

PROJECT REVIEW REPORT

This document tracks the findings raised in Verra’s review of the project specified below. The VVB must address the findings before the project request can be considered by Verra for approval. The document will be made publicly available on the Verra Registry. Confidential information may be provided as separate attachments.

Review Type	Crediting period renewal
Project ID	753
Project Name	The Cevizlik Run-of-River-Hydroelectric Power Plant
Program(s)	VCS
Verification Period	N/A
Project Proponent	SANKO ENERJI SANAYI VE TICARET. A.S.
Methodology	ACM0002: Consolidated baseline methodology for grid-connected electricity generation from renewable sources, Version 20.
VVB	Earthood Services Private Limited
Assessment Criteria	VCS Version 4.2
Date of First Issue	6 August 2022
Review Conclusion	11 January 2023
Date of Final Issue	17 January 2023

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

#	Description	Response	Status
1	<p>Commercially sensitive information:</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The project proponent mentions under Section 1.17 of the project description, “Sanko Enerji Sanayi ve Ticaret A.S. does not find it ethical to announce these social and financial aids, therefore this is commercially sensitive information that needs to be excluded from the public version of the VCS project description that will be displayed on the VCS Project Database.”</p> <p>Action required:</p> <p>The VWB must ensure that the project proponent has provided another project description in PDF that will be visible to the public so that commercially sensitive information is protected.</p> <p>Program rule:</p> <p>VCS version 4.2, Section 3.4.1</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VWB Response:</p> <p>PP has updated section 1.18 “Commercially Sensitive Information” in the revised PD. Hence, it is concluded that there is no commercially sensitive information that needs to be excluded from the public version of the VCS project description.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.</p>	Closed
2	<p>The reason for changing the other entity is not given:</p> <p>Issue:</p> <p>The names of the other entities are the same as those in the registered project description. If there was a change in the name, this is reflected in the current CPR project description but the reason for changing has not been given.</p> <p>Action required:</p>	<p>Round1:</p> <p>VWB Response:</p> <p>It has been understood that the project owner had initially agreed with another Carbon Consultant named as Ecosur for its initial validation. It is also apparent that soon after validation, they had ended their agreement as the first and second</p>	Closed

The VVB must ensure that the project proponent uses the same names of the other entities as those in the registered project description. And if there was a change in the name, this should be clearly described as well as the reason for this change.

Program rule:

Monitoring Reports were prepared by the Project Owners. Sanko Enerji Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş started working with Gaia Finansal Danışmanlık Hizmetleri Ticaret Limited Şirketi (Gaia Climate) for its third verification for the duration of 2012-2018. The Consultancy Agreement between Enerji Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş and Gaia Finansal Danışmanlık Hizmetleri Ticaret Limited Şirketi (Gaia Climate) is still valid and hence Gaia Climate is listed as consultant under section 1.6 “Other Entities Involved in the Project” of the renewal PD. The reason for the change could just be commercial and does not affect in any way the renewal of the crediting period of the project activity.

Verra Review:

This explanation is sufficient. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.

3 The regulatory surplus requirements is not demonstrated:

Issue:

The project proponent does not demonstrate how the project meets the regulatory surplus requirement as part of the additionality assessment at renewal of crediting period under Section 3.5 of the project description.

Action required:

1. The VVB must ensure that the project proponent explains under Section 3.5 of the VCS project description how the project meets the regulatory surplus requirements as part of the additionality assessment at renewal of crediting period.

Round1:

Closed

VVB Response:

The PP has demonstrated the regulatory surplus of the project activity in line with para 3.8.9 (1) of VCS Standard, version 4.3 under section 3.5 of the revised PD. The VVB has accordingly provided the assessment opinion under section 3.3.5 of the revised Validation Report. The VVB therefore concludes that the Project activity entitled “Cevizlik Run-of-River Hydroelectric Power Plant” is a voluntary activity is not a mandate to meet the

<p>2. The VVB must assess this explanation in the validation report.</p> <p>Program rule:</p> <p>VCS version 4.2, Section 3.8.9 (1)</p>	<p>regulatory compliances or any obligations of the host country, Turkey.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>The regulatory surplus has been demonstrated. This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.</p>
<p>4 Formatting:</p> <p>Please correct the numbering and formatting of the project description.</p>	<p>Round1: Closed</p> <p>VVB Response:</p> <p>The VVB confirms that formatting and numbering has been corrected in the revised PD.</p> <p>Verra Review:</p> <p>This finding is now closed, and no further response is required.</p>