p>The domestic laws and regulations in Turkey do not require an Environmental Impact Analysis for wind power plants.</p> <p>The environmental impacts have been analysed in the GOLD Standard Passport as Gold Standard version 2.1. requirements.</p>	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
8.2. Have the project participants undertaken an analysis of environmental impacts?	VVM	132	<p>The environmental impacts have been analysed in the GOLD Standard Passport as Gold Standard version 2.1. requirements.</p>	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
8.3. Does the host Party require an environmental impact assessment?	VVM	132	<p>The domestic laws and regulations in Turkey do not require an Environmental Impact Analysis for wind power projects.</p>	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
8.4. If yes, have the environmental impact assessment	VVM	132	N/A	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>



Report No: TURKEY-val/800.08.C71-2008/2011.rev04

VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	§	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
approved by local government?					

**TABLE 2 VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS BASED ON THE GOLD STANDARD PASSPORT REQUIREMENTS (VERSION 02.1)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>A. Project Title</b>					
a. Is the Project title given in the Passport the same as in the PDD?	T-1.6		The project title given in the passport is Soma Wind Power Plant. The title is the same given in the PDD.	OK	OK
<b>B. Project Description</b>					
a. Is the Project description given in the Passport consistent with the one given in the PDD?	T-1.6		The project description given in the passport is consistent with the one given in the PDD.	OK	OK
b. Has the estimated start date of construction been given under the Project description?	Annex R		The estimated date of construction has been given as August 2009 in the PDD version 01. Hence it is accepted. The estimated period for construction is expected to be 24 months. ▪ Please supply a proof for validation of the estimated construction period.	CL24	OK
<b>C. Proof of project eligibility</b>					
<b>C.1. Scale of Project</b>					
a. Has the scale of the Project activity been defined as per Gold Standard Toolkit Section 1.2.?	T-1.2		The project is defined as a large scale project in the Passport.	OK	OK
b. Does the project proponent have a written statement (e.g. in the PDD) against de-bundling of the project? (De-bundling of small and large-scale	T-3.5.1		Please clarify if the project is a debundled project and include a written statement in the PDD.	CL25	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
projects to create micro-scale projects is not allowed.					
<b>C.2. Host Country</b>					
a. Does the host country have cap on its GHG emissions?	T-1.2.2		The host country, Turkey does not have a cap on GHG gasses.	OK	OK
b. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided an official approval from the relevant local authorities stating that an equivalent amount of allowances will be retired to back-up the GS VERs issued?	T-1.2.2		N/A	OK	OK
c. If the host country does not have a cap on its GHG emissions, has it been stated in the Passport?	T-1.2.2		It has been in section C.2. of the passport that Turkey dose not have a quantative reduction target under the Kyoto Protocol	OK	OK
<b>C.3. Project Type</b>					
d. Is the Project a Renewable Energy Supply Project or an End-use Energy Efficiency Improvement Project? (If not, the validation has to be aborted)	T-1.2.3		The project is renewable energy supply project.	OK	OK
e. Has the Project type and eligibility of the Project activity been defined as per Annex C of Gold Standard Toolkit?	T-1.2.3		Annex C of the Gold Standard Toolkit does not have a specific eligibility criteria for Wind Power Plants. Hence there is no specific explanation given in the passport under section C.3.	OK	OK
f. Has a previous announcement of the project going ahead without the revenues from carbon credits been made?	T-1.2.6		It has been stated in section C.3. of the passport that a previous announcement of has not been made.	OK	OK
g. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the project subsequently been cancelled or the design has been significantly revised?	T-1.2.6		N/A	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
h. If the answer to question © is no, have the Project Proponents provided a pre-announcement statement under section C.3 in the Gold Standard Passport, attesting that no such previous announcement has been made?	T-1.2.6		It has been stated in section C.3. of the passport that a previous announcement of has not been made.	OK	OK
<b>C.4. Greenhouse Gas</b>					
a. Does the project reduce emissions of one or more of the following an GHG? Carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide?	T-1.2.4		The project reduces Carbon dioxide gasses as indicated under section C.4. of the PDD	OK	OK
<b>C.5. Project registration type</b>					
a. Does the project apply the correct project cycle (regular vs. pre-feasibility assessment)?	T-3.5.1		The project applies the regular project cycle	OK	OK
b. Is the Project activity a regular registration?	T-1.2.6		The project has been estimated to start in August 2009. Please supply the date of registration/ application to the GS to clarify if the project activity is a regular registration.	CL26	OK
c. Is the Project activity a retroactive registration?	T-1.2.6		See C.5.B.	OK	OK
d. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the Project proponents applied to the Gold Standard for the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-1.2.6		See C.5.B.	OK	OK
e. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided the Gold Standard pre-feasibility assessment feedback to the DOE?	T-2.5		See C.5.B.	OK	OK
f. Does the Project activity need preliminary evaluation? (Large hydro or palm-oil related project as defined in Annex C of the Toolkit)	T-2.5		The project is large scale wind power plant project. Hence there is no need for preliminary evaluation.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
g. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the Project proponents applied to the Gold Standard for the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
h. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided the Gold Standard pre-feasibility assessment feedback to the DOE?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
i. Has the Project activity been rejected by UNFCCC?	T-2.5		Turkey can not benefit from the CDM projects under UNFCCC at the date of validation since the deliberation has been ongoing. Since the checklist question is N/A	OK	OK
j. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the Project proponents applied to the Gold Standard for the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
k. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided the Gold Standard pre-feasibility assessment feedback to the DOE?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
l. Are there any double counting occurring with other certification schemes?	T-3.5.1		There is no double counting occurring with other certification schemes.	OK	OK
<b>D. Unique project identification</b>					
<b>D.1. GPS-coordinates of Project location</b>					
a. Has the Project proponent stated the exact GPS coordinates of Project location for point source activities and the boundaries for projects spread over a broader area?	T-1.6		The coordinates of the project location has been indicated in D.1 of the GS passport.	OK	OK
b. For Programme of Activity projects have the Project Proponent explained the reasoning behind	T-1.6		The proposed project is not under programme of activity hence the checklist	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the definition of the project location and coordinates carefully?			question is N/A		
<b>D.2. Map</b>					
a. Have the coordinates been illustrated with a map? (Optional)	T-1.6		The coordinates of each turbine has been illustrated on the map in the PDD version 1.1. Hence it is accepted by the DOE.	OK	OK
<b>E. Outcome stakeholder consultation process</b>					
<b>E.1. Assessment of stakeholder comments</b>					
a. Has the Project proponent inserted the "Table ii-Assessment of Stakeholder Comments" which was given under section B5 of the Stakeholder Consultation Report?	Annex R, E.1		Table ii-Assessment of Stakeholder Comments" has been inserted in section E of the passport.	OK	OK
b. Has the Project proponent given a summary of alterations based on stakeholders comments?	Annex R, E.1		The project proponent has given a summary of alterations based on stakeholders comments	OK	OK
c. Has an invitation tracking table been filled out?	T-3.5.1		The invitation tracking table has been filled.	OK	OK
d. Are copies of invitations published/sent out available?	T-3.5.1		Please supply the invitation mails/faxes sent for stakeholder consultation meeting. Please also clarify if the invitations / non technical summary of the project were also announced in the public places. Please also clarify how participation of different genders have been compiled.	CL27	OK
e. Has a non-technical summary in local language been included in the Local Stakeholder Consultation report, as well as an English	T-3.5.1		A non technical summary in local language has not been included in the consultation report.	CL28	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
summary?			Please also clarify if the non technical summary has been communicated to the stakeholders during the invitation process.		
f. Is a participant list presented?	T-3.5.1		List of participants have been presented in B.3. of the stake holder consultation report. Participants to the meeting are male except the representatives of the Pioneer Carbon. Please clarify how the potential participants have been invited actively to the meeting and what action has been taken to include the views of different genders to the stakeholder consultation process.	CL29	OK
g. Are stakeholder evaluation forms available?	T-3.5.1		Stakeholder evaluation forms are available in the LSC Report.	OK	OK
h. Are minutes of the meeting(s) available?	T-3.5.1		Minutes of meeting has been included in the LSC Report.	OK	OK
i. Has due account been made on comments received?	T-3.5.1		Comments received and the responses have been documented in the stakeholder consultation report.	OK	OK
j. If stakeholders required a revisit fo the sustainable development assessment, has this been done?	T-3.5.1		Please clarify If stakeholders required a revisit fo the sustainable development assessment.	CL30	OK
k. Is the consolidated sustainable development matrix presented based on own 'preliminary' scoring and the matrix from the outcome of the blind stakeholder exercise.	T-3.5.1		The consolidated sustainable development matrix presented based on own 'preliminary' scoring and the matrix from the outcome of the blind stakeholder exercise.	CL31	OK
l. Were comments accepted and received by email or other means actually considered?	T-3.5.1		Please clarify if there are any comments received by e-mail or other means	CL32	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			concerning the stakeholder consultation process.		
<b><i>E.2. Stakeholder Feedback Round (Can be performed in parallel to the validation process)</i></b>					
a. Has the Project proponent organized a stakeholder feedback round to give feedback to the stakeholders on how their comments have been taken into account?	T-2.11		The stakeholder feedback round has not been implemented at the date of validation. The approach for the stakeholder feedback round has been summarized in section E.2 of the passport. The results will be followed after the stakeholder feedback round has been completed. Please supply the stakeholder feedback round results.	<b>CL33</b>	<b>OK</b>
b. Did the stakeholder feedback round include a physical meeting? (optional)	T-2.11		The approach for the stakeholder feedback round does not include a physical meeting.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
c. Have all the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round?	T-2.11		Please clarify how the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation have been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round ( especially for those who do not have internet access)	<b>CL34</b>	<b>OK</b>
d. Have all of the following documents been made available to the public for a period of at least two months prior to completion of the validation: a. The Latest version of the complete PDD (including the EIA, if applicable); b. A non-technical summary of the project (in appropriate local language(s)); and English summary. c. The (revised) Passport	T-3.5.1		Please justify that the following documents been made available to the public for a period of at least two months prior to completion of the validation: The Latest version of the complete PDD (including the EIA, if applicable); A non-technical summary of the project (in appropriate local language(s)); and English summary.	<b>CL35</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>d. if applicable, supporting documentation such as an environmental impact assessment (EIA) (if available, in appropriate local language(s)); in the case of an EIA, at least a one-page English summary is required</p> <p>e. Additional, non-translated information must be made available as well and shall be translated to the local language upon any justified request of a stakeholder.</p>			<p>The (revised) Passport if applicable, supporting documentation such as an environmental impact assessment (EIA) (if available, in appropriate local language(s)); in the case of an EIA, at least a one-page English summary is required</p> <p>Additional, non-translated information must be made available as well and shall be translated to the local language upon any justified request of a stakeholder.</p>		
e. Did the Project proponent also prepare hard copies to be publicly displayed at local places like the post Office, municipality, etc?	T-2.11		The approach includes informing of villagers by faxing the report and the summary of PDD. However the approach does not include displaying the hard copies to local places. Please clarify	CL36	OK
f. If the Project is a retroactive Project, did the stakeholder feedback round include a site visit by the stakeholders participating in the process?	T-2.11		The project is not a retroactive project.	OK	OK
g. If the Project is a retroactive Project, did the Project proponent follow the guidance provided by the Gold Standard in the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-2.11		The project is not a retroactive project.	OK	OK
<p>h. Does the stakeholder feedback round report given in the Passport include the following information:</p> <p>a. How the feedback round was organized (A description of the procedure followed to invite comments, including addressing all the details of the oral hearing such as</p>	T-3.5.1		The stakeholder feedback round results have not been supplied.	CAR3	OK



VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
place, date, participants, language, local or national Gold Standard NGO supporters, etc.), b. What the outcomes of the feedback round are (All written or oral comments received.) c. How did the Project proponents followed up on the feedbacks. (The argumentation on whether or not comments are taken into account and the respective changes to the project design.)					
<b>F. Outcome Sustainability assessment</b>					
<b>F.1. 'Do no harm' Assessment</b>					
a. Has the Project proponents considered the critical issues for their Project type that are listed in Annex C of Gold Standard?	T-2.4.1		The wind power plants has no critical issues to be considered in Annex C of Gold Standard.	N/A	OK
b. Have the Project participants discussed all of the safeguarding principles with the stakeholders?	T-2.4.1		Do no harm assessment has not been filled in the passport. The following points could not be verified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the Project participants discussed all of the safeguarding principles with the stakeholders</li> <li>• Have the Project participants introduced mitigation measures for the safeguarding principles with a medium to high risk?</li> <li>• Does the 'Do No Harm' Assessment base on accurate information and have the reference sources been included</li> </ul>	CAR4	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
c. Have the Project participants introduced mitigation measures for the safeguarding principles with a medium to high risk?	T-2.4.1		The Mitigation measures have been introduced.	OK	OK
d. Does the 'Do No Harm' Assessment base on accurate information and have the reference sources been included?	T-3.5.1		The references are supplied.	OK	OK
<b>F.2. Sustainable Development matrix</b>					
a. Has the Sustainable Development Matrix table been inserted in the Passport?	Annex R, F.2		Sustainable development matrix has been included into the passport.	OK	OK
b. Has the project been scored on the following indicators?: a. Environmental b. Social c. Technological d. Economic	T-2.4.2		The project has been scored on environmental, social, technological and economic parameters.	OK	OK
c. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of each of the indicators been selected?	T-2.4.2		Indicators for the corresponding parameters have not been filled.	CAR5	OK
d. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for each parameter?	T-2.4.2		Baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for each parameter have not been defined in the passport.	CAR6	OK
e. Are the indicators connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T-2.4.2		Indicators are not linked to the localized MDGs.	CAR7	OK
f. Was the reason for choice of the parameters described?	T-2.4.2		The reason for the choice of parameters were not defined in the Passport	CAR8	OK
g. Have all of the indicators been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T-2.4.2		All the indicators have been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral'. However since the baseline for some parameters are	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			not described; the score for the indicators could not be assessed by the DOE. This checklist question will be assessed after the baseline for each parameter has been defined.		
h. If there are any 'negative' indicators, are there any mitigation measures for these indicators?	T-2.4.2		It has been stated that necessary precautions will be taken for species under conservation by international conventions for the biodiversity parameter. However; the mitigation and the monitoring measures have not been identified for the biodiversity parameter in section F.2. of the passport. Please clarify the mitigation and the monitoring measures and justify the choices and the data sources.	<b>CL37</b>	<b>OK</b>
i. Has the matrix been filled by the stakeholders during the Local Stakeholder Consultation?	T-2.4.2,		In the PDD version 1.1. it has been stated that the matrix been filled by the stakeholders during the Local Stakeholder Consultation. However Stakeholder consultation report has not been supplied to the DOE.	<b>CAR 9</b>	<b>OK</b>
j. Were there any negative scores during the stakeholder consultation?	T-2.4.2		In the PDD version 1.1. it has been stated that there were no negative scores during the stakeholder consultation however, However Stakeholder consultation report has not been supplied to the DOE.	<b>CAR10</b>	<b>OK</b>
k. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the sustainability assessment been revisited?	T-2.4.2		N/A	<b>N/A</b>	<b>OK</b>
l. Have the project indicators been classified in three	Annex		The project indicators have not been	<b>CAR11</b>	<b>OK</b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
categories namely "environment", "social development" and "economic and technological development" under the sustainable development matrix?	I		classified in three categories namely "environment", "social development" and "economic and technological development".		
m. Does the project contribute positively to least at two of the three categories and neutral to the third category?	T-2.4.2		The project contributes positively to the "environment", "social development" and "economic and technological development". However the conclusion will be realized after the CL on the scoring of the parameters will be concluded.	OK	OK
n. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information? (can include data from existing reports, results from stakeholder consultations, and experiences with similar projects in similar situations, etc. Where data are unavailable or are of poor quality, or severely outdated, independent opinions and expert judgments can also be used.)	T-3.5.1		The sustainability matrix is not based on the existing sources of information I a sufficient detail.	CAR12	OK
o. Are the data or expert opinions presented in a sufficient degree of detail and transparency?	T-3.5.1		The sustainability matrix is not based on the existing sources of information I a sufficient detail.	CAR12	OK
p. Are the data uncertainties clearly stated, if possible with associated margins of error?	T-3.5.1		Data uncertainties are clearly stated.	OK	OK
q. Is the scoring reproducible and verifiable?	T-3.5.1		This checklist question will be concluded after the F.2.A-P has been concluded.	OK	OK
r. Does the project demonstrate clear benefits in terms of sustainable development?	T-2.4.2		This checklist question will be concluded after the F.2.a-q has been concluded.	OK	OK
<b>G. Sustainability Monitoring Plan</b>					
a. Are the mitigation actions included in the	T-		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled .	CAR13	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring plan?	2.4.3				
b. Are all the non-neutral indicators included in the monitoring plan?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
c. Is the current status (or expected status under the baseline) of the parameters, the future status and the way they will be monitored described in the monitoring plan?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
d. Have the project proponents identified parameters that can be used to properly monitor each non-neutral Sustainable Development Indicator according Annex I of the Toolkit?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
e. Are chosen parameters relevant to the indicators?	T-3.5.1		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
f. Are these parameters planned to be monitored over the crediting period and on a recurrent basis?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
g. Are all mitigation measures put in place to prevent violation or the risk of violating a safeguarding principle of the 'Do No Harm' Assessment or to 'neutralize' a Sustainable Development Indicator included in the monitoring plan?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
h. Is the sustainability monitoring plan clear about who will monitor with what frequency?	T-3.5.1		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
i. Is the monitoring plan feasible?	T-3.5.1		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
<b>ANNEX 1 ODA declaration</b>					
e. Does the project receive ODA under the condition that the credits coming out of the project are transferred to the donor country?	T-3.5.1		The ODA declaration form has been supplied	OK	OK



Report No: TURKEY-val/800.08.C71-2008/2011.rev04

VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
f. Is a scanned copy of the Official Development Assistance Declaration statement signed by the project owner given in Annex 1?	Annex D		The ODA declaration gorm has not been included in the Annexex.	CAR14	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

**TABLE 3    LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>1. Legal requirements</b>					
1.1. Is the project activity environmentally licensed by the competent authority?	2	DR	Yes, the project activity is environmentally licensed by the competent authority. The project has EIA exemption letter.	OK	OK
1.2. Are the conditions of the environmental license being met?	2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.3 Are the conditions of the Designated National Authority being met?	2	DR	The host country does not have a DNA.	OK	OK





**TABLE 2 VALIDATION REQUIREMENTS BASED ON THE GOLD STANDARD PASSPORT REQUIREMENTS (VERSION 02.1)**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>H. Project Title</b>					
a. Is the Project title given in the Passport the same as in the PDD?	T-1.6		The project title given in the passport is Soma Wind Power Plant. The title is the same given in the PDD.	OK	OK
<b>I. Project Description</b>					
a. Is the Project description given in the Passport consistent with the one given in the PDD?	T-1.6		The project description given in the passport is consistent with the one given in the PDD.	OK	OK
b. Has the estimated start date of construction been given under the Project description?	Annex R		The estimated date of construction has been given as August 2009 in the PDD version 01. Hence it is accepted. The estimated period for construction is expected to be 24 months. ▪ Please supply a proof for validation of the estimated construction period.	CL24	OK
<b>J. Proof of project eligibility</b>					
<b>C.1. Scale of Project</b>					
a. Has the scale of the Project activity been defined as per Gold Standard Toolkit Section 1.2.?	T-1.2		The project is defined as a large scale project in the Passport.	OK	OK
b. Does the project proponent have a written statement (e.g. in the PDD) against de-bundling of the project? (De-bundling of small and large-scale	T-3.5.1		Please clarify if the project is a debundled project and include a written statement in the PDD.	CL25	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
projects to create micro-scale projects is not allowed.					
<b>C.2. Host Country</b>					
d. Does the host country have cap on its GHG emissions?	T-1.2.2		The host country, Turkey does not have a cap on GHG gasses.	OK	OK
e. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided an official approval from the relevant local authorities stating that an equivalent amount of allowances will be retired to back-up the GS VERs issued?	T-1.2.2		N/A	OK	OK
f. If the host country does not have a cap on its GHG emissions, has it been stated in the Passport?	T-1.2.2		It has been in section C.2. of the passport that Turkey dose not have a quantative reduction target under the Kyoto Protocol	OK	OK
<b>C.3. Project Type</b>					
i. Is the Project a Renewable Energy Supply Project or an End-use Energy Efficiency Improvement Project? (If not, the validation has to be aborted)	T-1.2.3		The project is renewable energy supply project.	OK	OK
j. Has the Project type and eligibility of the Project activity been defined as per Annex C of Gold Standard Toolkit?	T-1.2.3		Annex C of the Gold Standard Toolkit does not have a specific eligibility criteria for Wind Power Plants. Hence there is no specific explanation given in the passport under section C.3.	OK	OK
k. Has a previous announcement of the project going ahead without the revenues from carbon credits been made?	T-1.2.6		It has been stated in section C.3. of the passport that a previous announcement of has not been made.	OK	OK
l. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the project subsequently been cancelled or the design has been significantly revised?	T-1.2.6		N/A	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
m. If the answer to question © is no, have the Project Proponents provided a pre-announcement statement under section C.3 in the Gold Standard Passport, attesting that no such previous announcement has been made?	T-1.2.6		It has been stated in section C.3. of the passport that a previous announcement of has not been made.	OK	OK
<b>C.4. Greenhouse Gas</b>					
b. Does the project reduce emissions of one or more of the following an GHG? Carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide?	T-1.2.4		The project reduces Carbon dioxide gasses as indicated under section C.4. of the PDD	OK	OK
<b>C.5. Project registration type</b>					
m. Does the project apply the correct project cycle (regular vs. pre-feasibility assessment)?	T-3.5.1		The project applies the regular project cycle	OK	OK
n. Is the Project activity a regular registration?	T-1.2.6		The project has been estimated to start in August 2009. Please supply the date of registration/ application to the GS to clarify if the project activity is a regular registration.	CL26	OK
o. Is the Project activity a retroactive registration?	T-1.2.6		See C.5.B.	OK	OK
p. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the Project proponents applied to the Gold Standard for the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-1.2.6		See C.5.B.	OK	OK
q. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided the Gold Standard pre-feasibility assessment feedback to the DOE?	T-2.5		See C.5.B.	OK	OK
r. Does the Project activity need preliminary evaluation? (Large hydro or palm-oil related project as defined in Annex C of the Toolkit)	T-2.5		The project is large scale wind power plant project. Hence there is no need for preliminary evaluation.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
s. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the Project proponents applied to the Gold Standard for the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
t. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided the Gold Standard pre-feasibility assessment feedback to the DOE?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
u. Has the Project activity been rejected by UNFCCC?	T-2.5		Turkey can not benefit from the CDM projects under UNFCCC at the date of validation since the deliberation has been ongoing. Since the checklist question is N/A	OK	OK
v. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the Project proponents applied to the Gold Standard for the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
w. If the answer to the above question is yes, then has the Project proponent provided the Gold Standard pre-feasibility assessment feedback to the DOE?	T-2.5		N/A	OK	OK
x. Are there any double counting occurring with other certification schemes?	T-3.5.1		There is no double counting occurring with other certification schemes.	OK	OK
<b>K. Unique project identification</b>					
<b>D.1. GPS-coordinates of Project location</b>					
c. Has the Project proponent stated the exact GPS coordinates of Project location for point source activities and the boundaries for projects spread over a broader area?	T-1.6		The coordinates of the project location has been indicated in D.1 of the GS passport.	OK	OK
d. For Programme of Activity projects have the Project Proponent explained the reasoning behind	T-1.6		The proposed project is not under programme of activity hence the checklist	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
the definition of the project location and coordinates carefully?			question is N/A		
<b>D.2. Map</b>					
b. Have the coordinates been illustrated with a map? (Optional)	T-1.6		The coordinates of each turbine has been illustrated on the map in the PDD version 1.1. Hence it is accepted by the DOE.	OK	OK
<b>L. Outcome stakeholder consultation process</b>					
<b>E.1. Assessment of stakeholder comments</b>					
m. Has the Project proponent inserted the "Table ii-Assessment of Stakeholder Comments" which was given under section B5 of the Stakeholder Consultation Report?	Annex R, E.1		Table ii-Assessment of Stakeholder Comments" has been inserted in section E of the passport.	OK	OK
n. Has the Project proponent given a summary of alterations based on stakeholders comments?	Annex R, E.1		The project proponent has given a summary of alterations based on stakeholders comments	OK	OK
o. Has an invitation tracking table been filled out?	T-3.5.1		The invitation tracking table has been filled.	OK	OK
p. Are copies of invitations published/sent out available?	T-3.5.1		Please supply the invitation mails/faxes sent for stakeholder consultation meeting. Please also clarify if the invitations / non technical summary of the project were also announced in the public places. Please also clarify how participation of different genders have been compiled.	CL27	OK
q. Has a non-technical summary in local language been included in the Local Stakeholder Consultation report, as well as an English	T-3.5.1		A non technical summary in local language has not been included in the consultation report.	CL28	OK



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
summary?			Please also clarify if the non technical summary has been communicated to the stakeholders during the invitation process.		
r. Is a participant list presented?	T-3.5.1		List of participants have been presented in B.3. of the stake holder consultation report. Participants to the meeting are male except the representatives of the Pioneer Carbon. Please clarify how the potential participants have been invited actively to the meeting and what action has been taken to include the views of different genders to the stakeholder consultation process.	CL29	OK
s. Are stakeholder evaluation forms available?	T-3.5.1		Stakeholder evaluation forms are available in the LSC Report.	OK	OK
t. Are minutes of the meeting(s) available?	T-3.5.1		Minutes of meeting has been included in the LSC Report.	OK	OK
u. Has due account been made on comments received?	T-3.5.1		Comments received and the responses have been documented in the stakeholder consultation report.	OK	OK
v. If stakeholders required a revisit fo the sustainable development assessment, has this been done?	T-3.5.1		Please clarify If stakeholders required a revisit fo the sustainable development assessment.	CL30	OK
w. Is the consolidated sustainable development matrix presented based on own 'preliminary' scoring and the matrix from the outcome of the blind stakeholder exercise.	T-3.5.1		The consolidated sustainable development matrix presented based on own 'preliminary' scoring and the matrix from the outcome of the blind stakeholder exercise.	CL31	OK
x. Were comments accepted and received by email or other means actually considered?	T-3.5.1		Please clarify if there are any comments received by e-mail or other means	CL32	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			concerning the stakeholder consultation process.		
<b><i>E.2. Stakeholder Feedback Round (Can be performed in parallel to the validation process)</i></b>					
i. Has the Project proponent organized a stakeholder feedback round to give feedback to the stakeholders on how their comments have been taken into account?	T-2.11		The stakeholder feedback round has not been implemented at the date of validation. The approach for the stakeholder feedback round has been summarized in section E.2 of the passport. The results will be followed after the stakeholder feedback round has been completed. Please supply the stakeholder feedback round results.	<b>CL33</b>	<b>OK</b>
j. Did the stakeholder feedback round include a physical meeting? (optional)	T-2.11		The approach for the stakeholder feedback round does not include a physical meeting.	<b>OK</b>	<b>OK</b>
k. Have all the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round?	T-2.11		Please clarify how the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation have been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round ( especially for those who do not have internet access)	<b>CL34</b>	<b>OK</b>
l. Have all of the following documents been made available to the public for a period of at least two months prior to completion of the validation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Latest version of the complete PDD (including the EIA, if applicable);</li> <li>b. A non-technical summary of the project (in appropriate local language(s)); and English summary.</li> <li>c. The (revised) Passport</li> </ul>	T-3.5.1		Please justify that the following documents been made available to the public for a period of at least two months prior to completion of the validation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Latest version of the complete PDD (including the EIA, if applicable);</li> <li>A non-technical summary of the project (in appropriate local language(s)); and English summary.</li> </ul>	<b>CL35</b>	<b>OK</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<p>d. if applicable, supporting documentation such as an environmental impact assessment (EIA) (if available, in appropriate local language(s)); in the case of an EIA, at least a one-page English summary is required</p> <p>e. Additional, non-translated information must be made available as well and shall be translated to the local language upon any justified request of a stakeholder.</p>			<p>The (revised) Passport if applicable, supporting documentation such as an environmental impact assessment (EIA) (if available, in appropriate local language(s)); in the case of an EIA, at least a one-page English summary is required</p> <p>Additional, non-translated information must be made available as well and shall be translated to the local language upon any justified request of a stakeholder.</p>		
m. Did the Project proponent also prepare hard copies to be publicly displayed at local places like the post Office, municipality, etc?	T-2.11		The approach includes informing of villagers by faxing the report and the summary of PDD. However the approach does not include displaying the hard copies to local places. Please clarify	CL36	OK
n. If the Project is a retroactive Project, did the stakeholder feedback round include a site visit by the stakeholders participating in the process?	T-2.11		The project is not a retroactive project.	OK	OK
o. If the Project is a retroactive Project, did the Project proponent follow the guidance provided by the Gold Standard in the pre-feasibility assessment?	T-2.11		The project is not a retroactive project.	OK	OK
<p>p. Does the stakeholder feedback round report given in the Passport include the following information:</p> <p>a. How the feedback round was organized (A description of the procedure followed to invite comments, including addressing all the details of the oral hearing such as</p>	T-3.5.1		The stakeholder feedback round results have not been supplied.	CAR3	OK



VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
place, date, participants, language, local or national Gold Standard NGO supporters, etc.), b. What the outcomes of the feedback round are (All written or oral comments received.) c. How did the Project proponents followed up on the feedbacks. (The argumentation on whether or not comments are taken into account and the respective changes to the project design.)					
<b>M. Outcome Sustainability assessment</b>					
<b>F.1. 'Do no harm' Assessment</b>					
e. Has the Project proponents considered the critical issues for their Project type that are listed in Annex C of Gold Standard?	T-2.4.1		The wind power plants has no critical issues to be considered in Annex C of Gold Standard.	N/A	OK
f. Have the Project participants discussed all of the safeguarding principles with the stakeholders?	T-2.4.1		Do no harm assessment has not been filled in the passport. The following points could not be verified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the Project participants discussed all of the safeguarding principles with the stakeholders</li> <li>• Have the Project participants introduced mitigation measures for the safeguarding principles with a medium to high risk?</li> <li>• Does the 'Do No Harm' Assessment base on accurate information and have the reference sources been included</li> </ul>	CAR4	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
g. Have the Project participants introduced mitigation measures for the safeguarding principles with a medium to high risk?	T-2.4.1		The Mitigation measures have been introduced.	OK	OK
h. Does the 'Do No Harm' Assessment base on accurate information and have the reference sources been included?	T-3.5.1		The references are supplied.	OK	OK
<b>F.2. Sustainable Development matrix</b>					
s. Has the Sustainable Development Matrix table been inserted in the Passport?	Annex R, F.2		Sustainable development matrix has been included into the passport.	OK	OK
t. Has the project been scored on the following indicators?: a. Environmental b. Social c. Technological d. Economic	T-2.4.2		The project has been scored on environmental, social, technological and economic parameters.	OK	OK
u. Have the corresponding parameters to represent the status of each of the indicators been selected?	T-2.4.2		Indicators for the corresponding parameters have not been filled.	CAR5	OK
v. Is the baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for each parameter?	T-2.4.2		Baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for each parameter have not been defined in the passport.	CAR6	OK
w. Are the indicators connected to the localized MDG's (Milenium Development Goals) when possible?	T-2.4.2		Indicators are not linked to the localized MDGs.	CAR7	OK
x. Was the reason for choice of the parameters described?	T-2.4.2		The reason for the choice of parameters were not defined in the Passport	CAR8	OK
y. Have all of the indicators been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral' in comparison with the baseline situation?	T-2.4.2		All the indicators have been scored 'negative', 'positive' or 'neutral'. However since the baseline for some parameters are	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
			not described; the score for the indicators could not be assessed by the DOE. This checklist question will be assessed after the baseline for each parameter has been defined.		
z. If there are any 'negative' indicators, are there any mitigation measures for these indicators?	T-2.4.2		It has been stated that necessary precautions will be taken for species under conservation by international conventions for the biodiversity parameter. However; the mitigation and the monitoring measures have not been identified for the biodiversity parameter in section F.2. of the passport. Please clarify the mitigation and the monitoring measures and justify the choices and the data sources.	CL37	OK
aa. Has the matrix been filled by the stakeholders during the Local Stakeholder Consultation?	T-2.4.2,		In the PDD version 1.1. it has been stated that the matrix been filled by the stakeholders during the Local Stakeholder Consultation. However Stakeholder consultation report has not been supplied to the DOE.	CAR 9	OK
bb. Were there any negative scores during the stakeholder consultation?	T-2.4.2		In the PDD version 1.1. it has been stated that there were no negative scores during the stakeholder consultation however, However Stakeholder consultation report has not been supplied to the DOE.	CAR10	OK
cc. If the answer to the above question is yes, has the sustainability assessment been revisited?	T-2.4.2		N/A	N/A	OK
dd. Have the project indicators been classified in three	Annex		The project indicators have not been	CAR11	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
categories namely "environment", "social development" and "economic and technological development" under the sustainable development matrix?	I		classified in three categories namely "environment", "social development" and "economic and technological development".		
ee. Does the project contribute positively to least at two of the three categories and neutral to the third category?	T-2.4.2		The project contributes positively to the "environment", "social development" and "economic and technological development". However the conclusion will be realized after the CL on the scoring of the parameters will be concluded.	OK	OK
ff. Is the matrix based on existing sources of information? (can include data from existing reports, results from stakeholder consultations, and experiences with similar projects in similar situations, etc. Where data are unavailable or are of poor quality, or severely outdated, independent opinions and expert judgments can also be used.)	T-3.5.1		The sustainability matrix is not based on the existing sources of information I a sufficient detail.	CAR12	OK
gg. Are the data or expert opinions presented in a sufficient degree of detail and transparency?	T-3.5.1		The sustainability matrix is not based on the existing sources of information I a sufficient detail.	CAR12	OK
hh. Are the data uncertainties clearly stated, if possible with associated margins of error?	T-3.5.1		Data uncertainties are clearly stated.	OK	OK
ii. Is the scoring reproducible and verifiable?	T-3.5.1		This checklist question will be concluded after the F.2.A-P has been concluded.	OK	OK
jj. Does the project demonstrate clear benefits in terms of sustainable development?	T-2.4.2		This checklist question will be concluded after the F.2.a-q has been concluded.	OK	OK
<b>N. Sustainability Monitoring Plan</b>					
j. Are the mitigation actions included in the	T-		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled .	CAR13	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
monitoring plan?	2.4.3				
k. Are all the non-neutral indicators included in the monitoring plan?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
l. Is the current status (or expected status under the baseline) of the parameters, the future status and the way they will be monitored described in the monitoring plan?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
m. Have the project proponents identified parameters that can be used to properly monitor each non-neutral Sustainable Development Indicator according Annex I of the Toolkit?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
n. Are chosen parameters relevant to the indicators?	T-3.5.1		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
o. Are these parameters planned to be monitored over the crediting period and on a recurrent basis?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
p. Are all mitigation measures put in place to prevent violation or the risk of violating a safeguarding principle of the 'Do No Harm' Assessment or to 'neutralize' a Sustainable Development Indicator included in the monitoring plan?	T-2.4.3		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
q. Is the sustainability monitoring plan clear about who will monitor with what frequency?	T-3.5.1		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
r. Is the monitoring plan feasible?	T-3.5.1		Sustainability monitoring plan is not fulfilled	CAR13	OK
<b>ANNEX 1 ODA declaration</b>					
g. Does the project receive ODA under the condition that the credits coming out of the project are transferred to the donor country?	T-3.5.1		The ODA declaration form has been supplied	OK	OK



VALIDATION REPORT

CHECKLIST QUESTION	GS Ref.	MoV	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
h. Is a scanned copy of the Official Development Assistance Declaration statement signed by the project owner given in Annex 1?	Annex D		The ODA declaration gorm has not been included in the Annexex.	CAR14	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

**TABLE 3    LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

CHECKLIST QUESTION	Ref.	MoV*	COMMENTS	Draft Concl	Final Concl
<b>1. Legal requirements</b>					
1.1. Is the project activity environmentally licensed by the competent authority?	2	DR	Yes, the project activity is environmentally licensed by the competent authority. The project has EIA exemption letter.	OK	OK
1.2. Are the conditions of the environmental license being met?	2	DR	N/A	OK	OK
1.3 Are the conditions of the Designated National Authority being met?	2	DR	The host country does not have a DNA.	OK	OK

## VALIDATION REPORT

**TABLE 4 RESOLUTION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND CLARIFICATION REQUESTS**

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
CAR1  The brief description of the project given in section A.2. of the PDD ver 1.1. does not include the baseline scenario ( in case the baseline scenario is the same as the scenario existing prior to the start of the project activity, please state that both are the same )		CAR1. Yes both are the same, this part of the PDD is improved by inserting a new explanatory paragraph (page 2 last paragraph) in version 2.0 of the PDD.	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b> It is indicated in pg 2 of the PDD that “In the absence of the project activity (same as pre project scenario) equivalent amount of electricity would have been generated in the regional grid which is electricity deficient.”  <b><u>The corrective action request is closed.</u></b>
CAR 2  Please include the The project boundary pictorially		CAR 2 The pictorial project boundary is added as Figure 4 in the PDD version 2.0 .	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b>  Project boundary is clearly stated with Figure 4.  <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
CAR03		<b>Please see document (13b)</b>	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
The stakeholder feedback round results have not been supplied.			<p><u>The stakeholder feedback round not been completed. However, the PP has informed GS registry and has been informed that the stakeholder feedback round results may be completed during 60 days review period.</u></p> <p><b>Review 2:</b> <b>The feedback round results have been reviewed. The corrective action request has been closed.</b></p>
<p>CAR04 Do no harm assessment has not been filled in the passport. The following points could not be verified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the Project participants discussed all of the safeguarding principles with the stakeholders</li> <li>• Have the Project participants introduced mitigation measures for the safeguarding principles with a medium to high risk?</li> </ul>		CAR04:Corrected please see passport attached	<p>The corrected passport includes the safeguarding principles with clear references. It has been seen that the relevance of the indicators with the project is low or medium. Mitigation measures have been implemented for the risks that are ranked as medium.</p> <p><b><u>The CAR04 has been closed.</u></b></p>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the 'Do No Harm' Assessment base on accurate information and have the reference sources been included</li> </ul>			
CAR05 Indicators for the corresponding parameters have not been filled.		Corrected please see passport attached And the LSC report	The indicators for the corresponding parameters have been filled. <b><u>CAR 05 has been closed.</u></b> <b><u>The corrective action request is closed.</u></b>
CAR06 Baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for each parameter have not been defined in the passport.		Corrected please see passport attached And the LSC report	Baseline situation and the situation aimed for the project described for each parameter has been defined in the passport. <b><u>CAR 06 has been closed.</u></b>
CAR07 Indicators are not linked to the localized MDGs.		Corrected please see passport attached And the LSC report version 3.1 available at the registry web site and also attached to this document. There the indicators are linked to local MDG. This was corrected upon the feedback from GS and was uploaded to the registry.	<b><u>Indicators are linked to the localized MDGs.</u></b> <b><u>The corrective action request is closed.</u></b>



VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
CAR08 The reason for the choice of parameters were not defined in the Passport		Corrected please see passport attached	The parameters have been reviewed. <b><u>The corrective action request is closed.</u></b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p><b>CL1</b> The project scenario has been defined as the following by the PP in section A.2. of the PDD version 1.1; " Bilgin RES Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. plans to build a wind power plant in order to utilise renewable energy resources to generate electricity in Manisa Province. A total of 36 wind turbines, each having a capacity of 2.5 MW will be erected in Soma and Kirkagac Boroughs. 12 of the turbines will be located in Kirkagac on East of the province and 24 of them will be on West in Soma Borough. The project aims to supply a portion of country's electricity demand as well as to contribute Turkish economy. The total installed power will be <b>90 MW</b> and the annual electricity generation is calculated as <b>266,600 MWh</b>. The project will be accomplished in 32 months and the project life is expected to be 49 years."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please clearly state the investment decision date in the PDD.</li> <li>Please supply project schedule.</li> <li>Please supply production license and the purchase agreement for the verification of the</li> </ol>		<p><b>CL1</b> 1. The investment decision date is indicated in pg. 2, Paragraph 2 of the version 2.0 of the PDD by inserting the following phrase:"... , as indicated in their board decision number 12 dated June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2008 decided to invest and planed... " 2. The project schedule is inserted as Table 1. Electricity production license is given as document (1) and the turbine purchase agreement as document (2)  3.The Investment decision date is corrected on version 2.1 of the PDD at page 2 (Second paragraph of section A.2).</p>	<p><b>Review 1:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Investment decision is stated in the PDD..</u> Please correct the date.</li> <li>The project schedule is inserted as Table 1.</li> <li>Licence and turbine purchase agreement are provided to DOE. Dates of these documents are correctly indicated in the schedule.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>The date has been corrected.</u></b> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
scenario			
<p>CL2</p> <p>The view of the project participants on the contribution of the project activity has been presented in section A.2. of the PDD rev 01 in relation with the Millennium Development Goal – No:9 of Turkey as the following:</p> <p><i>“The project will utilise local resources for electricity production. This will stimulate the economic development as wind power, being an infinite and natural resource, is more ecologically and financially sustainable than other choices.</i></p> <p><i>From a local perspective, the project will provide job opportunities for local people and create household income for them. Associated works such as wiring will be done by local companies and this will increase their technological capacity in renewable energy projects and will stimulate the local economy as well.”</i></p> <p>Means of validation has been given below:</p>		<p>CL2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OK</li> <li>2. OK</li> <li>3. The wiring agreement is presented as document (3)</li> <li>4. The number of people employed by the subcontractors during the construction period is provided in the document (4). As indicated in this document project provided temporary jobs to 407 people. As the local inhabitants were not qualified they worked in construction works and in basic jobs such as catering and services.</li> </ol> <p>The Date of the document is 07/07/2010 it was signed with the initials of Mr. Ahmet Cavlı the General Manager of Bilgin Elektrik Üretim A.Ş. the project owner.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Wiring has been contracted with a local company (Areva T&amp;D).</p> <p>The document for the number of people employed has been reviewed.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>1. Since the proposed project is an energy production project from renewable sources and that the project results in no GHG emissions; it is also agreed by the DOE that the project will contribute to sustainable development (<i>OK</i>).</p> <p>2. It has been stated in section A.2. of the PDD that “.procurement of wiring will stimulate the technological capacity in renewable energy sector”. The contract for the wiring has been reviewed and the statement has been agreed.</p> <p>3. It has been agreed that local purchasing of the wiring service will create house hold income. Please supply purchase agreement etc. to the DOE to prove that the wiring will be done by local firms(<i>CL requested</i>).</p> <p>4. It has been stated that the local workforce will be employed. Please clarify the number of persons to be employed and job descriptions of the potential local recruitments (<i>CL requested</i>).</p>			



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>CL3 Means of validation on listing of project participants are given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bilgin RES Enerji Üretim A.Ş , JPMorgan Ventures Energy Corporation are the parties involved in the project. (OK)</li> <li>2. The parties involved are listed in the A.3. of the PDD using the tabular format. ( OK)</li> <li>3. The contact information has been provided in Annex 1 of the PDD. (OK)</li> <li>4. Please clarify if host Party wishes to be a project participant. ( It is stated as yes in the tabular format )</li> </ol>		<p>CL3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OK</li> <li>2. OK</li> <li>3. OK</li> <li>4. That part (section A.3)is updated to indicate “no” in version 2.0 of the PDD</li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Parties do not wish to be project participants.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p><b>CL4</b></p> <p>List and arrangement of the main manufacturing/ production technologies, systems and equipments involved have been given in section A.4 of the PDD ver 1.1. Means of validation (in addition to those given in Table 1.1.d ( of this protocol) have been given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project comprises 36 wind turbines, each having 2.5MW capacity.</li> <li>2. The installed capacity of the project is 90 MW as stated in the generation license.</li> <li>3. ) Please give present the avarege lifetime of equipments, load factors and efficiency for the turbines in the PDD. Please justify the data that will be presented.</li> <li>4. Please include a list of equipments (including the monitoring equipments) that will be installed.</li> </ol>		<p><b>CL4</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We assume this is OK</li> <li>2. We assume you have the generation licence and this is OK but we have presented the licence again as document (1) .</li> <li>3. Average life time of the turbines are indicated in the version 2.0 of the PDD as indicated in the turbine catalogue presented as document(5).Since Turbines are the main components the individual life times of each equipment to be installed is not given, since the project owner is responsible for the maintenance and running of the entire project and that information is therefore not relevant</li> <li>4. A list of equipments is included as table 3 in version 2.0 of the PDD..</li> </ol> <p>Response 2:</p> <p>3. Added answers to review 3: The Garrad Hassan report is added as a reference to indicate that the electricity amount considered in the PDD thus the load and the efficiency factor is estimated based on this report. Also the efficiency factor is indicated in the relevant paragraph,of PDD v.2.1 ( p. 2, paragraph 3 of section A.2.)</p>	<p><b>Review 1:</b></p> <p>3.Nordex catalogue provided to DOE indicates a life span of at least 20 years. OK</p> <p><u>Please provide</u> a reference for “micrositing report by Garrad Hassan and Partners Ltd” which is the evidence for efficiency.</p> <p><u>Please provide</u> information and reference about the load factor, too.</p> <p>4.List of equipments is presented in the PDD. OK</p> <p><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></p> <p><b>Validation team conclusion 2</b></p> <p>Garrad Hassan Report has been reviewed.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p><b>CL5</b> Approved consolidated baseline and monitoring methodology selected is; ACM0002 (Version 8) for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources (<a href="http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools">http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/tools</a>) Please clarify the revision of the selected methodology.</p>		<p>CL5 The version of the methodology is updated to version 12.1.0 and the relevant corrections in the PDD are made.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b> <b><u>The clarification is closed.</u></b></p>
<p><b>CL6</b> <b>The tools</b> that the methodology is used in conjunction with are given in section B.1. of the PDD version 1.1. The methodology is used in conjunction with the following tools; (a) Version 8 of ACM0002 “Consolidated baseline methodology for grid connected electricity generation from renewable sources” The above methodology is hereafter referred to as the “Baseline Methodology”. The Baseline Methodology will be used in conjunction with the approved monitoring methodology Version 8 of ACM0002 (“Monitoring Methodology”).  (b) Version 5.2 of “Tool for the demonstration</p>		<p>CL6 The tools and the version of the methodology is updated in the PDD version 2.0.  The version of the tool to calculate emission factor is 02, as also mentioned at Section B.1, p. 10 as item 8c, other pages this tool is mentioned are corrected by adding the version number 02 ( p 11, p15, p28). The reference to this tool is corrected in the relevant tables at pages 33 and 34 in the PDD version 2.1.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b>  The tools and the version of the methodology is updated in the PDD version 2.0. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
and assessment of additionality” Please clarify the tool used for the calculation of emission factor.			
<p>CL7</p> <p><i>In PDD version 1.1.; three alternatives have been defined.</i></p> <p>a. In PDD version 1.1., three alternatives have been defined Proposed project activity not undertaken as a VER project activity</p> <p>b. Supply of equal amount of electricity by the existing grid</p> <p>c. No project activity</p> <p>Please clarify if the alternative investment form a renewable energy is credible or not.</p>		<p>CL7: The tool explains that” <b>Sub-step 1a: Define alternatives to the project activity:</b></p> <p><b>(1) Identify realistic and credible alternative(s) available to the project participants or similar project developers<sup>4</sup> that provide outputs or services comparable with the proposed CDM project activity.<sup>5</sup> These alternatives are to include:</b></p> <p><b>(a) The proposed project activity undertaken without being registered as a CDM project activity;</b></p> <p><b>(b) Other realistic and credible alternative scenario(s) to the proposed CDM project activity scenario that deliver outputs services (e.g., cement) or services (e.g. electricity, heat) with comparable quality, properties and application areas, taking into account, where relevant, examples of scenarios</b></p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Please discuss in the PDD in details if and why the alternatives identified are realistic or not.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The clarification is accepted</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
		<p>identified in the underlying methodology;</p> <p>(c) If applicable, continuation of the current situation (no project activity or other alternatives undertaken). “ Also in foot note 4 it is indicated that “... a coal-fired power station or hydropower may not be an alternative for an independent power producer investing in wind energy ... Alternatives are, therefore, related to technology and circumstances as well as to the investor. ”</p> <p>Therefore as Turkey’s energy demand is increasing the only realistic and viable scenario is identified as the “<i>continuation of the existing situation</i>”, this is the reason why it is also referred to as the baseline scenario and the emission reductions are compared to the CM EF of the existing grid. This is tried to be elaborated in the existing PDD by adding the following sentence:</p> <p><b>“Since the electricity demand of Turkey</b></p>	

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
		<i>is increasing, and since there are no private sector wind farms constructed without VER revenue"</i>	
<p>CL8</p> <p>In subsection 2.c.-Section B.5 of PDD version 1.1., it has been stated that acceptable IRR values for similar projects in Turkey are announced as at least 10% for renewable projects which will benefit from the loans by World Bank. The reference given (<a href="http://www.temev.org.tr/duyurularS">http://www.temev.org.tr/duyurularS</a>) could not be reached.</p>		<p>This reference is no more available on the web site but its pdf print is provided as document (10)</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Reference is provided to DOE and the information is correct.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL9</p> <p>In PDD version 1.1. -Section B.5 Subsection 3. a.; <b>the investment barriers are;</b></p> <p><b>“Payback Period and Usage:</b> In general, wind farm investment costs are about 40% higher than those of a comparable coal-fired power plant, in terms of cost per unit of installed capacity (\$/MWh). Furthermore, the utilisation hours of wind farms are about one third of those of a coal-</p>		<p>As explained in CL7, The part related to barrier analysis is corrected according to the ACM002 v.12 and its tools please see version 2.0 of the PDD</p>	<p>The barrier analysis is removed from the PDD version 02.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>fired power plant. Therefore, the high initial investment cost leads to a longer payback period and a higher investment risk on project financing compared to more conventional fossil-fired power plants that constitute the majority of the baseline.</p> <p><b>Higher Proportional Interconnection Fees:</b> The annual fee for the usage of the interconnection line is determined in accordance with the established capacity of the power plant by TEİAŞ. However, conventional power plants tend to utilise 80-85% of their established capacity whereas wind power plants only utilise 30-45%. This means a thermal power plant and wind power plant with the same established capacity will pay the same annual fee but the wind power plant will produce significantly less electricity and therefore the fee will be a higher proportion of annual revenues<sup>†</sup>.”</p> <p><b><u>The given barriers above are related with finance. Please clarify.</u></b></p>			
CI 10		<b>Please refer to CL7 as explained there :</b>	The barrier analysis is removed

\* [www.bwea.com/energy/rely.html](http://www.bwea.com/energy/rely.html)

† The speech of Mr. Ü. Tolga Bilgin, chairman of RESSIAD, in 6<sup>th</sup> Energy Arena on March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2007 in İstanbul Continental Hotel about the Problems of Renewable Energy (<http://www.ressiad.org.tr/makaleler.php?ID=62>)

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>In clause (b) Lack of infrastructure -Technological Barriers of Substep 3-b/Step 3 /section B.5. of the PDD rev 1.1.; it has been stated that TEİAŞ has limited the capacity of the wind power to 5% of the short circuit capacity of the high voltage transmission line into which wind power is fed. Also it has been stated that many projects with high potential capacity (and therefore lower costs per installed MW) cannot be realised as the capacity is limited by the capacity of transmission line to the grid. Please justify the assumption. Please supply an appropriate proof that the barrier is strong enough to prevent the project from occurring. Please also justify how the carbon credit will benefit the barrier.</p>		<p>The part related to barrier analysis is corrected according to the ACM002 v.12 and its tools please see version 2.0 of the PDD</p>	<p>from the PDD version 02. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL11 It was stated that VER revenue was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. 03.06.2008 dated board decision has been seen by the validation team. Please supply the proof for the start of the project.</p>		<p>CL11 Please refer to table2 in PDD V.2.0, The board decision is even before the licence date, so the project owner after applying to the license considered carbon finance and on 3.06.2008 they have decided that they can only start implementing the project with the carbon finance. The construction start date is documented with document (6)</p>	<p>The proof which is social security record which is the proof for the start of the real action has been reviewed. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>CL12</p> <p>Clear and transparent references have been presented in the tabular format or additional information have been presented in Annex 3 for the parameters used in the calculation of CM emission factor.</p> <p>However the references are not given for the tables in Annex 3 . However the references are given in the PDD</p>		<p>CL12: please be more specific. And explain if this CL request is closed or not. The foot note 43 is added to the Annex 3 to indicate the obvious source of data which is the capacity projection reports available at TEİAŞ web site, in version 2.1 of the PDD.</p>	<p>Please refer the references in the PDD.</p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL13</p> <p>The parameter EGy has been defined as amount of net electricity supplied to the grid by the proposed project according to ACM002 version 8. Please clarify “the source of data” in line with the requirements of the ACM0002 version 8.</p>		<p>Please re-assess this after checking the changes in PDD version 2 that is corrected based on version 12.1.0 of the ACM0002.</p> <p>Response 2: The expression that has the same meaning as the previous one is added upon your request in version 2.1 of the PDD. Please see page 40.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Source of data is indicated as plant records/logbooks. Please include the expression “meter reading document” as source of data, too.</p> <p>The clarification request is still open.</p> <p>Review 2 :</p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
			<p>The PDD has been reviewed as the following: The electricity generated will be metered by TEİAŞ by two meters placed on the switchgear station where the plant is connected to national grid</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL14</p> <p>It has been stated that in section B.7.2 in PDD ver 1.1. that the sustainable development indicators will not be monitored. However the sustainability monitoring plan has been included in the passport. Please clarify.</p>		<p>The sustainability indicators are not included in the body of the PDD (all versions) so that the PDD will be in compliance with the UNFCCC CDM EB rules. However, the sustainability indicators that are different than “0” (zero) are going to be monitored with a separate sustainability monitoring report . Thus the indicators to be monitored are covered in the updated version of the Gold standard passport, to comply with the Gold Standard rules.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Please indicate where exactly the statement is revised.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2: The PDD version 2.5. has been reviewed.</u></b> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p><b>CL15</b></p> <p>The responsibilities for institutional arrangements for data collection and archiving have been given in section B.7.2. of the PDD REV 1.</p> <p>However, please clarify the responsibility within the company for reading the records and comparing with the invoices</p> <p>The PMUM (TEIAS) Market Balancing Center pricing and monitoring system has been changed as of 1.12.2009. Please clarify if there will be any changes in the QA/QC plans. Please clarify how the electronic and the hardy copy files/ protocols will be kept.</p>		<p>CL15</p> <p>Please refer to document (7), an internal document produced to guide monitoring of the emission reductions”Soma WPP Monitoring Manual”, this document also addresses the QA/QC procedures..</p> <p>CL15 Further comment: Please visit p. 41 of PDD version 2.1. For the QA/QC procedures the following sentence is added: <b>“In addition to this the PMUM/MFRC screen shots are also going to be used as a cross reference, to ensure the .quality and reliability of the data”</b> and as an additional note, the following sentence is added:” <b>The data collection, preparation of the monitoring report, and the QA/QC procedures that are going to be applied are detailed in the Monitoring Manual of Soma WPP, an internal document that is provided to the DOE during validation.”</b></p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b> The internal QA/QC procedures have been included in Soma WPP Monitoring Manual. Please include the related details of the procedures in the PDD as requested by the PDD template. <b><u>The clarification still open.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b> The PDD version 2.1 includes references to the monitoring manual of Soma WPP. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>CL16 Contact information of the people; Aslı Sezer Özçelik (representing JP Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation) and Tolga Bilgin (representing BİLGİN RES Elektrik Üretim A.Ş.) are given in Annex 1.</p> <p>Please clarify the specific responsibilities Aslı Sezer Özçelik and Tolga Bilgin considering the application of the baseline and monitoring methodology to the project activity.</p>		<p>CL16 These are clarified in the “Soma Monitoring Manual” document (7)</p>	<p><b>Review 1:</b></p> <p><b>Specific responsibilities of Aslı Sezer Özçelik:</b>Project consultant that prepares emission report and accompanies verification(s). Quality check of the monitoring data reported in the monitoring workbook</p> <p><b>Specific responsibilities of Tolga Bilgin:</b> Data entry in Excel workbook “SomaRESWorkbook_2010.xls”.</p> <p>Solve problems (see „Temporary electricity data collection procedure” [Section 7]).</p> <p>Responsible for QA/QC, including archiving.</p> <p>Requests calibration and</p>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
			maintenance certificates.  Roles are clearly stated.  <u><b>The clarification request is closed.</b></u>
CL17 It has been stated in section C.1.1. of the PDD version 01 that; construction of the project is expected to start in May 2009 and estimated commissioning date is Oct 2009. Please clarify the starting date of the project and supply the evidence available to support this start date into the section C.1. of the PDD.		CL17 Please refer to document (6) for the construction start date and document (8) for the commissioning date of the project. These dates are also updated in the version 2.0 of the PDD, as the project became operational during the course of the validation process.	<u><b>Review 1:</b></u> <u><b>The start date of the project has been validated by the validation team.</b></u>  <u><b>The clarification request is closed.</b></u>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>CL18</p> <p>The expected operational lifetime of the project activity has been given as 25 years in section C.1.2 of the PDD version 01.</p> <p>Please state operational lifetime of the project activity in years and months.</p> <p>Please justify the technical life time of the project.</p>		<p>CL18</p> <p>The operational life time of the project activity is revised as 20 years based on the turbine manufacturer's catalogue (document (5)). Document (5) is the justification for the revised life time of the project.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Lifetime of turbines is indicated as "20 years" in catalogues. Lifetime of turbines is indicated as "20 years and 0 months" in PDD. Document is provided to DOE.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL19</p> <p>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is not mandatory for wind power plants according to the national legislations.</p> <p>It has been stated in section D.1 of the PDD that EIA is not required for the project activity after reviewing the project documents for the Soma WPP project by the Ministry of Environment.</p> <p>Please supply the EIA exemption document and Annex 5 as referred in the PDD.</p> <p>Please clarify if there is endemic species in the</p>		<p>CL 19</p> <p>EIA exemption document is submitted as document (9). In addition to the EIA exemption at the beginning of the validation process the full EIA in the printed format is sent via "Yurtiçi" Cargo company after the site visit. As also indicated in the Project Description document (doc. 14) there are no endemic Flora and Fauna species at the project site. The project site, as shown at the English summary(doc 15) of the flora and fauna of the EIA project Description document, is close to some migration</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>"EIA not required" document is provided to DOE.</p> <p>Please clarify if there is endemic species in the project area.</p> <p>Please clarify the possible effect of the project on the birds.</p>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>project area. Please clarify the possible effect of the project on the birds.</p>		<p>routes, but it is highly unlikely that the birds will strike the turbines.</p>	<p><b><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></b></p> <p><u>Review 2:</u></p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL20</p>			

## VALIDATION REPORT

<b>Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team</b>	<b>Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2</b>	<b>Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.</b>	<b>Validation team conclusion</b>
<p>Invitations have been done by visiting, fax, e-mail, newspapers and announcement in public places. The invitation and the announcements have been realised Please clarify the time that the announcements have been for the stakeholders invitations.</p>		<p>This is clearly indicated in the revised PDD version 2.0 and the GS Passport and the GS LSC report Please clarify if this CL is closed?</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b> The invitations have been seen. It is concluded that relevant time has been allocated before the meeting. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL21 In section E.3 it has been stated that the comments noted during the LSC have been reviewed. It was concluded that there were no significant effect that would require a revision in the project design. Please clarify if there is any study carried out related to the fire risk that has been raised as a concern from the stakeholders.</p>		<p>CL21. This issue was assessed as part of the EIA assessment and the assessment concluded that the project was EIA exempted. In addition to this the project owner has to be careful and be cautious to protect its facility and surrounding against the fire risk to protect its own investment. The EIA Project description document (document 14), has a section that describe how the project proponent's staff will react to an emergency. Please see p. 36 of this project description document.</p>	<p><b><u>Review1 :</u></b> Please clarify how the concern about the fire is risk evaluated by the project owner.</p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL22 In outcome step 3b; it has been stated that the barriers analysed don't prevent the baseline alternative from implementation because</p>		<p>CL22: Please refer to version 2.0 of the PDD as this part is revised according to the version 12.1.0 of the ACM0002 methodology.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b> <b><u>The barrier analysis is removed. Hence the CI request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>government policies support nuclear energy development and and private investment is minimal. Please provide documented evidence that alternatives ( one of the alternative) are prevented or nor prevented by the barriers</p>			
<p>CL23 It was stated that VER revenue was seriously considered in the decision to proceed with the project activity. 03.06.2008 dated board decision has been seen by the validation team Please clarify the date for the main stakeholder consultation and the start date of the project</p>		<p><b>CL23</b> The Stakeholder consultation meeting was held on November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2009 in the same day in two different locations to be able to reach as many stakeholders as possible as also indicated in the LSC report. The Construction start date of the project is 20.08.2009 as shown in document (6). These are also outlined in table 1 of PDDv.2.0. No only in here, the date of the LSC meting is indicated wrong as 10.11.2009, but it is 10.11.2008, the construction started about 9 months later, after the LSC was uploaded to the registry. This is also evidenced in the document (16) LSC NewsPaperAnnouncements.</p>	<p><b>Review 1:</b> <u>The LSC is after the construction date. Please clarify.</u></p> <p><b>Review 2:</b> <u>The explanation is reviewed. The LSC is before the construction date.</u> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
CL24		CL24.Please refer to document (6) for the	<b>Review 1:</b>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p>The estimated date of construction has been given as August 2009 in the PDD version 01. Hence it is accepted.</p> <p>The estimated period for construction is expected to be 24 months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Please supply a proof for validation of the estimated construction period.</li> </ul>		<p>evidence of construction start date. There is no more estimation, the project is operational and the construction period lasted only 15 months. Much better than estimated. That sentence indicating an estimated time for the construction is also removed from version 2.0 and version 2.1 of the PDD.</p> <p>The construction period is defined here as the time elapsed between the construction start date (document 6) and the commissioning date of the last batch of Turbines (document 8).</p>	<p>The estimated period for construction is expected to be 24 months.</p> <p>Please supply a proof for validation of the estimated construction period.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL25 Please clarify if the project is a debundled project and include a written statement in the PDD.</p>		<p>Document (10 ) the official single line transmission document justifies that the project operates with two switch gear areas but under one single licences</p>	<p><b><u>The clarification is closed.</u></b></p>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
		therefore the project is neither a bundle nor a POA. This is also indicated in version 2.0 of the PDD (under section A.4.1.4).	
<p>CL26 The project has been estimated to start in August 2009. Please supply the date of registration/application to the GS to clarify if the project activity is a regular registration.</p>		<p>Please refer to GS registry page : <a href="https://gs1.apx.com/mymodule/ProjectDoc/EditProjectDoc.asp?id1=655">https://gs1.apx.com/mymodule/ProjectDoc/EditProjectDoc.asp?id1=655</a></p> <p>the report appears to be uploaded on 22 jan 2009, this is also indicated on table 5 of the PDD v.2.0</p>	<b><u>The clarification is closed.</u></b>
<p>CL27 Please supply the invitation mails/faxes sent for stakeholder consultation meeting. Please also clarify if the invitations / non-technical summary of the project were also announced in the public places. Please also clarify how participation of different genders have been compiled.</p>		<p>CL28 Supplied as document (11) The means of invitation is detailed in the GS LSC report.</p> <p>The non-technical summary is distributed in the villages. The Invitation letter faxed to the UNFCCC focal Point is provided as document 11.</p> <p>Response 2: The site is visited approximately 2 weeks prior to the announcement of the LSC meeting in the newspapers. We have</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b> Public invitations are included in the LSC report.</p> <p>Please also clarify if the non-technical summary of the project were also announced in the public places.</p> <p>Please also clarify how participation of different genders have been compiled.</p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
		visited the Muhtars in their houses, we have met there most of the women of the village and invited them to the meeting.	<p><b><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL28 A non technical summary in local language has not been included in the consultation report. Please also clarify if the non technical summary has been communicated to the stakeholders during the invitation process.</p>		<p>CL 28 Yes it was Please see doc (11) It is now attached as document 11.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>Document 11 is reviewed. .</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p>CL29 List of participants have been presented in B.3. of the stake holder consultation report. Participants to the meeting are male except the representatives of the Pioneer Carbon. Please clarify how the potential participants have been invited actively to the meeting and what action has been taken to include the views of different</p>		<p>CL29 –Please note that in the second meeting there were more female. Also they are visited and verbally asked their opinion about the meeting prior to LSC meeting. They noted that they are only happy because of the job opportunities.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

<b>Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team</b>	<b>Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2</b>	<b>Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.</b>	<b>Validation team conclusion</b>
genders to the stakeholder consultation process.			
<b>CL30</b> Please clarify If stakeholders required a revisit for the sustainable development assessment.		CL30-No as also indicated in the LSC report and Passport. CL 30 Further explanation: In the first version of the LSC report that was send to you by mistake, the part related to "Revisit sustainability assessment" was erroneously marked as yes. This is corrected in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> version which is updated after receiving feedback from GS registry. Please see that version attached.	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b>  The revised LCS report indicated that revisit sustainability assessment is not needed.  <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b><u>CL31</u></b> The consolidated sustainable development matrix presented based on own 'preliminary' scoring and the matrix from the outcome of the blind stakeholder exercise are not supplied		These are updated please see LSC and Passport's latest versions these will be uploaded to the registry by 18 Jan2011	The passport has been reviewed.  <b><u>The clarification request is closed</u></b>
<b><u>CL32</u></b> Please clarify if there are any comments received by e-mail or other means concerning the stakeholder consultation process.		<b>No there is no such comments</b>	The stakeholder feedback round has not been realised at the end of validation.  <b><u>Review 2:</u></b> <b><u>Closed.</u></b>
<b><u>CL33</u></b> The stakeholder feedback round has not been		We believe that CL 33 is incorrect. The Feedback Round has been completed.	<b><u>Review 1.</u></b> <b><u>The feedback letters have</u></b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

<b>Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team</b>	<b>Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2</b>	<b>Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.</b>	<b>Validation team conclusion</b>
implemented at the date of validation. The approach for the stakeholder feedback round has been summarized in section E.2 of the passport. The results will be followed after the stakeholder feedback round has been completed. Please supply the stakeholder feedback round results.		We enclose the letter sent to the Mukhtars, the evidence they were received. No further response was received by us. We	<u>The feedback letters have been reviewed.</u> <u>The PDD and the passport have been webhosted on 11.10.2011.</u> <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b>CL34</b> Please clarify how the stakeholders invited for participation in the Local Stakeholder Consultation have been included in the Stakeholder Feedback Round ( especially for those who do not have internet access)		CL-34 please re-visit the LSC report and the Passport We have used normal land posting See document (13). We have send the feedback documents to each of the Muhtars.	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b>  <b><u>The clarification is closed.</u></b>
<b><u>CL35</u></b> The approach includes informing of villagers by faxing the report and the summary of PDD. However the approach does not include displaying the hard copies to local places. Please clarify		CL-35 please re-visit the LSC report and the Passport We have used normal land posting See document (13). Document 13 was nested within document named Soma2 but we are now separately sending it. The feedback letters sent is also presented as document13b.	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b>  Document 13 is not available to DOE. Please provide document.  <b><u>The clarification request is still open.</u></b>  <b><u>Review 2:</u></b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
			<p>Document 13 has been reviewed by the DOE. And concluded that the hard copies are displayed in local places.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p><b>CL36</b> The approach includes informing of villagers by faxing the report and the summary of PDD. However the approach does not include displaying the hard copies to local places. Please clarify</p>		<p>CL-36 please re-visit the LSC report and the Passport We have used normal land posting See document (13 and 13b), we have also called the Muhtars and asked them to post the letters in the window of his administrative building, and we told them to share this with their villagers.</p>	<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p><u>Land posting documents have been reviewed.</u></p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p><b>CL37</b> It has been stated that necessary precautions will be taken for species under conservation by international conventions for the biodiversity parameter. However; the mitigation and the monitoring measures have not been identified for the biodiversity parameter in section F.2. of the passport. Please clarify the mitigation and the</p>			<p><b><u>Review 1:</u></b></p> <p>The EIA report has been reviewed and it has been stated that there is no species under conservation has been defined in the areas.</p> <p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
monitoring measures and justify the choices and the data sources.			
<b>CL38</b> In the table; CO2& CH4& N2O has not been included as emission sources since the WPP do not generate emissions. Please revise the wording according to the ACM version 002		Corrected please see Please see version 2.0	<b><u>Review 1:</u></b>  It is stated in the PDD that project emissions are not applicable to WPP.  <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b>CL39</b>  Please check whether the sum of Interest in "Loans Summary" sheet is the sum of the Interest figures in "Commercial Loan" and "ECA Loan" sheets.		Corrected please see Please see version 2.0 documents provided as cash flow evidences	It is seen that the summation is corrected. <b>The clarification request is closed.</b>



## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<p><b>CL 40</b>  <b>Analysis period is chosen as 20 year and since depreciation period is taken as 10 years and there is no asset to be depreciated that means, fair value of assets is “0”.</b>  <b>10 year is used to find the depreciation amounts for the investment as a whole. However, depreciation periods should be different in different asset classes. Please apply the Turkish Accounting Rules for the depreciation calculations. After this is applied, asset wouldn't be totally depreciated so fair value would be required.</b></p>		<p>Corrected please see Please see version 2.0 and the financial analysis version 9 Version 9 is calculated with 10 years of depreciation. And the numbers indicated in the PDD are taken from that version. !0 years is chosen as a company policy, however we can also present you a version of the financial analysis with 20 years of depreciation. The result is the same, the IRR is below benchmark, which is determined taking into consideration the cost of capital and the Eurobond rates. The sensitivity analysis without carbon revenue shows that the project may only become slightly more feasible than the benchmark under the extreme and unlikely conditions that the energy production will be more than 10 % and the electricity price will increase 10 %. However even if these conditions are realized the IRR is still less than the world bank's minimum 10% IRR criteria. So the project is not viable without carbon revenue.</p>	<p>It is still 10 years. But, version is supplied. So please provide the version 9 document.  Depreciation periods must differ among the different asset classes.  <b>Not closed</b>  Review 2:  The financial analysis with 20 years depreciation is reviewed and accepted. .  <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
<b>CL 41</b> Depreciation should be added back to the cash flow in the IRR on capital employed as well.		Corrected please see Please see version 2.0 and the financial analysis version 9	Depreciation is added back to the cash flow correctly, <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b>CL42</b> In PDD Eurobond rate is compared by the Capital on employed. On the other hand, it is stated that expected IRR for renewable projects is 10%. First of all, WACC result must be used to compare the Project IRR result. Or, equity IRR can be compared by the figure that is calculated by CAPM. 10% of expectation is not a verified statement.		Corrected please see Please see version 2.0 and the financial analysis version 9	IRR on Capital Employed is compared to WACC correctly. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b>CL 43</b> Sensitivity analysis should be run for the carbon excluded scenario as well		The ACM 0002 version 12.1.0 and the related tools imply only the use of sensitivity analysis for the scenario without carbon revenue.	The correction has been accepted. <b><u>The clarification request is</u></b>

## VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
			<u>closed.</u>
<b>CL 44</b> Please justify the costs in the investment analysis table.		<b>Attached as cash flow evidence</b>	The cash flow evidence has been reviewed. <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b>CL45</b> Please clarify it is reasonable to assume that no investment would be made at a rate of return lower than the benchmark by assessing the previous investment decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	Corrected please see Please see version 2.0 and the financial analysis version 9	<b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b>
<b>CL46</b>  The investment decision date has been indicated as 03.06.08. However all the proofs for the investment costs are purchase agreements which are later than the investment decision date. The proofs supplied should be basic to the investment decision. Please clarify and revise if needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	The analysis and evidence has been updated. Evidence is presented from the contract of a similar 22.5 MW wind farm Mazi3, dated 4 <sup>th</sup> March 2008, just 3 months before the Investment Decision Date for this Soma Project. This was the best information that the developer had at the time for the costs of wind investment. The cost per MW for turbines in Mazi3 project (EUR1,022,200) is used in the financial analysis and the amount per MW multiplied by 90MW to give the turbine cost – the figure that was used by the developer in	According to the “GUIDELINES ON THE ASSESSMENT OF INVESTMENT ANALYSIS” Guidance: Input values used in all investment analysis should be valid and applicable at the time of the investment decision taken by the project participant. The DOE is therefore expected to validate the timing of the investment decision and the consistency and appropriateness of the input values with this timing. The DOE



VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
		<p>the analysis for investment decision. The contract is supplied to the DOE for reference. This accounts for 90% of the project cost. We trust that it is acceptable to the DOE that 90% of costs are estimated and 10% are actual.</p> <p>Note that the turbines used in each project are the same make and model.</p> <p>Please could the DOE note that the amount of power generated by each project is not taken into account – a capital cost per MW installed is used.</p> <p>The wording of the PDD has been updated to reflect this source of information and the contract for Mazi is supplied.</p>	<p>should also validate that the listed input values have been consistently applied in all calculations.</p> <p>Rationale: The use of investment analysis to demonstrate additionality is intended to assess whether or not a reasonable investor would or not decide to proceed with a particular project activity without the benefits of the CDM. This decision will therefore be based on the relevant information available at the time of the investment decision and not information available at an earlier or later point. Any expenditures occurred prior to the decision to proceed with the investment in the project will not impact the final investment decision as such expenses sunk costs</p> <p><b>which remain unaffected by the decision to proceed or not with a project activity.</b></p>

VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
			<p>In the PDD it is stated that The investment decision was taken based on quotations from suppliers who had not yet signed contracts. The DOE has been supplied with information regarding the costs charged by suppliers based on the contracts that resulted from these quotations.</p> <p>The dates of the evidences supplied are not applicable at the time of decision. Please clarify.</p> <p><b><u>Review2:</u></b> <b><u>Please justify the appropriateness of Mazi project values for the Soma project. Please clarify if the costs are directly related with</u></b></p>



VALIDATION REPORT

Draft report clarifications and corrective action requests by validation team	Ref. to checklist question Table 1 and 2	Summary of project owner response Please summarise the change in the PDD or the project. Please also give reference to the version of the revised PDD and the section if needed.	Validation team conclusion
			<p><u>the electricity generation or number of turbines</u>  <u>The clarification request is not closed.</u></p>

VALIDATION REPORT

<p><b><u>CL47</u></b></p> <p>The QA QC procedures such as accuracy of the meters, the back up meters, archiving of the documents are not given in PDD version 2.6. It is stated that incompletely that “The data collection, preparation of the monitoring report, and the QA/QC procedures that are going to be applied are detailed in”.The sentence is incomplete. Please clarify.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>The words “the Monitoring Plan” are added. Furthermore the QA/QC procedures are also described in more detail.</p>	<p><u>The words monitoring plan are added.</u> The QA QC procedures are described in a more detail. The clarification is accepted. <b>The clarification is closed.</b></p>
<p><b><u>CL48</u></b></p> <p>It has been stated in GS passport Additional remarks part that the dead birds will be recorded by the security personnel. However please clarify the frequency and records ( QA / QC) in the sustainability monitoring plan for the verification period.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>“on an annual basis at time of Verification” has been added</p>	<p><b>Review1:</b></p> <p><b>Please supply the Gold Standard Passport.</b></p> <p><b><u>Review2:</u></b></p> <p><b>It has been stated that the records will be kept on an annual basis.</b> <b><u>The clarification is closed.</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>CL49</u></b></p> <p>In Gold Standard Passport version 2 the following issues have been recorded;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>This evidence will be provided at the site at the time of first verification, this is already stated in the Monitoring Plan. The Monitoring plan has been updated to</p>	<p><b><u>Review1:</u></b></p> <p><b>Please supply the Gold Standard Passport.</b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b></p>

VALIDATION REPORT

<p>It has been stated the necessary improvements and renovations of the roads would be made for the proper transportation of the turbine components.</p> <p>It has been stated that stakeholders were ensured that there will not be massive consignments but the turbines will be secured by individual fencing as verified during the site visit through the conversations with the stake holders.</p> <p>It has been stated that minimal risk of fire due wind farm operation. However there will be an emergency action plan to be prepared for any kind of fire incidence.</p> <p>It has been stated that during construction such micro reservoirs can be built to help collect water precipitation during rainy days and save the water for dry times.</p> <p>It has been stated that there will not be massive construction affairs but dust will be managed and controlled by regularly spraying the excavations and road construction sites.</p> <p>It has been stated that during the construction stage the roads will be improved and renewed</p> <p>Since the above issues were not included in the monitoring plan, please include the related</p>		<p>include the parameters requested here but not previously mentioned.</p> <p>This is also added to “Additional Remarks on Monitoring” in the Passport provided</p>	<p><b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>
---	--	---	---

VALIDATION REPORT

<p>evidence.</p> <p><b><u>CL50</u></b></p> <p>It has been stated that the water for domestic uses will be supplied by tankers and wastewater will be collected in septic tanks and disposed regularly in accordance with Water Pollution Control Regulations. It has been stated in GS passport that the waste oil will be collected and transferred to recycling centre in accordance with the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations and Waste Oil Control Regulations.</p> <p>It has been stated the lubricants are going to be collected in impermeable containers and will be sent to the recycling facilities</p> <p>Please clarify the precautions taken during construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><u>Each of these points have been added to the Monitoring Plan and presented at the first Verification. The Monitoring Report and Passport have been updated accordingly.</u></p>	<p><b><u>Review1:</u></b> <b><u>The clarification is closed.</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>CL51</u></b></p> <p>Please update the Gold Standard Monitoring Manual and Gold Standard PDD for the contact person on behalf of J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>The PDD is updated</p>	<p><b><u>Review1:</u></b> In Annex 1 of PDD version 2.6 (sent on 26.07.2011) Annex 1 is not revised. <b>Clarification request is still open</b></p> <p><b><u>Review 2:</u></b> The PDD is updated.</p>



VALIDATION REPORT

<p><b><u>CL 52</u></b>                  The investment cost of the project is assumed based on the installed capacity. However, the cost is directly related with the number of turbines Please clarify.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>This has been resolved by email correspondence</p>	<p><b><u>Review1:</u></b>  <b><u>The clarification is request is closed.</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>CL53</u></b>                  The Passport has not been updated according to the updated generation capacity etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p>Passport is updated</p>	<p><b><u>Review1:</u></b>  <b><u>The clarification request is closed.</u></b></p>